GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Annual Program Review   2012-2013 ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAMS

RESEARCH, PLANNING & GRANTS

Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be reviewed and <u>submitted to the Program Review</u> <u>Office</u> <u>by the Manager.</u>

Author/Manager: Edward Karpp

Date Received by Program Review: January, 15, 2013

1.0. Trend Analysis

Please provide the following information for the service functions within your area. Use the data to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures.

SERVICE / FUNCTION	Service Provided	Contacts/ Production/ Recipients	Academic Year			
			2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Institutional Research	Produce publications to support decision-making (Campus Profile, Student Views, Campus Views, Community Profile, Planning Handbook, Institutional Effectiveness Report)	About 400 recipients for Campus Profile; 50-100 recipients for other publications	5	5	6	6
	Provide evaluation information for grant-funded programs and other special programs (e.g., information competency program, Title V grants, basic skills programs, etc.)	About 10-15 basic skills programs and 3 Title V grants				
	Conduct surveys of students and faculty/staff	300-400 responses to faculty/staff survey; 2,000 responses to student survey	2 formal surveys	2 formal surveys	2 formal surveys	2 formal surveys
	Provide program review data to instructional programs	15 instructional divisions				
	Coordinate responses to external surveys and reporting (IPEDS, Gainful Employment, Student Right-to-Know, etc.)	External surveys completed (3-5 per year)				

	Handle ad hoc requests for information, including PeopleSoft queries	Requests			
	Coordinate CCFS 320 apportionment reporting to state (3 reporting periods in January, April, and July every year)				
Planning	Support college planning process and accreditation reports by providing data, facilitating meetings, etc.				
Grants	Maintain college grants approval process and grants website				
	Support grant writing by providing data and evaluation expertise				

STAFFING	FTEF	Mgmt.	Classified	Hourly	Student Workers Hrs.
2007-2008	2.0	1.0	1.0	0	0
2008-2009	3.0	1.0	2.0	0	0
2009-2010	3.0	1.0	2.0	0	0
2010-2011	3.0	1.0	2.0	0	0
2011-2012	3.0	1.0	2.0	0	0

1.1. Describe any trends and how this affects students (if applicable) and or your service recipients, area or the district.

Reporting requirements have increased. Gainful Employment disclosure began in 2011-2012. The college joined a data sharing partnership run by the Institute for Evidence Based Change in 2012-2013. The office took over responsibility for state apportionment reporting in 2011-2012. The office contributes to reporting for the college's two solo Title V grants and one cooperative Title V grant, all of which began in 2012-2013.

1.2. Please explain any other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

2.0. Program Level Outcomes

Please provide the following information for each outcome developed within your area.

Program Service/Function	Program Outcome Developed (describe)	How will the outcome be assessed?	Have outcomes been assessed? Y or N	Has the assess-ment data been analyzed? Y or N	Has the data been used for program changes or improve-ment? Y or N
Research & Planning	Satisfaction (measured through a survey in 2011-2012)	Survey results	Y	Y	N

2.1. Please comment on your answers above. Include whether evidence from assessments shows that the program is improving and/or achieving desired outcomes

> Satisfaction with Research, Planning, and Grants was assessed with an online survey in 2011 of administrators, division chairs, and other faculty leaders. (The survey was not repeated in 2012 due to the collegewide faculty/staff survey, which is normally conducted in early November but which was moved to the end of November in 2012 because of the election that included Proposition 30.)
>
> The survey results showed satisfaction with the office. When asked "How would you rate the Research & Planning office's overall contribution to supporting GCC's mission?", all 21 respondents answered either "Excellent" (81%) or "Good" (19%).
>
> The lowest level of agreement in the 2011 survey was in response to the item "Research & Planning has an adequate number of staff," with only 29% of respondents with an opinion agreeing.

2.2. Briefly summarize any elements of your program/services that have been changed or will be changed as a result of your outcomes assessments

> Because of the survey item on inadequate staffing and increasing demands for data internally (e.g., annual program review, more IHAC requests, enrollment management requests, and a greater emphasis on data-based decision-making) and externally (e.g., Federal gainful employment disclosure and reporting requirements), additional staffing will be requested in future years. For this year, a resource request will be made to move one full-time position's salary from restricted funding to the unrestricted general fund. (This same request was first made in the 2011-2012 program review and was not funded.)
>
> A request made in 2011-2012 for upgrades to the office's SPSS statistical analysis software was funded through the Title V grants. These upgrades have improved our ability to conduct statistical analyses and made operations more efficient. An 8-year-old computer and monitor were also replaced, also increasing efficiency and research capacity.

2.3 Based on the program assessment evidence you have gathered, please comment briefly on how far along your department/program is in the assessment process (change and/or improvement and your plans to continue progress.

> We plan to continue the assessment survey next year.

3.0. Reflection and Action Plans

3.1 Based on your data and analysis presented above, as well as on issues or items that you were unable to discuss above, please comment on the Strengths and Weaknesses of the program.

Strengths
List the current strengths of your program

1. Institutional commitment to research and data-based decision-making
2. Staff experience and education in statistical analysis
3. Involvement in college governance and other processes such as accreditation and program review

3.2 Weaknesses
List the current weaknesses of your program

1. Insufficient staffing and dependence on short-term grant funding
2. Inefficient access to data necessary for analysis and decision support
3. Lack of resources, including staffing, to support college grants function

3.3   Using the weaknesses, trends and assessment outcomes as a basis for your comments, please briefly describe any future plans and/or modifications for program improvements. Any plans for reorganization should also be included, along with a resource request (if applicable).

Plans or Modifications	Anticipated Changes/ Improvements	Link to EMP, Plans, Outcomes
Subscribe to Foundation Directory Online database of potential grant funders	Improved access to information about sources of private grants to improve the college's grants function (this will address the weakness listed above, lack of resources to support college grants function)	Goals 2.2 (grant-writing function) and 4.4 (Establish a centralized, GCCD-wide grant-writing function)
Move one position funding from categorical funding to the general fund	Improved flexibility of work assignments (this will address the weakness listed above, insufficient staffing and dependence on short-term grant funding)	Goal 3.1 (Implement empirically-based planning and decision-making)

10.15.12

4

2012 PROGRAM REVIEW

Section 4
Resource Request

Research, Planning & Grants *Change in Funding Source for Staff Position*	A: RP-1

Mark Type of Request:

	Facilities / Maintenance			Computer Hardware
	Classroom Upgrade			Software/Licenses/Maintenance Agreements
	Instructional Equipment			Conference/Travel
	Non-Instructional Equipment			New Classified Position
	Supplies			Replacement of Classified Position
			X	Other

4.1 Clearly describe the resource request.

Move funding for one classified staff position (Planning & Research Analyst) from categorical funding (Title V grants) to the unrestricted general fund.

Amount requested $ 67,000 per year from restricted to unrestricted general funding

4.2 Funding

	Requires one time funding
X	Requires ongoing funding
X	Repeat Request
2011	Year(s) Requested

4.3 Please check if any off the following special criteria apply to this request:

	Health & Safety Issue
	Accreditation Requirement
	Contractual Requirement
	Legal Mandate

4.4. Justification and Rationale: What EMP goal, plan, program level outcome or institutional level outcome (core competency) does this request address? Please use information from your report to support your request.

Terrence Yu's position is funded by basic skills and Title V. He is only assigned projects that relate to Title V activities. Moving funding to the unrestricted general fund would make it possible to assign him more flexibly to improve the ability of the program to respond to internal and external requests for data and analysis. This relates to EMP Goal 3.1, Implement empirically-based planning and decision-making.

4.3. What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?

Improved ability for the program to respond to internal and external requests for data and analysis; improved knowledge base for employee to help decision-making across the college.

APPROVAL

AGENCY	DECISION	
The Program Review Committee has reviewed the information in this request and finds it to be:	COMPLIANT	**X**
	NON COMPLIANT OR INCOMPLETE	
	a) Request not adequately described or incomplete	
	b) Request not linked to assessments or assessments not completed	
	c) Request not linked to EMP, plan or SLO,PLO or ILO	
	d) Report Incomplete	
PRC Comments		

Form Revised 9.19.12

Reports determined to be "Non-Compliant" will be returned to the division member responsible. Reports must be resubmitted with needed changes to the Program Review Office. Requests will not move forward in the budget process if the report or request is Non-Compliant.

2012 PROGRAM REVIEW

**Section 4
Resource Request**

Research, Planning & Grants: *Subscription to Grants Database*	A: RP-12

Mark Type of Request:

	Facilities / Maintenance			Computer Hardware
	Classroom Upgrade			Software/Licenses/Maintenance Agreements
	Instructional Equipment			Conference/Travel
	Non-Instructional Equipment			New Classified Position
	Supplies			Replacement of Classified Position
			X	Other

4.1 Clearly describe the resource request.

Subscribe to the Foundation Directory Online grants database with a Professional single-user plan for one year.

Amount requested $ 1,295
):

4.2 Funding

X	Requires one time funding
	Requires ongoing funding
	Repeat Request
	Year(s) Requested

4.3 Please check if any off the following special criteria apply to this request:

	Health & Safety Issue
	Accreditation Requirement
	Contractual Requirement
	Legal Mandate

4.4. Justification and Rationale: What EMP goal, plan, program level outcome or institutional level outcome (core competency) does this request address? Please use information from your report to support your request.

The college's capacity for identifying grant opportunities is not strong. A subscription to the Foundation Directory Online would greatly increase our capacity to find grants, particularly from private organizations. This is directly related to EMP goals 2.2 (grant-writing function) and 4.4 (Establish a centralized, GCCD-wide grant-writing function). This request is being made for one year to try out the database to see if it is helpful.

4.3. What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?

Improved ability for the college to identify grant funds; increased amount of grant funds

APPROVAL

AGENCY	*DECISION*	
The Program Review Committee has reviewed the information in this request and finds it to be:	COMPLIANT	**X**
	NON COMPLIANT OR INCOMPLETE	
	a) Request not adequately described or incomplete	
	b) Request not linked to assessments or assessments not completed	
	c) Request not linked to EMP, plan or SLO,PLO or ILO	
	d) Report Incomplete	
PRC Comments		

Form Revised 9.19.12

Reports determined to be "Non-Compliant" will be returned to the division member responsible. Reports must be resubmitted with needed changes to the Program Review Office. Requests will not move forward in the budget process if the report or request is Non-Compliant.