

**Program Review Committee**

November 15, 2019

9:00 am – 11:00am  
SS 104

**Notes**

**Purpose:**  Review and discuss program review process for the year.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.0 | Instructional Reviews   * Addiction Studies   **Program Information:**  Exemplary: The mission and function of the program clearly and concisely aligns with the mission of the College. The program information shows the connection it has within the community. The Committee members commend personnel for obtaining CCAPP certification, but it is not so clear how the certification will specifically benefit CR’s program. The committee also appreciated that the program is working to increase completers and this is reflected in the data.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Developing/Satisfactory: the assessment findings seem short and vague. The committee is concerned that only 54.5% of the curriculum is up to date. Committee members recognize that the Addiction Studies program will need to realign or deactivate courses with the creation of the Social Work degree, but that doesn’t seem like a compelling reason that so much of the curriculum is out of date as that degree was just approved Fall 2019. The committee hopes to see the plan carried out to update all course outlines so they are up to date.  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Developing: The current status of the plans is clear, but the impact of action lacks data and are minimally explained in all three previous plans.  **Planning:**  Satisfactory: Committee members appreciate that the two plans are directly linked to the Guided Pathways initiatives and those dovetail with the Vision for Success goals listed below. It is not clear, though, how the program personnel discovered that there were deficiencies in student planning, registering, and completing because the relationship to previous plans section is left blank.   * Administration of Justice/Basic Academy   **Program Information:**  Exemplary: The mission of the program aligns with the mission of the college and the program’s function and impact on the college and the community are clearly identified. Committee members commend the program for its three Police Science AS completers and for its successful POST review and reaffirmation of accreditation.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Satisfactory/Developing: Assessments do not appear to be regularly conducted within the college’s established cycle. There is an explanation as to why the CLOs are not regularly assessed. Program personnel may consider creating a more manageable CLO and PLO regimen. Committee members appreciate that the out-of-date curriculum will be addressed during this academic year. Committee members also recognize that the external agency, POST, drives much of the programmatic changes and not internal assessment findings. Committee members are curious, though, about what data the program has accumulated that indicates that a hybrid format for degree courses is necessary. This information appears anecdotally in Section 5.1 (“Program Plans”).  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Satisfactory: Some plans are stated vaguely in a way that committee members recommend further elaboration in order to fully understand what is being planned (such as “Range parking lot”, “Hydration station”, and “Update supply of rental equipment”). Any unmet plans would benefit from having a more developed explanation. Current status of planning actions is clearly explained. Committee members would like to see some additional quantification in the “impact” section. For example, is there a way to quantify “increased awareness of cultural diversity”? Perhaps indicating how many students participated in the diversity training and successfully completed the training would work here? The resources provided seem to have remedied the problem of instructors spending time repairing worn-out equipment in lieu of focusing on instruction.  **Planning:**  Exemplary/Satisfactory: Program plans are directly and clearly linked to institutional plans. The committee appreciates the information in the “Relationship to Previous Assessment” section that clearly explains why the plans are necessary. However, the third one (about increasing the use of technology) seems to rely on anecdotal information rather than data. It seems to make sense that there would be a certain population of students who are unable to attend regular day courses, but it’s not entirely clear exactly what that number is. The committee recognizes the achievements toward Vision for Success goals 1, 2, and 4 but it’s unclear how social media marketing and promoting the program in local high schools connects with the “Equity” goal.   * Agriculture   **Program Information:**  Exemplary: The program mission is clear and supports the larger mission of the college. The program highlights section contains relevant details; committee members appreciate all of the hard work that has been done to improve the Shively Farm, including the outreach efforts to the college community (the farm share and “Farm-to-Table Dinners”) and the local area (visits to local high schools, sponsoring middle school students.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Satisfactory: Many course assessments are out of date, but (1) some classes are being inactivated and (2) it seems many of the assessments were planned to occur much more often than the required 4-year cycle. The committee recognizes that 91.7% of the course outlines are up to date. The stoplight indicates that AG 22 is “out of date” but there is no mention of it in the section calling for an explanation of “mitigating circumstances” surrounding this course outline (others are explained in that section, however). It appears that program faculty dialog about assessment, but the example provided (the shade structure) doesn’t seem to have derived from a specific course- or program-level outcome assessment. Committee members also observed that program personnel commented on the 4021 recommendations, rather than specific assessment findings, in the “Summary of Section 3” part at the bottom of the page that calls for a brief link between assessment findings and planning.  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Satisfactory: The current status of planning actions is clearly stated, but both Plan 1 & 5 list the “Action”, but not the “impact of that action”. No relevant data is provided to judge the impact of any plans. Committee members would be interested in seeing some more quantitative data in the impact section, where available. For example, how many students have declared an educational goal the attainment of the certificate in organic/sustainable agriculture? How many students did the CE advisor see last year? Committee members would like to see a more detailed response to how resources provided contributed to program improvement.  **Planning:**  Satisfactory/Developing: Program plans are linked to institutional planning goals and are not stated as resources requests, but do not seem to be derived from any assessment findings. For example, Plan #3 calls for additional “hands-on” experience in the AG Business and AG Econ courses in order for students to “better understand the concepts and theories that inform the business and economic aspects of agriculture.” Was there a specific course-level assessment that revealed that there was a deficiency in student understanding of these concepts and theories? Committee members assume this to be the case, but the “Relationship to Previous Assessment” section has been left blank in the document. It is unclear how Plans 1 & 3 will be measured; Plan 2 seems measurable but it is not clear how it will be measured. The program is doing a nice job addressing the Vision for Success criteria.   * Auto Tech   **Program Information:**  Exemplary: The program’s mission clearly aligns with that of the college. Program personnel provide a substantial amount of information about the program’s function and the impact on the college and the service area of the local community. Committee members commend the program for reaffirming its ASE accreditation and for the successful student completion of the ASE certification exams.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Satisfactory: It appears as though assessment activities are not entirely on track with the college’s four-year cycle; each follows a different schedule (every 2, 3, or 4 semesters) for each individual assessment item. The committee suggests to check the accuracy of reported assessment as it appears 6 assessments have been completed for Spring 2020. The program’s curriculum is entirely up to date and it received a reaffirmation of its ASE accreditation. The changes discussed in section 3.1 directly link assessment, changes in terms of resource acquisition, and an assumption that this will lead to greater achievement of course-level outcomes. The information in the “Summary of Section 3” part at the bottom of the page doesn’t seem to relate to the question of how assessment findings will impact planning. All changes listed are based on additional funds, not based on assessment  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Satisfactory: The current status and impact of planning actions is clear. The retirement of Professor Richards and the lack of a replacement seems to be the main reason many of the planning actions and assessments were not completed. To provide more insight on the impact of these plans, data should be included instead of anecdotal evidence although it may be difficult to measure.  **Planning:**  Satisfactory: Planning actions are linked to institutional plans, but the “Relationship to Previous Assessment” section remains a bit vague with certain plans. For example, plan #2 calls for instructors and students to wear professional work attire in the classroom to both model a professional environment and promote the program. Was there any type of assessment that produced the observation that students were lacking in an awareness of the professional work environment that program completers will enter upon graduation? Similarly, plans #3 and #5 rest on an assumption that students lack engagement and require additional incentivization. Is there a specific outcome assessment(s) that reveal this to be a problem? That remains unclear in the program review. The program does a nice job addressing Vision for Success goals, though the “Equity” one seems to rely on the teaching style of just one faculty member (referred to as “I” in the program review document), rather than a programmatic effort.   * CIS   **Program Information:**  Satisfactory: The mission of the program ties to the college mission are stated. Committee members would like to see how the specific program functions link to the mission. Updating the program functions and how they connect to the mission gives committee members a fresh view of the program as the program evolves. Excellent list of highlights/accomplishments.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Satisfactory/Exemplary: Committee members see clear ties of course/student learning outcomes to course changes and need for an ISS for telepresence course. Program level assessments should be spoken about in order to provide more clear detail to the committee.  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Satisfactory: The current status of all actions is clear and impacts are stated. The committee commends the CIS department for following through with the majority of the listed plans. In order to strengthen the impact data should be provided to show that an accurate assessment was completed for each plan.  **Planning:**  Satisfactory: The plans are clear but lack data to provide clear detail on the expected impact on program or student learning. The need for 8 plans may be excessive and may be difficult to report out on. Perhaps consolidating plans would be helpful for the authors and the committee. Plans 1 and 2 are identical with some differences in the narratives. The loss of FT faculty could be detrimental to the representation in this program and has been noted by the committee.   * Dental Assisting   **Program Information:**  Satisfactory/Exemplary: Clear ties to the college mission are stated, but might be more clear if the relevant portions of the mission statement were included with each specific program function. Committee members view the description of the program highlights as excellent.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Developing/Satisfactory: Assessments appear to be on track for the 4-year cycle, but 6 of 9 COR are out of date. Authors state this is due to compliance with site visits and self-study, but there’s a 5 year timeline on curriculum.  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Satisfactory: The status of all plans is indicated as completed and/or continuing. Commentary is provided on the impact of each action, but each is missing data to support the desired impact. Providing numerical data gives deeper insight to the health and progress of the program. For example, Plan 1 includes information on outreach that could be supported with data in order to show the importance of continual evaluation of seats filled in the program.  **Planning:**  Satisfactory: Majority of plans are not listed as resource requests. Plan 4 is stated as a resource request and should. Please make sure to follow the link in the prompt in the template in order to list how each specific plan is linked to the institutional goals. The authors state that the plans are connected to assessment, but no data is provided to justify assessment has occurred.   * English Composition   **Program Information:**  Exemplary: The mission of the program is clearly aligned with the mission of the college. The program functions clearly demonstrate the impact is has on the college and the surrounding community. Committee members recognize the hard work put into revising the English pathway students take in order to reach their desired goal.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Exemplary: The critical reflection of assessment activities is clear and concise. All assessment is on track with the 4-year cycle and all course outlines are up to date. This report provides absolute connections of assessments to program outcomes/changes. Committee members see the amazing work on the implementation of AB705.  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Exemplary: Status of all plans is clear and impacts are clearly stated and supported by data.  **Planning:**  Exemplary: All plans clearly stated and applied to assessments with data provided. None of the listed plans are stated as resource requests.   * Forestry/Natural Resources (FNR)   **Program Information:**  Exemplary: The mission of the program is clear and concise with obvious connection to the mission of the college. The positive impact of the program on the community and the college campus is apparent.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Exemplary: All courses have been assessed on schedule. Committee members commend the authors for the excellent narrative on closed loops and program impacts. The program is using assessment data to update the PLO`s.  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Exemplary: All courses have been assessed on schedule. Committee members commend the authors for the excellent narrative on closed loops and program impacts. The program is using assessment data to update the PLO`s.  **Planning:**  Exemplary/Satisfactory: Most plans are clearly stated and applied to assessments with data provided. For example, plan 1 is stated as “Replace Full-time Faculty” and plan 5 is “Update lab and instructional technology.” These resource requests could fall under more ge broadly stated plans like "Provide program continuity" and "provide relevant labor market experience" respectively.   * Humanities   **Program Information:**  Exemplary: The mission of the discipline clearly aligns with the mission of the college. The authors discipline’s demonstrate the impact on the students’ ability to transfer. The writing is clear and concise.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Exemplary: As a result of the assessment that was done, the results were used to create a drop-in writing program and collect more data as part of ongoing support.There is a discrepancy in the amount of assessment completed, the authors indicate that 80% of outcomes have been assessed in the past year.  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Satisfactory: The status of plans is clear, relevant data cited as evidence. Additional information could be included to help the reader better comprehend the evaluation process and conclusions. For example, “Solutions have been arrived at for students in Pelican Bay State Prison.” What are these solutions?  **Planning:**  Satisfactory: All plans are linked to institutional plans, but are solely based on anecdotal assessment, the impact on student learning can be measured and data should be included to support each plan. For example, there must be supporting data to support why a tenure-track versus associate faculty is required to meet this program plan.   * LVN   **Program Information:**  Exemplary: The mission of the discipline clearly aligns with the mission of the college. The writing is clear and concise.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Satisfactory: A significant amount of assessment has been completed. A plan to convert the LVN program to concept-based curriculum is directly linked to the drop in pass rates for DN students in 2019. An explanation is provided, more detailed results would be useful to the reading to help understand why the changes to concept based curriculum has been applied. There is no explicit tie between college level assessment outcomes and future plans.  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Exemplary: The plan for the program to conduct a 4-year self-study was carried out, resulting in the program being approved by the BVNPT. Detail was provided on the importance of the resources provided and showed the impact it had on the Eureka and Del Norte campus as it ensured external licensing and continuation of the program on both campuses.  **Planning:**  Developing/Satisfactory: The first plan is stated as resource request. Committee members see the plans are not tied to previous assessment activities but the authors demonstrates the connections between the plan and institutional goals and between student learning.   * Manufacturing Technology   **Program Information:**  Exemplary: The mission of the discipline clearly aligns with the mission of the college. The writing is clear and concise.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Exemplary/Satisfactory: The author reports that assessment has been conducted as required, but access to previous assessment reports have been difficult to access. Committee members see fewer course action plans (open loops) have been done, but in reviewing existing assessment reports the author makes the link between assessment findings and a rationale for needed improvements to the MT program. The author “believes that the entire program should be revised and updated” but does not tie this belief to data. The author also notes that “No Course Outline of Record updates have been submitted,” but does not indicate why this is the case.  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Exemplary: Past planning actions were carried out and evolved as needed or were integrated into routine annual planning as a result of the AP4021 recommendations. Continued community outreach, student success, program resilience, responsiveness to the advisory committee, and faculty development were all demonstrable outcomes of these plans. Programs that are technology-based must continually upgrade the technology used in instruction to ensure program relevancy.  **Planning:**  Exemplary: All actions are linked to educational plans (ed master plan) and based on assessment findings/faculty reflection on assessment. All plans have clearly defined and measurable impacts.   * Math   **Program Information:**  Exemplary: The mission of the program clearly aligns with the mission of the college. The function identifies the program and discipline`s impact on the college and community.  **Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:**  Exemplary: In completing the outcome assessment and faculty reflecting on other variables such as enrollment this led to actionable plans and demonstrates responsiveness to the effect of legislation and new policy on student enrollments and course sequencing. All program assessment led to the recommendation for mathematics faculty consultation and assistance in the drop-in writing center and guidance is now being provided to STEM students about approaching writing projects in their Science and Math courses.  **Evaluation of Previous Plans:**  Exemplary: Past actions were carried out and evaluated (or termination of action was explained). The impacts of these plans is clearly described in terms of student access, increased compliance with regulations, best practices improved technology support, and student resource support.  **Planning:**  Exemplary: Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions and are discussed. Planning actions are not stated as resource request and based on assessment findings of institutional outcomes #1 and 2. actions clearly show the expected impact on the student learning and are measurable in terms of program data, enrollments, completion rates, student support and success, student access, and test performance. | |
| 2.0 | Debrief on utilization of new plan ranking rubric. | * There was some confusion on how to evaluate and score number of students affected. * The committee decided to evaluate in reference to the proportion of students impacted among those in a discipline and not the student body as a whole. * Several members would like to go over their initial scoring of plans following the discussion before finalizing. * The committee realized that they would like a place in the PRC comments to discuss how the numerical plan rankings were determined. * After speaking with IR it was determined that it was too late to add a comment box to this year’s templates, but that it will be among the edits we recommend for next year. |
| 3.0 | Make Assignments for 12/06/2019 Meeting. | * Three work groups were created and assigned with reviewing the remaining Instructional Annual Reviews. |

Next meeting: December 6, 2019.