

## Findings of Academic Senate Program Review Committee, 2015-2016

### **Academic Senate Program Review Committee Members:**

Corey E. Andrews (coordinator), Jane Beese (BCOE), Rebecca M. Curnalia (CCAC), Kin P. Moy (STEM), William G. Vendemia (WCBA), Albert J. Sumell (CLASS), Patricia Hoyson (HHS), Ernest M. Barket (student)

### **Process of Program Review:**

This year marked the beginning of a new formalized process of program review. All academic programs on campus submitted either an abbreviated program review or a full program review. 20% of all academic programs were self-selected by College Deans to undergo full program review. The process for both abbreviated and full program review was explained in the Program Review Handbook, which included specific categories for review as well as a rubric that was used in the evaluation process. In addition, data concerning programs' enrollment, retention, and associated categories was provided for program coordinators; training sessions on the use and interpretation of this data were also made available.

### **22 Full Program Reviews Evaluated:**

1. BSE Early Childhood (BCOE)
2. BA Communication Studies (CCAC)
3. BA Music—Music History, Music Theory, Applied Music (CCAC)
4. BFA Musical Theater (CCAC)
5. BA Long-Term Care (CLASS)
6. BA Professional and Technical Writing (CLASS)
7. BA Psychology (CLASS)
8. BGS General Studies (CLASS)
9. AAS Dietetic Technician Human Ecology (HHS)
10. AAS Emergency Medical Services Health Professions (HHS)
11. BSAS Coordinated program in Dietetics Human Ecology (HHS)
12. BSAS Didactic Program in Human Ecology (HHS)
13. BSW Social Work (HHS)
14. CER Emergency Medical Services Health Professions (HHS)
15. BA Chemistry (STEM)
16. BS Chemistry (STEM)
17. BS Biochemistry (STEM)
18. BE Industrial Engineering (STEM)
19. BE Mechanical Engineering (STEM)
20. BSBA Accounting (WCBA)
21. BSBA Advertising and Public Relations (WCBA)
22. BSBA Marketing Management (WCBA)

### **Program Reviews Approved / Not Approved:**

All program reviews were approved with the exception of the following: BE Industrial Engineering, BSAS Coordinated Program in Dietetics Human Ecology, BS Biochemistry, BFA Musical Theater, and BA Long-Term Care. Coordinators for these programs will be required to revise and resubmit these program reviews on a time-line to be determined.

Please note that program reviews were approved or not approved solely on the basis of the review itself; no judgement of a program's quality was made by reviewers, but rather the quality of the reviews that were submitted was assessed. In some cases, the reviews were incomplete or lacked data; in others, coordinators did not follow the program review guidelines in writing the review. Feedback from all committees on the full program reviews will be archived online and made accessible to faculty.

### **Overall Success of Program Review:**

Program review approval rate for this first round was 77% (17/22). All program reviews underwent three stages of evaluation: College level, University level, and Academic Senate Program Review Committee level. In addition, all abbreviated program reviews were evaluated at the College level. In sum, 75 abbreviated and full programs were submitted for this first round of evaluation.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Recommendations for Program Coordinators Concerning Program Review:**

1. Program reviews need to provide evidence (such as enrollment and retention data) to substantiate claims about both program quality and program needs; data was provided for all program coordinators. In several cases this data was not utilized in the program reviews.
2. Program reviews need to present plausible solutions to existing problems within the program, especially concerning allocation of present and future resources. Program reviews need to offer constructive plans for the resolution of existing problems that can be addressed at the program level.
3. Programs need to be aligned more clearly and explicitly to university mission and strategic goals, as well as provide greater evidence of engagement at the local, national, and / or global levels. Program outcomes also need to be directly tied to achievement of these goals at the program level.
4. Program effectiveness needs to be more clearly stated and explained; in addition, explicit action steps with specific details on implementation need to be provided. These action steps should also be able to be implemented in a reasonable timeline.

5. Program coordinators need to improve outreach to alumni for tracking, job placement, and program quality data. Establishing such ties with alumni should enable a stronger and more coherent evaluation of program effectiveness in general.
6. Programs which are requesting resources for growth and development need to provide specific costs for their implementation; in addition, programs need to present proposals that substantiate the need for resources. Faculty and facilities may be considered as resource requests in this respect.
7. Programs need to provide a clearly defined evaluative process to assess program outcomes. Improved methods and / or strategies for determining student success in meeting these outcomes need to be clearly stated and capable of effective utilization.

**Recommendations for University / Administration Concerning Program Review:**

1. The University and Administration need to develop a protocol for resource requests; programs that need facilities and faculty as resources for growth and development require a clearly-defined process to initiate and maintain their requests.
2. Resources for program maintenance (especially as they impact enrollment) need to be provided by the University and Administration, particularly regarding a program's need to maintain adequate quality control standards.
3. The University and Administration need to aid program coordinators with tracking alumni to gain data on job placement and program quality. Outreach to alumni needs to extend beyond the program level; with greater institutional aid, better data may be gathered to evaluate a program's overall effectiveness for its graduates.
4. The University and Administration should be responsible for ensuring ADA compliance, not individual faculty or programs; all programs need institutional resources and support in order to meet the demands for ADA compliance.

**Recommendations about the Overall Process of Program Review:**

1. The program review process will take place over two semesters beginning in the fall 2016 semester; this will involve earlier deadlines for submission of program reviews, but it will also allow for more time for their composition and evaluation.
2. Data for analysis will be provided earlier in the process for program coordinators; in addition, training sessions on data usage will be offered over a longer period.
3. The entire program review process will be evaluated before its next implementation in the fall 2016 semester, with attention to feedback on the current model's strengths and areas for improvement.