

Program Review Revision, Spring 2013 Submission Cycle

In addition to substantive revisions and updates summarized below, the 2013 revision reflects developments and innovations in SLO assessment and institutional planning. The program review forms used in the 2012 submission cycle have been “piloted” since 2008. The revision addresses the need to better integrate program SLO and student learning data assessment into the Institutional Planning Committee’s (IPC) overall planning and self-assessment cycle (See “ACCJC Accreditation Standards: Annotated for Continuous Quality Improvement”).

The revision process began in Spring, 2012. The Program Review Revision Group, an ad hoc Academic Senate committee charged with reviewing and revising program review, is made up of the Academic Senate President, Academic Senate committee chairs, appointees, and the Dean of the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE).

The members are James Carranza (Academic Senate President), Laura Demsetz (Faculty Co-Chair, Accreditation), Cheryl Gregory (appointee, Learning Support Centers), Teeka James (appointee, AFT President), David Locke (Chair, College Assessment Committee), Teresa Morris (Chair, Committee on Instruction), Eileen O’Brien (appointee, Student Services), and John Sewart (Dean, PRIE).

Summary of major changes:

The revised program review forms and processes (for how they will be used to inform institutional planning) address all relevant accreditation standards in an efficient, logical manner.

All programs submit an annual program review, emphasizing ongoing reflection, assessment, planning, and action—the focus of which is to sustain and improve student learning on a continuous basis. The revised forms strive to avoid duplication of data entry and analysis.

The revised forms provide links to essential planning documents and data resources. Ideally, we will move to an electronic, database format for the 2014 cycle to simplify input and retrieval and, more importantly, to facilitate the use of program reviews in institutional planning.

The program review template begins, generally, with program reflection, followed by SLO and student learning data assessment, long-range planning, short-term action planning, and budgeting. Instruction, Learning Support Centers, and Student Services use the common template though sections and sub-sections may vary.

Program review is essential to program and institutional self-assessment and planning. It is the most important contribution to the institutional planning process that programs make in support of student learning and success.

Full-Time Faculty Requests are made using criteria agreed to by both the Academic Senate and Instructional Administrators Council, so faculty and deans do not duplicate efforts in making requests. The Full-Time Faculty Request Form is no longer in the program review form but is instead linked or “attached.”

Program Vision informs IPC’s long-range institutional planning and decision-making. The short-term action planning aids programs in prioritizing, documenting, and tracking plans to sustain and improve student learning and success. These plans will be used to further inform and guide IPC in matters directly related to student learning.

PRIE revised the “Student Success and Core Program Indicators” data sheet, replacing linear projections with student success indicators tracked over three years. The demographic variables section now captures data over three years rather than one, making it possible for programs to note trends in success.

The Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) and Academic Senate are actively engaged in revising the process for how program review is used to inform college planning.

The revised form for Instruction addresses Title 5 requirements for CTE programs.

The revised forms encourage all programs to document and share “professional enrichment” needs, consider possible connections to other programs across the institution in support of student learning and success, and anticipate long-term resource needs.

(For additional context, refer to “ACCJC Accreditation Standards: Annotated for Continuous Quality Improvement” and *Program Review: Setting a Standard*, adopted 2009, ASCCC.)

Program Review Outline (Instruction)

I. Description of Program

II. Summary of Student and Program Data

- A. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
- B. Student Success Indicators
 - 1. Student success and demographic variables
 - 2. Course delivery mode
- C. Program Efficiency Indicators
- D. Course Outline Updates
- E. Website Review
- F. Additional Career Technical Education Data

III. Student Learning Outcomes Scheduling and Alignment

- A. Course SLO Assessment
- B. Program SLO Assessment
- C. SLO Alignment

IV. Additional Factors

V. Institutional Planning

- A. Results of Previous Plans and Initiatives
- B. Program Vision
 - 1. Future faculty and staff development initiatives and professional enrichment
 - 2. Future collaboration across student services, learning support centers, and instructional programs
 - 3. Long-range planning, categorized by resources (i.e. faculty, equipment and technology, instructional materials, etc.)
- C. Plans and Actions to Improve Student Success

VI. Resource Requests

- A. Itemized Resource Requests
- B. Cost for Prioritized Plans