



## 2019-20 Program Review Executive Summary

The Program Review Steering Committee (PRSC or the Committee) uses established guidelines and criteria to evaluate program and service unit support for Collin College’s mission, core values, and strategic plan; processes; procedures; and opportunities for improvement as outlined in the review documents supplied by those organizational units in their fifth year of the performance improvement cycle. Overall, the submissions reflect an enhanced understanding of the evaluation process and demonstrate a willingness to use data to support their claims. While modifications to the continuous improvement section for 2018-2019 clarified how the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) aligns with the program review, the CIP continues to be challenging for many. The PRSC modified its message to those scheduled for review by integrating meaningful examples into the fall workshop. Mentors were available to assist individual programs and service units, and the communication loop was tightened to provide a summary of recommendations by the Committee. Programs now have a clearer understanding of the expectation and timeline for changes.


### What are Program Review Steering Committee Judgments?

PRSC judgements are decisions reflecting the *adequacy of the report* regarding assertions, data supporting them, conclusions drawn, and—based on the conclusions—the CIP as a reasonable means of program or service unit improvement. They are *not* judgments about the viability of the programs and service units. Viability decisions belong to the institutional leaders who oversee the organizational units. The focus of program review is formative assessment rather than summative assessment.

There were 17 programs and service units scheduled for review during 2019-2020, including two that received a Revisit and Revise decision from the 2018-2019 review cycle and three that failed to provide a review submission in 2018-2019. Three programs did not submit a review to the committee. Of those 17 programs, the committee found the following:

Acceptable	18%
Acceptable with Recommendation	53%
Revisit and Revise	18%
Not received	12%

**Review Outcome Distribution**



## **Judgments for 2019-20 Program Review Submissions**

### **Accepted: 3**

- Computer-Aided Drafting and Design
- Graphic Design
- Respiratory Care

### **Accepted With Recommendations: 9**

- Admissions and Records
- Business Office Support Systems
- Computer Systems
- Criminal Justice Field of Study
- Development Education unit
- Math and Writing Labs unit
- Nursing RN
- Student Engagement unit
- Web and Mobile Development

### **Revisit & Revise: 3**

- Culinary and Pastry Arts
- Interior Design
- Veterinary Assistant

### **Not Received: 2**

- eLearning Centers unit
- Information Technology unit

## **Evaluating the Process**

The goal of the Committee is to provide tools, training, and feedback for programs and service units actively engaged in performance improvement. Committee work during summer 2018 focused on making changes to the CIP, providing meaningful information to programs and service units undertaking the review process during 2018-2019, improving the on-boarding process for new Committee members, and creating a summary document identifying areas for improvement as well as timelines for changes to be sent to each program and service unit completing the process.

### **Program Review Process Opportunities for Improvement (to Be Conducted Summer 2019)**

**Prep Sheet:** A subcommittee will convene to develop an aid to prepare programs and units for program review by advising what data should be gathered and tracked in the years prior to the fifth-year Program Review submission.

**Review Template SACS-COC Update:** The templates used for fifth-year Program Review submissions will undergo maintenance to respond to the latest understanding of SACS-COC guidelines.

### **Individual Program and Service 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 submissions of the programs and service units will be posted on the Institutional Effectiveness Program Review intranet page after the programs or units whose submissions were accepted with recommendations have had an opportunity to submit edited documents: by August 1, 2020.

## Appendix

*Table 1. Ratings by Review Section and Category for the Academic Program That Was Reviewed during 2019-2020. (Criminal Justice Field of Study)*

### Average of Available Category Ratings for 2020 Academic Program Review Submissions

Where 1= Revisit & Revise, 2= Accepted With Recommendations, 3= Accepted

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 & strategic plan.	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
3. Program relationship to student demand.	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
4. What marketable skills should students have after completion?	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
5. How effective is the program's curriculum?	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
6. How well does program communicate?	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
7. How well are partnership resources built and leveraged?	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
8. Are faculty supported with professional development?	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
9. [Optional] Is the program supported with facilities, equipment, and financial resources?				
10. How have past CIPs contributed to success?	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
11. How will program success be evaluated?	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Table	1.0			1.0

Table 2. Average Ratings by Review Section and Rating Category for Nine Workforce Education Programs That Were Reviewed during 2019-2020. (Business Off Support Systems, Computer-Aided Drafting and Design, Computer Systems, Culinary and Pastry Arts, Graphic Design, Interior Design, Nursing RN, Respiratory Care, Web and Mobile Development)

### Category Rating Averages for 2020 Workforce Program Review Submissions

1=Revisit & Revise, 2=Accepted With Recommendations, 3=Accepted Without Recommendations

Review Prompt	Responsiveness	Evidence	Analysis	Overall Judgment
1. What does your workforce program do?	2.8			2.9
2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan.	2.7	2.6	2.1	2.2
3. Program relationship to student demand.	2.7	2.6	2.3	2.6
4. Program relationship to market demand.	2.6	2.1	2.2	2.2
5. How effective is the program's curriculum?	2.6	2.4	2.1	2.2
6. How well does program communicate?	2.3	2.0	2.1	2.1
7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged?	2.8	2.4	2.3	2.4
8. Are the faculty qualified and supported with professional development?	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.8
9. Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment, and financial resources?				
10. How have past Program Reviews contributed to success?	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.3
11. How will we evaluate our success?	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4
12. Complete the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) tables that follow.	2.3			2.3

Table 3. Ratings by Section and Category for the Continuing Education Program Reviewed during 2019-2020. (Veterinary Assistant)

**Category Rating Averages for 2020 Continuing Program Review Submissions**

1=Revisit & Revise, 2=Accepted With Recommendations, 3=Accepted

Review Prompt	Responsiveness	Evidence	Analysis	Overall Judgment
1. What does the program do?	2.0			2.0
2. Program relationship to the college mission and strategic plan.	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
3. Program relationship to student demand.	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
4. Program relationship to market demand.	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
5. How effective is the program's curriculum?	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
6. How well does program communicate?	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
7. How well are partnership resources built & leveraged?	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
8. Are the faculty supported with professional development?	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
9. [Optional] Does the program have adequate facilities, equipment and financial resources?				
10. How have past CIPs contributed to success?	<b>Not applicable due to program's new inclusion in the process</b>			
11. How will program evaluate its success?	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP)	2.0			2.0

Table 4. Average Ratings by Section and Rating Category for Service Units That Were Reviewed during 2019-2020. (Admissions and Records, Developmental Education, Math Lab and Writing Centers, Student Engagement)

**Category Rating Averages for 2020 Service Unit Review Submissions**

1= Revisit & Revise, 2= Accepted With Recommendations, 3= Accepted

Review Prompt	Responsiveness	Evidence	Analysis	Overall Judgment
1. What does the unit do?	3.0			3.0
2. What is the unit's relationship to the college mission, core values, & strategic plan?	2.7	2.7	2.3	2.7
3. Why are the unit processes done?	2.7	2.7	2.3	2.7
4. How does the unit impact student outcomes?	2.3	2.3	2.0	2.0
5. How effectively does the unit communicate?	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
6. Does the unit leverage partnership resources?	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
7. Are staff qualified and supported with professional development?	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
8. [Optional] Does the unit have sufficient facilities and equipment?				
9. How have past Program Reviews contributed to success?	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
10. How will the unit evaluate its success?	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
11. Future Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) Tables.	2.7			2.7

## Programs Identifying Needs for Budget and/or Facilities Enhancement

The following programs requested additional funds for their budget and/or indicated insufficient facilities in their 2018-2019 Program Review submissions:

Program	Program Review Author	Administrator
Academic Advising	Bill Horstman	Alicia Huppe
Culinary & Pastry Arts	Jill McCord	Karen Musa
Dental Hygiene	Jackie Langford	Michelle Millen
Marketing	Gloria Cockerell	Karen Musa
Music FoS	Fernand Vera	Garry Evans
Polysomnography	Amber Allen	Michelle Millen
Student Life	Torrey West	Doug Willis
Video Production	Tonya McMillion	Garry Evans

These requests align with the following SACSCOC and Collin College Strategic Priorities:

### SACSCOC Principle 7.1

The institution engages in ongoing, comprehensive, and integrated research-based planning and evaluation processes that (a) focus on institutional quality and effectiveness and (b) incorporate a systematic review of institutional goals and outcomes consistent with its mission.

Effective institutions demonstrate a commitment to principles of continuous improvements, based on a systematic and documented process of assessing institutional performance with respect to mission in all aspects of the institution. **An institutional planning and effectiveness process involves all programs, services, and constituencies; is linked to the decision-making process at all levels; and provides a sound basis for budgetary decisions and resource allocations** (see p. 56 of Resource Manual for the Principals of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 2018, for complete information).

### Collin College Strategic Priorities

Priority 6: Create an Increasingly Welcoming Environment for Students, Community Members, Faculty and Staff.



Priority 7: Expand the Physical Footprint of Collin College to Meet Emerging Programmatic Needs; Improve Facilities as Necessary, and Implement the Maintenance Plan to Elevate Services to Our Students ([https://www.collin.edu/aboutus/strategic\\_goals.html](https://www.collin.edu/aboutus/strategic_goals.html)).

Such requests should show up in Collin's budget process as supplemental requests, but the PRSC respectfully requests that Leadership Team member(s) follow up with the appropriate administrators associated with programs or service units requesting budget or facilities enhancements (specific information can also be found in the program review submissions) to determine whether or not the program's requests are feasible and reasonable within the overall College context. The SACSCOC *Resource Manual* suggests that budgetary allocations and planning outcomes should be aligned and that resource allocation decisions be documented to demonstrate some relationship to effectiveness and continuous improvement planning. Instructional programs, service units, or administrators making requests for budget or facilities enhancements related to their program reviews or continuous improvement plans should share such documentation with the Institutional Research Office so it can be maintained on file and be available on demand for SACSCOC reviewers and reporting.