

**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
2017-2018 Final Report**

**Executive Summary**

The work of the Program Review Committee (PRC) is essential to building the foundation on which College of the Redwoods develops, identifies, and documents quality improvement plans district wide. This report summarizes the committee's findings and highlights overarching themes and areas for improvement.

Program review reports have continued to improve in quality this year; however, areas for additional improvement still exist. Programs and service areas have struggled to close the loop between their evaluations of previous plans, assessments, and subsequent planning documents. The need for improved linkages between assessment and annual planning were particularly evident in comprehensive reviews.

Many resource requests continue to be misclassified as planning actions and are therefore not linked to measureable outcomes. One result of this misclassification is that when resources are not funded, programs do not have alternate plans in place, which impedes future efforts to evaluate plans.

The PRC recommends improved communication between the PRC and the Budget Planning Committee (BPC) and clarification on how PRC's work informs the ranking of resource requests. It is unclear whether or not the BPC takes into consideration the quality of planning and assessment work presented in program reviews when ranking requests. In updating the PRC's rubrics and templates for next year, it would be helpful to know what additional information the BPC needs to more adequately evaluate and prioritize submitted requests.

Lastly, the difficulties faced by instructional programs in need of full-time faculty were evident in the reports, specifically in the areas of planning and assessment. The Program Review Committee believes that increased administrative oversight of the program review process could improve the quality of the written documents submitted by these areas.

The committee would like to commend program review authors for their hard work and to recommend that professional development opportunities be available to all programs and service areas on how to use data to inform strategic planning. Program reviews as a whole would benefit from more consistent data-driven planning and decision-making.

**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
2017-2018 Final Report**

## **I. Introduction**

The College of the Redwoods' Program Review Committee (PRC) reviews and evaluates annual and comprehensive<sup>1</sup> program review submissions from all subject and service areas. PRC leads and facilitates authentic assessment of College programs to improve student success and coordinate integrated planning. The work of the PRC is essential to building the foundation on which College of the Redwoods develops, identifies, and documents quality improvement plans and goals. The process also informs the provision of District funds in order to implement identified plans related to larger district planning goals.

This report documents the important work of the PRC during the 2017-2018 Academic Year, including detailed analyses of submissions and Committee recommendations for future program review submissions.

## **II. Overview and Assessment of Program Review Submissions**

Instructional programs submitted 22 annual and 6 comprehensive reviews.<sup>2</sup> General Studies was scheduled to complete a comprehensive review this year, but did not complete one. Student Development service areas submitted 13 reviews and Administrative areas submitted 12 reviews. Though required, no annual review was submitted by Maintenance.

The PRC used specialized rubrics to review each program review submission (Appendix A). Each criterion in the rubric aligns with a section of the program review template. Sections are evaluated and assigned a rating of Exemplary (E), Satisfactory (S) or Developing (D). Below are descriptive statistics, general observations, and overarching themes derived from this year's instructional, student development, and administrative program reviews.

## **III. Instructional Program Reviews**

Annual instructional reviews continue to reflect a strong understanding of how their individual program supports the mission of the College. Instructional program reporting of assessment activities was more detailed and robust this year. Specifically, the number of programs that scored exemplary on their reporting of assessment activities increased by 22% over last year.<sup>3</sup>

The evaluation of previous plans and planning sections of the reports have improved overall, indicating a better understanding of how program planning integrates with the larger college planning process. Nevertheless, some programs still struggle with evaluating progress on their previously reported plans. Some programs went as far as leaving this section blank.

The quality of Comprehensive Instructional reviews from last year to this year was inconsistent. Because the sample includes entirely different programs each year, it is hard to draw a conclusion when comparing samples from year-to-year. Overall, the number of excellent scores increased in all categories, except evaluation of previous plans. However, when each program's comprehensive review from this year was compared to the same program's annual review from last year, four out of the six programs scored lower.

---

<sup>1</sup> Comprehensive Reviews are completed on a 4-year rotating cycle.

<sup>2</sup> Comprehensive reviews included analyzing data trends, such as enrollments, equity and completions.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix B for a detailed comparison of 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 data.

**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
2017-2018 Final Report**

**Table 1: Instructional Program Reviews (Annual)**

	<i>Program Information</i>	<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Previous Plans</i>	<i>Planning</i>
<b>E</b>	77%	55%	18%	50%
<b>S</b>	18%	41%	55%	41%
<b>D</b>	5%	5%	27%	9%
<i>(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory or (D) Developing.</i>				n = 22

**Table 2: Instructional Program Reviews (Comprehensive)**

	<i>Program Information</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Previous Plans</i>	<i>Planning</i>
<b>E</b>	83%	40%	50%	17%	33%
<b>S</b>	17%	60%	33%	67%	67%
<b>D</b>	0%	0%	17%	17%	0%
<i>(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory or (D) Developing.</i>					n = 6

Taken together, there remains room for growth in terms of evaluating previous plans and planning for the next year and tying assessments and annual planning together in comprehensive reviews. Many plans are still listed as a resource request with no measureable outcomes and no alternate plan if a requested resource is not received.

The PRC recognizes that instructional program reviews reflect the voice of various authors, thus creating some discrepancies in overall analysis. Additionally, many programs maintain no full-time faculty, which impinges on the program's ability to participate in strategic and continuous planning as well as assessment activities. The PRC would like to commend all authors on their efforts to effectively report on the health of their programs. The PRC would also like to praise the following programs for exceptional submissions, and recommend that authors for all programs review them as a benchmark for program analysis and improvement:

***Social Sciences***

- The program clearly defines its alignment with the College's mission.
- The program indicates an impressive array of accomplishments and actions to actively engage students and perform outreach in the community.
- Assessment findings directly link to specific program changes and are evaluated regularly for improvement. Annual planning is based on findings and is thoroughly discussed.
- Program plans are developed using relevant qualitative and quantitative data. Excellent analysis was presented for all action plans.
- Plans are specific, actionable, and clearly tied to institutional plans as well as to numerous assessment activities. Plans take into consideration course-, program-, and institutional-level outcomes.

**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
2017-2018 Final Report**

***Computer Information Systems (CIS)***

- The program's mission and purpose clearly aligns with the mission of the college. Their function demonstrates the program's continuing and positive impact on the community.
- The review highlights the creation of cyber security courses and associated certificate, as well as, ongoing professional development of faculty.
- Data analysis is complete and insightful and includes an analysis of the factors that contribute to changes in the program and discipline as a whole.
- The program has assessed course- and program-level outcomes within the College's established timeline. Program authors have included changes to courses that were made as a result of assessment results and indicated how those changes improved student success and achievement.
- Planning actions link to institutional planning and are discussed thoroughly. Planning actions are based on assessment findings and clearly describe the expected influence on the program, discipline, and students.

**Instructional Program Review Themes**

*Challenges Facing Disciplines without Full-Time Faculty:* The difficulties faced by instructional programs in need of full-time faculty were clear, specifically in the areas of curriculum development, planning, and assessment. The committee believes that increased administrative oversight of the program review process could improve some of the challenges these programs face and the quality of the program review document submitted by these areas.

*Improving technological relevancy or industry relevancy through expanded course offerings and industry accreditations:* Many programs outlined needs to develop curriculum that is relevant to students and in line with emerging industry standards such as cyber security. Additionally, Forestry and Natural Resources, Dental Assisting, and Construction Technology-Residential all indicated that they were in the process of maintaining or applying for industry accreditation.

*Improving persistence, retention, and pathways towards degree completion and transfer:* Several programs indicated participation in the Retention Alert program that helps identify students in need of additional support and notifies counseling and other service areas to reach out to these students. Business Technology and Administration of Justice, among others, noted initiatives to improve and expand course offerings to increase persistence in their program's degrees and certificates.

*Improving marketing or distributing program information:* Programs indicated a desire for more marketing materials to promote their programs and provide accurate information to advisors, counselors, and students on program qualifications and prerequisites. Programs that indicated these plans include Dental Assisting, Biological and Environmental Sciences, Manufacturing Technology and Behavioral and Social Sciences.

*Offering and enhancing essential services in order to achieve equity for all students:* In addition to the Retention Alert program, instructional program reviews frequently stated a desire to improve student equity. Biological Sciences, for example, plans to implement more hands-on learning experiences for students, and increase access to the library and other support services and materials. English plans to provide faculty development for faculty in the areas of ESL/ELL student support and increase access for all students to the Writing Center.

**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
2017-2018 Final Report**

**IV. Student Services Program Reviews**

This year’s student services program reviews improved dramatically from the previous year in all areas except planning. The number of programs that ranked as Exemplary in planning declined by 40% from last year, however other areas saw increases of 17-26%. This shows that service areas are having difficulty making the transition from assessment findings to integrated planning and developing appropriate and actionable plans that are not only a request for resources.

**Table 3: Student Services Program Reviews**

	<i>Program Information</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Equity Data</i>	<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Previous Plans</i>	<i>Planning</i>
<b>E</b>	100%	62%	62%	46%	38%	31%
<b>S</b>	0%	31%	31%	31%	54%	69%
<b>D</b>	0%	8%	8%	23%	8%	0%
<i>(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory or (D) Developing.</i>						n = 13

The PRC would like to commend all authors on their efforts to effectively report on the health of their service areas and would like to highlight the following exceptional programs, and recommend that program review authors review them as a guide to overall program improvement:

***DSPS***

- The program’s mission is clearly defined and aligns with that of the College.
- Data is complete and insightful; commentary is provided regarding factors that may have contributed to changes in program outcomes. Factors affecting student achievement and learning is described in detail.
- Plans are substantive and specific. Quantitative data is used to describe impact of planning. Incomplete plans are appropriately carried over to this year’s planning objectives and resource requests.

***Trio***

- The program’s mission is clear and aligns with that of the College. The program has clearly defined, measurable goals that support student success and achieve equity.
- The program has been consistently successful in its central indicators. The program also has a detailed student equity strategy that directly affects their measurable indicators of success.
- Planning actions are directly linked to stated institutional planning activities. Planning actions show the expected impact on the program and student learning and can be measured.

***Enrollment Services***

**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
2017-2018 Final Report**

- The program completed a significant amount of assessment work in line with the College’s assessment cycle and changes were implemented based on these assessments.
- Assessment data was complete and insightful. Student equity indicators were thoroughly addressed.
- Planning actions are directly linked to stated institutional planning activities. Planning actions show the expected impact on the program and student learning and can be measured.

**Student Development Program Review Themes**

Planning as its own process-not only tied to resource requests: Student service areas struggle in enumerating plans that are not resource requests. A result of this misclassification is that when resources are not funded, programs do not have alternate plans in place, thus impeding future efforts to evaluate these plans. The committee recommends that mandatory training take place for all program review authors and administrative signatories.

Professional Development: Nearly all Student Service areas identified a need for professional development for staff. Increased access to better training for all college employees in all service areas will facilitate discussion on pedagogical innovation, improve service to students, increase staff morale, and continue building an organizational culture that values innovation and change.

Improving essential services in order to improve persistence and retention and achieve equity for all students: Student services reviews stated a desire to achieve equity for all students. Several areas (including counseling and DSPPS) indicated significant involvement in the Retention Alert program that identifies and contacts students in need of additional support. (Additionally, several areas listed planning actions toward improving access to counseling and student support services for distance students through Cranium Café software.)

**V. Administrative Services Program Reviews**

Administrative reviews showed steady progress in the areas of planning and assessment, which indicates that programs integrated last year’s recommendations. Scoring in the evaluation of previous plans and program information sections decreased slightly overall.

**Table 4: Administrative Services Program Review**

	<i>Program Information</i>	<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Previous Plans</i>	<i>Planning</i>
<b>E</b>	67%	58%	25%	58%
<b>S</b>	25%	33%	58%	42%
<b>D</b>	8%	8%	17%	0%
<i>(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory or (D) Developing.</i>				n = 12

Although tremendous gains were made, the PRC recognizes there is still difficulty for areas not directly involved in student learning to develop outcomes that relate meaningfully to student success. The PRC recommends providing additional assistance to help areas develop appropriate and measurable indicators and report on their results.

**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
2017-2018 Final Report**

The PRC would like to commend all authors on their efforts to effectively report on the health of their service areas and would like to commend Distance Education, which showed tremendous growth from last year in the area of assessment; and we recommend that program authors review DE's submission as a guide to overall improvement in writing program reviews.

***Distance Education***

- The program clearly aligns with the college's mission to "provide accessible and relevant" education.
- Assessment is regular and ongoing and the results inform program planning. Explanations are clear and detailed.
- The program has clearly defined and measurable outcomes that are regularly assessed.
- Past plans were completed and evaluated using relevant data. The description and impact of actions and connection to program improvements is detailed and complete.
- Planning actions directly link to stated institutional planning actions. Actions are made with assessment in mind. Actions clearly show the expected impact on program and student learning outcomes and can be measured.
- Resource requests tie to corresponding actions that are linked to assessment results.

**Administrative Services Program Review Themes**

*Administrative Oversight:* Many Administrative Services' program reviews, did not have an authorizing Director's or Vice President's signature. Administrative Reviews that lacked an authorizing Program Director's and Vice President's signature this year included: Business Office, Communications/Marketing, Community and Economic Development, Human Resources, IT/TSS, Maintenance, Non-Credit/Adult Education, President's Office, and Safety/Security.

Furthermore, many of the programs categorized as "developing" in the areas of assessment, evaluation, and planning were missing the required administrative signatures. It is the hope of the committee that Director's and VP's approving signatures will not just be another box to check, but a signifier of a more robust review process that includes all levels of the service area.

*Incomplete, Missing, or Underdeveloped Entries:* Some Administrative Area Program Reviews were not completed or only partially completed this year with no explanation given as to why. Additionally, the committee noticed that some Administrative Areas still need assistance completing the assessment of their programs. These areas include IT/TSS, Information Systems and Institutional Research, Maintenance, Community and Economic Development, and Non-Credit/Adult Education.

*Professional Development:* Nearly all Administrative Service areas identified a need for professional development for staff. The business office and IT both indicated that employees require relevant training to stay up to date on current and best practices. HR and the President's Office both highlighted efforts to increase access to better training for all college employees in order to maintain, improve, and enhance skills to better serve students inside and outside of the classroom.

**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
2017-2018 Final Report**

Providing support for a staff and faculty professional development programs will facilitate discussion on pedagogical innovation, improve service to students, increase staff morale, and continue building an organizational culture that values innovation and change.

*Insufficient Data to Assess Quality of Service Areas:* Reviews showed a need for quantitative data, not only surveys, to assess program performance and inform planning and quality improvement. Administrative areas should continue to work with the Assessment Committee and IR to develop measurable and appropriate student-level outcomes to inform planning.

## **VI. Overarching Themes in Program Review**

*Increased Administrative Oversight of Program Review Process:* Many program reviews were submitted without an authorizing Director's or Vice President's signature. A further analysis shows a general association between programs without the required signatures and those programs that were classified as developing in the areas of assessment, evaluation, and planning. It is the hope of the committee that Director's and VP's approving signatures will not just be another box to check, but a signifier of a more robust review process that includes all levels of the program and service area.

*Authentic Assessment of Programs and Previous Plans:* While most program reviews outlined ongoing assessment activities, the PRC would like to emphasize to program authors the importance of tying the assessment, data, planning, and resource requests sections together. Assessment and evaluation of student achievement and past planning should inform plans for the upcoming year, which can result in the need for additional resources.

*Authentic Strategic Planning:* One issue that seems to persist is the need for program review authors to more closely align planning with assessment. The Program Review Committee recommends that PR authors do not use the planning tab for initiating new program plans not derived directly from assessment. Some plans and actions may arise out of day-to-day program operations. In working toward improved alignment between assessment and planning, it may be necessary to accommodate for those planned actions that emerge alongside existing plans and assessment schedules. In the future, it may be worth considering a template that distinguishes between assessment-driven planning and ad hoc planning,

*Closing the Loop: Connection between Current and Future Assessment and Planning:* Programs and service areas have struggled to close the loop between evaluation of previous plans, assessment, and subsequent planning. The need for improved linkages between assessment and annual planning were particularly evident in comprehensive reviews.

## **VII. Committee Recommendations and Process Revisions**

The Program Review Committee continually focuses on improving the quality and efficiency of the program review process. Consistent with this, the committee is considering the development of concise, yet detailed, instructions and targeted assistance for authors who would like to improve their submissions.

An overarching theme this year is the need for more data-driven planning across programs and areas. The committee would like to recommend that professional development opportunities be



**College of the Redwoods  
Program Review Committee  
2017-2018 Final Report**

given to all programs and service areas on how to use data to inform strategic planning. Program reviews as a whole would benefit from a more consistent data-driven approach to planning and decision-making.

The committee also identified a number of missing signatures in program review submissions from either the Dean, Director, or Vice President. While the PRC recognizes that changes in personnel are likely the cause of much of this trend, it highlights a need for greater attention from administrators to ensure the completion of high-quality program reviews by the programs and areas they oversee. The committee believes that some, although not all, of the difficulties in assessment and planning faced by instructional programs in need of full-time faculty could be addressed by increased administrative oversight.

In order to close the loop on our own processes, the PRC has developed and submitted a detailed list of template revisions to the Director of Institutional Research this year. These suggested revisions include renaming the tabs and fields to create better alignment between the program review template and rubric and mandating administrative oversight signatures.



**Appendix A: 2017-2018 Program Review Rubrics**

**College of the Redwoods**  
**PRC Instructional Committee Evaluation Rubric**  
 (Revised 3/2017)

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Developing</b>
<b>Mission</b>	<p>Mission of program or discipline clearly aligns with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Function identifies the program and discipline’s impact on the college and community or service areas;</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Mission of program or discipline aligns with the mission of the college; Scope and reach of function is present;</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program or discipline mission fails to align with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Identifies functions of the program or discipline but not the greater purpose.</p>
<b>Data Analysis- General</b>	<p>Data is complete and insightful; commentary was given regarding factors that may have contributed to program or discipline changes;</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning were described in detail.</p>	<p>Data is complete and some comparative comments regarding program or discipline changes were present;</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning were clearly stated.</p>	<p>Some data may be missing or is unclear;</p> <p>Comparative analysis was absent or sparse regarding program or discipline changes and/or factors impacting student achievement and learning.</p>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>A significant amount of assessment activity has taken place which includes student and program learning outcomes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are used to inform planning and program or discipline changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are thorough and detailed.</p>	<p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program or discipline can reflect on what it has learned;</p> <p>Assessment findings are linked to program or discipline changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p>	<p>Insufficient assessment activity completed for the program or discipline to reflect on assessment-based changes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are not linked to program or discipline changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are not clear.</p>

<b>Evaluation of Past Plans</b>	<p>Past actions were carried out and evaluated, and their impact is clearly described with relevant data;</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is a clear explanation as to why the action was not completed and the resulting impact on the program or discipline.</p>	<p>Current status of actions taken is clear;</p> <p>Impact of actions are clear with some relevant data described;</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is an explanation as to why the action was not completed.</p>	<p>The impact of the action was not evaluated with relevant data, and there is no plan for evaluation in the future;</p> <p>Status of Incomplete plans are not explained sufficiently.</p>
<b>Program and Discipline Plans</b>	<p>Planning actions link to stated institutional planning actions and are discussed;</p> <p>Planning Actions are clearly based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Planning actions clearly show the expected impact on the Program and discipline/student learning and can be measured.</p>	<p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions;</p> <p>Most planning actions are based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Most planning actions show the expected impact on the program or discipline/student learning and can be measured.</p>	<p>Institutional plans are not linked to program or discipline planning actions;</p> <p>Planning actions are not tied to assessment results;</p> <p>The impact of actions on program or discipline/student learning is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p>

**College of the Redwoods**  
**PRC Student Development Evaluation Rubric**  
(Revised 3/2017)

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Developing</b>
<b>Mission</b>	<p>Program mission clearly aligns with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Scope and reach of function identifies the program’s impact on the college and community or service areas;</p> <p>Mission and function are clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission aligns with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Scope and reach of function is present;</p> <p>Mission and function are clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission fails to align with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Identifies functions of the program but not the greater purpose.</p>
<b>Data Analysis</b>	<p>Data is complete and insightful; commentary was given regarding factors that may have contributed to program changes;</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning were described in detail;</p> <p>Student equity outcomes or initiatives were thoroughly addressed.</p>	<p>Data is complete and some comparative comments regarding program changes were present;</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning were clearly stated;</p> <p>Student equity was discussed.</p>	<p>Some data may be missing or is unclear;</p> <p>Comparative analysis was absent or sparse regarding data program changes and/or factors impacting student achievement and learning;</p> <p>Student equity was not discussed or was unclear.</p>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>A significant amount of assessment activity has taken place which includes student and program learning outcomes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are used to inform planning and program changes;</p>	<p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned;</p> <p>Assessment findings are linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p>	<p>Insufficient assessment activity was completed for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are not linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are not clear.</p>

	Assessment explanations are thorough and detailed.		
<b>Evaluation of Past Plans</b>	<p>Past planning actions were carried out, evaluated, and their impact is clearly described with relevant data;</p> <p>A planning action may not have occurred but there is a clear explanation as to why the action was not completed and the resulting impact on the program.</p>	<p>Impact of planning actions are clear with some relevant data described;</p> <p>A planning action may not have occurred but there is an explanation as to why the action was not completed.</p>	<p>Current planning action(s) status is unclear;</p> <p>The impact of the planning actions were not evaluated with relevant data, and there is no plan for evaluation in the future;</p> <p>Status of Incomplete plans is not explained sufficiently.</p>
<b>Program and Discipline Plans</b>	<p>Planning actions link to stated institutional planning actions, and are discussed;</p> <p>Planning actions are clearly based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Planning actions clearly show the expected impact on the program/student learning and can be measured.</p>	<p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions;</p> <p>Most planning actions are based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Most planning actions show the expected impact on the program/student learning and can be measured.</p>	<p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions;</p> <p>Planning actions are not tied to assessment results;</p> <p>The impact of planning actions on program/student learning is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p>

**College of the Redwoods**  
**PRC Administrative Services Evaluation Rubric**  
(Revised 3/2017)

	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Developing</b>
<b>Mission</b>	<p>Program mission clearly aligns with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Scope and reach of function identifies the program’s impact on the college and community or service areas;</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission aligns with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Scope and reach of function is present;</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p>	<p>Program mission fails to align with the mission of the college;</p> <p>Identifies functions of the program but not the greater purpose.</p>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>A significant amount of assessment activity has taken place which includes program learning outcomes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are used to inform planning and program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are thorough and detailed.</p>	<p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned;</p> <p>Assessment findings are linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p>	<p>Insufficient assessment activity completed for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are not linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are not clear.</p>
<b>Evaluation of Past Plans</b>	<p>Past actions were carried out and evaluated, and their impact is clearly described with relevant data;</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is a clear explanation as to why the action was not completed and the resulting impact on the program or area.</p>	<p>Impact of actions are clear with some relevant data described;</p> <p>An action may not have occurred but there is an explanation as to why the action was not completed.</p>	<p>Current action status is unclear;</p> <p>The impact of the action were not evaluated with relevant data, and there is no plan for evaluation in the future;</p> <p>Status of incomplete plans is not explained sufficiently.</p>

<p><b>Program Plans</b></p>	<p>Planning actions link to stated institutional planning actions, and are discussed;</p> <p>Planning Actions are clearly based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Actions clearly show the expected impact on the program and student success and can be measured.</p>	<p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions;</p> <p>Most planning actions are based on assessment findings;</p> <p>Most actions show the expected impact on the program and student success and can be measured.</p>	<p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions;</p> <p>Planning actions are not tied to assessment results;</p> <p>The impact of actions on program and student success is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured</p>



**Appendix B: Year-to-Year Comparison of Program Review Submissions**

2016-17						
	Program Info	Data	Assessment	Previous Plans	Planning	
<b>Instruction Annual Reviews (n=24)</b>						
E	83%	N/A	33%	29%	33%	
S	17%	N/A	54%	54%	63%	
D	0%	N/A	13%	17%	4%	
<b>Comprehensive (n=6)</b>						
E	67%	17%	17%	17%	17%	
S	33%	33%	67%	33%	67%	
D	0%	50%	17%	50%	17%	
<b>Student Services (n=14)</b>						
	Program Info	Data	Equity Data	Assessment	Previous Plans	Planning
E	64%	36%	43%	21%	21%	71%
S	36%	57%	50%	29%	64%	21%
D	0%	7%	7%	50%	14%	7%
<b>Administration</b>						
E	85%	N/A	N/A	46%	31%	15%
S	8%	N/A	N/A	46%	62%	69%
D	8%	N/A	N/A	8%	8%	8%

2017-2018						
	Program Info	Data	Assessment	Previous Plans	Planning	
<b>Instruction Annual Reviews (n=22)</b>						
E	77%	N/A	55%	18%	50%	
S	18%	N/A	41%	55%	41%	
D	5%	N/A	5%	27%	9%	
<b>Comprehensive (n=7)</b>						
E	71%	33%	43%	14%	29%	
S	29%	50%	43%	57%	71%	
D	0%	17%	14%	29%	0%	
<b>Student Services (n=13)</b>						
	Program Info	Data	Equity Data	Assessment	Previous Plans	Planning
E	100%	62%	62%	46%	38%	31%
S	0%	30%	30%	31%	54%	69%
D	0%	8%	8%	23%	8%	0%
<b>Administration</b>						
E	67%	N/A	N/A	58%	25%	58%
S	25%	N/A	N/A	33%	58%	42%
D	8%	N/A	N/A	8%	17%	0%