

Gadsden State Community College

Program Review Report to the President

2011-2012

Executive Summary

Program review is peer analysis and performed to address the quality and viability of a program in terms of student learning, accountability, service to the community, and alignment with institutional mission and goals. Program Reviews are useful in assuring quality of the instructional program, demonstrating accountability, and making improvements based on assessment findings. Program Reviews demonstrate the College's commitment to accountability through voluntary compliance with Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Core Requirements and Comprehensive Standards and with the policies enacted by the Alabama State Board of Education. The Committee reviewed nine programs from both technical and transfer divisions. The most often cited recommendation was to upgrade or add computer laboratory equipment. Other recommendations include completing industry certification, use of technology and formation of business and community partnerships.

Introduction

The Program Review and Curriculum Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Dean of Instructional Services, to the Dean of Technical Programs, and to the President. This committee represents the faculty in academic matters and may serve as a liaison between the faculty and administration. The committee is concerned, specifically, with curriculum changes, curriculum review, proposals for new programs, and program evaluation in terms of cost, enrollment, and effectiveness.

Program reviews support academic quality assurance and continuous program improvement but more recently this has been expanded to include accountability and assessment components. Also, there is increased emphasis on follow-up procedures to ensure positive student learning outcomes.

Policy and Accreditation Agency Compliance

-

Guiding Principles

1. Content, quality, and effectiveness of curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty. ¹
2. Program Reviews are conducted for the purpose of program improvement.
3. The process should be intuitive and not burdensome for committee members or faculty.

Model

For the past two academic years, the Program and Curriculum Review Committee has developed and refined a common model. The purpose in developing this model is to eliminate ambiguity, simplify planning and implementation, standardize the documentation, improve transparency for external evaluators, and promote an increase in participant “comfort” level. (Pet-Armacost, 2008)

From a review of the literature, procedures currently in place at the College, and the “best practice” policies and procedures of other institutions², a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods was proposed. Of specific interest to Gadsden State is a goal-based model which compares data gathered during the review process to program mission, goals, and objectives. The process is driven by the President, Dean of Instruction, and the Dean of Technical Instruction. The responsibility for the evaluation rests with the Program Review Committee.

Communication plays a vital role in meaningful Program Reviews. The first step in communication was to bring the Program Review Committee together to receive the charge from the President and Deans. Committee members worked with the Department Chairs and program faculty to accomplish the reviews. The Chair served as a liaison between the department, faculty and the committee members charged with reviewing the program. Representatives from Institutional Planning and Research were included in the initial meeting to ensure that the appropriate data was made available for reviewers. Minimally this included enrollment data, graduation/completer data, class size, student: faculty ratio and credit hours generated. Other information made available included surveys of student, alumni, and employers, as well as reports on completer data, and other assessment related information. The format of the review and proposed timeline was introduced at this meeting.

The Institutional Research staff constructed an InfoPath document to collect reports from Committee members. The Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research webpages served as a repository for resource documents and templates.

¹ SACS Comprehensive Standard 3.4.10: “The Institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty.”

² University of Central Florida; Hillsborough Community College, Tampa; University of Tennessee; University of Alabama; University of Oregon; Austin Community College, TX; University of Wisconsin-Madison; Richland Community College, VA; Coastline Community College, FL

2011-2012 Program and Curriculum Review Committee

Civil Engineering Technology	Stacy Hicks and Patti Wilborn
Diesel Mechanics Technology	Gary Udaka and Leah Elkins
Drafting and Design Technology	Cindy Williams and Julian Thornton
Industrial Automation Technology	Eric Campbell
Machine Tool Technology	Harold Waddell and Donna McCurley
Music	Shelby Cochran and Larrhea Sims
Psychology	Angela Waits and Hugh Hammer
Sociology	Kaci Rodgers
Therapeutic Massage Therapy	Gay Utz and Susan Brown

Elements of Program Review

I. Introduction

- Degrees and Certificates
- Accreditation
- Industry Certification
- Student Licensure
- Mission Statement of Program

II. Quality

- Faculty Credentials
- Feedback Summary
- Learning Outcomes Summary
- Craft Advisory Board Summary

III. Demand

- Enrollment Data
- Credit Hour Production
- Graduation/Completer Data
- Future of the Discipline Survey

IV. Resources

- Financial Data
 - Budget Data
 - Unmet Needs Summary
 - External Funding Summary
- Human Resources Data
- Space & Furnishings Survey

V. Other

VI. Recommendations

Timeline

November/December 2011	Programs notified of review and provided with copy of components of the review
January 31, 2012	Program Review begins
March 22, 2012	Program Review Committee (PRC) teams post reviews to IE system
April 13, 2012	IE send notice of Final collated Program Reviews to PRC
April 26, 2012	PRC Approve Final Program Review Document
May 1, 2012	Distribute Program Reviews and Recommendations to Instructional Deans
August 1, 2012	Action Plan and Timeline for response to recommendations due to IE
December 12, 2012	IE follow up on PRC recommendations

Summary of Recommendations

The Committee makes the following recommendations:

Civil Engineering Technology

1. Improve effectiveness in helping students gain employment in their field
2. Establishment of business partnerships
3. Development of internship opportunities
4. Increase the rigor of the math requirement to address student deficiencies noted in geometry and trigonometry

Diesel Mechanic Technology

1. Complete program certification through NATEF
2. Improve student recruitment efforts
3. Explore integration of diesel mechanics with automotive courses
4. Improve tools and equipment as recommended by the Craft Advisory Committee and required by NATEF
5. Update diesel computer lab as funds become available
6. Seek additional Cooperative education opportunities with local business and industry
7. Improve Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to measure more accurately what students should know as they near the end of the program.

Drafting and Design Technology

1. Review all CAD software to ensure the program remains current
2. Increase in departmental budget to acquire 3D Modeling machine and related instructional materials

Industrial Automation

No recommendations

Machine Tool Technology

1. Update lab equipment to meet industry standards

Music

1. Full-time music faculty member should be replaced
2. Update instruments and equipment

Psychology

1. Increase faculty participation in in-field professional development as funds are available
2. Acquire departmental membership in the appropriate professional society
3. Seek funding for a computer lab for the Social Sciences division
4. Increase departmental oversight of the ratio of full-time to part-time instructors

Sociology

No Recommendations

Therapeutic Massage Therapy

1. Acquire additional space for labs and clinics
2. Continue efforts to gain permission to offer weekend and evening hour clinics

The committee acknowledges the fiscal limitations of the College and recognizes that the recent increase in enrollment is a significant factor affecting the College.

Five Year Program Review Schedule

2010-2011

Air Conditioning Technology
Auto Collision Repair Technology
Clinical Lab Technology
Computer Science
English
Office Administration
Radiologic Technology
Reading
Realtime Reporting
Speech

2011-2012

Civil Engineering Technology
Diesel Mechanics Technology
Drafting & Design Technology
Industrial Automation Technology
Machine Tool Technology
Music
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology
Spanish
Therapeutic Massage Therapy

2012-2013

Biology
Business Administration
Chemistry
Early Childhood Development
Economics
English, Reading and Speech

Fishery Science
Geography
History
Home Economics
Marketing Management
Physical Science
Physical Education

2013-2014

Alabama Language Institute
Art
Criminal Justice
Electronics Engineering Technology
Electrical Technology
Emergency Medical Technology
Human Services
Humanities
Mechanical Design Technology
Paralegal
Public Safety Telecommunications
Religion

2014-2015

Automotive Service Technology
Carpentry
Cosmetology Technology
RN/LPN Nursing
Masonry
Mathematics
Theatre
Welding Technology

Assessment Rubric

Program: _____ **Date of Review:** _____

PRC Reviewer(s): _____

Program Director: _____

Contact Information: _____

Introduction

- Degrees and Certificates _____
- Accreditation _____
- Industry Certification _____
- Student Licensure _____
- Mission Statement of Program _____

Remark: _____

Quality

- Faculty Credentials _____
- Feedback Summary _____
- Learning Outcomes Summary _____
- Craft Advisory Board Summary _____

Remark: _____

Demand

- Enrollment Data _____
- Credit Hour Production _____
- Graduation/Completer Data _____
- Future of the Discipline Survey _____

Remark: _____

Resources

Financial Data

- Budget Data _____
- Unmet Needs Summary _____
- External Funding Summary _____

Human Resources Data

Space & Furnishings Survey

Remark: _____

Other

Remark: _____

Recommendations

Remark: _____

Frequently Asked Questions

1. **Degrees and Certificates** – what Degrees and Certificates does this unit have the authority to award? AS, AA, AAS, CER, STC
2. **Accreditation** -- SACS accredits the entire college but some programs have separate accreditation through a professional organization; sometimes (but not always) accreditation and Industry Certification are synonymous. NATEF is an example for technical accreditors and the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission is another.
3. **Industry Certification** -- program faculty will be the best authority to determine if there is industry certification.
4. **Student Licensure** – can students earn a personal license for professional practice in the field? Massage Therapy and Cosmetology are examples of professional licensure.
5. **Mission Statement of Program**—each program should have a mission statement that is directly related to the mission statement of the College. This is usually found on their web page or in their Unit Strategic Plan (USP), look at the IE webpage to see USPs with Mission Statements, <http://www.gadsdenstate.edu/faculty-and-staff/ie/index.php>. If the program doesn't have a written mission statement, the director or chair should develop one.
6. **Faculty Credentials**—this data is provided by HR but should be reviewed with the program faculty to make sure all degrees, certificates, and credentials are up to date.
7. **Feedback Summary**—access the survey data on the IR Webpage, <http://www.gadsdenstate.edu/faculty-and-staff/ir/index.php>, for the latest survey data on employer, student and faculty satisfaction. The peer reviewers should review at least the past three years (2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11) and write a summary of feedback received from internal and external sources.
8. **Learning Outcomes Summary**—access the IE Webpage, <http://www.gadsdenstate.edu/faculty-and-staff/ie/index.php>, for the past three years of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) reports. A brief synopsis of at least the past three years of assessment of student learning should be written by the peer reviewer to support the College's efforts to demonstrate Continuous Quality Improvement.
9. **Craft Advisory Board Summary**—Technical programs will have minutes of Craft Advisory Board Meetings. The peer reviewer, working with the department chair or program director should write a summary paragraph of these minutes. If the Board made recommendations, report what action has been taken or is planned to address these.
10. **Enrollment Data**—this has been provided by IR but should be reviewed with program faculty.
11. **Credit Hour Production**—this has been provided by IR but should be reviewed with program faculty.
12. **Graduation/Completer Data**—this has been provided by IR but should be reviewed with program faculty.
13. **Financial Data**
14. **Budget Data**—this has been provided by IR but should be reviewed with program faculty.

15. **Unmet Needs Summary** – committee members should consult with program faculty to determine unmet needs. This should not be limited to funding. It may be that additional space, curriculum updates, certification initiatives or plans to improve the program or department could be mentioned in this space.
16. **External Funding Summary**—departmental or programmatic faculty should be consulted to determine the extent of external funding if applicable.
17. **Human Resources Data**—department chairs or program directors will have access to this information.
18. **Space & Furnishings Survey**—faculty should be consulted for consensus in response to these survey-type questions.
19. **Recommendations Tab** – since our orientation meeting on January 24, 2012, this tab has been added. Use this space to make recommendations in conjunction with the department chair or director with respect to instructional delivery, staffing, budgeting, facilities and the improvement of student learning in general.

Thank you for your time and expertise to complete this peer review process.

Bibliography

Pet-Armacost, J. (2008). Designing an Assessment system to enhance Program Quality. *SACS-COC Institution on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation*. Orlando, Florida.

Pitter, G. W. (Fall 2007, Number 105). *Program Review: A Tool for Continuous Improvement of Academic Programs*. Chicago: Association for Institutional Research.