IEC PROGRAM SUMMARY

Academic Year: 12/13
Program Name: Athletics
Date of Review: 2012-2013

Major Program Goals:
- Develop department-wide fundraising projects.
- Add additional intercollegiate athletic programs.
- Develop partnership with San Jose State University to establish internships for athletic trainers, sports information directors, and other key support staff positions.
- Develop a department-wide recruiting brochure Kinesiology-Athletics brochure.

Concerns/Trends:
- Facility scheduling challenges as a result of the APE building expansion and the subsequent loss of KIN designated classroom space.
- Athletic program support needs have increased but support personnel hours for departmental assistant and counselor have not increased.
- Need for updated equipment and renovation of facilities including fitness center, fields, and swimming pools.
- Due to the limitations of the BIO sections available, athletic students, who are KIN majors, may have challenges completing their programs efficiently.
- Retention and transfer of student athletes.
- Recruitment of student athletes.
- Part-time status of coaches for some sports at the college.
- Maintaining Title IX compliance, adding additional female programs when appropriate.

Plans for Addressing Concerns/Trends:
- Hire full-time coaches and support staff.
- Expand intercollegiate opportunities for men and women.
- Renovate and modernize existing facilities.
- Generate additional revenue sources to supplement general fund.
- Develop partnership with San Jose State University.
- Create a recruiting brochure for department use.

IEC Recommendations:
- Through dean, initiate discussions regarding Bio course availability and facility scheduling.
- Develop recruitment plan and materials for athletic programs.
- Work with foundation to re-energize outside funding streams to potentially supplement state funding plan to advance facility updates.
- Secure additional hours for departmental assistant and counselor as funding becomes available.
- Evaluate the first year of women’s basketball as it relates to Title IX and future planning.
Introduction

Overview:
The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) reviewed programs during the 2012-2013 academic year: Vice President of Administrative Services, Facilities, Security, Business Services, Natural Sciences/Engineering, Tutoring/Computer Place, Human Services, Child Development Center, Child Development/Educational Studies, MIS, Athletics and Kinesiology

The IEC Annual Report includes a Program Review Summary, submitted by the IEC describing and evaluating the process, and an Executive Summary, submitted by each program as part of their self study report. The Program Review Summary is based upon the program’s entire written report, committee dialogue, and the in-person meetings with the program administrator and/or representative. The second section of the report includes status updates on programs that were reviewed during the 10-11 year.

Process:
Programs to be reviewed were notified at the beginning of Fall 2012 semester and were provided an orientation in October of 2012. The orientation introduced the programs to their IEC support team and explained the process, including a tour of the website and self-study forms. Two committee members were assigned to each program under review and assumed a support function, supporting and communicating with the program representatives throughout the process. Drafts of the self study were due in February. Committee members read each submission for review and provided comments and suggestions for revision. The suggestions were forwarded to the programs under review. In the weeks that followed, programs were scheduled to meet with the committee in person to ask questions about the committee’s feedback, and to clarify expectations for revision of the draft of the self-study reports. Upon receiving the revisions, the committee met to review the final drafts. The complete text of each self-study report as presented to the committee may be found on the IEC website.

IEC Evaluation of the Process for 2012-2013
Overall, the process was effective, in the sense that the IEC was able to adequately evaluate each program, generate useful dialogue and provide feedback to each program that submitted a report.

The main change to the process this year was the inclusion of the IEC recommendations as a criterion in the budget process. Now that the IEC program is explicitly linked to the integrated planning process, the role of the IEC self-study as a useful tool for planning is much clearer. Next year, representatives of the IEC committee will spend more time educating the college community about the purpose of the IEC, continuing our efforts to make the process more meaningful and effective.

The IEC identified some areas that need further attention in the coming year. Enforcement of the committee’s deadlines and standards has been a continual issue, and this year was no exception.
Only two of the reports were submitted on time: Athletics and Kinesiology. The others were submitted late, or in at least one case, there was no submission at all until the person was subjected to considerable intervention by the IEC and the Dean. In a couple of instances, the committee did not receive a revision of the drafts after meeting with the programs, and were forced to submit the drafts in their rough state. This continues to be a problem year after year. The IEC is not an enforcing body, and we can only do so much if the authors of the reports do not comply.

The reasons for the late, incomplete, or inadequate drafts of the self-study are varied. In all cases, the programs in question are spread very thin, with more duties and fewer people to discharge those duties. As a result, the self-study report was not a high priority. Other programs needed more support, either internally or from the Dean, in order to make the report substantial and meaningful. In the cases of six reports (MIS, Vice President of Administrative Services, Security and Support Systems, Business Services, Facilities, Human Resources), the initial draft of the report was delayed pending signature from the President, who was unavailable until after the deadline had passed. Several of the programs were confused about due dates, and confused about the process in general. Each of the explanations for late submission requires a different approach, which the committee will address at the August retreat.

Enforcing the requirement of the Dean’s signature may help with the quality and timeliness of the reports that are submitted. Additionally, IEC needs to continually improve the process and procedures in order to make it more meaningful. This will encourage individual programs to include authentic insights and self-reflection that they can use as they plan for their program’s future and reflect upon the challenges and accomplishments of the past. Linking the recommendations to the budget process will certainly help with this, especially as people get used to thinking of the IEC report as a way to articulate what they want for their programs. Other, smaller changes could help in this effort as well; for example, changing the language in the self-study from “weaknesses” to “challenges” encourages people to think of the report as an opportunity for self-reflection and planning, rather than as an inquisition or a trial.

Another improvement made was to include more IEC representatives in the budget and strategic planning committees, as well as have IEC committee members visit Department Chair, Dean and Senate meetings, to better explain the process and the goals behind Program Review. Our goal is to make this process a key part of integrated planning, instead of something that is viewed as an extra task, unrelated to the decision-making process at Gavilan.

The IEC continues to encourage the campus community to read the findings from all reports as they relate to the strategic planning process, as well as in preparation for future program reviews and overall college improvement.