

**College of the Redwoods
Program Review Committee
2025-2026
Executive Summary**

Committee Co-Chairs

Bob Brown

Colin Trujillo

Committee Members

Anibal Florez

Amy Moffat

Misty Knight

Tory Eagles

Amanda Staack

Ross Odell

Valerie Elder

Kyle Champ

Kelly Carbone

Jon Pace

Sky Kirsch

Executive Summary

The Program Review Committee (PRC) plays a vital role in College of the Redwoods' ongoing efforts to enhance institutional effectiveness, ensure transparent budgeting, promote student success, and align programs with the college's Mission, Vision, and Education Master Plan. The committee evaluates Annual and Comprehensive Program Reviews across Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative areas to help prioritize funding and support needs within the strategic planning framework. This report provides an overview of the committee's findings, highlights key themes, and identifies opportunities for improvement.

The Program Review process promotes innovation and continual improvement in the college's programs and services, in that spirit the PRC continued working this year to transition the college to an improved process. The committee, through its representation on the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), engaged in extended work to redraft the college's Integrated Planning Model (IPM). The new IPM includes plans for reimagined program review and assessment processes. While this work remains ongoing, it has been the result of extensive review of feedback from faculty, staff, and administration regarding the current process as well as ongoing discussions within the committee around enhancing and improving the process.

Annual program reviews continued to be optional this year while comprehensive instructional reviews were required in-line with the designated cycle. Even so, many programs chose to submit annual reviews. Programs used the program review process to highlight the amazing work they did over the last year, evaluate the overall effectiveness of their area, and set a benchmark by which to assess future progress. Additionally, the program review process continued to play an important role in resource allocation, with many programs submitting reviews to make resource requests and/or align requests with program plans.

In 2025-26, the PRC's core responsibilities included the following:

- Working with the Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative areas of the college to promote full understanding and participation in the program review process
- Ensuring that the college's programs aligned with the overall college mission and plans
- Evaluating programs in their use of relevant data to inform program direction and continual improvement
- Establishing that program personnel have adequately reflected upon and documented the impact of the previous year's plans
- Providing professional development opportunities around the program review process

I. Introduction

The College of the Redwoods Program Review Committee (PRC) supports institutional improvement by providing feedback on annual and comprehensive program review submissions across all college divisions to ensure they align with district priorities and regulatory requirements. Beyond providing feedback, the committee integrates these reviews into the funding process to support data-driven decision-making. Following the 2025–26 academic year, this report evaluates the committee’s progress, outlines significant trends in the data, and proposes strategic updates to the review process.

II. Overview and Assessment of Program Review Submissions

The PRC received a total of 17 program reviews. Instructional programs submitted 4 comprehensive and 10 annual reviews. Student Services submitted 3 reviews. This participation closely mirrors the 24-25 academic year when 18 total reviews were submitted. Notably, no administrative services submitted reviews this year. The committee utilized specialized rubrics to evaluate and rank each program review. Each section of the rubric corresponds to a specific part of the review template and is rated as Exemplary (E), Satisfactory (S), or Developing (D), depending on how well it meets the established criteria. In some cases, intermediate ratings such as Satisfactory/Developing (SD) or Exemplary/Satisfactory (ES) were also assigned. Additionally, the PRC used a separate rubric to assess program plans, assigning numerical scores based on various factors, including alignment with institutional goals, program assessment, the number of students affected, compliance with safety or legislative mandates, the urgency of the request, and the author’s own prioritization. Separate rubrics were used to rank comprehensive and annual reviews along with their associated resource requests. The following section provides an overview of this year’s submissions from Instructional and Student Services program reviews.

Table 1: All Annual Program Reviews

Rating	Program Information:	Program Data and Updates:	Resource Requests:
E	6 (46%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)
E/S	0 (0%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)
S	4 (31%)	4 (31%)	1 (20%)
S/D	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	1 (20%)
D	3 (23%)	2 (15%)	1 (20%)
<i>(E) Exemplary, (ES) Exemplary/Satisfactory, (S) Satisfactory, (SD) Satisfactory/Developing, (D) Developing</i>			

III. Instructional Program Reviews

Annuals

This year's highlights from the annual optional reviews that were sent include:

- **Forestry & Natural Resources** - They showed specifically how the program aligns with the North Coast region, and it continues to prepare students for careers in the field while being mindful of sustainability and the complex forest needs of the area. Congratulations also for 60 years of running strong!
- **Welding** - Notable accomplishments include expansion of the dual enrollment program, AWS certificates, and the increased student involvement in the welding club competition.
- **Fine Arts** - Great use of data and relevant examples of how many students are back accessing and taking courses in fine arts area since the downturn from Covid. In addition, the increased opportunities to be a pathway to Cal Poly Humboldt with their addition of a B.F.A. program in 2025. The continuation of work and updates to plans from the comprehensive review was thorough and provided excellent rationale and direct correlation to student success metrics. Student equity data was used to be reflective of inclusive participation and success across demographic groups to better reflect student lived experiences and cultural identities. All resource requests are clearly aligned to plans and assessment activities.
- **Auto Tech** - Program mission clearly aligns with the College of the Redwoods mission. Description provides clear description of program and employer partnerships such as Subaru. Great work on SLO's, description of industry demand and engagement.
- **Athletics/Kinesiology** - Data and updates are complete and insightful; commentary was given regarding factors that have contributed to program or discipline changes; Factors impacting increased enrollments, student achievement and learning are described in detail; Student equity data is thoroughly discussed.

Table 2: Annual Instructional

Rating	Program Information	Program Data and Updates	Resource Requests
E	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	1 (25%)
E/S	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)

S	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	1 (25%)
S/D	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	1 (25%)
D	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	1 (25%)
<i>(E) Exemplary, (ES) Exemplary/Satisfactory, (S) Satisfactory, (SD) Satisfactory/Developing, (D) Developing</i>			

Comprehensive:

This year's Instructional required Comprehensive reviews highlights include:

- Computer Information Systems** - Excellent references and examples to each of the bolded sections of the mission and how the program is having an impact on those areas. Reviewers noted the programs' efforts in collaborations with HCOE and businesses, increased growth of students in the program overall, and in all the metrics measuring overall student success. Authors provided many relevant numbers, percentages, and other data that demonstrated the increased demand for CIS graduates in regional employment. A good analysis of the growing numbers of completers in the program over the last four years was provided. Reviewers appreciated how they spoke to the various support services, increased flexible modalities of course offerings and ISS support in assisting in building enrollment, academic success retention, and completers. The program provided some insight on how they have worked to provide equitable resources to all campuses but also acknowledged what they need to try and do better to attract more female students and underrepresented groups to the field.
- Addiction Studies/SWHS** - Data analysis was detailed and included factors that impacted results through examination of disaggregated data examining differences between campus, gender, first generation and other factors. The data was separated into sections, including insight about why the changes happened and the factors that may have impacted student success. Explanations of factors within the Student Equity plan were clearly outlined, and comprehensive analysis has been performed including the review of different campuses and what would happen if their program request were not given funding. The timeline of course offerings are shown, including substantial amounts of assessment activity strongly integrated into program planning year-to-year. Outside factors such as regulatory changes and collaborative committee work through the Program Advisory Committee are also weighed in program planning. The specific narrative examples provided also paint a clear picture of the impact and importance of program changes, future planning, and workforce needs.
- Physical Science** - The review provided relevant details about how the program impacts

the college and community or service areas. Details describing new hires, development of online and hybrid course modalities, and increased enrollment numbers are useful in evaluating the overall health of the program relative to pre-Covid circumstances. Assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned. Program improvement is linked to assessment findings. Program authors note that there is a clear rationale for changing how assessment is conducted in chemistry (shifting from end-of-semester assessment to mid-semester assessment) to better capture data regarding student success rates. Past actions were carried out and evaluated, and their impact on program improvement is clearly described with relevant assessment and/or student achievement data. An action may not have occurred, but there is an explanation as to why the action was not completed. Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions and are discussed. Planning actions are not stated as resource requests. Planning actions are clearly based on specific assessment and/or student achievement data.

Table 3: Comprehensives

Rating	Program Information:	Data Analysis:	Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:	Evaluation of Previous Plans:	Planning:
E	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)
E/S	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
S	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)
S/D	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
D	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

(E) Exemplary, (ES) Exemplary/Satisfactory, (S) Satisfactory, (SD) Satisfactory/Developing, (D) Developing

IV. Student Services Program Reviews

This year's Student Services Program Review highlights include:

- **The Multicultural Education Center:**
 - **High Student Engagement:** Between July 2024 and June 2025, the MEC saw 11,898 total student sign-ins, with daily visits ranging from 10 to 218.
 - **Support and Outreach:** The MEC provided 200–300 advising sessions and distributed 145 items from its clothing closet.
- **Counseling & Advising / Welcome Center:**
 - **Growth in Demand:** The Eureka Campus saw a 28% increase in advising

appointments (reaching 5,538), and the Klamath-Trinity campus saw a 37% increase. This aligns with a district-wide enrollment growth of 6.4% FTES.

- **Welcome Center Impact:** Staff assisted approximately 4,620 students in person and managed 1,258 voicemails. They also conducted 53 guided tours for prospective students and families.

Table 4: Student Services

Rating	Program Information	Program Data and Updates	Resource Requests
E	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
E/S	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (100%)
S	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
S/D	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
D	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>(E) Exemplary, (ES) Exemplary/Satisfactory, (S) Satisfactory, (SD) Satisfactory/Developing, (D) Developing</i>			

The PRC would like to highlight the **Counseling and Advising** program for their review that produced all exceptional sections. The PRC suggests that authors look to the Counseling and Advising submission as a guide for using the Program Review process for overall program improvement.

- The Counseling and Advising program information section was ranked exemplary by the committee for providing relevant and specific examples of how C & A directly impacts the college's mission. They Pointed out the importance of the switch to ConexEd from SARS and the transition with CCN and that the new Cal-GETC GE patterns is a key professional development and change that will require a broad educational transition campus wide. Included examples such as increasing student access and success by providing students with support services.
- The PRC also ranked the Counseling and Advising program data and updates section as exemplary. Many highlights were covered and updates provided on each of the campuses. The program data and updates were thorough, transparent, and an insightful discussion of program activity, challenges, and progress. Even some of the challenges or declining numbers were addressed. Despite the existing and ongoing challenges of obtaining reliable data through the transfer from SARS to ConexEd, many data points were still covered that spoke to regular student contacts. Many relevant and measurable goals were

mentioned and tied back to the last program review and assessment work of 2022-23. The resource requests mentioned in the goals and objectives spoke directly to their impact on student success, alignment with their mission, and providing support for student success.

V. **Overarching Themes in Program Review**

The program reviews across various departments reveal several recurring themes, primarily focused on **modernizing equipment, addressing staffing shortages, and improving facilities** to support growing student enrollment.

Enrollment Growth and Program Success: Several programs highlight significant increases in FTES and student headcounts. Departments like CIS and Physical Sciences report strong retention and success rates, using this data to justify the expansion of course offerings and resources.

Accreditation and Regulatory Compliance: Maintaining professional standards is a priority, with programs requesting funds for accreditation fees and self-study visits. New state mandates (such as ESS 25-61) are also driving the need for more advising capacity to ensure every student has a required education plan.

Holistic Student Support and Outreach: Beyond academics, programs like the Multicultural Education Center emphasize the importance of basic needs support (food and clothing) and culturally responsive outreach to improve retention among underrepresented populations.

Technology Modernization and Student Access: Multiple programs identify a critical need for updated technology to support instruction and equity. This includes requests for student-checkout laptops or iPads to bridge the digital divide, replacing outdated faculty and staff computers, and upgrading department-specific software or systems like the ID card system.

Infrastructure and Facility Upgrades: A common theme is the need to improve physical learning environments. Key requests include acoustic treatments to mitigate noise and echo in classrooms, shop and lab expansions to accommodate more students, and safety-related modifications such as improved ventilation, better sinks with clay traps, and outdoor overhangs for inclement weather.

Equipment Replacement for Industry Alignment: Many departments emphasize replacing aging, unreliable, or unsafe equipment with industry-standard tools to ensure students are prepared for transfer or the workforce. This spans from patrol vehicles for public safety training and welding machines to dental models and nursing manikins.

Personnel and Staffing Expansion: There is a widespread call for additional personnel to manage increased workloads and regulatory requirements. Requests include Instructional

Support Specialists (ISS), and Student Development Advisors to meet new mandates for comprehensive education plans.

VI. **Committee Recommendations and Process Revisions**

The landscape of higher education continues to shift rapidly brought on by advancement in technology, changing regulations and standards, and an ever-evolving political climate. It is more important than ever that the college continues to adapt to meet the needs of new students, partner with the community, and build resilience into our institution by strengthening support for students, staff, and faculty. Continual growth and improvement is the only way forward and in that spirit the committee makes the following recommendations:

- **Align Program Review and Assessment with Faculty and Staff Priorities** – Replace the "one-size-fits-all" model with a differentiated review process tailored to the specific operational needs of instructional, student service, and administrative units. Grant program authors the autonomy to define and measure metrics that are professionally meaningful to their unique disciplines. For programs already undergoing rigorous external accreditation, the internal program review should serve as a bridge to support those existing standards, eliminating redundant labor.
- **Continue to Clarify the Connection Between Review and Resource Allocation** – Clarify and communicate the integrated relationship between program evaluation and the various funding streams of the college. As noted above in the overarching themes, resource allocation continues to be a major driver behind authors' submitting program review. However, this function is also one of the most misunderstood. Establish a protocol for authors to receive timely, formal feedback on the status of resource requests, including the rationale behind funding decisions. Provide professional development to help authors distinguish when a program review request is appropriate versus seeking supplemental budgets, grants, or departmental funds.
- **Incentivize Engagement Through Accountability** – There has been a marked decrease in areas participating in the program review process since it became optional (outside of instructional comprehensives). Re-establish program review as a core institutional expectation by aligning participation with professional incentives and departmental metrics. Even when the process was compulsory, there were several areas that routinely did not engage. By making the process more meaningful, the college can shift the culture from compulsory compliance to continuous improvement.
- **Modernize Infrastructure, Templates, and Rubrics** - Transition from manual, spreadsheet-based submissions to a robust, integrated digital platform. Replace the current Excel-based holdover forms with a streamlined interface that reduces technical

frustration and allows for better data aggregation. Finalize and implement updated rubrics that align strictly with new templates, ensuring that the evaluation of programs is objective, clear, and actionable.