

PROGRAM REVIEW: SETTING A STANDARD

BASED ON THE ORIGINAL PAPER BY EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE 1995-1996

ADOPTED SPRING 2009

Highlights from the ASCCC document

Keep PR distinct from PIV process; avoid treating PR as evaluative

Neither faculty nor staff is best motivated by statutory regulations and threats of external accountability, but rather by the desire to see students succeed . ***Overemphasis on external criteria results in program review being perceived as a time-consuming process for an externally mandated product with little positive effect on the program's activities or relevance maintaining academic excellence***

The process by which programs and services are reduced or eliminated should be clearly defined, as well as separate and distinct from program review

Program review should include both quantitative and qualitative evidence

Quantitative factors have great value in the context of a comprehensive program review process...***However, excessive preoccupation with quantitative measures, particularly productivity measures, will have the effect of skewing the program review processes away from a program's concerns over educational quality or student success .***

...quantitative data should not be presented without a narrative explanation nor should it be used for comparison among a college's programs. Such use would tend to promote the use of program review for program reduction or program elimination and would completely disregard the qualitative value of a program . Rather, ***trends in data over a period of time within the program itself may be most useful for the program faculty to identify their needs and design the necessary intervention or support .***

Learning-centered conversations with researchers are essential . Institutional support necessary for the successful implementation of a program review process **includes research support—both qualitative and quantitative research**

There should be a clearly defined ***feedback process*** for PR—ideally in draft and final form

From “Processes for Validating Program Review”

Some colleges use rubrics to assess the self- study . Other colleges score the components of the self-study and conclude with a final assessment . Other colleges have a loose validation through simple acceptance of the self-study .

This stage of the program review requires a clear understanding by the program review committee and the programs undergoing review about how their work will be judged . Did they provide adequate evidence? Did they create an adequate plan to address improvement? Does their forecast of future needs exhibit analysis and thought? Some colleges create a summary of the program review committee’s reflections . *Somehow* the work of the program will need to be boiled down into recommendations sent to other committees that can bring those recommendations to fruition .

Sample feedback process from Evergreen Valley College

A few other findings:

There doesn't seem to be any mandated timeline nor agreement on how often program review takes place: some colleges have an annual process; others three, four, five, six years...

Not all programs have to be reviewed at the same time (?) At least [one college staggers the reviews](#)

The forms and questions *can* be simpler and clearer: [Foothill example](#)

Possible goals for the Spring “Great Read”

- Create a rubric (or do we have one from last time?) for evaluating program reviews—one that could be used by smaller committees in the future (Dean, Inside Faculty/Outside Faculty) similar to Evergreen’s
- Identify areas that are currently working well in the reviews
- For areas that are consistently not working well, consider revising the program review forms to be a little more like Foothill’s...