



Educational Master Plan Program Review Part I: Academic Portfolio Assessment/Program Review

Philosophy Statement

Program Review is an institution-wide, integrated process that works toward the common goal of institutional effectiveness as an organic whole. The *Portfolio Assessment/Program Review* evaluation process should be conducted by professional educators working in the program who participate in continual dialogue. Clearly-defined goals, assessment of those goals, and plans for improvement should be ongoing and cyclical.

Although *Program Review per se* will take place on a quadrennial basis, a detailed portfolio with goals and assessment of those goals must be conducted annually. SLO assessment must also be ongoing and follow the institutional cycle. All budget requests must be a result of planning efforts and must have rationale. Where appropriate, valid and reliable multiple measures (qualitative as well as quantitative data) should be collected and utilized in the preparation of objective and viable planning / goals and in requests for resources.

Concern and attention to continuous improvement, keeping in mind the mission of the institution and the *Strategic Plan*, will result in identifying program strengths as well as areas that need improvement or that might need to be changed due to changing need of the community and student body. This could result in program revisions, staff retraining, technology changes, etc.

The *Portfolio Assessment/Program Review* process will be validated by the Division Curriculum Committees, which will report to the IE&A Committee. After departments complete the “19QT” report summarizing PR conclusions, the departments inform the Division Curriculum Committee/Dean that PR has been completed and placed in the department Planning Portfolio. The dean will forward report to the IE&A Committee and the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Teaching Learning Committee will receive a summary of concerns from the Division Curriculum Committees regarding direct assessment of SLOs and engage in dialogue. The TLC will then send an aggregate report to the IE&A Committee.

Template for Department Planning Portfolio Assessment/Program Review

These guiding questions are intended as a point of departure for a department's self-reflection and collaborative self-assessment with the goal of program improvement and student success. Each department undergoing the PA/PR process is expected to select or develop a response for each of the four categories utilizing questions that apply within that category: I. Goals and Objectives; II. Student and Program Success; III. Curriculum, Pedagogy and Innovation; IV. Assessment of Conclusions and Recommendations

I. Goals and Objectives (Refer to data from Department Planning Portfolio)

1. What are the department's annual goals? How do they align with the college mission statement and the Santa Ana College *Strategic Plan*?
2. What progress has been made toward the department's goals in the last four years? What causes can be identified? e.g., population/demographics; industry; technology; lack of resources
3. Do goals need to be restructured, eliminated or pursued with different activities?
4. What are the proposed goals for next year?

II. Student and Program Success

5. What are the strengths of the program? What improvements does it need?
6. What are faculty's perceptions of the success of the program?
7. What are opinions of students regarding the program's quality? Upon what variables is this based?
8. What, if appropriate, are employer attitudes towards the program?
9. What successes may be identified?

III. Curriculum, Pedagogy and Innovation

10. Describe the curriculum offerings, their relationship to the discipline, and substantive curriculum changes, e.g., new courses, deletions. How has the program kept up with changing needs of the students and community?
11. Describe the program's relationship to student services and its offerings to the students served.
12. Describe the use of technology, e.g., computer labs, increased use of *Blackboard*, hybrid or online courses, etc. How does the use of these tools enhance learning?
13. What changes have been made in pedagogy?
14. What grants has the program been involved with? How has this changed the program?

IV. Assessment of Conclusions and Recommendations

15. What research has the department conducted?
16. What resources has the department explored to ascertain the status of the discipline/program in other arenas? E.g., conferences, advisory committees, review of peer programs, collegial dialogues with discipline experts in feeder or transfer institutions.
17. Please summarize findings of direct SLO assessment. How has this informed future plans for the program? (See Direct SLO Assessment forms)
18. What changes are recommended for the program?

19. What issues have emerged that require interdisciplinary dialogue and possible inclusion in overall college planning?

**Possible Data for Indirect Assessment Included in the
Department Portfolio**

1. CR 1110 Report:
 - A. Course Enrollments per semester (from the end of the second week in a 16-week semester)
 - B. Grade distribution (retention, success rate by course)
 - C. Student Characteristics
2. Persistence rates as appropriate for sequential courses within programs (see p 14)
3. FTE program generates
4. FTES per FTEF (See enrollment data)
5. CORE measures for Career Tech Ed (CTE)
6. Number of degrees by major & certificates granted (see p 4)
7. Ratio of full-time to adjunct faculty

bnj/
3/04/08