

Academic Program Review

Institutional Effectiveness Manual

Fall 2021



Contents

1. Purpose of this Manual
 2. Purpose of Academic Program Review
 3. Institutional Effectiveness and Continuous Improvement
 4. Definition of Academic Program
 5. Timeline and Process
 6. Review and Approval Process for Academic Program Review
 7. Posting of Academic Program Review Report
- Appendix A List of Academic Programs
- Appendix B Examples for Academic Program Review
- Appendix C Program/Departmental Review Committee (PDRC)

1. Purpose of this Manual

This manual provides procedures, definitions, guidelines and timelines to assist academic programs with the Academic Program Review process.

2. Purpose of Academic Program Review

The primary focus of academic program review is to improve the quality of programs, advance the quality of core teaching and learning, professional/creative activity, and service/academic outreach. The academic program review process at Garden City Community College has been developed to analyze and evaluate the program under review and to become a vital part of institutional planning. The review is a comprehensive, systematic method of self-evaluation and review of achievement that evaluates the status, effectiveness, and progress of programs. The review helps identify the future direction, needs, and priorities of those programs. The process is comprehensive and cyclical and is the means for which all programs periodically review themselves according to a set of established criteria.

The purpose for program/department review is to:

1. Provide quality programs/departments through peer review and self-evaluation
2. Encourage systematic collection and review of student learning assessments and effectiveness measures
3. Ensure that the program/department meets its stated mission and addresses the strategic directions of the college
4. Recognize and celebrate achievements and successes
5. Identify and address concerns and difficulties for continuous quality improvement
6. Ensure that academic programs remain focused on student success and serving the needs of the community
7. Align academic program needs and campus priorities with the planning and budgeting process
8. Address and fulfill accreditation requirements
9. Ensure that each program/department or service is consistent with the regulations and guidelines published by the Kansas Board of Regents, regional and specialized accrediting or certifying associations, and other relevant and applicable laws and regulations

3. Institutional Effectiveness and Continuous Improvement

Institutional Effectiveness at Garden City Community College is an ongoing systematic set of documented institutional processes and practices utilized for strategic planning, evaluation, and assessment of outcomes at the institution, department and division levels. Institutional effectiveness uses performance indicators to provide substantive information for both strategic and operational decision making. It also includes all non-instructional (non-academic) components of the institution that either directly or indirectly contribute to student success in college. In doing so, it recognizes that a well-rounded college experience extends to co-curricular and residential life experiences. These experiences influence and shape students' maturation and personal development. The Higher Learning Commission's Criterion 4 requires institutions to demonstrate responsibility for the quality of educational programs, learning environments and support services and to evaluate their effectiveness through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

The basis for continuous improvement for Garden City's academic departments is the review and assessment of program effectiveness in relation to outcomes, relevancy and efficiencies. This review and assessment is used along with Non-Academic Program/Departmental Review to inform decision makers in the resource allocation process, improving programs and services, increasing student success, and improving institutional quality. Beyond demonstrating commitment to institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement, the

Academic Program Review process is intended to create greater awareness and understanding of the interdependencies that exist among all of Garden City's programs and departments. Collaboration and trust are best achieved through overt and transparent processes.

4. Definition of Academic Program

For the purpose of the Academic Program Review process an Academic Department is defined as an instructional unit that produces credit hours. An Academic Program is a course of study which results in a credential, either a college certificate or a two-year degree. The list of Academic Programs is shown in Appendix A of this manual. Individual programs (semester plans) that are stackable and / or are in related areas may produce one Program Review as an umbrella for individual programs, with data disaggregated appropriately.

5. Timeline and Process

Each academic department will perform a Program Review self-study every five years. The program Reviews will be staggered so that approximately one-fifth are performed each year. The annual review schedule below serves as a guide for dates and steps of the review process. Dates are set as a reference point during the academic year. The Program/Department Review Council (PDRC) chair may modify this timeline in certain circumstances.

Time Frame	Process
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kick-Off Meeting • Faculty/Division Chair meeting with Institutional Research and Data Support to discuss data parameters
October, November, December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty/Division Chair complete Program Review document, with facilitation from Dean and Institutional Research and Data Support
January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First draft of review due for peer review. (One College Council member selected to review document and suggest feedback)
February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisions of Program Review
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of Program Review at PDRC/College Council meeting • Council submits review to President's Cabinet with recommendation for approval.
April-October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department representative and/or Division chair present findings (strengths, what was learned, potential initiatives moving forward) to the Board of Trustees at a regular meeting.

6. Review and Approval Process for Academic Program Review

Upon completion of the Academic Program Review Report, the appropriate Division Chair and Dean should provide feedback to ensure the data is linked to continuous improvement strategies.

A more formal review will then take place with at least one member of College Council providing a reading and feedback. This feedback may or may not result in requested changes to the Program Review.

After this feedback process, the Program Review will be placed on the agenda for a College Council meeting. The College Council will vote to approve and send to President's Cabinet or will vote to not approve and send back for additional changes.

After receiving the recommendation from College Council, President's Cabinet will then approve or disapprove the Program Review.

The appropriate department representative and / or Division Chair will then provide a short, **5-minute** presentation to the Board of Trustees at a regular meeting. This presentation should provide **strengths of the program, what was learned in the Program Review process, and potential initiatives moving forward**. The Board of Trustees will not have the full review (which will be posted to the public-facing college web site at the end of the process), so it is *essential* that presentations condense information effectively and present only a few key initiatives and supporting information.

Department representatives and / or Division Chair will translate the Program Review plan into initiatives

- Initiatives which do not have a budgetary impact can be inserted directly into the Strategic Plan initiative form on the college web site: https://gcccks.formstack.com/forms/strategic_plan
- Initiatives which *would* have a budgetary impact should be routed through the college's annual budget planning process, which typically begins with department-level requests in March.

7. Posting of Academic Program Review Report

In order to provide transparency, after the Academic Program Review Report is approved by President's Cabinet, those documents will be archived on the college's web site: https://www.gcccks.edu/about_gccc/accreditation/assessment.aspx

Appendix A: Examples for Academic Program Review

Program reviews will include discussion of relevant information for a given point in time as defined in the Academic Program Review Template. These measures help identify where a program is and how it has changed over a five-year time period. These measures relate to faculty, students and other included metrics.

Sample statements

Based on the data provided in the Autobots program review queries, statements such as these below may be used. These are only examples:

- a) The number of students enrolling in this program has increased/decreased from “x” to “y” over the past five years.
- b) This program serves a diverse number of students, with “x”% being minority, increasing ‘X’ over the past five years.
- c) Students have competed in various areas at both state and national competitions. (Elaborate on those events-highlighting accomplishments/awards etc.)
- d) Curriculum has been constantly updated and revised in response to recommendations of the program’s advisory council. (Elaborate on a few changes and what the council recommended.)
- e) Over the past five years, courses are continuously at capacity. (Use this as a basis for argument to add faculty, resources, etc.)

Sources for Assessing:

Some examples of methods that can be used to assess academic programs:

Satisfaction Surveys	Tracking withdrawals/incompletes
Retention and Graduation Rates	CCSSE results/other survey results
Recruiting results	Faculty length of service
Benchmark comparisons	Focus groups
Setting timelines or budgets	Program resources
Comparison of teaching methods	Behavioural observation data
Enrollment diversity	Improvements to student learning
Quality measures (i.e. GPA average etc.)	Use of resources

Example of Documentation

Course Syllabi

Advisory Council Minutes

Catalog descriptions of courses along with objectives and outcomes for courses and program.

Program Brochures and recruiting materials

Other documentation not included in the template. Support what you discuss in the narrative.