Establish criteria, determine process and conduct evaluation of the effectiveness of the link between SLO assessment and program review to resource allocation.

Over the last 5-6 years, PRAC has worked diligently to review requests for equipment, supplies, staffing and faculty positions. The program review (PR) template includes space for writers to justify their requests in terms of student access, success and outcomes. Most things directly relate to student outcomes – whether it is the deeper commitment a full time teacher brings to teaching, the additional assistance in navigating the college that students receive from staff, or equipment necessary to teach courses. It should be noted, however, that many of the interventions described as a result of SLO assessments required shifts in pedagogy rather than additional funding.

Due to the age of much of our equipment or recent changes in law, however, most funded equipment has fallen under the heading of “critical to teach the class (“A” – level). Requests for funding of “interventions” that would be nice and might improve things at some level – have generally not been funded. In addition, the turn around time for funded requests to actually be purchased or implemented is somewhat lengthy, so we are only now beginning to get the feedback loop closed on what effect various allocations have had.

While we have, through the PR template, a method for including SLO assessments or instructional requirements at the outset of the allocation process, PRAC decided in spring of 2013 to ask those whose requests were funded in the 2011-2012 cycle to report back on the status of their requests and on any results they might have due to implementation.

Criteria include:
1. Item was funded based on SLOs or other instructional criteria
2. Allocation was awarded and item purchased (or hired)
3. Student outcomes were assessed
4. Results were reported back via program review, in discipline meetings, in surveys and/or to PRAC directly.

Establish Process:
1. Program Review request justifications include reference to improved SLOs.
2. These justifications are taken into account in the allocation process.
3. In 2013 an additional survey sent out to determine the effectiveness of the modernization of buildings and equipment on student learning.
4. In May each year, disciplines will report back to PRAC the status of funded requests.
5. Subsequent Full Program Reviews include a place to report on the status and results of earlier funded requests.

Evaluation Process:
If allocations meet the criteria above, then the link between program review, SLO assessment and the allocation process is effective.

Communication:
VPSL and VPSS will communicate with the funding recipients the expectation of this process so funding recipients would be ready to share their outcomes with PRAC at the end of spring semester.