



2016-17 Program Review Executive Summary

How well are our academic and workforce programs and service units doing what they intend to do? Are they positioning themselves for the future by addressing the issues identified in their self-studies with their Continuous Improvement Plans? Do the reports identify actionable issues, supported with data, for consideration in the Strategic Planning process? On February 7, 2017, the Program Review Steering Committee commenced this cycle of submission review to evaluate programs' and units' attempts to respond to these questions.

What are Program Review Steering Committee (PRSC) Judgments?

They are decisions reflecting the *adequacy of the report* regarding assertions, data supporting them, and conclusions. They are not judgments about the viability of the programs and units. The PRSC believes the viability decisions belong initially to the provosts and deans for the programs and to the vice-presidents and directors for service units.

Six percent of the 17 expected Program Review reports were accepted with no recommendations; 59% were accepted with recommendations that primarily centered on data-related issues, and twelve percent of the reports were recommended to be revisited and revised. Twenty-four percent of the expected reports were not received. The following is a more detailed synopsis.

Judgments for 2016-17 Program Review Submissions

Accepted Without Recommendations: 1

- Policy & Planning service unit

This report was accepted without reservation. Reviewer comments highlight acknowledgement of the challenges faced with distributing massive volumes of current and suitable data, and a focused and direct Continuous Improvement Plan.

Accepted With Recommendations: 10

- Academic Partnerships service unit
- Academic Success (Orientation & Testing Center) service unit
- Child Development
- Core Curriculum
- Electronic Engineering Technology
- Emergency Medical Services Professions
- Health Information Management
- Hospitality and Food Service Management
- Library service unit
- Photography, Commercial

Because of the variation in the templates, observations may not be effectively applied generally. The reviewer checklists accompanying each of these programs provide specific information and guidance. The heat maps in the appendix show the overall weaknesses of the reviews by rubric category and type of unit or program reviewed.

Revisit & Revise: 2

- Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT)
- Information Systems Cybersecurity

The Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) submission excelled in its responsiveness to the prompts provided in the Program Review template, but was found to face challenges in other areas. Of the twelve prompts where evidence was examined, seven were met with the recommendation to revisit and revise. Struggling slightly more was the presence of analysis within the responses, where nine received the revisit & revise recommendation and reviewers observed that for many of those, analysis was completely absent.

Information Systems Cybersecurity's submission was a response to a past recommendation for revision. It was understood that some if not all members of the original authoring team were not available for the revision. The reviewers found Cybersecurity's response about communication practices to be a strong point, where the remaining responses were either found acceptable with recommendations, or requested for the responses to be revisited and revised. It is recommended that Information Systems Cybersecurity transition to the revised template being developed for the 2017-2018 year. Working under the revised template will provide the authoring team a clear path.

Not Received: 4

- AA, AS
- Business Services (Service unit)
- Geospatial Information Systems (GIS)
- Nursing RN

Of the submissions not received, Business Services and Nursing RN had the equivalent status of Revisit & Revise from previous Program Review years, and out-of-cycle submissions were expected for each. The AA, AS program was a newer inclusion into the Program Review process, and the unique structure of the AA, AS program compared to more commonly structured programs was cited as a cause for the submission not being ready for this year's review cycle. Geospatial Information Systems' submission was expected as part of the regular schedule.

Organizational maturity regarding how well the Program Review process is implemented

Please see the three attached heat maps in the appendix which are the foundations for the following observations.

Responsiveness to the prompts is commonly rated higher than Evidence, with Analysis trailing. Overall Judgment frequently did not exceed the lowest average of the other, specific criteria.

Report weaknesses focus primarily on data and analysis;

- Occasionally data is omitted.
- In the averages represented on the heat maps, there is no instance where rating of analysis exceeds the rating of evidence quality; therefore, when evidence is lacking, analysis suffers.
- Reviewers typically identified academic program submissions (appendix Table 1) to be stronger in responses to market demand and curriculum management, whereas workforce programs (appendix Table 2) in general did better on operational prompts, such as communication, resources, and budgetary impact of continuous improvement. Service units (appendix Table 3) also responded strongly to operational prompts, but struggled connecting to student outcomes.

Solution: Also mentioned below, the Steering Committee intends to address these issues through template revision and focused training.

Program Review process weaknesses

1. Program Review Steering Committee members are unclear about expectations.

Solution:

- A training session will be provided to Steering Committee members prior to the regularly scheduled kick-off meeting, which will give them a consistent foundation to interpret the reviewer rubric and improve inter-rater reliability.
- The reviewer rubric and checklist themselves are undergoing review by a summer subcommittee to minimize misinterpretation.

2. Report preparers are unclear about expectations.

Solution:

- Provide focused training for report preparers before supporting data is available, as well as mentors upon request.
- Templates are being continually evaluated and revised to improve clarity, with a summer subcommittee dedicated to this end.

3. Fifth year Program Review and out-of-cycle document submission counts need improvement.

Solution:

- Mentoring and training opportunities are being evaluated by a summer subcommittee which is expected to have a plan available for the 2017-18 review year. While this cannot address programs/units that do not commit sufficient resources to complete a submission on time, it may help authoring teams with process knowledge to improve turnaround time, as well as reduce the number of recommendations for revision.
- The support of the Program Review and Continuous Improvement processes from leadership is significant in encouraging programs/units to see the value in the process and not as something to be dismissed.

Individual program and unit recommendations

Individual program and unit recommendations are shown in the checklists found within each program and unit folder on the J Drive at **J:\Program Review** for the Leadership Team. Per Steering Committee guidelines, the Program Review status of the units will be posted on the Institutional Effectiveness Program Review intranet page after the programs or units whose submissions were accepted with recommendation have had an opportunity to submit edited documents, by August 1st.

Appendix

Table 1.

Average Category Ratings for 2017 Academic Program Review Submissions

N=2, Where 1= Revisit & Revise, 2= Accepted With Recommendations, 3= Accepted Without Recommendations, 4= Exemplary

Review Question	Responsiveness	Evidence	Analysis	Overall Judgment
1. What does the program do?	3.0			3.0
2. Program's relationship to the college mission, core values, & strategic plan	3.0	2.0	1.5	2.0
3. Program has a transfer pathway to a related baccalaureate award	3.0	2.5	1.0	1.0
4. Program relationship to student demand	2.5	2.0	1.5	2.0
5. Program relationship to market demand	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0
6. How effective is the program's curriculum?	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.5
7. How well does program communicate?	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0
8. How well are partnership resources built and leveraged?	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
9. Are qualified faculty hired and supported with professional development?	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.5
10. Is the program well-supported with facilities, equipment, and financial resources?	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
11. How does the program intend to improve?	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.5
12. How will program success be evaluated (CIP)?	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0
13. How will improvement plans impact the program budget?	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

Table 2.

Average Category Ratings for 2017 Workforce Program Review Submissions

N=7, Where 1=Revisit & Revise, 2=Accepted With Recommendations, 3=Accepted Without Recommendations, 4=Exemplary

Review Prompt	Responsiveness	Evidence	Analysis	Overall Judgment
1. What does the workforce program do?	2.6			2.6
2. Program relationship to the college mission, core values, and strategic plan	2.0	2.2	2.0	1.9
3. Program relationship to student demand	2.1	2.0	1.8	2.0
4. Program relationship to market demand	2.0	1.7	1.7	1.9
5. How effective is the program's curriculum?	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.6
6. [Omitted]				
7. How well does program communicate?	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.7
8. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged?	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.7
9. Are the faculty qualified and supported with professional development?	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.6
10. Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment, and financial resources?	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.6
11. Given its present status, how does the program intend to improve?	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.7
12. How will program evaluate its success (CIP)?	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.0
13. How will the improvement plans impact the program's budget?	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.8

Table 3.

Average Category Ratings for 2017 Service Unit Review Submissions

N = 4; 1= Revisit & Revise, 2= Accepted With Recommendations, 3= Accepted Without Recommendations, 4= Exemplary

Review Prompt	Responsiveness	Evidence	Analysis	Overall Judgment
1. What does the unit do?	2.8			2.3
2. The unit's relationship to the college mission, core values, & strategic plan.	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.5
3. Why are the unit processes done?	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.3
4. How does the unit impact student outcomes?	2.5	2.8	2.0	2.0
5. How effectively does the unit communicate?	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.5
6. Does the unit leverage partnership resources?	2.5	2.8	2.3	2.3
7. Are staff qualified and receiving professional development?	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
8. Does the unit have sufficient resources?	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.8
9. How does the unit intend to improve?	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
10. How will the unit evaluate its success? (CIP)	2.5	2.8	2.5	2.3