



Program Review End-of-Cycle Report

AY 2024–2025

Jeremy Anderson, Ed.D. – Vice President of Institutional Research and
Technology Services

and

Katie Robinson – Institutional Effectiveness Data Coordinator

Institutional Research Office

June 5, 2025

Executive Summary

The 2024–2025 Program Review process began on August 1, 2024, and concluded on April 23, 2025. Main action items completed in this Program Review cycle were the following:

- Sixteen programs and service/administrative units—a 100% compliance rate—submitted Program/Unit Reviews to the Institutional Research Office in 2024–2025.
 - 8 were accepted without required revisions
 - 6 were accepted with required revisions due by October 1, 2025
 - 2 must revisit and resubmit by October 1, 2025
- Approximately 50 reviewers from the Program Review Steering Committee (PRSC), divided into teams of three reviewers, actively reviewed all the Program/Unit Reviews.
- Three programs from the 2022–2023 Program Review cycle went through the process a second time in Fall 2024 after receiving “Revisit and Revise” ratings in Spring 2024.
 - All 3 were accepted with required revisions due by October 1, 2025
- Seventeen of the 19 programs due submitted their Year 2 CIPs (89% compliance) and 22 of the 23 programs due submitted their Year 4 CIPs (96% compliance).
- The PRSC Template Subcommittee continued to improve the Program/Unit Review templates for workforce, academic field of study, and continuing education programs and for service units to clarify the requested data and analysis and to create separate instructional documents for the aid of Program/Unit Review authors. Further, the Template Subcommittee enhanced the coverage of program-level learning outcomes.
- The PRSC Heatmap/Rubric Subcommittee improved the objectivity and uniformity of criteria on the Program Review heatmaps and rubric by which review teams evaluated the Program/Unit Reviews. Specifically, the subcommittee established a numeric rating system for each criterion and a scale by which the total of the numeric ratings would dictate the ultimate recommendation that the review team would make to the PRSC.
- The PRSC Procedures Manual Subcommittee revised the Manual to address areas like a procedure for appealing a decision of the PRSC and a timeline for a program or unit whose report received a rating requiring changes to submit those changes for review.
- The PRSC presented an interactive panel discussion for Program/Unit Review authors at the August 2025 Faculty Development Conference regarding the timeline and logistics of preparing the reports. The panel consisted of PRSC members who had authored their programs’ Program Reviews and a representative of the Institutional Research Office.
- Representatives of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the PRSC met individually with Program/Unit Review authors to provide guidance and answer questions.

Table of Contents

Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction	4
SACSCOC Linkage	7
Program Review Submission Process 2024–2025	7
The CIP Process	9
What Worked in the Program Review Process?	9
What Needs to be Revised or Improved?	10
Action Items for the Upcoming Program Review Cycle 2025–2026	13
Conclusion.....	14
Appendix A – Program/Unit Reviews due for 2025–2026	15
Appendix B – Year-2 CIPs due for 2025–2026	16
Appendix C – Year-4 CIPs due for 2025–2026.....	17

2024–2025 Program Review Results

Introduction

Collin College has committed to an ongoing cyclical, comprehensive review process of its instructional programs and service units. The purpose of this process, called Program Review, requires program faculty and unit directors to undertake a self-study of their respective programs and units to ensure that they are addressing key best practices and effectively delivering their instruction and services. Program Review is an essential part of Collin College’s overall planning and Continuous Improvement Plan, conducted on a five-year cycle. The FY2025 Program Review process began on August 1, 2024, and was completed on April 23, 2025.

The Program Review Steering Committee (PRSC), currently comprising approximately 50 staff and faculty from many disciplines, divisions, and Collin campuses, provided oversight to the Program Review process. The PRSC used a defined, systematic process to facilitate and guide the self-assessments by instructional programs and service units regarding their past and future alignment with Collin College’s mission and strategic priorities, accreditation standards, and institutional resource needs and demands.

The PRSC members, nominated to the committee by Campus Provosts, District Discipline Deans, and Vice-Presidents, were informed colleagues who provided the instructional programs and service units with an impartial assessment of, and response to, the data and analysis presented in the Program/Unit Review reports. The PRSC’s Executive Committee comprised the elected chair, the outgoing chair, the incoming chair, and a representative of the Institutional Research Office. The Program Review process has reaped important benefits in building a sustainable culture of assessment, using data and analysis to document effectiveness, drive planning, and inform decisions.

Specifically, the PRSC Executive Committee assigned each Program/Unit Review report to a review team comprising at least three PRSC members, all of whom were outside the program or unit under review, and one of whom was an especially experienced PRSC member who served as the team’s senior reviewer. The team carefully evaluated the program or unit’s responses to the required sections of the template, including the supporting data provided, according to three criteria: (1) *responsiveness* to the template section; (2) *adequacy of the data/evidence* adduced to support assertions; and (3) *adequacy of the analysis* of that data/evidence. Based on this evaluation, the review team then recommended an overall rating for

the Program/Unit Review, which the team, normally through its senior reviewer, presented to the full PRSC for a vote.

Each Program/Unit Review received one of the following ratings:

1. *Accepted Without Recommendations*

A Program/Unit Review that received an Accepted Without Recommendations rating—the highest attainable—was acceptable to the PRSC as submitted, and the program or unit did not need to take any further action.

2. *Accepted With Recommendations*

A Program/Unit Review that received an Accepted With Recommendations rating was acceptable to the PRSC as submitted, and the program did not need to take any further action. However, because of the recommendations, the program or unit was encouraged, but not required, to submit a revised review addressing the areas of recommendation. A program or unit that elects to submit a revised review will submit it to the Institutional Research Office by July 31, 2025.

A Program/Unit Review may receive the related rating of Accepted With Recommendations *and Required Changes*, which involves not only recommendations that the program or unit is encouraged, but not required, to implement but also specified changes that the program or unit is required to make as a condition of acceptance. The programs or units whose report received this rating must submit the required changes to the Institutional Research Office by October 1, 2025, for evaluation by PRSC representatives.

3. *Accepted With Required Changes*

A Program/Unit Review that received an Accepted With Required Changes rating will be acceptable to the PRSC only if the program or unit revises the document to make specified changes. The programs whose reports received this rating must submit the required changes to the Institutional Research Office by October 1, 2025, for evaluation by PRSC representatives.

Regarding Program/Unit Reviews that received a rating that requires changes, upon submission of those changes to the Institutional Research Office, a PRSC representative will evaluate the changes for compliance by October 1, 2025. If a

program or unit fails to submit the proper changes or corrections by this deadline, the PRSC will downgrade the rating to Revisit and Revise.

4. *Revisit and Revise*

A Program/Unit Review that received a Revisit and Revise rating was one in which one or more required sections of the template were left unanswered or that otherwise required more extensive revisions. The program or unit must revise the report to correct the deficiencies and submit the revised report to the Institutional Research Office by October 1 of that year for review by PRSC representatives. The PRSC will then hear recommendations and vote on the revised submissions in November 2025.

During the 2024–2025 Program Review process, the PRSC developed and implemented improvements to the Program/Unit Review process in four main areas. First, the PRSC Template Subcommittee improved the Program/Unit Review templates to clarify the requests for required data and analysis. For templates relating to instructional programs, the Template Subcommittee also revised the templates to require enhanced reporting regarding the Continuous Improvement Plan and program-level learning outcomes. Further, the Template Subcommittee prepared a separate instructional document corresponding to each template to help guide authors in responding to template questions and locating supporting data.

Second, as a complement to the template improvements, the PRSC Heatmap/Rubric Subcommittee enhanced the precision, objectivity, and uniformity of the three main criteria by which PRSC review teams evaluate Program/Unit Reviews. Specifically, the subcommittee revised the Program/Unit Review rubric to incorporate a numeric rating system for each of the three criteria and established a scale for calculating the ultimate recommendation that the review team would make to the full PRSC. The subcommittee also revised the heatmap applicable to each template to reflect the numerical allocations.

Third, the PRSC Procedures Manual Subcommittee revised the PRSC Procedures Manual to address action items from last year's Program Review End-of-Cycle Report—namely, a procedure for programs and units to appeal PRSC ratings and a protocol for reviewing the required changes submitted by programs or units whose original reports received a rating of Accepted With Recommendations and Required Changes or a rating of Accepted With Required Changes. The subcommittee also crafted a more detailed protocol for reviewing revised reports submitted by programs or units whose reports received a Revisit and Revise rating.

Finally, the PRSC enhanced its engagement with Program/Unit Review authors by presenting an interactive panel discussion at the August 2024 Faculty Development. The panelists consisted of a representative of the Institutional Research Office, the current PRSC chair, and two additional seasoned members of the PRSC, all of whom offered guidance to the authors and answered their questions. In January 2025, the PRSC also held its annual in-person training meeting for new PRSC members.

Tableau dashboards showing summary data as well as enhanced program-level data that align to prompts in the program review templates were rolled out to promote data-informed reflection in Program Reviews and Continuous Improvement Plans. Additional ZogoTech reports were available to supplement these resources. The Institutional Research Office provided training and just-in-time support to individuals to ensure adoption was robust.

SACSCOC Linkage

Program Review is critical to the SACSCOC evaluation process in that it demonstrates that Collin College is requiring program faculty and unit directors to undertake a self-study of their respective programs and units to ensure that they are addressing key best practices and effectively delivering their instruction and services. SACSCOC reviews both the Program Review process and the Continuous Improvement Plans to evaluate whether Collin College is assessing the programs in workforce, academic, and continuing education programs and in support units to ensure that the institution is continuing to improve the learning process, learning outcomes, and services for the students. The Program Review process not only serves to document the assessment process at Collin College but also increases accountability.

Program Review Submission Process 2024–2025

Sixteen programs and service units were scheduled to submit Program/Unit Reviews in 2024–2025. Approximately 50 PRSC reviewers, divided into review teams of three members, actively reviewed all the Program Review documents submitted to the PRSC. This year saw 100% compliance; that is, all 16 programs and units submitted their Program/Unit Review documents to the Institutional Research Office. Of the 16 submissions, ten were by workforce programs, five were by service units, and one was by an academic field of study.

Seven of this cycle's Program/Unit Reviews—approximately 44%—received the top rating of *Accepted Without Recommendations*. This percentage is double the percentage of Program/Unit Reviews that received that rating from the previous cycle. These programs and

units are to be commended for their excellent work on the reports and for setting a high standard for the Program Review Process:

- Admissions (service unit).
- Business Office Systems Support (workforce program).
- Criminal Justice (academic field of study).
- Math, Science, and Writing Labs (service unit).
- Nursing RN (workforce program).
- Respiratory Care (workforce program).
- Software Development, formerly Web and Mobile Development (workforce program).

One Program/Unit Review, submitted by the Records Unit, received an *Accepted With Recommendations* rating with no required changes. If the unit elects to submit a revised review to address the recommendations, the unit will submit the revisions to the Institutional Research Office by October 1, 2025.

Four Program/Unit Reviews received an *Accepted With Recommendations and Required Changes* rating:

- Computer Systems (workforce program).
- Continuing Education and Workforce Development (service unit).
- Grant Management (service unit).
- Interior Design (workforce program).

Two Program Reviews received the rating of *Accepted With Required Changes*:

- Communications Design (workforce program).
- Culinary Arts and Pastry Arts (workforce program).

The programs and units whose reports received either the Accepted With Recommendations and Required Changes rating or the Accepted With Required Changes rating must submit the required changes to the Institutional Research Office by October 1, 2025. Failure to submit the required changes by this deadline will result in a downgrading of the rating to Revisit and Revise.

Finally, two Program Reviews received the rating of *Revisit and Revise*:

- Information Systems Cybersecurity—AAS and BS (workforce program).
- Nursing BSN (workforce program).

These programs must revise their Program Reviews to correct the deficiencies and submit the revised report to the Institutional Research Office by October 1, 2025. The PRSC review team will evaluate the revised report and present a recommendation to the PRSC for a vote in November 2025.

In addition to evaluating the 16 Programs/Unit Reviews scheduled for the 2024–2025 cycle, the PRSC evaluated three Program/Unit Review submissions from the previous cycle. One, by the Business Services unit, had originally been on schedule for the previous cycle, but the unit submitted its report too late in Spring 2024 for evaluation. The other two submissions, by Dental Hygiene (a workforce program) and by Engineering—Civil, Electrical, Mechanical (an academic field of study), were resubmissions because of Revisit and Revise ratings during the previous cycle. In November 2024, the PRSC review team for each of these Program/Unit Reviews recommended an Accepted With Required Changes rating, which the full PRSC approved. Therefore, the Business Services unit, Dental Hygiene program, and Engineering—Civil, Electrical, Mechanical field of study must submit the required changes to the Institutional Research Office by October 1, 2025, for evaluation by PRSC representatives.

The CIP Process

This year, two academic programs, fourteen workforce programs, and three service units had Year 2 CIPs due. Of those, both academic programs, thirteen workforce programs, and two service units submitted their CIPs. Marketing (W) and Financial Aid/Veterans Affairs (U) did not submit their Year 2 CIPs as of the writing of this document.

Additionally, one academic program, sixteen workforce programs, one continuing education program, and five service units had Year 4 CIPs due. Of these, all the academic programs, continuing education programs, and service units turned their CIPs in to the Institutional Research Office. Only Insurance Management (Workforce) did not turn in a CIP.

What Worked in the Program Review Process?

The doubled percentage of Program/Unit Reviews that received the highest rating, Accepted Without Recommendations, this cycle was the combined result of the following improvements: (1) revisions to the Program/Unit Review templates that clarified the requests for

data and analysis; (2) the new instruction documents for completing the templates and accessing relevant data; (3) the new numeric rating system incorporated into the PRSC review teams' rubric and heatmaps; and (4) enhanced engagement with Program/Unit Review authors by representatives of the Institutional Research Office and the PRSC, including the panel discussion hosted by Institutional Research Office and PRSC representatives at the August 2024 Faculty Development Conference.

The Program Review Process itself also benefitted procedurally from the revisions to the PRSC procedures manual that clarified deadlines and other protocols relating to the submission of required changes by programs and units and review of these submissions by PRSC representatives for compliance.

Institutional Research initiated a project to improve response rates for Unit Satisfaction Surveys for faculty/staff and students. The results of these surveys are a key data source for setting continuous improvement goals for awareness of and satisfaction with service units, but declining response rates have limited the reliability of the results. Both surveys were streamlined to reduce the time needed to complete the survey. Institutional Research also collaborated with several members of Information Security and Student and Enrollment Services to create an improved communications plan to disseminate the surveys. As a result, the faculty/staff survey response count grew 64% compared to the 2022 collection and the student response count grew over 1000% compared to the 2023 collection to the highest levels in 10 years.

What Needs to be Revised or Improved?

The improvements to the Program Review process notwithstanding, the PRSC is always engaging in its own continuous improvement process. Accordingly, the PRSC reflected on the 2024–2025 cycle to identify opportunities for improvement. Those areas fell into four main categories:

1. *Further Revisions to Program/Unit Review Templates*

Despite the recent improvements to the Program/Unit Review templates in terms of clarity and guidance, concerns have arisen regarding the appropriate scope of the data and analysis required by the Program/Unit Review templates. For example, certain portions of the templates call for data or analysis that a District Discipline Dean or Vice-President potentially may be in a better position to assess than a program Discipline Lead or a Unit Director, who is typically the main author of a Program/Unit Review. Conversely, more attention must be given to

ensuring programs and units provide evidence of closing the loop in their assessment practices. This will ensure that the institution demonstrates progress on a recommendation from the SACSCOC decennial reaffirmation process.

In addition, questions have arisen regarding the lengthiness of the templates and the relative utility of certain template sections in guiding quality improvements to instructional programs and service units in alignment with the college's mission and strategic priorities, accreditation standards, and institutional resource needs and demands. To address these questions, the PRSC this spring formed two new Template Subcommittees. The first, led by Dr. Jon Hardesty, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, is evaluating the templates for academic fields of study, workforce programs, and continuing education programs. The second, led by Dr. Jeremy Anderson, Vice-President of Institutional Research, is evaluating the template for service units. These subcommittees will be meeting throughout Summer 2025 to streamline the templates more effectively for their intended purposes.

2. Enhanced Coordination Among PRSC Subcommittees

The PRSC has perceived the need for greater coordination and communication among subcommittees to ensure uniformity and secure the benefits of mutual feedback. For example, the PRSC discovered some discrepancies between the section titles on the templates and the titles of the corresponding sections on the heatmaps. The PRSC Heatmap/Rubric Subcommittee will meet this summer to resolve the discrepancies, and the PRSC will strive to improve coordination of the work of the respective committees to achieve consistent products across the board.

3. Additional Revisions to PRSC Procedures Manual

Third, the PRSC has identified some policies that the procedures manual should address—for example: (1) whether adjunct faculty members are eligible to serve on the committee; (2) whether a Program/Unit Review author who is also a PRSC member should exit the meeting during the presentation and abstain from voting on his or her submission; (3) the deadline to submit the required changes for a program or unit that, having originally received a Revisit and Revise rating, later received an Accepted With Required Changes rating upon resubmission; and (4) clarification that participation on a review team during a fall review of resubmitted Revisit and Revise from the previous spring does not satisfy the member's obligation to serve on a review team the following spring.

4. *Increased PRSC Membership for 2025–2026 Cycle*

Finally, PRSC needs to recruit additional members for the upcoming 2025–2026 cycle. This spring, several members of the PRSC withdrew from the committee at the last minute, just as review teams were beginning their work. As a result, all four PRSC Executive Committee members had to substitute on review teams, and another PRSC member had to serve on two review teams. Because next year's cycle will involve many more Program/Unit Review submissions—26—the committee will call on Campus Provosts for nominations for new members after the PRSC has assessed the number of returning members for the upcoming cycle. The goal will be to increase membership sufficiently to staff three-person review teams for each of the 26 Program/Unit Reviews, plus some additional new members who can serve as non-voting team observers during their first cycle and substitute for any voting team members who have to withdraw.

Subcommittees in Progress During Summer 2025

The following subcommittees of the PRSC will be meeting this summer:

First, the two *Template Subcommittees* are reviewing and updating the templates for the Program Review process.

1. The *Template Subcommittee—Academic Field of Study, Workforce, and Continuing Education Program Templates*, led by Dr. Jon Hardesty, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, will streamline the Program Review templates with a greater focus on student learning outcomes. Its members are the following:
 - Cathleen Akers – Professor of History
 - Jeffery Johnson – Professor of Business Management
 - Richard LeBlanc – Professor of Communication Design
 - Jeni McMillin- Professor of English
 - Lee Powell – Dean of Academic Affairs and Workforce at the Frisco Campus
 - Gage Waggoner – Professor of Legal Assistant Program
 - Benedict Nguyen-Lee – Professor of Biology (*ex officio* as 2025–2026 PRSC Chair).
2. The *Template Subcommittee—Service Unit Template*, led by Dr. Jeremy Anderson, Vice-President of Institutional Research, will streamline the Unit Review and

Continuous Improvement Plan templates to better accommodate the needs of service units. Its members are the following:

- Wendy Gunderson – Dean of Academic Services and Curriculum
- Alicia Huppe – Associate Vice President of Student & Enrollment Services
- Jennifer Mangrum – Lab Assistant
- Lindsay Moore – Director of Dual Credit
- Katie Robinson – Data Coordinator for Institutional Effectiveness.

Second, the *Heatmap/Rubric Subcommittee* will revise the Program/Unit Review rubric and heatmaps to conform to the template revisions made by the two Template Subcommittees, reevaluate section weighting as needed, and ensure consistency between the maximum total point values available under the Program Review Rubric, on the one hand, and the overall recommendation scale indicated on the heatmaps, on the other. Subcommittee membership is yet to be determined for Academic Year 2025-26.

Third, the *Procedures Manual Subcommittee* will revise the language of the PRSC Procedures Manual to address the matters described elsewhere in this report and any other matters that the PRSC Executive Committee may deem appropriate. Subcommittee membership is yet to be determined for Academic Year 2025-26.

Finally, the *Training/Videos Subcommittee* will prepare training videos and other instructional materials for Program/Unit Review authors and new members of the PRSC. Subcommittee membership is yet to be determined for Academic Year 2025-26.

Action Items for the Upcoming Program Review Cycle 2025–2026

Attached to this report are the following exhibits:

- Exhibit A, which is a list of the Program/Unit Reviews due for 2025–2026.
- Exhibit B, which is a list of the Year 2 CIPs due for 2025–2026.
- Exhibit C, which is a list of the Year 4 CIPs due for 2025–2026.

Summer is a great time for Campus Provosts, District Discipline Deans, Associate Deans, Discipline Leads, and Unit Directors to begin collecting and analyzing evidence for the Program/Unit Review and Continuous Improvement Plan cycles for 2025-2026. Those programs and units who have required changes should begin to address changes immediately in time for

the mid-June 2025 deadline. Those who must revisit their submissions also should begin to undertake new data collection and/or reflective processes in the summer.

Conclusion

The Program Review Process continues to undergo its own continuous improvement process. Over the last several years, the Institutional Research Office implemented a series of technological improvements for the Program/Unit Review and CIP process. Included in these enhancements are improved institutional recordkeeping and documentation in CougarWeb; refined job aids; new data tools to support data-informed goal setting and reflection; additional training; and improvements to the Unit Satisfaction surveys that yielded more reliable results.

In addition, improvements to the Program/Unit Review templates are ongoing in the work of two PRSC Template Subcommittees that began in Spring 2025 and will complete in Summer 2025. The PRSC Rubric/Heatmap Subcommittee then will make corresponding updates to the Program Review rubric and heatmaps to ensure proper alignment. New member training resources, to be provided by the PRSC Training/Video Subcommittee, will prepare stakeholders to use the new forms and job aids in 2025-26. The Procedures Manual Subcommittee will also be revising the PRSC procedures manual to provide enhanced guidance and uniformity to the Program Review Process.

Appendix A – Program/Unit Reviews due for 2025–2026

- Access (U)
- Athletics (U)
- Automotive Technology (W)
- Biomedical Equipment Technology (W)
- Business Services FOS (A)
- Career Services (U)
- Cloud Computing (W)
- Collision Technology (W)
- Commercial Music (W)
- Construction Technology – Electrical (W)
- Construction Technology – Plumbing (W)
- Construction Technology – Safety (W)
- Fire Science (W)
- Hospitality and Food Service Management (W)
- Information Technology & eLearning Centers (U)
- Insurance Management (W)
- Interpreter Training Program (W)
- Law Enforcement (CE)
- Medical Assisting Advanced Practice (W)
- Mental Health Counseling (U)
- Robotics and Automation Technology (Formerly Industrial Automation) (W)
- Sport & Recreation Management (W)
- Veterinary Technology (W)

Key

- A – Academic
- CE – Continuing Education
- U – Support Unit
- W – Workforce

Appendix B – Year-2 CIPs due for 2025–2026

- Academic Advising (U)
- BAS – Clinical Operations Management (W)
- Business Services (U)
- CE Health Sciences (CE)
- Computer-Aided Drafting and Design (W)
- Construction Management (W)
- Dental Hygiene (W)
- Developmental Education (U)
- Diagnostic Medical Sonography (W)
- Engineering FOSs – Civil, Electrical, and Mechanical (A)
- Information Assurance – AAS (W)
- Music FOS (A)
- Paralegal/Legal Assistant (W)
- Physical Therapist Assistant (W)
- Polysomnographic Technology (W)
- Rehabilitation Aide OSA (W)
- Student Engagement (U)
- Video Production (W)

Key

- A – Academic
- CE – Continuing Education
- U – Support Unit
- W – Workforce

Appendix C – Year-4 CIPs due for 2025–2026

- AAT (A)
- Academic Partnerships (U)
- Academic Success (New Student Orientation) (U)
- Academic Success (Testing) (U)
- Banking and Financial Services (W)
- Commercial Photography (W)
- Core Curriculum, AA, AS (A)
- Database Development (W)
- Drama FOS (A)
- Economics FOS (A)
- Emergency Medical Services Professions (W)
- Fine Arts FOS (A)
- Geospatial Information Science (GIS) (W)
- Health Information Management (W)
- Human Resources (U)
- Human Resources & Organizational Management (W)
- Institutional Research Office (U)
- Library (U)
- Political Science FOS (A)
- Psychology FOS (A)
- Simulation Unit (U)
- Sociology FOS (A)
- Urban Sustainable Agriculture (W)
- Welding (W)

Key

- A – Academic
- CE – Continuing Education
- U – Support Unit
- W – Workforce