UHCC Workshop on Program Review
Aug 7-8, 2006 ? Windward CC

Survey was distributed online via SurveyMonkey from August 11-21, 2006 to the 42 participants who had signed in at the workshop. The request to complete the survey was answered by a very high percentage (79%): 30 completed the survey (71%), while 3 declined.

1. Please evaluate these workshop activities:

	Poor 1	2	3	4	5	Excl. 6	No Opinion	Avg.
Introduction – Morton	1	0	1	2	5	18	3	5.37
How we got to where we are – Rota, Chappell-Long	0	3	4	8	9	4	2	4.25
Breakout sessions	0	0	2	4	10	13	1	5.17
Workshop length & activities	2	1	3	5	12	7	0	4.50
Adequacy of WinCC site	0	0	0	2	13	14	1	5.41

Total Respondents = 30. Skipped this question = 0.

2. Rate how well the workshop helped clarify your understanding of doing and using program review.

Category	No.	Pct.	
1. A little	2	7.4%	
2.	1	3.7%	
3.	1	3.7%	
4.	9	33.3%	
5.	7	25.9%	
6. A lot	6	22.2%	
7. Other; specify	1	3.7%	Gave clarification on how other people and campuses are doing it.

Total Respondents = 27. Skipped this question = 3.

3. I wish more time were spent on:

Making concrete decisions. In the instructional session, it seemed that many tentative decisions could have been made and then left to the PRC to decide what actions to take on those decisions. All it seemed like we were doing was to go in circles.

On concrete decisions.

How we can use the data that is produced to help efficiently run all the campuses.

Through the course of our conversations it occurred to me that organizationally we would all benefit from doing a formal Needs Assessment. This way we aren't just looking at the program review process, we are looking at what is not working in the organization and coming up with a plan to move us to where we need to be. Program review is just a piece of the pie. More time needs to be spent on collaboration and understanding issues and less time spent on covering one's backside and trying to assign blame. I wish more time was spent on importance of accountability in the organization. A "RACI" model works well in business & should be a good starting place.

Figuring out how what elements would be useful in the program review process.

Re: the Instruction breakout group... determining core elements; re: the groups as a whole…determining the program review timeline/ deadlines & the criteria and procedure for distribution of funds.

Limiting the 42 indicators and consolidating into one common system data collection infrastructure. Another committee now needs to come forward with recommendations.

Developing benchmarks and defining healthy, cautionary and unhealthy programs.

Discussing benchmarking. Very interesting to me and most difficult to figure out, I think.

Updating the status of the Academic Support template and how it will be finalized and operationalized.

More dialogue.

This program was well-planned and executed.

The time was adequate.

I think the time we spent was pretty much right. Any more time and we would have been groggy and, worse, going in circles or trying to make decisions without necessary data. We might have given ourselves a little more time to share the results of the separate discussions.

4. I wish less time were spent on:

How we got there. It's true that the context and reason for the meetings was important, but the majority of folks knew the history. Perhaps the newbies could have been invited to come an hour earlier to hear the lead-in to the current discussion.

History.

The expectations of ACCJC; since it's an accreditation year, we're all very aware of the importance and function of program review.

Maybe we could have gotten into the breakouts sooner, but generally, I think we had the right timing.

Listening to system office personnel tell us that they have been providing the supporting data that we need all along.

Everything.

The 2nd day -- I wish there were no second day.

Rehashing what data was necessary.

Complaining.

The handouts for the second session could have been sent to us in advance for review. This would have given us more time for large group discussion on analyzing our program review process.

The time was adequate.

N/A.

5. Comments and suggestions:

Good to get different people together at the same time -- look at the issues from different views.

We need to do more of these kinds of cross-functional discussions.

Continued collaboration across the organization will pay off ten fold in the investment. A good mix of expertise is necessary in the program review process if a quality end product is desired. Thanks for the opportunity to participate. Good idea with the survey too.

Everything seemed to work out fairly well. I can't think of anything I would have cut shorter or made longer. The mix of CAOs, Chancellors, and IR analysts was very useful. Should happen more often.

We will all move forward from here. It was extremely valuable to have all the various groups together.

I learned a lot meeting with the ADMIN group. This workshop was a very good pro-fessional development opportunity for me.

Faculty members need to be at the table. They are central to actually doing the things, or they should be. Sure if the administration did them we'd be more uniform, more timely and possibly with less bellyaching. But we would have shelf documents at the end.

Outcomes of the sessions were reasonable and do-able.

This was very helpful. Now that we are reconstituting the system, it's time to act like one instead being seven distinct entities doing analysis that doesn't allow for norms and benchmarks.

It was a very well organized and coordinated two days of meeting with colleagues. More of these type sessions should be organized in the future that brings us together to discuss issues and to get to know each other better.

Recommend having this annually.

The workshop could have completed in much less time. Half of the first day (Rota/Chappell-Long) could have been eliminated. Small group discussions with members of all breakout groups together in one room would have been more productive, especially in establishing what the PRC (Program Review Cadre) would look like.

To have a better agenda.

Keep the momentum and direction that was set in terms of a Program Review Coordinating Council up.

Have colleges present best practices.

Survey templates developed by IR.

We are all in this together. System no doubt provides resources that are not properly appreciated. However, we are also provided data support that is difficult to appreciate. The Academic Program Profiles provide a case in point. This source includes erroneous information which makes trust in the entire product difficult until a full accounting of the errors is made public.

Many thanks to Louise. She did a marvelous job at facilitating the instruction group and in summarizing the group's Monday discussion. Suggest that she or Suzette facilitate the next PRC meetings. end product is desired. Thanks for the opportunity to participate. Good idea with the survey too.