



**Academic Program Review Guide**

## Introduction

The overall purpose of the academic program review is to comprehensively review information specific to student learning and viability to inform program planning and improvement.

Each program review will be composed of four parts— a review of student learning outcomes indicators (1d) by designees from the Student Learning Outcomes Committee, a self-assessment conducted by the program faculty members appointed to the self-assessment task force, a review of the self-assessment task force's report by the program viability task force, and a final leadership review and response conducted by the Division Dean and the Vice President of Academic Affairs & Faculty Development/College Provost. Reviews will be completed in a five-year cycle.

Planning objectives (action items) that stem from the academic program review will be indicated as such in the Strategic Planning Online (SPOL) system as part of the program/divisions annual planning. Items identified as action, watch, and forward will be communicated to the President's Administrative Council in a synthesized annual report that includes all program review outcomes for the reporting year.

## Program Cover Sheet

Academic Year:

Division:

Academic Program(s):

Academic Program Review Committee:

Self-Assessment Task Force:

Participants: This should be a group of faculty teaching in the program and appointed by the division dean or their designee. The size of the group will vary depending on the program, but will likely consist of 3-5 faculty members, including a designated faculty member to chair the self-assessment task force.

Charge: The self-assessment committee is responsible for providing a 1-2 paragraph response to each of the subcomponents in the 2 program review categories. The response should be provided after committee members analyze the evidence for each subcomponent. The committee is also responsible for generating a response to the outcome prompts (pg. 5) for each category and making any revisions they deem necessary after reviewing feedback provided by the viability task force and the leadership task force.

Name, Title

Student Learning Outcomes Task Force:

Participants: Representatives from the Student Learning Outcomes Committee.

Charge: Make recommendations to the self-assessment task force based on the review of the student learning outcomes evidence provided by the program and available as evidence in subcomponent 1.d (Program Learning Outcomes). Recommendations will be related to the learning outcomes assessment evidence and use of results and will be provided to the self-assessment task force as a piece of evidence at the beginning of the academic program review.

Name, Title

Program Viability Task Force:

Participants: Representatives from library services, academic technology, office of disabilities, and student development.

Charge: Respond to the self-assessment task forces summary of findings and associated subcomponents for each category by making recommendations, acknowledging strengths, and asking probing questions.

Leadership Task Force:

Participants: Division Dean, the Dean of Academic Affairs and Institutional Accreditation, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs & Faculty Development/College Provost.

Charge: Respond to the final report produced by the self-assessment task force and make final recommendations for action items.

## Let's Begin (Self-Assessment Task Force)

The academic program review is structured into two main categories: student learning and program viability. Each category has multiple subcomponents supported by evidence, some of which is **provided** to the program and some of which is generated by the program. Provided or suggested evidence may not be entirely inclusive of all relevant program data or information and task force members are encouraged to include additional evidence as appropriate. A glossary of subcomponent terms, timeline for completion, and category response templates are provided to committee members as part of the academic program review process.

In addition to providing a 1-2 paragraph response to each of the subcomponents in the 2 program review categories. Please list and provide access to any additional pieces of evidence the program wishes to consider. Academic program review requires the following outcomes for each primary category:

Strengths (Program Strengths):

Action Items (SPOL planning objectives for the coming year(s); 2-3 across both categories; examples for Category 1 Student Learning might include: revising course sequences, PLOs, MLOs, course outlines, curriculum maps, assessment maps, etc.):

Watch Items (Items that are not immediate planning items, but that the program will watch for potential future action items.):

Forward Items (Items that the self-assessment task force would like to forward to division and institutional leadership for consideration in division or college-wide planning.):

Category 1 Student Learning: This section focuses on the program’s mission, curriculum, student learning outcomes, and student achievement.

Category	Subcomponent	Evidence	Guiding Questions
Student Learning	1.a Program Mission	Program Mission Statement Enrollment, Retention, and/or Completion data on target populations.	How does Program Mission align with industry standards, discipline specific accrediting bodies, and/or curriculum frameworks. Are there special populations the program is targeting. If so, how is that population faring?
Student Learning	1.b Curriculum	<a href="#">Curriculum Map</a> <a href="#">Master Course Outlines</a> Description of Key Learning Experiences (i.e. internship, community-service, etc.)	Have we added or removed courses to the program and is this reflected on the curriculum map? Does program curriculum offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular degree? How well does the curriculum align with learning outcomes?
Student Learning	1.c Program Sequence	Sequence Map	Does our sequence map consider the curriculum map and scheduling needs of the student body?
Student Learning	1.d Program Learning Outcomes	<a href="#">Learning Outcomes Map</a> <a href="#">Learning Outcomes Results</a> <a href="#">Learning Outcomes Action Items</a> <a href="#">Learning Outcomes Committee Report</a> Student Surveys Employer Surveys	Have we used learning outcomes data to make changes to our program? Have we considered the feedback provided by the student learning outcomes committee? Are there changes we need to make to the program based on the review of the data in this section? Does the curriculum meet the rigor required for achievement of the program learning outcomes? How does the college know the rigor is appropriate? What are the standards of achievement?
Student Learning	1.e Student Achievement	<a href="#">Retention Data</a> <a href="#">Completion Data</a> <a href="#">Placement/Transfer Data</a> <a href="#">Course Success Rates</a> <a href="#">Perkins Measures</a>	Are students being retained and graduating in a timely fashion (i.e. between 100%-200% completion time)? Are students prepared for advanced study or the world of work?

Findings (Category 1): After reviewing the evidence collected for the program analyze your findings for each subcomponent. Responses should reference evidence reviewed during your analysis. Conclude the section with overall statements of strength, action items, watch items, and forward items for the category.

Analysis of Findings for Subcomponents:

1.a Program Mission

1.b Curriculum

1.c Program Sequence

1.d Program Learning Outcomes

1.e Student Achievement

Strengths (Program Strengths):

Action Items (SPOL planning objectives for the coming year(s); 2-3 across both categories; examples for Category 1 Student Learning might include: revising course sequences, PLOs, MLOs, course outlines, curriculum maps, assessment maps, etc.):

Watch Items (Items that are not immediate planning items, but that the program will watch for potential future action items.):

Forward Items (Items that the self-assessment task force would like to forward to division and institutional leadership for consideration in division or college-wide planning.):

Category 2 Program Viability:

Category	Subcomponent	Evidence	Guiding Questions
Program Viability	2.a Faculty Ratios	FT:PT Ratio Faculty:Student Ratio	Are ratios aligned with accreditation standards? Are ratios sufficient for student success?
Program Viability	2.b Program Demand	Enrollment Data Employment Trends Advisory Board Surveys Fill Rates Recruitment Efforts	Do fill rates indicate that we offer too many or not enough sections of a given course? Is the employment outlook/wage for graduates positive? Are enrollment trends positive? How are we recruiting students?
Program Viability	2.c Policies and Procedures		Are the programs current policies aligned with relevant state statutes and/or board rules?
Program Viability	2.d Learning Environment	Classroom Space Library Resources Technology Accessibility	Do students have the support they need to do their work? Do program faculty have the support they need to do their work?
Program Viability	2.e Student Support	Advising	Who advises students for the program? Do students receive accurate information about the program? Do students receive accurate information about post-graduation options related to their program?

Findings (Category 2): After reviewing the evidence collected for the program analyze your findings for each subcomponent. Responses should reference evidence reviewed during your analysis. Conclude the section with overall statements of strength, action items, watch items, and forward items for the category.

Analysis of Findings for Subcomponents:

2.a Faculty Ratios

2.b Program Demand

2.c Policies and Procedures

2.d Learning Environment

2.e Student Support

Strengths (Program Strengths):

Action Items (SPOL planning objectives for the coming year(s); 2-3 across both categories; examples for Category 1 Student Learning might include: revising course sequences, PLOs, MLOs, course outlines, curriculum maps, assessment maps, etc.):

Watch Items (Items that are not immediate planning items, but that the program will watch for potential future action items.):

Forward Items (Items that the self-assessment task force would like to forward to division and institutional leadership for consideration in division or college-wide planning.):