

College of the Redwoods
Program Review Committee
2022-2023
Executive Summary

Committee Co-Chairs

Peter Blakemore Crystal Morse

Committee Members

Anibal Florez
Molly Blakemore
Erik Sorenson
Maria Morrow
Kintay Johnson
Joe Hays

Cindy Hooper
Philip Mancus
Laura Meglemre
Valerie Elder
Caroline Haug
Jon Pace

Executive Summary

The work of the Program Review Committee (PRC) is essential to building the foundation upon which College of the Redwoods develops, identifies, and documents quality improvement plans districtwide and makes budgetary decisions through a transparent and consistently applied process. The committee reviews Annual and Comprehensive Program Reviews to prioritize funding and support needs as organized under the strategic planning model. This report summarizes the committee's findings and highlights themes and areas for improvement.

Though there was significant turnover in both the leadership and the membership of the committee, the PRC used the same highly functional system for reviewing reports and engaging in the overall planning process. Reports continued to improve in quality, especially among major segments of the Student Services and Administrative Services.

Suggestions for improvement and model reports will be noted below, but it's fair to say that more and more members of the college community are beginning to understand the value of creating rigorous, data-informed, and well detailed analyses of programs. The committee commends all program review authors for their diligence, and we continue, as in years past, to recommend that professional development opportunities be made available to personnel in all program and service areas. The more constituencies across campuses understand how to use data to inform strategic planning, the more transparent and well-informed college-wide planning will be.

In 2022-23, the PRC's core responsibilities included the following:

- Ensuring that each of the college's programs clearly identifies itself and its role in the context of the overall college mission
- Evaluating and analyzing data provided as part of comprehensive program reviews
- Monitoring programmatic compliance with the college's established assessment and curricular review cycles
- Establishing that program personnel have adequately reflected upon and documented the impact of the previous year's plans
- Determining that proposed program plans are informed by assessment and, if applicable, other factors like safety, compliance with outside agency requirements, etc.
- Reviewing and recommending programs for submission to the Program Viability Committee for further careful review, analysis, and recommendations

During the 2022-23 academic year, the committee started out with the intention of continuing to refine and revise rubrics and responsibilities related to the district's budget and planning processes, especially in the areas of Student Services and Administrative Services. During previous years, some program authors of reviews within those areas had found need for reassessing the efficacy of the templates, including occasional requests for revision. Unfortunately, due to changes in staffing and membership on the committee, there was less

opportunity to explore modifications to existing rubrics and documents. In addition to reviewing program submissions, the committee evaluated and ranked all program plans, not only the ones that contained resource requests. To do so, the committee used the existing rubric for evaluating non-personnel resource requests (the prioritization and ranking of staff and faculty requests is conducted by separate processes outlined in the college's policies and procedures). The PRC ranked the submitted instructional program plans in accordance with an established rubric and forwarded its rankings to the Dean's Council for those members to determine what plans could be funded through discretionary and categorical budgets controlled by the deans and directors. After that process, the plans and resources that remained unfunded were routed to Expanded Cabinet for further funding review, informed by the PRC's plan ranking. After review by the Expanded Cabinet, the PRC rankings and funding sources were organized in a database and shared with all contact persons requesting resources through Program Review. The searchable database is available districtwide.¹

Even with the considerable turnover in the PRC membership, the committee believes that this collegial, objective, and collaborative system for supporting the college's resource allocations continues to function as designed. Because we are still in the early stages of using this process, committee members continued to consider possible revisions and clarifications to the plan ranking rubric. The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) continues to use the Program Review Committee Executive Summaries to inform their decision-making and analytical processes. The PRC's plan rankings also inform the creation of the district's annual plan.

Lastly, PRC members realize the crucial role they play in monitoring and encouraging the district's efforts to support the cycle of assessment, continuous quality improvement, and re-assessment. The committee's members work with this general idea at the forefront of their thoughts: we are helping to develop a district-wide system for all programmatic areas of the college to link planning, assessment, and budgeting. Making this process as transparent and readily accessible to entities both within and outside the district will increase the overall project's value to the college and the community.

¹[Request Rankings link](#)

I. Introduction

The College of the Redwoods' Program Review Committee (PRC) reviews and evaluates annual and comprehensive² program review submissions from all subject and service areas. The 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 Redwood Community College District funds to implement identified plans related to larger district planning goals.

This report documents the important work of the PRC during the 2022-2023 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 15 annual and 5 comprehensive reviews.³ Student Service areas submitted 18 reviews and Administrative areas submitted 14 reviews. Thus there was an overall increase in the number of programs being reviewed during the 2022-23 academic year.

The PRC continued to use specialized rubrics to evaluate each program review submission (Appendix A). Each criterion in the rubric aligns with a section of the program review template. Sections are reviewed and assigned a rating of Exemplary (E), Satisfactory (S) or Developing (D) and, in some cases, combinations thereof (i.e. Satisfactory/Developing). Additionally, the PRC also utilized a Plan Ranking Rubric that evaluated programs' plans for consideration in the college's Annual Plan and funding decisions for non-personnel resource requests. Below are descriptive statistics, general observations, and overarching themes derived from this year's Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative program reviews.

III. Instructional Program Reviews

Highlights from the Instructional program reviews this year include:

- The **English Composition Program** continued to offer a specialized English-Language-Learners-focused 1A course. Coming out of Covid restrictions allowed the class to be offered successfully face to face for the first two times, enhancing the college's outreach to diverse populations of students representing ESL and 1.5 students from local area high schools.
- The **Agriculture Program** hired a new full-time faculty member who has engaged during the year in the continuing process of developing new course and revising existing courses to better serve the local agricultural industries.
- The **Biological and Environmental Sciences Program** faculty, working with forestry, athletics, digital photography, and the maintenance and landscaping department, as well as outside representatives from Cal Poly Humboldt, the Wiyot tribe, and the larger community, initiated the Outdoor Campus Collaborative. This initiative uses learning projects in courses to teach students real skills in natural resource science and sustainable management while restoring and increasing access to the outdoor campus and building relationships across the college and greater community.

² Comprehensive Reviews are completed on a 4-year rotating cycle.

³ Comprehensive Reviews included analyzing data trends such as, enrollments, equity, and completions.

- The **Physical Sciences Program**, in response to an acute need in the Pelican Bay program for incarcerated students, began offering physical science courses to help students complete their associate degree graduation requirements. The classes, ASTRO 10 and ENVSC 12, were offered in a very successful and effective correspondence format during the 21-22 school year (pandemic required). In addition, Astro 10 has also been transitioned effectively into a face-to-face format in the Fall of 2022. There is further discussion about adding additional science classes as well to relieve the back pressure created by the lack of such classes in the past. There have been more graduations at CRPB as a result of these offerings.

Instructional areas described in detail how their individual programs support the mission of the College. Instructional program reporting of assessment activities and evaluation of previous plans was consistent with last year's reviews.⁴

The consistent quality of Comprehensive Instructional reviews from last year to this year was noteworthy, because they remain overwhelmingly in the Exemplary/Satisfactory range. Nevertheless, because the sample includes entirely different programs each year, it is hard to draw a conclusion when comparing samples from year to year. All programs completing a comprehensive review should be commended for the high quality of submitted work.

Table 1: Instructional Program Reviews (Annual)

Table 1: Instructional Program Reviews (Annual)

| <i>Rating</i> | <i>Program Information</i> | <i>Assessment</i> | <i>Previous Plans</i> | <i>Planning</i> |
|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| E | 73% | 13% | 27% | 47% |
| S | 27% | 80% | 53% | 47% |
| D | 0% | 7% | 13% | 7% |
| I | 0% | 0% | 7% | 0% |

(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory, (D) Developing, (I) Incomplete. n = 15

Table 2: Instructional Program Reviews (Comprehensive)

| <i>Rating</i> | <i>Program Information</i> | <i>Data</i> | <i>Assessment</i> | <i>Previous Plans</i> | <i>Planning</i> |
|---------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| E | 50% | 33% | 50% | 50% | 33% |
| S | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 67% |
| D | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| I | 0% | 17% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory, (D) Developing, (I) Incomplete. n = 6

⁴ See Appendix B for a detailed comparison of 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 data.

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 highlight the following programs for exceptional submissions and recommend that authors for all programs review them as benchmarks for program analysis and improvement:

AUTO

- The program made major revisions in its offerings and content, and streamlined its certificates and degrees in such a way that students could complete two certificates or an associate's degree in two years.
- New course work in hybrid and electric vehicles was also added. All of this was done at the same time that program developers were able to reduce the overall core units for the program.
- Program authors used concrete data sets and deep analysis to show how it had bounced back from the initial decline caused by Covid and the difficulties first encountered in working in the online modality. Future program review authors in other disciplines would do well to look closely at how much effort was put into interpreting and teasing out meaningful trends and plans moving forward in the equity section particularly. This section is a model for future Program Review authors.
- The program has a thoughtful, well-crafted and detailed analysis and multiple interpretations of data. The feeling one comes away with after reading the Auto Tech program review is that it was written by consummate professionals who care about their students and their discipline and who take assessment, review, and revision of their program very seriously. Constituencies across the college community would benefit from taking a close look at this review.

Forestry & Natural Resources

- The program highlights and accomplishments sections show numerous important items indicating strong engagement and active, ongoing program improvement.
- The responses for such a hands-on discipline to the prompts were thoughtful and data were carefully analyzed and used to inform the program changes. Data are complete and insightful; commentary was given regarding factors that may have contributed to program or discipline changes; factors impacting student achievement and learning are described in detail; student equity data are thoroughly discussed.

IV. Student Services Program Reviews

Highlights from the Student Services Program Reviews this year include:

- The **ASC** registered a significant increase in face-to-face faculty and peer tutoring in the 2021-22 academic year, which represents a rebound from Covid.
- **EOPS** increased the total number of students served over the previous two years, returning to nearly pre-pandemic levels. The program also continued to invest heavily in direct student support this year, purchasing additional student laptops and providing meal assistance cards to eligible students. EOPS also maintained the same level of direct aide as last academic year and received overwhelmingly positive student feedback. The program also recorded a 77% increase in tutoring contact over the previous year.
- **TRIO** experienced a large increase in contacts made and services provided from 375 contacts in 2020-21 to 1156 contacts in 2021-22. Program authors attributed this increase to an intrusive advising model and the program’s move to the LRC, which allowed students to easily drop-in with no appointment and receive help on the spot.

Table 3: Student Services Program Reviews

| <i>Rating</i> | <i>Program Information</i> | <i>Data</i> | <i>Assessment</i> | <i>Previous Plans</i> | <i>Planning</i> |
|--|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| E | 67% | 50% | 33% | 41% | 44% |
| S | 28% | 22% | 28% | 24% | 33% |
| D | 0% | 17% | 22% | 18% | 11% |
| I | 6% | 11% | 17% | 18% | 11% |
| <i>(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory, (D) Developing, (I) Incomplete. n = 18</i> | | | | | |

This year’s student services program reviews were consistent with those from the previous year, with many areas receiving high marks. 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 consult them as a guide for overall program improvement:

ASC

- The ASC produced a concise and detailed analysis, as well as responding meaningfully to comments made during the previous year’s program review.
- The ASC notes on trends and implications for program improvement in the Program Indicators section are particularly salient and valuable for understanding how a program can improve through assessment, reflection, and innovation.
- The Evaluation of Previous Plans also demonstrates careful thought and real efforts to gain valuable insight through analysis and recursive assessment.

Enrollment Services

- Enrollment Services used a holistic system of regular discussion during department meetings to engage ideas that were included during their review. This led to the inclusion of specific reference to new programmatic learning outcomes and methods of assessment and to one of the most detailed and clearly reflective sections on Program Indicators among all non-instructional programs.
- The Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities included a detailed analysis of a single PLO and a data-driven, fully reasoned plan.

Veterans

- A general relaxation of pandemic restrictions led to increased traffic through the Veterans Resource Center, as well as increased electronic and tech-based interactions (from 1040 to 1462, a 29% increase).
- The program also experienced other increases, including in persistence indicated by course completions rising from 80% up to 91%.
- The Program Review Committee commends the Veterans Program for showing a deep understanding of the value of data in measuring outcomes and using results to guide themselves and cut new paths into the future.

V. Administrative Services Program Reviews

Highlights from the Administrative Service Program Reviews include:

- The **Communications/Marketing/Print Services Program** generated excellent outcomes data, showing across the board increases in outreach and general promotion in public media sources. The program put up robust numbers in all areas, especially including news stories, increase in Instagram and Facebook followers, and a large increase in DEI-related promotional materials.
- The **VP Instruction Program** noted many assessments leading to plans for professional development and other kinds of improvement for the various programs. Additionally, the VP of Instruction described multiple actions leading to a broad array of improvements based on past plans, indicating how clearly the program review process has taken hold and become an active and transparent process for assessment, review, planning and resolution.
- The **Dining Services Program** implemented an online ordering feature to promote safe food handling and distancing while supporting student success. Additionally, the Student Resource Center provides a safe learning environment for students to gather, study, and eat.

Administrative reviews showed steady progress in the areas of planning and assessment, which indicates that programs are integrating last year's recommendations. Scores in the "Evaluation of Previous Plans" and "Program Information" sections decreased slightly overall.

Table 4: Administrative Services Program Review

| <i>Rating</i> | <i>Program Information</i> | <i>Assessment</i> | <i>Previous Plans</i> | <i>Planning</i> |
|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| E | 54% | 23% | 38% | 23% |
| S | 15% | 38% | 15% | 46% |
| D | 15% | 23% | 31% | 15% |
| I | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% |

(E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory, (D) Developing, (I) Incomplete. n = 13

Although 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 that administrative services areas go through a similar process as student services areas to develop appropriate and measurable service-learning outcomes and work closely with the Assessment Coordinator to accomplish this goal.

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 especially commend IT/TSS, which showed significant growth from last year in the area of assessment; *the PRC recommends that program authors review IT/TSS's submission as a guide to overall improvement in writing program reviews.*

IT/TSS

- This program showed continuous connection between assessment, surveys, and previous year's plans to underscore a solid methodology for generating plans and resource requests based on data and interpretation.

Information Systems and Institutional Research

- This program developed integral plans that should be useful for the whole college community, especially in the fields of assessment and distance education.
- In addition to creating multiple new data sets and graphical interfaces to increase the ability of staff to engage with data in regular work activities, thus improving the program review process itself and generating closer connection across constituencies, Information Systems and Institutional Research program moved the college closer to being able to fully participate in the statewide CVC/OEI.

Dining Services

- Dining Services used innovative new methods and continued to expand its menus and offerings in the cafeteria and through the online order and pickup service.
- The program also initiated surveys to generate assessable outcomes, which led to immediate changes in practices, allowing the program to implement more than half of the suggested improvements garnered through the survey process.

VI. Overarching Themes in Program Review

Increased collaboration across constituencies

Multiple new initiatives such as the Caring Campus, the Outdoor Campus Collaborative, the ACUE program, and the interface between IT, Instruction, and Student Services to raise the District's ability to participate in the CVC-OEI, all point to a flourishing of the campus into a stronger and more interconnected community. This is particularly noteworthy looking back over several semesters of disconnectedness during Covid and considering the effects on an institution that had been so severely disrupted by the global pandemic. Continued increases in enrollment and a greater awareness of the value of community action and group resilience point to an institution that is well prepared to return to active, in-person participation in its community.

Increase in awareness of the value of DEIA

With the CCCCO emphasizing diversity, equity, inclusion, and access as these concepts relate to student success and the creation of a more equitable system of higher education, across programs with the District the PRC noted many efforts to incorporate these ideas into programmatic missions and initiatives. It's fair to say that the District doesn't need to emphasize this since individual employees and members of the CR community across practically all constituencies are responding with authentic care for improving equity and access. From Dining Services, where they have "partnered with the Multicultural and Diversity Center to support holidays and events by providing cultural food specials that will attract diverse student groups to events," to the mathematics department scheduling professional development opportunities with DEIA specialists, and hiring of a full-time tenure-track position in Ethnic Studies toward creating a new program of study, programs within the college community offer continuous evidence that staff and leadership at College of the Redwoods understand why we choose to focus on issues of DEIA. Programs like CalWORKS, EOPS, TRIO and others show that College of the Redwoods is fully engaged in enhancing diversity, equity, inclusion, and access. Solid evidence exists to demonstrate that the college is doing more than merely claiming that issues of equitable treatment matter—College of the Redwoods is creating a more equitable and caring institution through multiple avenues.

Continuous improvement in effectiveness for online courses

The District has added distance education support positions and increased professional development opportunities for faculty teaching online, and these efforts are bearing fruit across many programs. It is reasonable to expect the College will become a successful participant should it achieve the desired Teaching College designation from the CVC/OEI.

An ongoing need for expanded professional development within and across constituencies

Based on the number of requests for professional development opportunities across programs, as well as many noted successful professional development initiatives over the recent past, the Program Review Committee believes professional development opportunities that engage participation across constituencies and programs would continue to build on a spirit of forward-thinking, interdisciplinarity, and a holistic sense of community generating overall improvement of the college and of our students' educational experiences.

A more data-driven and informed use of survey results

Across the District's programs, the staff and faculty continue to connect data and survey results to interpret programmatic assessments and improvement. Going forward, the Program Review Committee will continue to highlight examples of meaningful and productive interpretation of data in order to keep this trend at the fore of the College's practices focused on generating improvement.

Continuing need for PRC assistance with authors

Though the program review process is now effective and well understood by most people across all constituencies districtwide, pockets exist where a greater effort by the Program Review Committee to assist review authors in preparing reports could improve the College's overall use of data, interpretation, and reflection in planning. A proactive approach, beginning with an overview of the process and a discussion about how to develop and assess outcomes in non-instructional programs, would benefit the college and move our community toward full implementation of program assessment and improvement based on review and interpretation of data.

VII. Committee Recommendations and Process Revisions

Though most programs put serious effort into the program review process, a few persist in only partially reviewing their outcomes assessments and reflecting on their program over time. As with previous years of the Program Review Committee recommendations for revision, the committee this year has concluded that some system of responsibility and notification should be enacted to promote more thorough use of the process throughout the District's various constituencies. The shift to outcomes assessment in instruction over the past 15 to 20 years helps explain why the Program Review Process has, essentially, achieved a fairly high level of robust and meaningful reflection within Instruction prior to other parts of the District. Even so, plenty of excellent examples of non-instructional programs using the process show up in the templates.

The committee returned to the idea raised in the past regarding developing more concise and detailed instructions embedded within the templates. Additionally, some kind of formal system of assistance for authors seeking to improve their submissions should be developed. Although a narrative had developed claiming that the Program Review forms were somehow faulty for use in non-instructional programs, the evidence points more toward a need for developing assistance for authors rather than changing the forms or processes. Though turnover in the committee and changes in the committee's leadership, as well as a decreased participation from broader constituencies, made it difficult to engage in the sort of analysis and revision of the process proposed at the start of the academic year, the committee believes that a major overhaul of the process is not warranted at this time.

The program plan ranking process may be the exception and some clarifying analysis of timelines, flow of information, and use of rankings generated by the PRC would probably benefit the college's planning process generally. Drift over time may have led to less transparency and clarity regarding the roles various planning committees play in the ranking, decision-making and funding processes. Since this process is at the heart of resource allocation, it would behoove the college if some review of the flow of information from program review through resource requests to ranking and allocations were undertaken.

Additionally, a deeper understanding across the entire college community, and spread throughout all constituencies, of how outcomes assessment should be used to plan and allocate resources would also benefit the institution. As we review and reflect on assessment and the Assessment Committee's role in documenting and explaining the process of outcome assessment, planning, plan implementation, and re-assessment in a way that is understood by the entire college community, we should be able to clarify and simplify how all of this flows together. While the high hopes formerly invested in the eLumen system may not lead to great improvements for non-instructional programs' outcomes assessment, the system does function well for instructional outcomes assessment, and especially for mapping and tracking connections from course-level to programmatic to institutional outcomes. The PRC believes closer work with the Assessment Committee, as well as other relevant groups over the next year should advance this work.

There were also several programs that simply did not respond to the need to perform a review, and the college will need to determine how best to address this issue. In some instances, the lack of a review may have been due to changes in employment conditions and leadership and the like. But for whatever reason, some kind of protocol should be in place to promote serious effort to engage in the Program Review process. It seems unreasonable to simply give a pass to two or three programs when the other 40 or more are all engaging in a rigorous and proven process.

Appendix A: 2022-2023 Program Review Rubrics

College of the Redwoods PRC Administrative Services Evaluation Rubric

(Revised 4/2018)

| | Exemplary | Satisfactory | Developing |
|---|---|---|--|
| Mission/Program Information | <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> <p>Seems to lack administrative oversight.</p> |
| Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities | <p>A significant amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college’s established cycle 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, in general, is not being done within the college’s established cycle;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are not clear.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Evaluation of Previous Plans</p> | <p>Past actions were carried out and evaluated, and their impact is clearly described with relevant data; 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; 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; The impact of the action were not evaluated with relevant data, and there is no plan for evaluation in the future; Status of incomplete plans is not explained sufficiently.</p> |
| <p>Program Planning</p> | <p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions, and are discussed; planning actions are not stated as resource requests Planning Actions are clearly based on assessment findings; 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; Most planning actions are based on assessment findings; Most actions show the expected impact on the program and student success and can be measured Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p> | <p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions; Planning actions are not tied to assessment results and are stated as resource requests; The impact of actions on program and student success is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured</p> |

College of the Redwoods PRC Student Services Evaluation Rubric

(Revised 4/2018)

| | Exemplary | Satisfactory | Developing |
|---|--|--|---|
| Mission/Program Information | <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> <p>Seems to lack administrative oversight.</p> |
| Data Analysis/Program Indicators | <p>Data are 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 are 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> |
| Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities | <p>A significant amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college's established cycle which includes student and program learning outcomes;</p> | <p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned;</p> <p>Assessment findings are</p> | <p>Insufficient assessment activity was completed for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are not</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | <p>Assessment findings are used to inform planning and program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are thorough and detailed.</p> | <p>linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p> | <p>linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment, in general, is not being done within the college's established cycle;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are not clear.</p> |
| Evaluation of Previous Plans | <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> |
| Program and Discipline Planning | <p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions, and are discussed; planning actions are not stated as resource requests</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>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p> | <p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions;</p> <p>Planning actions are not tied to assessment results and are stated as resource requests;</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 Instruction Evaluation Rubric

(Revised 4/2018)

| | Exemplary | Satisfactory | Developing |
|---|---|--|--|
| Mission/Program Information | <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> <p>Seems to lack administrative oversight.</p> |
| Data Analysis- General/Program Indicators | <p>Data are 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 are described in detail; Student equity data are thoroughly discussed.</p> | <p>Data are complete and some comparative comments regarding program or discipline changes are present;</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning are clearly stated; student equity data are discussed briefly.</p> | <p>Some data may be missing or are unclear;</p> <p>Comparative analysis is absent or sparse regarding program or discipline changes and/or factors impacting student achievement and learning; student equity data are not discussed or is unclear.</p> |
| Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities | <p>A significant amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college's established cycle 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 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 was completed for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes;</p> <p>Assessment findings are not linked to program changes;</p> <p>Assessment, in general, is not being done within the college's established cycle;</p> <p>Assessment explanations are not clear.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Evaluation of Previous Plans</p> | <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> |
| <p>Program and Discipline Planning</p> | <p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions and are discussed; planning actions are not stated as resource requests</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>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p> | <p>Institutional plans are not linked to program or discipline planning actions;</p> <p>Planning actions are not tied to assessment results and are stated as resource requests;</p> <p>The impact of actions on program or discipline/student learning is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p> |

**Program Review Committee
Plan Ranking Rubric
(August 2019)**

| Category | No (0) | Low (1) | Medium (2) | High (3) |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Necessary to achieve an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective | Has no alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective | Has minimal alignment with Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective | Has moderate alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective | Has strong alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective |
| Ranking by Program Review authors | Low ranking | Low to mid ranking | Mid to High Ranking | High Ranking |
| Identified as a need based on assessment. <i>For Instructional Program this would be SLOs.</i> | Has no link to assessment. | Has minor link to assessment | Has moderate link to assessment | Has strong link to assessment. |
| Number of students affected | No student affected. | Impacts smaller focused group of students | Impacts many students in multiple areas | Impacts students district wide |
| Improves institutional efficiency | Has no cost/benefit value | Has low cost/benefit value | Has moderate cost/benefit value | Has high cost/benefit value |
| Meets a safety or legislated mandate | Has no link to safety or mandate | Has low or indirect link to safety or mandate | Has moderate link to safety or mandate | Has strong link to safety or mandate |
| Criticality of the request | If unfunded there will be no disruption or service | If unfunded will have minor impact on service | If unfunded will have moderate impact on service | If unfunded will have major impact on service |

Appendix B: Year-to-Year Comparison of Program Review Submission

| 2019-2020 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Instruction | Program Info | Data | Assessment | Previous Plans | Planning |
| <i>Annual Reviews</i> | | | | | |
| Exemplary | 15 | N/A | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| Satisfactory | 1 | N/A | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Developing | 0 | N/A | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| % E | 94.0% | N/A | 56.0% | 50.0% | 56.0% |
| %S | 6.0% | N/A | 44.0% | 44.0% | 44.0% |
| %D | 0.0% | N/A | 0.0% | 5.0% | 0.0% |
| n=16 | | | | | |

| <i>Comprehensive</i> | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Exemplary | 7 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Satisfactory | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Developing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| % E | 78.0% | 56.0% | 22.0% | 44.0% | 33.3% |
| %S | 22.0% | 44.0% | 78.0% | 44.0% | 56.0% |
| %D | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.0% | 11.0% |
| n=9 | | | | | |

| 2020-2021 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Instruction | Program Info | Data | Assessment | Previous Plans | Planning |
| <i>Annual Reviews</i> | | | | | |
| Exemplary | 17 | N/A | 9 | 10 | 8 |
| Satisfactory | 2 | N/A | 9 | 7 | 11 |
| Developing | 0 | N/A | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| % E | 89.5% | N/A | 47.4% | 52.6% | 42.1% |
| %S | 10.5% | N/A | 47.4% | 36.8% | 57.9% |
| %D | 0.0% | N/A | 5.2% | 10.6% | 0.0% |
| n= 19 | | | | | |

| <i>Comprehensive</i> | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| Exemplary | 5 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Satisfactory | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Developing | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| % E | 100.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 40.0% | 60.0% |
| %S | 0.0% | 0.0% | 80.0% | 60.0% | 40.0% |
| %D | 0.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| n= 5 | | | | | |

| Student Services | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-------|------------|----------------|----------|
| | Program Info | Data | Assessment | Previous Plans | Planning |
| Exemplary | 8 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| Satisfactory | 7 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 11 |
| Developing | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| % E | 53.3% | 60.0% | 53.3% | 42.9% | 26.7% |
| %S | 46.7% | 33.3% | 40.0% | 57.1% | 73.3% |
| %D | 0.0% | 6.7% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| n=15 | | | | | |

| Student Services | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-------|------------|----------------|----------|
| | Program Info | Data | Assessment | Previous Plans | Planning |
| Exemplary | 12 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| Satisfactory | 3 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 6 |
| Developing | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| % E | 80.0% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 20.0% | 53.3% |
| %S | 20.0% | 26.7% | 40.0% | 73.3% | 40.0% |
| %D | 0.0% | 6.7% | 26.7% | 6.7% | 6.7% |
| n= 15 | | | | | |

| Administration | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|------|------------|----------------|----------|
| | Program Info | Data | Assessment | Previous Plans | Planning |
| Exemplary | 10 | N/A | 7 | 6 | 4 |
| Satisfactory | 5 | N/A | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| Developing | 0 | N/A | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| % E | 66.7% | N/A | 46.7% | 40.0% | 26.7% |
| %S | 33.3% | N/A | 26.7% | 40.0% | 53.3% |
| %D | 0.0% | N/A | 26.7% | 20.0% | 20.0% |

| Administration | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|------|------------|----------------|----------|
| | Program Info | Data | Assessment | Previous Plans | Planning |
| Exemplary | 10 | N/A | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Satisfactory | 1 | N/A | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| Developing | 0 | N/A | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| % E | 90.9% | N/A | 45.5% | 18.2% | 18.2% |
| %S | 9.1% | N/A | 36.4% | 72.7% | 72.7% |
| %D | 0.0% | N/A | 18.2% | 9.1% | 9.1% |

Appendix C: Updated for 2021-2022 Program Review Rubrics
College of the Redwoods
PRC Instructional Evaluation Rubric
(Revised 4/2021)

| | Exemplary | Satisfactory | Developing |
|---|---|--|--|
| Mission/Program Information | <p>Program mission clearly aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review provides relevant details about how this program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Substantial and specific examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p> | <p>Program mission aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review briefly provides relevant details about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Some examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p> | <p>Program mission needs more clarification about how it aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review requires more relevant detail about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Administrative oversight is not apparent.</p> |
| Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities | <p>A substantial amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>Program uses specific assessment findings to inform program plans that can be assessed in the future to determine their effectiveness.</p> <p>Programs that have implemented plans, have included specific reassessment data to</p> | <p>Enough assessment activity has taken place such that the program can reflect on what it has learned.</p> <p>Program improvement is linked to assessment findings but not in a specific way.</p> <p>Reassessment to determine the effectiveness of program changes following the implementation of plans has not taken place or needs improvement.</p> | <p>More assessment activity is required for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes.</p> <p>It is unclear how assessment findings links to program improvement.</p> <p>Assessment is not up to date based on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>There is an unclear connection between specific assessment, specific plans, and reassessment</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>determine whether or not plans resulted in improvement.</p> <p>Assessment explanations are thorough and detailed.</p> | <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p> | <p>in order to determine effectiveness and improve performance of the metric and the program overall.</p> <p>Assessment explanations need more clarity.</p> |
| <p>Evaluation of Previous Plans</p> | <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 was 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>Program Planning</p> | <p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional planning actions and are discussed</p> <p>Planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</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>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p> | <p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions.</p> <p>Planning actions, where appropriate, need to be more clearly tied to assessment results.</p> <p>Planning actions are stated as resource requests and not plans.</p> <p>The impact of actions on program and student success is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p> |

College of the Redwoods
PRC Administrative Services Evaluation Rubric
 (Revised 4/2021)

| | Exemplary | Satisfactory | Developing |
|---|--|---|---|
| Mission/Program Information | <p>Program mission clearly aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review provides relevant details about how this program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Substantial and specific examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p> | <p>Program mission aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review briefly provides relevant details about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Some examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p> | <p>Program mission needs more clarification about how it aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review requires more relevant detail about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Administrative oversight is not apparent.</p> |
| Data Analysis-General/Program Indicators | <p>Data are complete and insightful.</p> <p>Commentary was given regarding factors that may have contributed to program or discipline changes.</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning are described in detail.</p> <p>Student equity data are thoroughly discussed.</p> | <p>Data are complete and some comparative comments regarding program or discipline changes are present.</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning are clearly stated.</p> <p>Student equity data are discussed briefly.</p> | <p>Some data may be missing or is unclear.</p> <p>Comparative analysis is absent or sparse regarding program or discipline changes and/or factors impacting student achievement and learning.</p> <p>Student equity data are not discussed or is unclear.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities</p> | <p>A substantial amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>Program uses specific assessment findings to inform program plans that can be assessed in the future to determine their effectiveness.</p> <p>Programs that have implemented plans, have included specific reassessment data to determine whether or not plans resulted in improvement.</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>Program improvement is linked to assessment findings but not in a specific way.</p> <p>Reassessment to determine the effectiveness of program changes following the implementation of plans has not taken place or needs improvement.</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p> | <p>More assessment activity is required for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes.</p> <p>It is unclear how assessment findings links to program improvement.</p> <p>Assessment is not up to date based on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>There is an unclear connection between specific assessment, specific plans, and reassessment in order to determine effectiveness and improve performance of the metric and the program overall.</p> <p>Assessment explanations need more clarity.</p> |
| <p>Evaluation of Previous Plans</p> | <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 are 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>Current action status is unclear.</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 is not explained sufficiently.</p> |
| <p>Program Planning</p> | <p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional</p> | <p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions.</p> | <p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | <p>planning actions and are discussed.</p> <p>Planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</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>Most planning actions are based on assessment findings.</p> <p>Most actions show the expected impact on the program or discipline and student success and can be measured.</p> <p>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p> | <p>Planning actions, where appropriate, need to be more clearly tied to assessment results.</p> <p>Planning actions are stated as resource requests and not plans.</p> <p>The impact of actions on program or discipline and student success is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

College of the Redwoods
PRC Student Services Evaluation Rubric
(Revised 4/2021)

| | Exemplary | Satisfactory | Developing |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mission/Program Information | <p>Program mission clearly aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review provides relevant details about how this program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Substantial and specific examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p> | <p>Program mission aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review briefly provides relevant details about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Some examples included.</p> <p>Clear and concise.</p> | <p>Program mission needs more clarification about how it aligns with the mission of the college.</p> <p>The review requires more relevant detail about how the program impacts the college and community or service areas.</p> <p>Administrative oversight is not apparent.</p> |
| Data Analysis/Program Indicators | <p>Data are complete and insightful; commentary is 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 are complete and some comparative comments regarding program changes were present.</p> <p>Factors impacting student achievement and learning were clearly states.</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> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities</p> | <p>A substantial amount of assessment activity has taken place on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>Program uses specific assessment findings to inform program plans that can be assessed in the future to determine their effectiveness.</p> <p>Programs that have implemented plans, have included specific reassessment data to determine whether or not plans resulted in improvement.</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>Program improvement is linked to assessment findings but not in a specific way.</p> <p>Reassessment to determine the effectiveness of program changes following the implementation of plans has not taken place or needs improvement.</p> <p>Assessment explanations are clear.</p> | <p>More assessment activity is required for the program to reflect on assessment-based changes.</p> <p>It is unclear how assessment findings links to program improvement.</p> <p>Assessment is not up to date based on the college's established cycle.</p> <p>There is an unclear connection between specific assessment, specific plans, and reassessment in order to determine effectiveness and improve performance of the metric and the program overall.</p> <p>Assessment explanations need more clarity.</p> |
| <p>Evaluation of Previous Plans</p> | <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 was 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>Program Planning</p> | <p>Planning actions specifically and overtly link to stated institutional</p> | <p>Planning actions are linked to institutional planning actions.</p> | <p>Institutional plans are not linked to program planning actions.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>planning actions and are discussed.</p> <p>Planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</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>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>Most planning actions are not stated as resource requests.</p> | <p>Planning actions, where appropriate, need to be more clearly tied to assessment results.</p> <p>Planning actions are stated as resource requests and not plans. The impact of actions on program and student success is not discussed adequately or cannot be measured.</p> |
|--|---|---|--|

**Program Review
Committee Plan Ranking
Rubric**

| Category | No (0) | Low (1) | (2) | Medium (3) | (4) | High (5) |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Necessary to achieve an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective | Has no alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective | Has minimal alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective | Has small alignment with Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective | Has moderate alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective | Has considerable alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective | Has strong alignment with an Institutional Goal or Institutional Objective |
| Identified as a need based on assessment outcome(s) | Has no link to assessment data | Has minor link to assessment data | Has some link to assessment data | Has moderate link to assessment data | Has considerable link to assessment data | Has strong link to assessment data |
| Category | No (0) | | Low (1) | Medium (2) | | High (3) |
| Ranking by Program Review Authors | Low Ranking | | Low to mid ranking | Mid to high ranking | | High ranking. |
| Number of students affected | No students affected | | Impacts students in single discipline affected | Impacts students in a specific division | | Impacts students districtwide |
| Improved institutional efficiency | Has no cost/benefit value | | Has low cost/benefit value | Has moderate cost/benefit value | | Has high cost/benefit value |
| Meets a safety or legislated mandate | Has no link to safety or mandate | | Has low or indirect link to safety or mandate | Has moderate link to safety or mandate | | Has strong of direct link to safety or mandate. |
| Criticality of the request | If unfunded there will be no disruption of service | | If unfunded will have minor impact on service | If unfunded will have moderate impact on service | | If unfunded will have major impact on service |