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Purpose & Rationale
The primary purpose of Program Review at Grand Rapids Community College (GRCC) is to systematically improve the educational program, curriculum, and teaching and learning. To achieve this purpose, the Program Review process has been designed to assess program outcomes and student learning relative to the program learning outcomes. Strengths and areas for improvement in each of these areas are identified in order to determine current needs and plan for the future direction of the program. This Program Review process integrates internal evaluation needs, including formative program development and strategic planning for academic programs, with the requirements for external accrediting bodies such as the Higher Learning Commission. To ensure the sustained quality of academic programs and curriculum, Program Review is conducted every four years for each program. The evaluation of programs and Program Review self-study reports are driven by the following guiding questions:

1) Is the discipline purpose/mission current and viable?
2) Is the current curriculum timely, relevant and aligned with external standards?
3) Is progress toward Program Outcomes and goals being met?
4) Are the Program Learning Outcomes being met by students?
5) Does the program have adequate resources to ensure educational quality?
6) What improvements are recommended for continuous quality improvement? What resources are required to implement these recommendations?

Program faculty and staff synthesize data and information associated with each of the Program Review guiding questions, using the recommended tactics and strategies, and then determine strengths and areas for improvement. Action plans are then developed for areas identified as needing improvement. The findings of the faculty are addressed in the Program Review Self Study Report. Action plans are created to address areas that need improving (curriculum and academic services) and planning for the future of the program. This work is documented in the GRCC Program Review Follow-Up Action Checklist.
Getting Started
This guide has been developed to help you with the strategies and resources you will need to complete your Program Review.

STEP ONE: Identify a team of program faculty that will complete the Program Review. At least one faculty member must be a “content expert.” A content expert is someone who is appropriately credentialed in the field in which the program resides. Other key roles in the Program Review process include a “coordinator”- someone who delegates work and collects that various components from faculty, and a “writer”- someone who compiles the actual Program Review document. It is helpful to identify one or more faculty who will facilitate each of these roles for every program going through the Program Review process in the current year. You may also include advisory board members, adjunct or non-teaching faculty, or staff to help with your Program Review.

STEP TWO: Review the timeline and activities. Develop a full understanding of the purpose, scope, activities, timeline, and deliverables for the work.

STEP THREE: Decide on a strategy for the work. Identify how the work will get done. Which work sessions will you sign up for? How will you divide up the work to ensure that it gets done in a timely manner? What are the most critical components or areas of focus for the Program Review given current departmental goals and plans?

Timeline & Process
Program Review is facilitated through the Curriculum Office, overseen by the Dean of Instructional Support and carried out by the Department Head/Program Director responsible for the program. Technical support is provided by the Curriculum Specialist. This work is supported by Institutional Research and Planning, through the development and administration of stakeholder surveys and compilation of institutional program specific data. Each academic year the Program Review process is initiated in September/October and concludes in May.

To help faculty understand the expectations for the various components of Program Review, and to support their work, the Curriculum Office offers work sessions throughout the academic year. The goal for the work sessions is provide technical support for different sections and to allow faculty concentrated time to complete the work. The specific activities of Program Review are outlined below and a proposed timeline for completing the work is included to provide direction.

AUGUST/SEPTEMBER- The Program Review team is established for each program. The team members are identified by the Department Head/Program Director and may include program faculty, adjunct faculty, external experts, GRCC staff, or other individuals deemed appropriate.
SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER- Program Review is officially launched. The Program Review team is oriented to the Program Review process and associated expectations. At this time data collection also begins. The Program Review team works with Institutional Research & Planning to identify pertinent data needs. Two work sessions are offered:

- ✔ Work Session- Introduction to Program Review: Purpose, Process, Timeline
- ✔ Work Session- Course Data: Enrollment & Success

NOVEMBER- Begin work on Section I: Mission/Purpose, Target Audience

- ✔ Work Session- Technical Assistance for Assessment

DECEMBER- Work continues. Work is focused around the external standards and expectations for curriculum development and review. Each department will receive the data packet for their Program Reviews.

- ✔ Work Session- Standards Identification for Disciplines/High School Standards
- ✔ Work Session- Developing & Maintaining Transferable Curriculum

JANUARY- Work continues. Data analysis continues to be focused on the external environment, with a close look at the Completion Comparisons.

- ✔ Work Session- Completion Comparisons: Community College & Transfer Institutions

FEBRUARY- Work continues. The focus shifts to curriculum.

- ✔ Work Session- Completing a Program Gap Analysis using External Standards

MARCH- Work continues, the focus returns to analysis of program data.

- ✔ Work Session- Course Data: Demographic Detail (Achieving the Dream data)

APRIL- It is time to pull all of the components of Program Review together in the final report. At this time the departmental information should be completed, and the reviews for each program currently undergoing Program Review should be combined into one document. The GRCC Data Packet for Academic Program Review should be added as an appendix.

- ✔ Work Session- Department Reporting
- ✔ Technical Assistance for Assessment

MAY- Career, Laddered Career APRs Due (May 2, 2014)
Certificate of Completion, Discipline, Student Services APRs Due (May 30, 2014)
Completing the Review of the Academic Program

Now you are ready to begin your Program Review. The outline and resources below will help provide structure for completing the review. Your Program Review will consist of five sections. In each section, you are being asked to document the various elements listed and then to answer the evaluation questions. As you are answering the evaluation questions, remember that the ultimate goal of Program Review is to understand the history and current state of the program, and then to make decisions about how to improve the program moving forward.

Mission/Purpose & Target Audience/Pre-Requisite Skills

Mission/Purpose

Review & Documentation:

- Document and review of the discipline purpose/mission statement to verify that it is current, and appropriately reflection the intentions for the discipline
- Review web pages and other marketing materials to ensure consistency of information being disseminated

Evaluation Question:

1. Does the purpose/mission statement clearly identify why the discipline courses exist? What is the scope of this discipline and the therefore the course prefixes? Do all courses fit within this discipline?
   ✓ Identify whether revision of purpose/mission statement is warranted
   ✓ Identify if a new course prefix is warranted

Resources:

✓ How to write a mission/purpose statement
  [http://assessment.uconn.edu/docs/HowToWriteMission.pdf](http://assessment.uconn.edu/docs/HowToWriteMission.pdf)

✓ Outcomes-Based Academic and Co-Curricular Review: A compilation of Good Practices, Marilee Bresciani, 2006 (Book- Contact Katie Daniels at kdaniels@grcc.edu for copy)
Target audience

Review & Documentation:

- Identify and document target population(s). Indicate the various populations the courses within the discipline is intended to serve, i.e., support for programs outside of the department, general education, courses for a major within the department.
- Key to student success is identifying success factors such as, pre-requisite knowledge and skills a student must possess prior to taking a course. Review the pre-requisite requirements and decide if they are appropriate for the courses within the discipline.
  - Use state or college standards as a resource. (ACT, SAT, Accuplacer, ASSET, Compass, WorkKeys, etc.).
  - For adult students, identify the college and adult learning assessment exam standards (TABE, CASAS), if appropriate.

Evaluation Questions:

1. Have the target audiences for the courses been identified?
2. If there are pre-requisites or assessments for the courses, are they appropriate and do they facilitate student success (based on your review of external data and course success data)?

Resources:


Data

Course Data

Review & Documentation:

- Review and document the Course Enrollment and Success data.
- Identify which courses have the highest and lowest success rates.
- Identify courses with patterns of low enrollment and consider the reasons for this.
- Identify the courses for which you would like to have IRP provide demographic details
- Review and document the Demographic Detail for courses.
- Identify any sub-populations that have having a more difficult time with success in the course.
**Evaluation Questions:**

1. What does the course enrollment by semester data tell you?
2. Are students passing courses at the appropriate rates? If not, which courses are of concern and what should be done about this?
3. Are the Course Success Rates the same for the various sub-group populations? If not, where are the areas of concern and what should be done about this?

**Resources:**

✓ GRCC Data Packet for Academic Review

**Program Outcomes**

**Review & Documentation:**

- List the Program Outcomes
- Identify the Program Outcomes for which you have been collecting data
- Document the data trends

**Evaluation Questions:**

1. Are these Program Outcomes appropriate given the target audience and intent for the program? If not, please list what the new Program Outcomes should be.
2. What does the data trend for the Program Outcomes tell you? What are the implications for these data?

**Resources:**

✓ Writing Outcomes: Program & Program Student Learning Outcomes- Academic Disciplines

---

**Curriculum**

**History**

**Review & Documentation:**

- Document the program history for the last eight years
  ✓ Document the history of the curriculum over the last eight academic years including:
    - new or significantly revised courses;
    - revision of courses as a result of external or field related requirements;
    - discontinuation of a course(s);
    - impact of partnerships, grants, or other efforts;
  ✓ Identify external recommendations that influenced curricular changes (for example, advisory committee, transfer institution, professional organization)
Transferability & External Standards

Review & Documentation:

- Identify the appropriate external standards with which these courses should be aligned.
- Identify and verify external assessments that could be used for challenge exams for these courses.
- Review high school state standards, Michigan high school academic curriculum standards.
- Develop a curriculum crosswalk of the academic foundational skills necessary to enter your courses (using High School standards, if applicable).
- Review the equivalent courses for primary transfer institutions. Identify whether the courses are well aligned, or if changes are necessary to ensure transferability to four year institutions.

Evaluation Questions:

1. To what extent is the course curriculum aligned with the K-12 standards? Are the current courses well aligned with the K-12 expectations? Are textbooks and student materials in the initial coursework at the appropriate level given their high school preparation? If there is not alignment, identify the gaps. If there is duplication, secondary to postsecondary, identify the opportunity for articulated credits.

2. To what extent are the existing courses aligned with the equivalent courses offered at transfer institutions? Which courses need to be updated to ensure alignment and transferability?

Resources:

- Assessments /certifications earned at completion of program
  - NOCTI – http://www.nocti.org/Jobready.cfm
- Lumina Foundation Degree Profile:
  - http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-38924---,00.html
Program Learning Outcomes
Review & Documentation:

- Document the Program Learning Outcomes (for the discipline)

Evaluation Questions:

1. Do the Discipline Learning Outcomes reflect the demonstrable skills, knowledge, and attitudes expected of students in each course within this discipline? Are they aligned with the standards identified in previous work? Are they clearly stated and measurable? If not, what changes are suggested? Document the revised Discipline Learning Outcomes here.

Resources:
- Writing Learning Outcomes Worksheet
- Writing Outcomes: Incorporating Bloom’s Taxonomy
- Writing Outcomes: Program & Program Student Learning Outcomes - Disciplines

Curriculum Delivery
Review & Documentation:

- Identify the Courses and Programs Approved for online delivery (Curriculum Office to provide)
- Honors Courses (Curriculum Office to provide)
- Study Away courses (Curriculum Office to provide)

Evaluation Questions:

1. Is experiential learning, including internships and academic service learning, systematically embedded into the courses? Are the current experiential learning opportunities sufficient? Please explain.
2. Are the online offerings (courses & number of sections) sufficient to meet student and programmatic needs?
3. Are the honors and study away offering sufficient for the program?

Assessment of Student Learning

Review & Documentation:

- For each assessment project, include the following documentation:
  - List the Discipline Student Learning Outcome assessed
  - List the Institutional Learning Outcome assessed
List the measurement instrument and whether it was a direct or indirect measure of student learning.

Summarize the data and findings about student learning from the measurement tools listed above. Add a detailed data summary as an appendix.

Briefly describe the changes that are made to the curriculum, the instructional strategies, or the difference in the service delivery this past academic year, based on the data that you collected. If you did not make a change, please describe your plan to do so for the next academic year.

Summarize the data and findings after the improvements/changes were made. Add the detailed data summary as an appendix. If you did not implement a change this year, you do not have to complete this section.

Resources:

- Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education, Mary Allen, 2004 (Book - Contact Katie Daniels at kdaniels@grcc.edu for copy)

Preparing for the future

Peer Institutions
Review & Documentation

- Review and assess the number of peer institutions/competitors currently offering programs that align with curriculum offered within this discipline.
- Identify institutions with whom GRCC may be able to partner to form Articulated Pre-Major programs.

Evaluation Questions:

1. Are peer institutions offering this program at the same level (certificate, associate’s degree)? Is the program offered at a bachelor’s degree? If so, could a pre-major program be created?
2. Are there any institutions with whom GRCC could explore articulation agreements?

Resource:

- GRCC Data Packet for Academic Review

Facilities & Equipment
Review & Documentation

- Assess adequacy of current facilities and equipment.
- Identify needs for facilities and equipment.
Consider opportunities to use and expose students to alternative facilities and equipment through community partnerships

**Evaluation Questions:**

1. Are the resources sufficient to meet identified needs and goals for the next four years? Please explain.
2. Are the facilities and equipment adequate to facilitate teaching and learning? Please explain.

**Work Products**

- [ ] Develop the Course Review schedule for the next four years (beginning with next year)
- [ ] Identify which courses from the department will be developed in online or hybrid format over the next four years. Indicate the highest priorities for online and hybrid development and the academic year in which the course will be developed.
- [ ] Curriculum Crosswalk