

## **DRAFT PROPOSAL**

### **Cuesta College Program Review and Planning Process**

From, "Program Review: Developing a Faculty Driven Process,"  
Statewide Academic Senate, The Educational Policies Committee - 1995-1996

#### **The Role of Local Academic Senates in Program Review and Planning**

The involvement of the local academic senate, as the representative of the faculty, is critical to the successful development and implementation of a program review process. While the role of the local academic senate is delineated in regulation, academic senates have a greater opportunity to create a collegial, supportive, student-centered, faculty-driven, academically relevant process for the evaluation of the college's programs and services. Local academic senates should see their role as an opportunity to redefine program review in order to eliminate unwanted or ineffective characteristics historically associated with the process. Administrations and boards need the professional expertise and judgment inherent in the collective wisdom of the faculty represented by the local academic senate. Through an organized resolution process or the development of a position paper, the local academic senate can affect one of the most important processes for determining how well the students' educational and support needs are being met on a college campus.

A Q&A document developed by Past President Jim Locke, and Vice President Bill Scroggins suggests standard language. With some modification, this language appears below. Based on local issues and discussions, revisions can be made. This resolution was developed with the intention of providing local academic senates a basis upon which they can build their program review discussions into a process.

"Whereas, faculty members derive their authority from their expertise as teachers and subject matter specialist and from their status as professionals and as a result, the faculty has an inherent professional responsibility in the development and implementation of policies and procedures governing the <insert college name> program review processes; therefore

Be it resolved that the <insert college name> program review process shall promote professionalism, enhance performance, and be effective in yielding a genuinely useful and substantive process for determining program effectiveness, and

Be it further resolved that the program review processes at the <insert college name> will

require 1) an articulation of clear, relevant criteria upon which reviews will be based,- 2) the establishment of reasonable and timely intervals; 3) the establishment of the specific purposes for which program reviews are conducted and articulation of those purposes to everyone involved, and

Be it further resolved that the principal purposes of the review process are to recognize and acknowledge good performance, to enhance satisfactory performance and help programs which are performing satisfactorily further their own growth, and to identify weak performance and assist programs in achieving needed improvement, and

Be it further resolved that one of the purposes of the program review process at <insert college name> is not that of providing a mechanism or justification for program elimination; and

## **DRAFT PROPOSAL**

Be it further resolved that a program 's students, administrators, faculty and their colleagues shall all contribute to the program review, but the program's faculty shall play a central role in the program review process and, together with appropriate administrators, assume principal responsibility for the effectiveness of the process; and Be it further resolved that procedures of the program review process shall foster a joint and cooperative exercise of responsibility by the faculty, administration, and governing board of <insert college name> and shall reflect faculty and administrator expertise and authority in evaluating professional work as well as the governing board's legal and public responsibility for the process, and

Be it finally resolved that the < insert college name > program review process shall provide an ongoing and thorough review of the relevance and responsiveness of vocational education programs, consideration of the relationship between other similar programs throughout the state, and the appropriate balance between vocational and general educational programs.<sup>(5)</sup>

Local academic senates will need to identify the process they will use, the participants time lines, and the needed resources/cost for the development of a program review process. It is recommended that the senate form a subcommittee that is responsible for the development of the program review process.

### **Definition of Student Learning Outcomes**

Consistent with the ACCJC and California Academic Senate, the following definition was developed by Cuesta faculty:

- *Student Learning Outcomes are broad statements developed by faculty of what students will know and be able to do with that knowledge upon completion of a learning experience.*
- This definition allows us to identify not only specific knowledge and skills, but also the capacities for creative expression and informed judgments, attitudes and ethical behaviors that are the essence of collegiate education.

## **Program Review and Planning Process Table of Contents**

### **I. General Information**

- General Information about the program
  - History of the program
  - (Can include the broad history of the program, significant changes/accomplishments since the last program review)
  - Describe when this Program Review was conducted and who was involved
  - (Can include information about current and/or new faculty)
- Program Goals (broad statements about what this program will accomplish – its “targets.” See Senate sheet for definition.)
  - (Can include the target students and their future roles)
  - (Can include a Program Map)
- Contributions and connections of this program to:
  - The Mission of Cuesta College
  - The Values of Cuesta College

### **II. Student Information and Analysis (Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes)** (Comes from Data sheets from IR Office – Ryan Cartnal)

- Data summary – relevant comments
  - Include enrollment, retention, success, FTES/FTEF
  - Can include early alert, or other pertinent information
- Identify areas for change or development to facilitate program health and growth

### **III. Program: Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment**

- List Program’s Intended Student Learning Outcomes (3-6)
- Identify connections to broad program goals
- Assessment of Program Student Learning Outcomes
- Recommended changes and updates

### **IV. Curriculum Review: Outcomes and Assessment**

- Review of each course (curriculum) from the discipline
  - Include Student Learning Outcomes for each course
  - Include assessment of SLO’s
  - Include connection to Program Intended Outcomes
- Include Prerequisite/Corequisite/Advisory validations
- Changes and Recommendations
- Can include comparisons to other college course descriptions, faculty development activity that make contributions to the program, etc.

### **Program Review and Planning Process**

#### **V. Planning – Looking Forward**

- List “assumptions” based on previous work and known factors of the institution
- Immediate needs to support goals/outcomes for AY 2006-7
  - Note if needs are one-time or ongoing
  - Include: Personnel, Equipment, Facilities and Other
  - Be as specific with costs as possible
  - (This sheet will be used during Unit Planning for AY 2006-7)

#### **VI. Yearly Program Planning Worksheets**

- AY 2007-8 (include information as required above)
- AY 2008-9
- AY 2009-10
- AY 2010-11

#### **VII. End Notes**

- Can include list of students working in the field, awards, letters, samples, etc.