

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK

**G R O S S M O N T
C O L L E G E**



GROSSMONT COLLEGE

Revised November 8, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Academic Program Review	3
Purpose and Goals	3
History	3
Process	5
Membership	7
Preparation of the Self Study Report	8
Definitions of the Terms	10
Writers Checklist	12
Department/Program Review	13
Section 1- Overview	13
Section 2 – Curriculum Development and Academic Standards	14
Section 3 – Student Learning Outcomes	16
Section 4 – Facilities & Scheduling	17
Section 5 – Student Equity and Success	19
Section 6 – Student Support/Campus Resources	20
Section 7 – On Campus / Off Campus Involvement	21
Section 8 – Fiscal & Human Resources	23
Section 9 - Summary and Recommendations	25

APPENDICES

1. Grade Distribution Summary
2. Enrollment Data
3. Student Success Data
4. Checklist Documentation (SLO, Instructional Operations, Articulation Officer, Library)
5. Department answers to committee follow up questions (completed *after* committee reads report)

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

PURPOSE AND GOALS

Academic program review is an integral part of the total process of curriculum planning, development and implementation at Grossmont College. The information gathered during the review process provides the basis for informed decision-making by the faculty and administration on the allocation of resources to those programs as well as the initiation, expansion, contraction, consolidation and termination of programs. The academic program review process is an effective vehicle that is utilized to provide program and department accountability and on-going program improvement by colleagues cooperatively sharing ideas to strengthen the college's academic programs.

Program review goals include:

- Develop a cooperative, standardized and flexible methodology to facilitate continuous program review.
- Collect and disseminate relevant information that will provide a database for long-range curriculum planning and development.
- Insure quality and excellence of academic programs.

All academic departments/programs are reviewed once every six years as part of the program review cycle using a three step process. During the year in which the program is reviewed, the department/program writes a self-study document including departmental recommendations. The Academic Program Review Committee reviews these documents. A summary of findings and recommendations are prepared by the committee and presented in a final report that is distributed to the Academic Senate, Vice President of Academic Affairs, College President, and the Governing Board.

HISTORY

Grossmont College began its review of academic programs in 1981-82 following a one-year period of development. The Phase I process spanned a five-year period, 1982-1987, during which time 62 programs were evaluated. At the time the process was begun, a commitment was made to evaluate and modify the first full program review cycle as appropriate, following the conclusion of Phase 1.

A standardized instrument that included a point system for rating programs was designed and piloted with the first four programs evaluated. Upon completion of the pilot, it was determined that the point system was too rigid and unwieldy. Committee consensus was substituted for the point system and proved to be a more practical and appropriate method to use in evaluating academic programs. Recognizing that all programs would be subject to both qualitative and quantitative judgments, both objective and subjective measures were utilized. It was also recognized that sensitivity and flexibility on the part of the Academic Program Review Committee would be essential to reduce the inherent fears and concerns of departments/programs involved in the evaluation process.

During the fall of 1987, a blue-ribbon committee consisting of former chairs and selected committee members of the Academic Program Review Committee, met to evaluate and modify as appropriate the Program Review process. They examined the total process including committee membership, review schedule, questions, etc. Modifications and changes were made for implementation in Phase 2.

Beginning in spring 1994, the Program Review Committee reexamined the program review process. With extensive input from department/program chairpersons and coordinators, administrators, faculty and Institutional Research, the committee redesigned both the instrument and process to provide annual reporting of informational data essential to department/program planning, decision-making and application for external funding sources. These annual reports are then compiled into a department/program academic review report.

In the evaluation report filed by the 2002 WASC Accreditation Site Visit Team, the college was given an accommodation for the “strong program review process.” The report later states that “The College has integrated planning, budgeting and program review processes into a well-orchestrated planning and budget allocation effort.”

The next cycle of review was completed in the early spring of 2002. The committee surveyed faculty and met with past chairs to again review and refine the process. The next cycle began in Spring of 2003 with the Communication and Fine Arts Division.

The next program review cycle was completed in spring of 2010, with another commendation from the WASC accreditation body in 2007. The committee took time to review the process, update the data sources, and align with the college planning process. The next cycle will begin with the Art, Language and Communication division writing in fall 2010.

The most recent program review cycle was completed in spring of 2017. In this cycle, the committee added a dedicated Data Liaison position to improve the data preparation and communication process. The committee also rewrote the writer’s handbook, making it more concise and aligning the questions with the college strategic plan. The committee also updated the membership structure and added more Dean support to the writing process. Lastly, the committee reviewed the entire program review process and identified which content was best suited for the six-year review process versus a more timely annual review process. Items warranting annual review were identified, removed from the handbook, and are being folded into the annual review process that is in development (Spring 2017).

PROCESS

Orientation

The Academic Program Review process is a four-stage process.

Stage One:

Two semesters prior to an academic department/program's scheduled review, the appropriate dean and department/program chairperson or coordinator will be notified of their upcoming program review. The department/program will begin the process of identifying writers and discussing the following semester schedule, in order to prepare for the reassign time impact of the assigned writer's schedule change.

Stage Two:

One semester prior to their review, the scheduled department/program will meet with the the Academic Program Review Committee Chair and Data Liaison, to discuss and clarify the program review self-study process. The assigned department writer will collaborate with their department to complete their department's program review this semester, and the writer will receive their reassign time compensation in this semester. The department writer will be supplied with the following resources to aid them in the writing process:

- **Checklist.** Writers will be provided with a checklist of steps to complete to prepare their program review document.
- **Data.** The Program Review Data Liaison will provide the department writer with all required data
- **Handbook.** The Program Review Chair will provide the department with the handbook, which provides questions to guide the writer in the development of their self-review document.
- **Prior Program Review document.** The Program Review Chair will also provide the department with their prior 6 year review document, for reference.

At the end of this semester, the assigned department writer is responsible for having their department's Academic Program Review document complete.

Stage Three:

During the review semester, the Academic Program Review Committee will review the department's document. The committee will ask follow-up questions and meet face to face with the department as part of this review process. This review stage concludes with the committee presenting formal department commendations and recommendations to the president. The department also attends the president's meeting.

Stage Four:

One year after their review, the department will follow up with the Vice President of Academic Affairs to discuss their department's progress on the Academic Program Review Committee's recommendations. As the college continues to develop its annual review process, this stage, and the content reviewed at this stage, is subject to change.

Self-Study Report

The department/program will prepare a self-study report that will provide an overview of the program, an analysis of data provided, and answers to standard questions contained in the guide entitled Academic Program Review Handbook provided by the committee. The report is due by the end of the department's assigned writing semester (see orientation above).

Academic Program Review Committee Assessment

1. The Academic Program Review Committee will read and discuss the department's self-study report and, when necessary, develop written follow up questions for the purpose of clarification. The committee will forward written questions to the department writer, chair and division dean. The department/program, in consultation with the division dean as needed, will provide written responses to these follow up questions. The department's response is due within two weeks following receipt of the committee's questions.
2. The department/program representatives and writer, along with the division dean, will meet with the committee to clarify information in the self-study report and answering the questions the committee submitted. This meeting also serves as an opportunity for the department to "tell their story" and explain department needs identified in the department's recommendations.
3. Following the response of the department/program to the questions, the committee will formulate its final commendations and recommendations regarding the department/program.
4. When the review process has been completed, the committee will submit a written final report to the editor, department/program chair and the division dean. The report will contain (a) commendations on accomplishments, (b) specific recommendations for change and (c) a recommendation to increase, maintain, reduce, re-review, or eliminate the department/program.
5. The Academic Program Review Committee will meet with the College President, Vice President of Academic Affairs, department/program representatives and dean to discuss the final recommendations. The President, department/program chair or coordinator and chair of the academic program review committee will sign the final report.
6. The Academic Program Review Committee will send the final report to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Academic Senate, appropriate dean and department/program chair or coordinator.
7. The chair of the Academic Program Review Committee will distribute the final report to the Governing Board.

Follow Up

1. The Vice President of Academic Affairs will meet with the department/program chair/coordinator and dean of the division a year after the review to follow-up on progress made on the recommendations.
2. The Vice President of Academic Affairs will present an annual status report to the Academic Senate on the implementation of Academic Program Review Committee recommendations.
3. The recommendations of the Academic Program Review Committee will be used as part of the criteria for making decisions in various committees such as Planning and Resource Council, classified, and faculty staffing.
4. As the college continues to develop it's annual review process, the follow up review process, and the content reviewed at this stage, is subject to change (as of Spring 2017).

Membership

The membership of the committee shall consist of the following:

ACTIVE PARTICIPANTS:

- Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Dean of division under review
- Faculty representatives – 1 from AHN, ALC, CTE, ESBS, MNESW, Counseling; 1 Academic Senate representative at large. (7)
- Data Liaison
- SLO Coordinator

RESOURCE MEMBERS:

- Instructional Operations Representative
- Academic Senate President
- CPIE Dean
- Vice President of Academic Affairs
- Library Chair

Upon the recommendation of the Academic Senate and the administrative staff, the members of the Academic Program Review Committee will serve for at least one academic year. A member must serve at least one semester to be eligible for selection as chairperson of the committee. A faculty member chairs the committee.

PREPARATION OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

Department writers should adhere to the following guidelines when preparing the department/program report.

Department's previous program review reports (scanned pdf file) will be provided at your orientation meeting. Prior reviews are also filed at the Academic Program Review website (See Committee Chair for details).

Program Review is **the responsibility of the entire department or program**. The bargaining unit has negotiated reassigned time for one semester available for the department/program to use. The reassigned time is usually allocated to one person who will assume the role of editor, primary author and/or coordinator of the project. This person may be the chair or coordinator, but it is not required. Some department/programs have chosen to split the load between two people. In any case, the decision regarding who receives the reassigned time should be reached collaboratively by the members of the department/program. Once the department or program decides who will receive the reassigned time and for what semester, notify the division dean so that appropriate hire letters can be generated. The writer identification and reassign time allocation needs to be completed one semester prior to the department's program review.

Academic departments/programs are expected to solicit participation from all full-time and part-time department/program members. Best practices to ensure broad input on the self-study may include:

- The editor delegates sections of the self-study to department/program members who may be most knowledgeable about specific questions. Drafts are reviewed by all for additional input.
- Department/program members meet during professional development week to brainstorm and create a draft document. The editor completes the report for review by the department/program and submittal.
- During a department/program meeting, a subcommittee is selected to create a self-study draft. The draft is submitted to the editor who e-mails drafts to all department/program members for input. The editor makes revisions.
- The Academic Program Review Committee can assist departments with setting up digital support to make the collaboration and delegation process easier. Contact the Academic Program Review Chair for details.

Department/programs may have their own processes of facilitating member self-study contributions; however, **the goal is to get as much involvement from all members of the department/program**.

The department/program/program has two representatives on the committee, the dean and the division representative. These representatives are excellent resources for departments to consult throughout this process. Additionally, committee membership also includes representatives from counseling, instructional operations, student learning outcomes, the library, and academic senate. Contact the Academic Program Review Chair if you need clarification on how to utilize these resources. These resources are listed under the earlier 'membership' section of this handbook.

Public Review

Departments should consider that their program review document is a public document that is filed in the Academic Senate Program Review website. This document can be accessed by college administration, faculty and other stakeholders. As such, professional language and discretion is advised. In other words, don't write anything in your program review document that you wouldn't want to be public knowledge.

When Writing the Self-Study Report:

1. Provide all the information requested.
2. Number all pages of the self-study including reports and appendices.
3. Answer all questions clearly and specifically in paragraph form. Cite sources used.
4. Review your draft report with your division dean before sending to printing.
5. Print all responses on white paper, **back to back**. 15 copies are needed for the committee. Be sure to make extra copies to share with your program/department.
6. Submit the report to Instructional Operations by the due date. Your due date will be communicated to you during your orientation meeting (this is the writing semester, one semester prior to your review). It is essential that the review timeline be maintained. If your department is experiencing challenges with your deadline, please notify the committee chair as soon as possible. Part of the committee's mission is to support writers in the writing process.

Academic Program Review Outcomes

Upon completion of the academic program review process:

- Department faculty involved in the process will produce a written appraisal of their Department/Program.
- Department faculty involved in the process will discover key areas for their department/program to strengthen and use to support planning, innovation, and funding through the PR committee's recommendations.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM – For the purpose of this review, a department/program shall be defined as follows: a course or series of courses which share a common Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) number at the four digit level of specificity.

EFFICIENCY – Maximizing the results given the limitations of the resource being considered.

- For room use efficiency, it is the extent to which the available seats in a section are filled.
- For human resource efficiency, it is the amount of full-time equivalent students (FTES) served by the full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF).

FULL TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT (FTES) – This unit is used as the basis for computation of state support for California Community Colleges. One student attending 15 hours a week for 35 weeks (1 academic year) generates 1 FTES.

$$1 \text{ FTES} = 15 \text{ (student contact hrs/week)} \times 35 \text{ (weeks)} = 525 \text{ (weekly student contact hrs/yr)}$$

To approximate *FTES* generated by a 17.5-week semester class, use the following formula:

$$\text{WSCH (from census)} / 525 \times 17.5 = \text{FTES}$$

For example, a class of 40 students meeting 3 hours per week generates 120 WSCH:

$$40 \text{ students} \times 3 \text{ contact} = 120 \text{ WSCH}$$

To figure the *FTES* for the class, insert the WSCH in the formula provided above:

$$120 / 525 \times 17.5 = 4.00 \text{ FTES}$$

FULL TIME EQUIVALENT FACULTY (FTEF) (also known as LED) – One FTEF is equivalent to a 100% load as defined by the current faculty contract (Section 7.8) AKA sum of 1.0 LED in any given semester.

FULL TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT (FTES) is the equivalent of a student taking 15 units in any given semester.

LOAD EQUIVALENCY DECIMAL (LED) – LED is a way of calculating faculty load by converting hours to a percent. (See faculty contract Section 7.8.2.)

RETENTION – After first census, the percent of students earning any grade but a W in a course or series of courses.

SUCCESS – The percent of students still enrolled after the first census who earned a grade of A, B, C, or Pass in a course or series of courses.

TAXONOMY OF PROGRAMS (TOP) – The Taxonomy of Programs is a classification system for academic programs at the California Community Colleges. Every course offered in the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District is assigned a six-digit TOP number. The first two digits of this

number define the course at the level of a discipline, and the remaining four digits of the TOP number further define courses into specific departments/programs. Courses within the same academic department/program share a common TOP number. The purpose of the TOP system is to provide a common statewide taxonomy to identify programs. Locally, the use of TOP numbers allows the gathering of valuable information about the programs offered at each college. Data such as *WSCH*, *LED*, *FTEs*, and *cost per program* can be collected using the TOP numbers as the key. A list of TOP numbers for each course offered at Grossmont College is available in the Instructional Operations Office.

WEEKLY STUDENT CONTACT HOUR (WSCH) – The "class hour" or "contact hour" is the basic unit of attendance for computing *FTEs*. A "contact hour" is a period of not less than 50 minutes of scheduled instruction. Weekly Student Contact Hours are the total number of students an instructor comes in contact with in a given week, stated in hours.

WSCH PER FTEF – The ratio of Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) to Full-Time Faculty Equivalency (FTEF).

WRITER CHECKLIST

Please see that all of these items are completed **BEFORE** submitting your department/program's self-study document to the Academic Program Review Committee.

- € Obtain an email from Instructional Operations listing the dates of all your course outline updates. Print this email and include it in Appendix 4.
- € Obtain an email from the Articulation Officer confirming your department/program is current with articulation agreements. Print this email and include it in Appendix 4.
- € Obtain an email from SLO coordinator confirming your department/program is current with SLO assessments. Print this email and include it in Appendix 4.
- € Obtain an email from a librarian to confirm what resources the library has available specifically for your department/program. Print this email and include it in Appendix 4.
- € Meet with Program Review Data Liaison to review department data.
- € Meet with Program Review Chair to discuss digital collaboration tools.
- € Schedule two follow-up meetings with Division Dean.
 - o Schedule these meetings during the writing semester.
- € Include a title page that indicates the semester and year your report was completed
- € Include a listing of all full-time and adjunct faculty on the 'signature page' section of your report. Make sure this page has signatures for all full-time faculty, as well as any part-time faculty that assisted with the report.
- € Number all pages of the self-study including the appendices. Please copy back to back
- € Email a complete digital version of your self-study, including appendices, to the committee chair.
- € Include a Table of Contents listing all the section headings and page references for these section headings. The Table of Contents is placed after the signature page and before section 1.
- € Be sure appendices include all requested information.
- € Request fifteen (15) copies (printed **back to back**) of the report and have them delivered to the Instructional Operations Office.

Remember your report is due at the end of the assigned semester. Consult the Academic Program Review Calendar for due dates, or contact the Academic Program Review Chair.

THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS OF THIS HANDBOOK CONTAIN THE SELF-STUDY REVIEW QUESTIONS FOR YOUR DEPARTMENT. THESE ARE THE QUESTIONS THAT YOU NEED TO ANSWER TO COMPLETE YOUR SELF-STUDY REVIEW.

YOU SHOULD INCLUDE THE SECTION NUMBER AND SECTION HEADING, AS SHOWN IN THE HANDBOOK, FOR EACH SECTION THAT YOU WRITE. DO NOT INCLUDE THE PROMPT IN YOUR HEADING, BUT MAKE SURE YOU REFER TO THE PROMPT AS YOU ANSWER THE QUESTION

YOU CAN USE YOUR OWN TITLES FOR SUBHEADINGS, BUT PLEASE INCLUDE THE SUB-SECTION NUMBER (1.1, 1.2, ETC.) FOR ALL SUBHEADS

IN THE EXAMPLE SHOWN BELOW, THE 'SECTION 1' HEADING IS TAKEN DIRECTLY FROM THE HANDBOOK , AND THE WRITER USED THEIR OWN SUBHEAD TITLES FOR THE SUB-SECTIONS. PLEASE FOLLOW THIS HEADING HIERARCHY IN YOUR DOCUMENT.

##

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW. DEPARTMENT HISTORY & PREVIOUS PROGRAM REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 Program Description and History

Overview

The English as a Second Language (ESL) department currently offers 22 courses, which include...

History

The Grossmont College ESL program had its beginnings in 1975 with the development of...

Faculty

Growth and change have been the main characteristics of the ESL program. In addition...

1.2 Program Changes from Prior Recommendations

Of the goals set in the department's six-year unit plan from the prior review, the one that has proven the most challenging to accomplish is...

SIGNATURE PAGE:

PLEASE BEGIN YOUR REPORT WITH A SIGNATURE PAGE, INCLUDING SIGNATURES FROM ALL FULL-TIME FACULTY IN YOUR DEPARTMENT, AS WELL AS ANY PART-TIME FACULTY THAT CONTRIBUTED TO THIS SELF-STUDY REPORT. A SUGGESTED FORMAT IS SHOWN BELOW

Please precede your faculty signatures with this statement:

“This program review report for *(insert the years of self-study review period. These are the years covered in your new six-year review (example 2012 - 2018)* **is respectfully submitted by the members of the Grossmont College** *(insert your department name here).*

Faculty Member A

Faculty Member B

Etc.

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

SECTION 1 – OVERVIEW.

DEPARTMENT HISTORY & PREVIOUS PROGRAM REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

PURPOSE OF SECTION 1.1: To help the committee understand the history of the department, what your department does, what population you serve, and your overall place in the college. Include any information that helps the reader understand your department, such as which courses are primarily GE, programs added, new degrees, certifications, where your students come from, where they go, and a description of your faculty (the role of FT, PT and staff). Student population specifics (transfer, basic skills, CTE, etc.) are useful as well.

- 1.1** Introduce the self-study with a brief department history. Include changes in staffing, curriculum, facilities, etc. (You may wish to cut/paste your previous department history and then add to it). Additionally, please list degrees and certificates your department offers.

PURPOSE OF SECTION 1.2: To help the committee understand what the last program review recommendations were, and how your department addressed and implemented them.

- 1.2** Your last program review contains the most recent Academic Program Review Committee Recommendations for the program. Describe changes that have been made in the program in response to recommendations from the last review including any activity proposals funded and what the results were. (Be sure to use the committee recommendations and not your own). Include the recommendations from the last program review in this section.

SECTION 2 - CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS

To answer these questions, refer to your department's catalog descriptions from the most recent college catalog (see "Courses of Instruction" section. This is the blue section).

If your program has an Associate Degree or Certificate program, refer to the relevant pages from the catalog (see "Associate Degree" section. This is the yellow section).

PURPOSE OF SECTION 2.1: To describe how curriculum is maintained and/or developed.

- 2.1** Describe how your course offerings have changed since the last program review. Have you added or deleted courses since the last review? If so, why? Include new or deleted programs, degrees and certificates.

PURPOSE OF SECTION 2.2: To understand your practice for reviewing outlines. For example: under what circumstances you submit a new course, a modified course, or a course update to the curriculum committee.

- 2.2** Describe your department's practice for determining that all course outlines reflect currency in the field, relevance to student needs, and current teaching practices.

PURPOSE OF SECTION 2.3: Explain how you incorporate new material in your courses on a semester-to-semester basis to maintain relevance and address current issues related to your discipline within the existing course outline.

- 2.3** How does your department use student engagement strategies in the classroom? How are your faculty including current issues in course content? Consider environmental, societal, ethical, political, technological, and/or other issues when answering this question.

PURPOSE OF SECTION 2.4: To describe what the department does to maintain consistently high academic standards amongst its faculty.

- 2.4.** What orientation do you give to new faculty (both full- and part-time), and how do you maintain dialogue within your department about curriculum and assessment? What strategies do you have in-place that ensure consistency in grading in multiple sections and across semesters (e.g., mastery level assessment, writing rubrics, and departmental determination of core areas which must be taught)? Consider department practices, academic standards, and curricular expectations (i.e. SLOs and teaching to course outlines)?

PURPOSE OF SECTION 2.5: To gauge the overall patterns of student success, retention, and grade distributions across the course offerings in your department. Here the committee is looking for explanation on unusually generous or rigorous grading patterns.

- 2.5** Referring to the Grade Distribution Summary graphs (see Appendix 1), comment on how your department patterns relate to the college, division and statewide patterns. For course-by-course graphs, provide an explanation for any courses with different grade/success patterns than others. This may relate to major's courses vs GE, first-year vs second-year or basic skills vs transfer. Please describe how the department handles any unusual grading patterns. If you have any information that allows calibration of your grading data to external standards (performance of your students on standardized tests or licensing exams, transfer and/or employment success) please provide those to us and explain the connection. [The Program Review Data Liaison can help you with this section and will be providing you with all required data.]

PURPOSE OF SECTION 2.6: To evaluate the department's success with course delivery methods in online vs. hybrid vs. face-to-face platforms.

- 2.6** If applicable, provide a comparison of the retention and success rates of distance education (online) sections (including hybrid) and face-to-face sections. What are your department policies on course delivery method? Is there anything in the data that would prompt your department to make changes? (Required data will be provided by the Program Review Data Liaison – insert graph here).
- 2.7** If applicable, include the list of courses that have been formally articulated with high schools. Describe any articulation and/or curricular collaboration efforts with K-12 schools. (Contact the Dean of CTE if you have questions).

PURPOSE OF SECTION 2.8: The committee wants to gauge if students are able to transfer successfully to four-year universities via your articulation agreements.

- 2.8** Please describe how the program ensures that articulations are current. Identify any areas concern or additional needs that your department has about articulation with four-year institutions.

SECTION 3 – STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs)

The SLO Cycle is summarized in figure 1 below.

Figure 1
SLO CYCLE



PURPOSE OF SECTION 3: To show how SLO assessments are used to improve teaching strategies, develop curriculum, modify and/or update curriculum, and guide program planning.

- 3.1 Describe any changes (e.g., addition/deletion of SLOs, postponement of assessments) your department has made to your SLO assessment cycle. Include a brief description of why these changes were necessary. **NOTE: Changes should include reassessment of SLOs requiring further attention.**
- 3.2 Give examples of how your department/unit has used SLO assessment results to improve a course, course sequence, and/or program over this program review cycle. In your narrative, please pay particular attention to assessment of courses that directly lead to a certificate/degree/transfer (e.g., English 120, Psychology 120) and/or constitute a high enrollment course. For help with this prompt, please see the chart on the following page:

Examples of Changes that *May* be Implemented as a Result of Assessment

Changes to the Assessment Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ revision of intended learning outcomes▪ revision of measurement approaches▪ changes in data collection methods▪ changes in targets/standards
Changes to the Curriculum	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ changes in teaching techniques▪ revision of prerequisites▪ revision of course sequence▪ revision of course content▪ addition of courses▪ deletion of courses
Changes to the Academic Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ revision of advising standards or processes▪ improvements in technology▪ changes in faculty staffing▪ changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

- 3.3 What resources (time, professional development, curriculum approval process, etc.) did you need to carry out these improvements? Please explain.
- 3.4 What evidence did you collect to demonstrate that the planned improvements were successful? If you have yet to assess the improvements, what evidence do you plan to collect?
- 3.5 How will you use this evidence to ensure ongoing course/course sequence/program improvements are sustained?

SECTION 4 - FACILITIES AND SCHEDULING

PURPOSE OF SECTION 4.1 – 4.4: To determine how departments utilize various campus services and the impact on student access (consider facilities, scheduling, campus resources and technology).

- 4.1 List the type of facility spaces your department/program utilizes for instruction. This can include on-campus, off-campus, and virtual.
- 4.2 Are the spaces listed in 4.1 adequate to meet the program's educational objectives?
Yes___ No___
- o If you checked 'yes', please explain how your department/program utilizes facility space so your department can meet its educational objectives. Please provide an explanation of specific facility requirements of your program, and how those requirements are being met.
 - o If you checked 'no', please explain how your department/program is not meeting its facility space needs to adequately meet its educational objectives. Please provide an explanation of specific facility requirements of your program, and how those requirements are not being met.
- 4.3 What proactive steps have you taken with regards to facility and scheduling to improve the ability of your department to meet the educational objectives of your program and ensure that students can complete their program in a timely manner?
- 4.4 Identify and explain additional needed technological and equipment resources that could further Enhance student learning in these spaces.

PURPOSE OF SECTION 4.5: To have departments determine, based on their review of waitlist data and student feedback, if their program could serve more students if it had more facility resources available and/or used them differently.

- 4.5 Are students trying to access your program impacted by the facility spaces listed in 4.1?
Yes___ No___
- o If you checked 'yes', please explain how students are being negatively impacted by unmet facility needs experienced in your department/program. Please provide some specific examples.
 - o If you checked 'no', please explain how your department/program is actively managing its facility space needs to meet its educational objectives and provide student access to your program. Please provide some specific examples.
- 4.6 If applicable, please include any additional information you feel is important regarding facilities and scheduling that was not included above including non-classroom spaces such as offices, storage, preparation areas, open workspaces for students/tutoring, etc.

SECTION 5 – STUDENT EQUITY AND SUCCESS

PURPOSE OF SECTION 5:

- To determine if student enrollment in your program is robust and if students are enrolling in your program in equal representation to the general Grossmont student population.
- To have the department examine student success and retention overall for your department and disaggregated by ethnicity, age, gender.
- To have departments explain what they have done to improve success for all students while maintaining academic rigor.

NOTE: See Appendix 2 for enrollment data; Appendix 3 for student success data.

5.1 What are the identifiable patterns with regards to overall trends in enrollments in your department? Explain what is causing these trends (e.g. campus conditions, department practices). Once you have identified and explained your enrollment patterns, then address what your department has done/is doing to address identified issues. Examples of any changes you made to manage enrollment are encouraged.

In addition, you should examine your enrollment data, disaggregated by gender, age and ethnicity. For any of these student groups in your department with enrollment data at lower or higher proportions than college-wide numbers, describe what factors you think is causing these patterns [Data and a summary of notable patterns will be provided by the Program Review Data Liaison].

5.2 Discuss trends in student success and retention overall in your department and explain these trends (e.g. campus conditions, department practices). Also examine the success and retention data disaggregated by gender, age and ethnicity. For any groups that have success rates in your department at lower or higher than college-wide describe what factors you think cause those patterns. Provide examples of any changes you made to improve student success/retention, especially for groups that have equity gaps. [Data and a summary of notable patterns will be provided by the Program Review Data Liaison]

5.3 Describe specific examples of departmental or individual efforts, including instructional innovations and/or special projects, aimed at encouraging students to become actively engaged in the learning process in their classes.

5.4 Explain how the program incorporates opportunities for student engagement outside of class time and/or in collaboration with other departments (e.g. interdisciplinary course offerings, learning communities, internships, research projects, service learning, or participation in community events, tournaments, competitions, and fairs) to enhance student learning.

5.5 If state or federal licensing/registration examinations govern the program, please provide data and comment on student success trends.

- 5.6** If your program offers a degree or certificate in the college catalog, explain the trends regarding number of students who earn these degrees and/or certificates, including any changes that you have made to increase awards. Insert the “Degrees and Certificates” data table in this section. [This data table will be provided to you by the Program Review Data Research Liaison.]
- 5.7** If you have any information on what students who major in your department go on to achieve after they leave Grossmont, please share that with us. For example, where do they transfer and do they graduate on time? What careers do they pursue? What are starting salaries in the field? Do you know if they go on to employment in their field and professional success? What impact did Grossmont have on their lives?

SECTION 6 - STUDENT SUPPORT AND CAMPUS RESOURCES

PURPOSE OF SECTION 6: To determine how departments utilize various campus services.

- 6.1 Are the college's student support services (Tutoring, Counseling, Health Center, Library, Financial Aid) adequate to meet your student's needs? Please elaborate on your answer.
- 6.2 What services do students in your department/program use most often or that make the most difference? Can you provide any examples where services have clearly improved student retention and success?
- 6.3 Are college support services adequately supporting your faculty and staff? Consider the following support services: IT, Instructional Operations, Business Services, Printing, Bookstore, Maintenance, CAPS, and any other support services important to your faculty and staff.

SECTION 7 – ON-CAMPUS/OFF-CAMPUS INVOLVEMENT

PURPOSE OF SECTION 7: *The purpose of this section is for your department to showcase the most meaningful outreach, engagement and retention work that you do, both on and off campus. We are interested in learning what the faculty and staff in your department do maintain/enhance their status as professionals in their field and as instructors, how you represent the college in the community/region, interact with other departments around campus, serve the college and your students, and participate in campus life.*

The first table you see in this section is INFORMATIONAL ONLY, so you can understand what type of information you should be providing for this section. The second table you will see is the suggested table format you should use to display your information for this section.

TABLE ONE: INFORMATIONAL ONLY – PLEASE ADDRESS THE CONTENT IN THIS TABLE

OFF CAMPUS	ON CAMPUS
Marketing Flyers, brochures, booths, radio	Marketing Flyers, brochures, booths, Summit newspaper
Discipline Specific activities Conferences, Clubs/Organizations, Department Events, Licensing Meetings, Technical Reviews/peer reviewing manuscripts/textbooks and other discipline-specific volunteer activities, regional and state task forces	Campus Volunteerism Involvement in college and other department’s activities (campus open houses, science fair, water project, helping out as a theater usher or at a sports team event)
Community Involvement Advisory committees, serving in regional groups, K-12 outreach, Job Fairs, other college-related but not discipline-specific activities	Interdisciplinary Collaboration Collaborating on shared events, cross-listed courses, working with campus student services, linked courses (sharing of expertise/resources between departments to benefit student success, such as guest lectures, shared lab activities, simulation or other special events)
Professional Development Attendance, creation/presentation, grants, sabbaticals	Professional Development Workshop Attendance, creation/presentation of professional development activities, grant-writing and sabbatical projects

Table two on the next page shows how you should organize your activity data. Complete this table with your commentary.

If you need assistance in creating a table, please contact the Program Review Chair. If you are using word, simply select ‘insert’ from the main menu, then table, and then select the number of columns and rows you want for your table.

TABLE TWO: SUGGESTED TABLE FORMAT

Faculty	Activity/Committee	Year(s)	Value to Student Success
Jane Doe			
John Doe			

7.1 Referring to the above table, what activities contributed most to student success?

7.2 Please provide an overall reflection on your department's activity displayed in your table.

7.3 Are your overall faculty professional development needs sufficient to ensure students are successful in your program?

Yes ____ No ____

If no, please describe what faculty professional development needs are not being met.

SECTION 8 – FISCAL & HUMAN RESOURCES

PURPOSE OF SECTION 8: To assess if the college is meeting the resource needs of your department and if your department is using those resources efficiently.

NOTE: All required data tables and graphs will be compiled and delivered to you by the Program Review Data Liaison.

Fiscal Resources

Refer to the Table provided that shows Enrollment, % Fill, Earned WSCH, FTEF and WSCH/FTEF to answer these questions. Data for Fall, Spring and Summer semesters are provided separately.

- 8.1 Describe any patterns in enrollment; maximum enrolment and % fill in the program since the last program review. What are typical section maximum sizes (capacity) for your courses and what dictates those caps? Have you changed the number of sections offered and/or section sizes in response to changes in demand? If so, what effect has it had?
- 8.2 Describe and explain any patterns in Earned WSCH, FTEF and Earned WSCH/FTEF since the last program review. Please explain changes in FTEF due to changes in faculty staffing levels. For courses/sections with low Earned WSCH/FTEF explain their importance in the program and measures the department/program has taken/plans to take to improve efficiency and/or balance low and high efficiency offerings and/or maximize course % fill.
- 8.3. For money that you get from the college and/or from Perkins funds as part of your budget, is this amount adequate? What is this money used for to operate your department? If it is not adequate, please explain how additional funds would be used to improve student learning and success.

PURPOSE OF SECTION 8.4: The committee is looking to recognize program/department efforts for outside funding.

8. 4 If your program has received any financial support or subsidy outside of the college budget process (grants, awards, donations), explain where these funds are from, how they are used, and any other relevant information such as whether they are on-going or one-time.

Human Resources

NOTE: Please refer to the table provided by the Program Review Data Liaison to answer the following questions.

PURPOSE OF SECTION 8.5 & 8.6: The committee is interested in knowing about the people in your department and what they do. The committee also wants to understand your department/programs staffing needs.

- 8.5 Describe the roles and responsibilities of full-time versus part-time faculty in your department. If any trends or changes are apparent in the past six years, please explain the reasons for them.
- 8.6 Are the current levels of staffing of faculty adequate? Discuss part-time vs. full-time ratios and issues surrounding the availability of part-time instructors as well as duties and responsibilities of full-time faculty members that influence their loads (such as reassigned time and use of overload).
- 8.7 If staffing levels are not adequate, give a justification of your request for increased Full Time faculty based on how this position would contribute to basic department function and/or the success, retention and engagement of students in the program.
- 8.8 In the table below, list non-faculty positions that are responsible to your program (by title rather than by individual name). This list should include classified staff as well as work study and student workers.

Indicate the FTE/hours and where funding comes from for these positions. Add or delete rows to the table as needed. If you have questions on how to complete this table, please contact the Program Review Committee Chair.

Position	Funding	FTE/Hours					
		YR 1	YR 2	YR 3	YR 4	YR 5	YR 6

- 8.8 Briefly describe the duties for each position. Include a discussion of any changes in terms of non-faculty staffing and describe the impact on basic department function and/or the success of students in the program. Are current staffing levels adequate in non-faculty positions? If not, give a justification of your request for increased resources.

SECTION 9 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PURPOSE OF SECTION 9: The purpose of this section is to demonstrate how your department/programs ties in to the college's 2017 – 2022 Strategic Plan targeted goals of Outreach, Engagement and Retention.

- 9.1 Summarize program strengths in terms of:
 - Outreach
 - Engagement
 - Retention

- 9.2 Summarize program weaknesses in terms of:
 - Outreach
 - Engagement
 - Retention

- 9.3 Describe any concerns that may affect the program before the next review cycle such as retirements, decreases/increases in full or part time instructors, addition of new programs, external changes, funding issues etc.

- 9.4 Make a rank ordered list of program recommendations for the next six-year cycle based on the College's new Strategic Plan which includes outreach, engagement, and retention.

APPENDICES

Please follow these instructions when gathering appendices information.

Please place tabs in front of each appendix with the appendix # and title. Please paginate the appendix as well, continuing the page count from the rest of the report.

1. Grade Distribution Summary
2. Enrollment Data
3. Student Success Data
4. Checklist Documentation (SLO, Instructional Operations, Articulation Officer, Library)
5. Answer to committee follow up questions. This step is completed *after* the committee reads your report. Add your answers to the digital copy of your report, and email a digital copy to the Program Review Chair.