Committee Procedures
College of the Canyons Program Review Committee

I. Mission
   a. The purpose of the Program Review Committee (an Academic Senate subcommittee) is to provide training, advisement and assistance to College of the Canyons faculty and staff to facilitate and improve the program review process. The committee will provide leadership and guidance by reviewing comprehensive program reviews, annual plans, outcomes and assessment cycles, and evaluating the program review planning process.

II. Oversight
   a. The Academic Senate reviews the activity of the Committee and gives general direction to its work.

III. Duties and Functions
   a. The Program Review Committee will be responsible for maintaining a process by which instructional and administrative programs systematically assess themselves to ensure currency, relevance, appropriateness, and achievement of stated goals and outcomes.
   b. The committee will review all proposed procedural and content changes to the program review including budget processes.
   c. The Committee will:
      i. Develop, write, evaluate and update program review forms and procedures in collaboration with other constituencies, as appropriate.
      ii. Review final instructional and administrative program reviews, identifying themes, and providing advisory guidance to faculty, staff and administrators.
      iii. Provide an annual report of its activities and actions to the College Planning Team, the Academic Senate, and other constituencies.

IV. Membership
   a. The committee will be composed of appointed and standing members from faculty and administration.
      i. Appointed members
         1. One faculty member from each instructional division.
            a. Allied Heath & Public Safety
            b. CTE
            c. ECE
            d. Enrollment Services/Counseling
            e. FAPA
            f. Humanities
            g. Kinesiology/PE/Athletics
            h. Learning Resources
            i. Math, Science and Engineering
            j. Social Science and Business
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ii. The Program Review Committee is open to all but the goal is to include at least one representative from each academic division, with possible alternates to attend in case of absences.

iii. Standing members
   1. CIO or academic dean
   2. Dean, Instructional Support and Student Success
   3. Assistant Superintendent–Vice President, institutional development & technology or designee
   3. Academic Senate President or designee
   4. Professional Development Committee representative
   5. SLO coordinator

b. Any change in membership structure must be approved by the Academic Senate.

c. If a new academic division is created, it will be immediately entitled to representation within the committee.

V. Management

a. The co-chairs will be elected at the first meeting of the academic year for a two-year term.

b. The co-chairs shall have served at least one semester on the committee prior to his/her term.

c. Only division representatives will have voting rights concerning academic program review processes and functions.

d. Only administrative representatives will have voting rights concerning administrative program review processes and functions.

f. When there is more than one faculty representative per division present, only one vote per division is allowed.

g. While alternates may attend in place of division representatives, they will not have voting rights unless the appointed representative has given permission for his/her proxy to vote.

h. Committee chairs may vote only if they are also acting as their division’s main representative.

i. Committee members will share the responsibility of taking minutes.

j. All documents related to the business of the Committee will be posted on the COC intranet committee website.

k. The committee will meet on twice each month during the fall and spring semesters.

l. All changes to procedures and forms will be submitted to constituencies for review before implementation.

m. Quorum will be 50% plus one of the total current membership.

n. The Committee will make decisions based on a majority vote.

o. The members of the Committee will be collaborative, engage in collegial discussions, be respectful of other members and presenters and their different points of view, and consider the college and community as a whole, not just the constituent group that the member represents.
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p. The Committee will review this agreement on an annual basis.

VI. Attendance
   a. It is the responsibility of the committee member to notify a co-chair when he/she is unable to attend a scheduled meeting.
   b. If a member of the Committee isn’t able to attend a meeting, he/she is encouraged to ask another faculty member from the division to attend in his/her place.
**Program Review Update**

Academic Senate  
May 8, 2014  
Dr. Miriam Golbert and Paul Wickline (co-chairs)

---

Why is completing Program Review important?

- Self-evaluation for institutional improvement
- Crucial for planning and budgeting
- “10+1” (Title 5 53200) faculty responsibility in policy development and implementation...

---

**Program Review Suggestions**

- Asked Institutional Research to export all data entered within academic program review (APR) for department use.
- Add additional data to the APR “home page”
- Provide a downloadable project management template in APR “home page”

---

*From the Academic Program Review Committee
How were suggestions arrived at?

- Examination of Paralegal Year 1 APR with checklist (in development)
- Ongoing APR committee discussions (bi-monthly meetings)
- Consideration of ACCJC standards and ASCCC guiding document “Program Review: Setting a Standard”
- TWO “open forums” in which faculty were invited to give feedback.
  - Bob Maxwell (Business)
  - Keith Kawamoto (Fire Tech)
  - Victoria Leonard (COMS)
  - Via email

Program Review Suggestions*

- Move due date to the end of the fall semester
  - Spring faculty (chair) workload is considerable
  - Summer schedule
  - Fall schedule
  - Spring schedule
  - Spring curriculum deadlines
- Other benefits
  - Provide administrators/chairs more opportunity to meet before budget decisions final.
  - Allow possibility for increased budget discussions and PAC–B representative involvement in conversation.
  - Provides TIME in spring for completion of additional APR-related tasks.

Program Review Suggestions*

- 1. Divide text box “Mission/Description” into two separate boxes:
  - “Mission of Program”
  - “Description of Program”
  - ADD connection statement of alignment with college mission.
    - Suggested language: "Briefly describe how the program supports the college mission."
    - This would be no more than 2–3 sentences at most.
Program Review Suggestions*

- The description of each degree or certificate would also be included in this area (prefilled from the official, adopted language in CurricUNET).

- Program (certificate/degree) SLOs may be listed under each degree for faculty reference.

2. Add area for “Program Goals.”

- 4–8 overarching key instructional goals defined in terms of student learning expectations and workplace outcomes.
- The ACCJC expectation as identified in the ACCJC SLO Rubric: “Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.”
- Paralegal program includes these both on the APR (Academic Program Review) and department website.

3. Evaluation of Program Descriptors

- Expand data tables to include last 5 years of data, rather than last two.
- Request – ADD “Transfers”
- Number of Overdue Courses (eliminate)
- Number of Sections Requested (CCC, VC, Online) (Eliminate and replace with FTES target)
- Cost per FTES (eliminate)
- Success Rate (keep – disaggregated)
- Retention Rate (keep – disaggregated)
5. **Add additional department specific data** after “Resourced Invested” area. (see "Program Review Data Elements" handout)

6. **Suggestion** -- move “Data Trends” (currently follows the “SLO Tables”) from “Previous Objectives/Internal Factors” to the area following “Resources Invested” near the beginning of the APR template.

---

7. **“Use of Data” and “Processes”**:  
   - **Expand word count** here (and other areas).  
   - **Bullet items** in these sections to help guide faculty in responding.  
   - **Move “Processes” before “Use of Data”** in the template.  
   - In “Use of Data” revise prompts to include this statement: "**Identify the most significant data elements you used in decision making/planning.**"
Program Review Suggestions*

- 8. Move “Data Trends” (currently follows the SLO tables) to immediately below “PROGRAM DESCRIPTORS” area.
- SO, order of areas would be as follows:
  - Data Trends
  - Processes
  - Use of Data
  - Enrollment Management Analysis (see #30, page 4)

SLOs and Program Review

- 10. Student Learning Outcomes
  - Reminder -- SLO tables will be removed for APR Year 1 (2014).
  - Assessments (both Assessment Plans “Phase 1” and Assessment Results “Phase 2” are now recorded in CAM (CurricUNET Assessment Database) beginning spring 2014.
  - Institutional Research will work with SLO Committee and SLO Coordinators to pull and help prepare information from CurricUNET Assessment Module (CAM) to provide to departments by late September.

SLOs and Program Review

- 10. Question(s) connecting SLO ASSESSMENT and PROGRAM REVIEW need to remain within the APR to keep assessment integrated with program planning.
- SLO & Program Review Committees proposed this prompt to maintain (and improve) this connection:
SLO/Program Review Connection
Prompt:

How has your department used assessment of student learning outcomes (at the course or program level) to initiate program improvement (i.e. curriculum updates or changes, delivery of content/services, and/or the development of new program goals) since the last program review cycle? How have these changes positively impacted student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness?

WHY this question?
Connects assessment results to planning and incorporates language from ACCJC annual report in prompt.

Program Review Suggestions*

- Strengths/Challenges/Objectives
  - Two years ago the APR committee suggested reorganizing the template to move these three items together for Year 2 and Year 3.
  - This will continue for Year 1 (2014) of next cycle.
  - However, suggestion has been made to move PLANNING, OBJECTIVES and DATA TRENDS together to more clearly connect these.
  - Discussion ongoing in APR Committee...

Internal Factors

- 13. Challenges (cut) - Redundant. Committee believes this is addressed by program faculty when identifying objectives. See #30 (New Objectives) on “Program Review Committee Report” document provided in 5-8-14 agenda.
- 14. Facilities Needs (cut) – this will be included in a new area of the program review where tables will be provided (TBA)
- 15. Canyon Country Campus and a possible Westside Campus (keep). Revise the PROMPTS to be more inclusive. Currently reads: “Please indicate any plans your department has for offering courses or new curricula at the Canyon Country Campus. Also include plans for offering courses or new curricula at a possible Westside Campus.” Revise to include MORE than just proposed curricula.
16. Connection to Educational and Facilities Master Plan *(keep)*
   - NOTE: Add hyperlink to the Ed Facilities Master Plan

17. Support Staffing and Faculty *(keep but REVISE)*
   - Change from one to two fields:
     - What changes have occurred in the last three years?
     - What changes are expected in the next three years within your program?
     - Adult hourly staffing needs
     - Classified staffing needs
     - Full time Faculty needs
     - Other staffing needs?

21. **ADD a prompt** asking for identification of "SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE" for department specific technology (CPR dummies, hardware replacement, software replacement, equipment replacement, etc.) This might be pulled to better alert the college administrators and committees as to when scheduled maintenance will be needed.

22. Add **UPLOAD FILE** area here at the end of this major section
Keep all.
Add UPLOAD FILE area here at the end of this major section

28. Departmental Strengths (keep)
29. Departmental Challenges (keep)

30. New Objectives. Revise to include a table instead which also identifies resources needed.
“Enrollment Patterns” analysis: “In light of the college’s enrollment management plan, the economy, and other factors, how would you evaluate your department’s enrollment patterns? Consider data such as: student retention and success, average class size, number of sections offered, number of students declaring a field in your department as a major, number of students completing certificates or degrees, number of students participating in work study, and number of students placed in jobs related to their majors in your departments.”

See slide 13. This question will be MOVED to below “Use of Data.”

DELETE QUESTION #2: “Based on your review, what do you need to do to excel next year? Consider issues such as: curriculum, location and scheduling of classes, partnerships and coordination with other departments and organizations.”

DELETE QUESTION #3: “What resources will you need to achieve your goals? Consider resources such as professional development, additional adult hourly, instructional supplies, assistance from other departments on campus, as well as other items.”

The Program Review Committee recommends deleting these questions believing they are repetitive and address elsewhere in program review.