Program Evaluation and Planning is Napa Valley College’s system of program review and is a key mechanism for maintaining and improving academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Program Evaluation and Planning – widely known as “PEP” – is a process of self-study, evaluation, and planning. The primary objectives of PEP are to assure the quality of all programs and services (spanning instructional programs, academic support services, student services, and administrative services), promote student success, and ensure the effectiveness of institutional support for programs. PEP is designed to encourage thoughtful review and reflection to identify areas for improvement and guide future planning efforts.

The PEP process is intended to enhance the integration of evaluation, planning, and resource allocation/budgeting. In good practice, planning processes are cyclical, the conclusions from program evaluation are used to identify program-level objectives, and the resources needed to achieve those objectives inform the development of program-level budget requests. It is not the purpose of PEP to reduce, eliminate, or otherwise negatively impact the unit being reviewed or its faculty and staff. Nor does this process alone result in the enhancement of program budgets or staffing.

Each program and service area of the college undergoes PEP review every six years. This cycle aligns with the accreditation calendar and ensures that all programs and services are reviewed between comprehensive accreditation site visits. Vocational programs complete comprehensive PEP review every six years, and summary data on vocational programs is collected and reviewed every two years to comply with California Education Code regulations (§78016).

Background: Development of PEP Process

The college developed the PEP process to address two of the eight recommendations made by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) following the comprehensive site visit for accreditation in October 2003. The two recommendations stated:

**Recommendation 2.** The team recommends that, as soon as possible, and with college wide participation, the college review and revise the college strategic planning process, including rewriting the college mission statement and evaluating the coordination, integration, and implementation of program review and college-wide planning and budgeting.

**Recommendation 3.** The team recommends that the college develop an effective, evidence-based program review process for implementation as early as possible.

Several of the 2014 ACCJC standards which Napa Valley College must meet relate to program evaluation and planning. Two standards cover program review in general terms:
Standard I.B.5
The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.

Standard I.B.9
The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources.

Standard II covers program review among programs and services:

Standard II.A.16
The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.

Standard II.B.3
The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services includes evidence that they contribute to the attainment of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Standard II.C.1
The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution.

The PEP process was launched in 2005. In the spirit of continuous evaluation and improvement, the process has been adjusted almost every year – to strengthen the process, incorporate suggestions for improvement, and address external compliance requirements.
Program Evaluation & Planning: Drafting the PEP Report

At the core of the PEP process is a self-study, conducted by faculty and staff within the program undergoing review. The Instructional PEP Form is organized around nine sections:

- Mission
- Accreditation, Licensing & Previous PEP
- Curriculum, Instruction & Articulation
- Enrollment Trends
- Student Success & Equity
- Community Outreach
- Student Satisfaction (Survey Results)
- Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Assessment
- Planning, Budget, & Resource Requests

There are two versions of the PEP form for service areas. One applies to Student and Academic Support Services and the other to Administrative Services. The Service Area PEP form generally mirrors that of instructional programs, with some minor exceptions appropriate for service areas. The Service Area PEP Forms include the following nine sections:

- Mission
- Accreditation, Licensing & Previous PEP
- Services
- Student Success & Equity
- Community Outreach
- Service Area/Enrollment Trends & Student/Client Satisfaction
- Service Area Outcomes Assessment
- Current Budget
- Planning & Budget Requests

All faculty and staff within the program have ownership of the PEP Report. Therefore, the PEP review process should be as collaborative and inclusive as possible – involving all faculty and staff affiliated with the program undergoing review. Surveys are conducted to collect information from the students’ perspective.

As writing teams respond to the questions on the PEP form, they determine whether objectives for improvement are needed in the areas listed above. Those objectives become the foundation for the program’s six-year plan which emerges as a result of the PEP review process. The completed Schedule A (submitted as part of the PEP Report) articulates the program plan, conveying the linkage between program-level objectives and institutional goals included in the Institutional Strategic Plan and identifying resources required to achieve the program-level objectives. Resource requests related to budget, staffing, technology, instructional materials, staff development, equipment, facilities, and research are recorded and summarized on the remaining “Schedules” of the PEP Report (Schedules B – I).
PEP Reports are developed over a calendar year. This timeline is coordinated with the college’s annual planning and budget cycle and the curriculum approval process. Part I is completed during the spring semester (January – May) and spans the first five Sections of the report (listed above). Part II is completed during the fall semester (August – October) and spans the final three Sections as well as the Schedules. Division Chairs/Deans (for instructional programs) and Vice Presidents/President (for service areas) are involved in the PEP process, as they review Part I and Part II of the reports and work with the writing teams to address any concerns before signing the reports.

The value of the self-study process for the program is that it:

- Encourages thoughtful review and reflection to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and services as well as their alignment with the institutional mission;
- Includes data and analysis to measure effectiveness and guide programs as they develop plans;
- Ensures regular review and compliance with requirements of external agencies, including the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and the ACCJC;
- Identifies strengths and successes of the program as well as areas for improvement;
- Yields a six-year plan for the program that supports strategic planning goals identified at the institutional level and informs the development of annual program-level plans in the six subsequent years;
- Improves the program, as the process yields explicit planning goals for increasing student success, linking offerings to student needs, reviewing and developing curriculum, and building relationships with internal and external programs;
- Maximizes the possibility of obtaining resources, as resource requests are tied directly to planning goals and based on evidence; and
- Enhances promotion of the program, as the results of the process are shared with the campus community.

To support the faculty and staff in writing their PEP Reports, a PEP Support Team is available. The PEP Support Team includes:

- the Faculty PEP Coordinator, who assists writing teams affiliated with instructional programs;
- the Faculty Co-Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who provides guidance on the completion of Curriculum Action Plans;
- the Faculty Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator, who provides support related to Student Learning Outcomes assessment for instructional programs;
- the Research Analyst, who provides data and analysis and helps writing teams interpret the findings; and
- the Dean of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness, who coordinates the PEP process and provides support to service areas undergoing PEP review.
The PEP Support Team is available to answer questions throughout the PEP review process. Writing team members are encouraged to contact and meet with PEP Support Team members as they draft their PEP Reports.

**Review of PEP Reports**

When the PEP Report is complete, Schedule A contains the six-year, program-level plan, and Schedules B – I identify the resource requests related to the program-level plan. Each PEP Report is reviewed by a Verification Team as well as the Vice President/President affiliated with the program or service undergoing review.

**Verification**: Each PEP Report is reviewed by a Verification Team. Verification Teams are comprised of at least three members, with representation from faculty, classified staff, and administrative staff. Verification Team members are drawn from programs that are scheduled for PEP review the following year. This approach is intended to prepare faculty and staff for review of their own programs and services. Verification Teams review the narrative, data, plans, and resource requests included in the PEP Report and meet with faculty and staff affiliated with the program undergoing review. Verification Teams confirm that the reports are accurate and complete, ensure that the process was inclusive and involved participation of program faculty and staff, and assess the consistency between the report narrative and the resulting plans and resource requests. Verification teams work with PEP Report writers and make suggestions for strengthening the report or/and for addressing any inconsistencies between the report narrative and the resulting plans or/and resource requests. Verification Teams complete a Verification Team Report summarizing the findings of the verification process. The Verification Team Report is integrated into the final PEP Report.

**Acknowledgement**: Once the verification process is complete, the PEP Report – including the Verification Team Report – is forwarded to the appropriate Vice President/President for final review. The Vice President/President reviews the materials and sends a letter to the faculty and staff affiliated with the PEP program, acknowledging completion of the PEP process. The acknowledgement letter highlights findings from the report, summarizes the Vice President’s/President’s recommendations related to the report, and outlines next steps regarding planning and resource allocation.

**Communicating Results of PEP**

The results of the PEP process are communicated to the campus community in several ways:

**Posting of Reports on NVC Website**: Completed PEP Reports – including the Verification Team Reports – are posted on the Research, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness portion of the college website. [Details regarding survey results and professional development forms pertaining to individual faculty and staff members are not posted on the website.]

**Open PEP Forum**: The results of the PEP process are conveyed to the campus community via an open forum following the verification process. The forum is structured around a joint meeting
of the Planning Committee and the Budget Committee and typically occurs in February/March. All members of the campus community are welcome to attend. The following participants in the PEP process are particularly encouraged to attend: faculty and staff affiliated with the programs and services that completed PEP review, Verification Team members, Division Chairs/Deans, Vice Presidents, and the College President. At the forum, Verification Team members present a summary of the findings and plans resulting from PEP. The following materials are available to inform discussion at the PEP Forum: the Program Evaluation Summary, the Verification Team Report, program-level plan (Schedule A), and associated resource requests (Schedules B – I) for each program that completed the verification phase.

Board of Trustees Report: Following the PEP Forum each year, the Dean of Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness informs the Board of Trustees that the PEP process has been completed. The report identifies the programs and services that completed PEP, highlights common themes among the programs that completed review, and summarizes findings and areas for improvement in the PEP process itself.

Integrating PEP Plans into College Planning Processes

PEP-related plans and resource requests are integrated into subsequent planning and budgeting cycles.

Annual Planning & Budget Process: The program-level plan outlined on Schedule A informs the development of annual unit plans over the next six years. Since verification and acknowledgement have been completed by February/March of each year, program-level plans can be folded into the annual planning and budget cycle immediately following the completion of the PEP process. Objectives and resource needs identified through PEP are integrated into appropriate unit plans. As part of the annual prioritization process, each Area Council (Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and President’s Area) reviews the unit-level resource requests and prioritizes among them (possibly combining common needs into area-level requests). Area-level priorities are then forwarded to the President’s Cabinet for consideration and prioritization at the institutional level. In addition to the formal annual planning and budget process, programs are encouraged to review their PEP plans regularly to monitor progress in achieving their stated objectives and implementing the improvements identified through PEP.

Resource Requests (Schedules): Not only are PEP resource requests shared within the respective areas of the college (Instruction, Student Services, Administrative Services, and President’s Area) through the annual planning and budget process, but specific resource requests are also shared with appropriate college committees and staff. Following PEP verification, Schedule B – I are distributed among administrative staff members who coordinate activities associated with each resource type. Those individual staff members, in turn, share the requests with campus committees assigned to each area.

Requests (PEP Schedules) pertaining to the following types of resources are distributed, as described in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Request Type (Schedule)</th>
<th>Recipients (Affiliated Committee/Group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing (B)</td>
<td>Human Resources (President’s Cabinet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Augmentation (C)</td>
<td>Business &amp; Finance (President’s Cabinet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-Specific Equipment (D)</td>
<td>Library &amp; Learning Resources, Information Technology, or Facilities (depending on request; see associated committees/groups listed below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (E)</td>
<td>Information Technology (Technology Committees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities (F)</td>
<td>Facilities (Facilities Planning Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development (G)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning (Staff/Professional Development Committees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resource/Media Materials (H)</td>
<td>Library &amp; Learning Resources (Library/Media Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Projects (I)</td>
<td>Research, Planning &amp; Institutional Effectiveness (Research Staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of Schedules among these individuals and groups is intended to communicate needs so that resources can be secured to address and support those needs.