

---

**Allan Hancock Joint Community College District  
Board Policy  
Chapter 3 – General Institution**

---

**BP 3255 PROGRAM REVIEW**

The primary purpose of program review is to determine program effectiveness; its processes are designed to recognize good performance and to identify and assist programs needing improvement. Program review also drives the institution's annual planning and resource allocation processes. All educational programs, student support services, and administrative departments of Allan Hancock College will be reviewed at least once every six years in accordance with the procedures. Based on findings and recommendations, such reviews may result in expansion or modification of programs, services, or departments, or a recommendation of further review to assess vitality and feasibility. Board Policy 4021 addresses the process to assess instructional and student services programs recommended for vitality review.

The superintendent/president may initiate an additional program review based on the needs of the district.

**References: Educational Programs:**

Education Code Section 78016  
Title 5 Section 51022  
Title 5 Section 53200  
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges - Standard 2

**Student Services Programs:**

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges - Standard 2

**Administrative Programs:**

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges – Standard 3

---

**Adopted: 1/16/85**  
**Revised: 3/17/98**  
**Revised: 1/25/00**

**Revised: 1/11/01**  
**Revised: 3/11/04**  
**Revised: 12/16/08**  
**Revised: 6/18/13**  
**Revised: 8/11/15**

*(Replaces Board Policy 7930)*

---

**Allan Hancock Joint Community College District**  
**Administrative Procedure**  
Chapter 3 – General Institution

---

## **AP 3255 PROGRAM REVIEW**

### **EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW**

#### **ALL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

1. Each spring semester, the Office of the Chief Instructional Officer notifies the appropriate academic dean which programs are scheduled to undergo program review for the succeeding year. The academic dean or supervising administrator notifies the department and/or program no later than April 1. The schedule is submitted to the Superintendent/President at the beginning of each fall semester.
2. The Academic Senate has primary responsibility for creating and revising processes for reviewing educational programs and services.
3. The department chair and all full-time instructors in the program comprise the self-study team. The self-study or update will, whenever possible, reflect the opinions of all discipline instructors. Associate faculty are encouraged to participate. CSEA members who are instructional staff are encouraged to participate on teams when appropriate.
4. The self-study team will use program data and evaluation criteria as a basis for preparing and writing an evaluation report. The self-study report includes a follow-up on the plan of action for the previous program review, a description of the program, an appraisal of the program, an assessment plan, and a new plan of action which identifies needed resources.
5. The self-study report is submitted to the appropriate academic dean by the first week of December for review. A copy is submitted to the Chief Instructional Officer by the second week of December.
6. The self-study report is made available to a validation team before the end of the semester in which the study was initiated.

7. The validation team is comprised of the dean of the area, one faculty member from a related discipline/program, and two faculty members from unrelated disciplines. At the option of the self-study team, the validation team may also include one or more of the following:
  - a. someone from a four-year institution in the same discipline.
  - b. someone from another community college in the same discipline.
  - c. a high school instructor in the same discipline.
  - d. a member of an advisory committee for the program.
8. The validation team prepares a cover report following its review of the self-study including observations and recommendations. This report is completed within one month of receipt of the self-study and is made available to the self-study team, who reviews it for accuracy of information. Recommendations may include the following:
  - a. continue the program as presently offered.
  - b. modify the program in specific ways.
  - c. review the program for vitality and feasibility under Board Policy 4021.
9. Every spring semester subsequent to the completion of the comprehensive six-year program review, the department or program submits an annual update to the program review by the end of the second week of April to be part of institutional prioritization the following fall.
10. For vocational programs the annual update replaces the two-year program and addresses, in addition to the other components, whether the program:
  - a. meets a documented labor market demand.
  - b. does not represent unnecessary duplication of other manpower training programs in the area.
  - c. is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students.
11. Upon completion (by the end of the second week of April), the program review or annual update is forwarded to the dean and department to be used for unit- and district-level planning and budgeting. The dean forwards one copy of the completed report to the Chief Instructional Officer. An electronic copy is sent to Institutional Research for archiving.
12. If the program review recommends a vitality review, the processes and procedures in Board Policy 4021 will be followed.

Adopted: 3/11/04  
Revised: 12/16/08  
Revised: 5/21/13  
Revised: 7/14/15

## **STUDENT SERVICES PROGRAM REVIEW**

1. Each spring semester, the Chief Student Services Officer notifies the appropriate dean or supervising administrator which programs are scheduled to undergo program review for the succeeding year. The appropriate dean or supervising administrator notifies the department and/or program no later than April 1. The schedule is submitted to the Superintendent/President at the beginning of each fall semester.
2. The Academic Senate has primary responsibility for creating and revising processes for reviewing educational programs and services.
3. The team is chaired by a full-time faculty person in the discipline area whenever possible and who has primary responsibility for writing the self-study. If not possible, the team is chaired by the program dean or director. The team consists of at least one full-time faculty member from within the program, if applicable; one representative from within that student services area, and an additional student services representative from another student services area. Every effort will be made to include a CSEA member on each team. Part-time faculty and a student are encouraged to participate. Additional members from within the program may serve as resources to the Program Review Team as their work assignment pertains to the program review development.
4. The self-study team will use program data and evaluation criteria as a basis for preparing and writing an evaluation report. The content of the report includes a follow-up on the plan of action for the previous program review, a description of the program, an appraisal of the program, an assessment plan, and a new plan of action which identifies needed resources.
5. The self-study report is made available to a validation team before the end of the semester in which the study was initiated.
6. The Chief Student Services Officer appoints the chair of the validation team. The chair will be a dean, director, or coordinator from another student service area. The remaining members of the validation team include one faculty member (from outside of student services) and one other student service representative. Optional members of the validation team may also include one or more of the following:
  - a. someone from a four-year institution in the same service area;
  - b. someone from another community college in the same service area;
  - c. a high school representative;
7. Written notification of the proposed composition of the validation team is forwarded to the Chief Student Services Officer for approval.

8. The validation team prepares a cover report following its review of the self-study including observations and recommendations. The report is completed within one month of receipt of the self-study and is made available to the self-study team, who reviews it for accuracy of information. Recommendations may include the following:
  - a. continue the program as presently offered.
  - b. review or modify the program in specific ways.
  - c. review the program for vitality and feasibility under Board Policy 4021.
9. The validation team chair forwards one copy of the self-study recommendations and the final validation report to the Chief Student Services Officer.
10. Every spring semester subsequent to the completion of the comprehensive six-year program review, the department or program submits an annual update to the program review by the end of the second week of April to be part of institutional prioritization the following fall.
11. Upon completion (by the end of the second week of April), the program review or annual update is forwarded to the appropriate dean or supervising administrator and department to be used for unit- and district-level planning and budgeting. The administrator forwards one copy of the completed report to the Chief Student Services Officer. An electronic copy will be sent to Institutional Research for archiving.
12. If the program review recommends a vitality review, the processes and procedures in Board Policy 4021 will be followed.

Adopted: 3/11/04  
Revised: 5/21/13  
Revised: 7/14/15

## ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT PROGRAM REVIEW

1. The superintendent/president will establish the schedule for review of programs.

2. Administrative programs are identified as:

### Administrative Services

- Business Services
- Auxiliary Accounting Services
- Bookstore
- Campus Police
- Auxiliaries-PCPA

### Academic Affairs

- Institutional Grants
- Institutional Research and Planning

### Facilities and Operations

- Plant Services

### President's Office

- Allan Hancock College Foundation
- Human Resources
- Information Technology Services
- Public Affairs and Publications
- Campus Graphics

3. Under the oversight of a cabinet level administrator, each administrative department manager shall develop a program review document based on data and evidence to assess and improve performance on established functions and Service Area Outcomes (SAO). Service Area Outcomes reflect the measures of effectiveness of the department functions. For example, if the function is payroll, an effective Service Area Outcome would be to process payroll on time with 99 percent accuracy. Example 2: If the function is Plant Services repairs, an effective Service Area Outcome would be to complete all work orders in a timely manner. Example 3: If the function is grant applications, an effective Service Area Outcome would be to file X amount of grant applications and complete the application process on time. The program review includes an Action Plan. Program review will be relied upon for integrating the planning and budgeting processes.

4. The manager responsible for the program review will establish a 3-4 member committee that includes members of the department and at least one external team member approved by the superintendent/president or cabinet level administrator.

a. The external member will provide validation to the program review by preparing a memo including the following:

Structural review: Does the report include the program scope, surveys or other data related to outcomes assessment, quantitative and qualitative data related to operations, findings and an action plan?

- Observations: Does the external team member find the information in the program review valid and accurate? Is there any important information missing?
- Commendations: Are there any areas in which the program deserves a commendation for performance excellence?
- Findings/Action Plan: Are the findings accurate and related to the outcomes assessment? Does the action plan address improvements based on outcomes assessment? Is the action plan reasonable and attainable within one program review cycle?

The external validation memo will be made available to the entire program review team, and included as an attachment to the program review when it is submitted to the appropriate cabinet member and the Institutional Research Office.

5. The written program review will include the following components:

- a. **Scope** A description of the current scope of services including the specific functions performed by the department and who it serves.
- b. **Survey** Data and analysis of performance on stated functions and Service Area Outcomes to include the following steps:
  - A survey instrument developed in collaboration with the office of Institutional Research and Planning appropriate to evaluating the performance of the department functions and Service Area Outcomes.
  - The survey will be distributed college-wide by the office of Institutional Research and Planning.
  - A compilation and analysis of survey results to measure the degree of effectiveness to which Service Area Outcomes are being achieved.
- c. **Current demand for services** Quantitative and qualitative data based on survey results, constituent feedback, evolving organizational needs, changes in technology, etc.
- d. **Findings** Recommendations to improve department performance in its functions and Service Area Outcomes:
  - Plans for expansion and improvement
  - Facility needs
  - Technology needs
  - Current and future staffing requirements



- e. **Action Plan** An Action Plan that details activities, responsibilities, timelines, measures of effectiveness and funding needs, if applicable. The plan provides for continuous improvement in Service Area Outcomes and links to the district's strategic plan.
- 6. The manager responsible for the program under review will coordinate the process and complete the written report in collaboration with the program review committee. The written report will be submitted to the appropriate cabinet member.
- 7. After approval by the appropriate cabinet member, the program review and annual update will be used for the unit and district level planning and budgeting. Send the completed program review electronically to Institutional Research for archiving.
- 8. A program review shall be conducted by each department in a six year cycle. Departments will annually review their program review and update their action plans.

Adopted: 3/11/04  
Revised: 12/16/08  
Revised: 6/19/12

---

**Approved: 1/16/85**  
**Revised: 3/17/98**  
**Revised: 1/25/00**  
**Revised: 1/11/01**  
**Revised: 3/11/04**  
**Revised: 12/16/08**  
**Revised: 6/18/13**  
**Revised: 7/14/15**

*(Replaces Administrative Procedures 7930.01,  
7930.02, 7930.03)*