

PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK & SELF-STUDY TEMPLATE

2015-2016



This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Program Review Process	2
Program Review Document Rubric	5
Self Study Rubric for Academic Program Review	6
Abridged 2 year program reviews for Career Technical Education Programs	7
Self-Study Template	8
Curriculum Development, Assessment, and Outcomes	10
Student Equity & Success	14
Program Resources	14
Programmatic Goals & Planning	14
Signature page	16
Finding Data for Self-Study	17

INTRODUCTION

At Solano Community College (SCC), program review has three essential goals:

- To maintain academic integrity and rigor;
- To facilitate integrated, long-range planning;
- To provide continual program improvement.

Both the California Education Code and Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) describe the purpose and essential features of program review. The California Education Code states: *“The segments of higher education are encouraged to improve the quality of undergraduate education as a central priority of California’s public colleges and universities”* (Ed Code #66050). Standard I of the code recommends that an institution use *“analysis of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission [of the institution] is accomplished.”* In addition, Standard II states that instructional programs be *“systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes.”*

In 2012 and 2013, the process of program review was revised to align more closely with ACCJC accreditation standards, increase accountability, and integrate with the budget and planning process. In May 2012, the Academic Senate established the Academic Program Review Committee. This committee is responsible for reviewing all programs and providing support to faculty tasked with completing program review. The Academic Program Review Committee works closely with the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to provide current data to the faculty of programs under review, to create and analyze student surveys, and in the future to support a manageable system for data entry and retrieval.

Program review at SCC is intended to provide faculty members an opportunity for self-reflection, review, and assessment. Program review is also intended to be central to the college’s overall planning, becoming the basis for goal setting, resource allocation, and needs assessment. Finally, program review will make visible and accessible to all interested parties the evidence that demonstrates fulfillment of accreditation standards.

Program review follows a five-year cycle wherein all of a school’s programs are reviewed over the course of one year. The process consists of two components: formal reporting and review. Faculty complete a comprehensive self-study every five years as well as an annual status report, which addresses progress made on recommendations identified in the previous program review cycle. In addition, Career Technical Education Programs (CTE) will submit an abridged program review every two years to meet Perkins funding requirements. Program review self-studies are created collaboratively with program faculty and then reviewed by the school dean. The dean submits the report to the Academic Program Review Committee with a narrative of their feedback on the self-study and programmatic needs. The Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Superintendent/President provide the final reviews and comments. Approved reports are submitted to the board and then posted on the Solano College website.

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

Preparation

The Academic Program Review Committee Chair will notify the dean of the school the year prior to the review. Each program will designate a committee from their faculty to produce a self-study report. Time spent on program review writing can be utilized as optional flex-cal credit. Adjunct faculty will be paid for time spent writing program reviews when there are no full-time faculty members in the department (see Office of Academic Affairs for exact hours allotted and time sheets). When full-time faculty members are present in the program, adjunct faculty can be paid for up to three hours for their contributions to the self-study.

Trainings

Early in the semester prior to the review year, a self-study training will be held. This meeting will be facilitated by the Academic Program Review Coordinator and the Office of Research and Planning. Instructions for accessing data will be provided and writers will be walked through the self-study process. The Academic Program Review Committee members and school deans will be available subsequently to answer questions and provide support to self-study committees.

Self-Study Report

A self-study report is completed every five years and addresses the program's performance as it relates to the college's mission and strategic goals, curriculum development, student success, program resources, and long-range planning. The report draws on qualitative and quantitative data relevant to the program. To assist the Academic Program Review Committee in providing sound feedback to the program, careful attention should be given to the quality of writing and the adequacy of documentation, so that the self-study accurately reflects the areas of strength and struggle for the program.

The self-study committee will collect and analyze data for the self-study, dividing work as appropriate. The self-study will include an examination of data from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, a student survey, and responses to questions from the self-study template (discussed below). The project should be a collaborative effort, so that the work doesn't fall solely on one faculty member, and so that the report reflects the collective assessment of the program.

The suggested timeline for the self-study is as follows. The dean may ask for status reports based on these benchmarks.

Spring the semester prior to the review year:

Train programs about the self-study process.

Programs form self-study committees.

Create and administer a student survey.

Decide how to divide tasks and calendar meetings for fall.

Gather evidence that will aid in report writing (advisory meeting minutes, labor market data, etc.).

Collect and begin to analyze data, complete Sections 1.1 and 1.2

Fall semester year of review:

Beginning of September – completion of sections 1.3-1.6.

Middle of October – completion of sections 2.1-2.19.

Middle of November – completion of sections 3.1-3.4 & 4.1-4.5.

End of semester – completion of sections 5.1-5.2

Spring semester year of review:

Beginning of term, draft disseminated to program faculty for review and feedback.

Create a signature sheet where faculty can state that they have read and concur with the self-study report.

Self-study reports should be completed by the 1st Monday in February, with some flexibility depending on programmatic need. The self-study should be submitted with the signature sheet from faculty (all full-time faculty and as many adjunct faculty as is feasible). Relevant evidence should also be attached (not raw data but items like a copy of the student survey, advisory meeting minutes, etc.). The dean will review the report and write a narrative that provides his or her feedback of the self-study including the principle strengths and needs of the program. If the self-study is incomplete according to the *Program Review Document Rubric* the dean will return the self-study and ask the faculty members to complete the template in its entirety, offering support to faculty as needed. Faculty are encouraged to review the dean's feedback and consider whether they want to integrate any of the feedback into the report. Particular attention should be paid to factual or data errors. The self-study with the dean's narrative should be submitted to the APR faculty coordinator as soon as is feasible (not later than March 1).

Programs are able to turn in their reports before the February deadline. Particularly if programs are trying to expedite requests for programmatic change, wish to hire new faculty, etc.

they may submit the self-study in the fall before the strategic proposal or faculty hiring request deadlines.

The Academic Program Review Committee will review self-studies utilizing two rubrics (attached). The first “Document” rubric assesses the completeness of the report. If the self-study arrives to the committee and is deemed unsatisfactory according to this rubric, it will be returned to the faculty to be revised before it is formally reviewed. The second “Self-Study” rubric tracks progress toward “Sustainable Continuous Program Improvement ” in such areas as mission/planning, PLOs/SLOs, curricular offerings, co-curricular activity and community integration, student success, and resources. It is not the expectation that all programs are immediately at the highest level, but that through short and long term planning, programs are working toward this goal. The Academic Program Review Coordinator will compile the feedback from the committee and submit a report and the two rubrics to the program faculty and dean. It is then up to the program faculty to decide if they want to integrate this feedback into their self-study and potentially adjust their short and long term goals. The program should return the self-study to the Academic Program Review Coordinator, who will in-turn pass it on to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for review.

The Vice President of Academic Affairs will review the self-study, the findings of the Academic Program Review Committee, and the Dean’s narrative. The Vice President will report on the program’s strengths and areas of needed improvement. The self-study will then be returned to the program faculty via the Academic Program Review Faculty Coordinator. If the program faculty wish to make changes suggested by the VP, they may do so within 30 days and then return the self-study to the APR Faculty Coordinator. If faculty do not choose to make changes, they should notify the APR Faculty Coordinator that they are ready to move the self-study forward to the Academic Senate President, Superintendent/President, and the Governing Board as information items. However, if there are fact-based (data) errors in the report which faculty do not voluntarily change, an addendum may be added with the accurate data, with a citation of who added the data (ex. Dean of Research and Planning or Program Review Coordinator). Further, if the Academic Program Review Committee feels there are significant unresolved issues in the self-study, a written record of those outstanding issues will be added to the hard copy of the file stored in Institutional Research and Planning. Faculty may submit a written rebuttal to the outstanding issues outlined by the APR committee, which will also be included in the hard copy of the file. Philosophical information or arguments made in the self-study will remain under the faculty’s purview and will not be altered by those outside the discipline. The self-study will be published on the Solano College website, and a hard copy will be retained in the Office of Institutional Research and Planning with all the supporting documentation.

Follow-up Report

Every year programs will be required to submit a follow-up report to the dean. The report shall address the status of programmatic goals and any new updates or goals. The goals can be submitted as “projects” to input into the Institutional Research and Planning Database. The follow-up report will be forwarded to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

PROGRAM REVIEW DOCUMENT RUBRIC

Program:

Rank	Structure & Organization	Content	Evidence	Assessment	Vision
Absent	Template not followed	Missing sections	No evidence	No assessment	No next steps
Needs Improvement	Information not organized clearly or succinctly	All sections reported, but information is minimal	Evidence lacking in relevance	Assessments do not follow from evidence	Initiatives are unrealistic or unfounded
Good	Information follows the template	Sections reported completely	Evidence used appropriately	Assessment follows from the evidence	Initiatives are realistic
Exceptional	Information well organized	Complete, thoughtful	Evidence shows variety of types and from several sources	Assessment complete including gap analysis	Initiatives connect with entire campus vision and mission

Comments:

SELF STUDY RUBRIC FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Attributes → Levels of Implementation ↓	Program Mission and Planning	PLOs and SLOs	Curricular Offerings	Co-curricular Activities & Community Integration	Student Success	Resources: Human, Equipment & Facilities
Undeveloped	No program mission or long range plans established	PLOs, SLOs and/or curriculum map not published	Curricular offerings are not adequate to meet programmatic needs; efforts have not been taken to update offerings	Program has not made efforts to link with student services or community	Data has not been gathered about student success	Inadequate resources to meet programmatic needs. Plans do not identify or address needs.
Awareness	Working toward a clear program mission and considering future plans for program development	PLOs and SLOs are written and published. Curriculum map has been developed	Program aware of curricular needs; steps have not been taken to rectify problem areas	Advertises campus and/or community events related to the program. Maintains some links to the community	Data about student success exists but has not been sufficiently analyzed.	Programmatic needs are identified, but are insufficiently met. Plans made to bridge some gaps in resources.
Development	Clearly defined program mission that is in line with the college's mission. CTE programs hold some advisory meetings and feedback is utilized by program	Most PLOs and SLOs have been assessed, with some linking to program plans/goals. Plans do not identify or sufficiently address some gaps	Program curriculum is analyzed for effectiveness and steps are being taken to strengthen offerings	Program is involved in some co-curricular and community activities, and is actively planning further endeavors	Data is analyzed to determine trends in student success, leading to some recommendations to address those trends	Programmatic needs are mostly met by resources; plans have been put in motion to bridge gaps
Proficiency	Most Educational Master and past program review recommendations are being addressed. Program has goals for future linked to mission; CTE programs hold twice yearly advisory meetings	All PLOs and SLOs have been assessed, mostly linked with programmatic planning. Understanding of gaps and action planned to address gaps	Curriculum is satisfactory and current for programmatic needs. Faculty analyze the efficiency of offerings and make adjustments when necessary	Program actively supports co-curricular and community partnerships. Regularly-scheduled activities foster community ties and address needs.	Data used to make changes in programs to improve student success; planned actions lead to documented results.	Resources are sufficient for current programmatic needs; ongoing planning to address future needs
Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement	Educational Master Plan and past program review recommendations are continually analyzed and acted upon. Program's mission is integrated in planning and there is a clear vision for the future. Community feedback from advisory meetings is an integral part of planning.	Data from SLOS and PLOs are regularly analyzed by all faculty to collaboratively make programmatic changes	Curriculum is routinely analyzed to assess content, rigor, prerequisites, sequencing, and efficiency in scheduling (time, location, modality, etc.). Faculty keep current on articulation agreements and state mandates for curriculum	Co-curricular activities are an integral part of the program. The program maintains links to the community and adjusts activities and efforts based on student and community needs.	Success rates for students in the program are regularly analyzed and action is taken to equalize student success; results are analyzed for continuous assessment. CTE programs routinely assess adequacy of workforce preparation.	Resources are sought and allocated based on regular assessment of needs, student learning, and expected benefits.

ABRIDGED 2 YEAR PROGRAM REVIEWS FOR CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

In addition to the regular five-year cycle of comprehensive self-studies, Career Technical Education Programs will be required to complete an abridged program review every two years to meet Ed Code and Perkins requirements. These abridged reviews should be submitted directly to the school dean, the Perkins coordinator (if not the same), and the Academic Program Review Faculty Coordinator by December 1st.

The abridged review should include:

Program Introduction – One or two paragraph introduction to the program including any significant programmatic changes that took place in the last two years

Enrollment – Number of sections offered and headcounts over the last two years. Explanation for any trends

Curriculum Analysis – Any changes to courses offerings (deletions, additions, prerequisite changes) and/or degrees or certificates over the last two years. Include any significant changes to course times, locations, and/or course modality.

Demonstrated Effectiveness – Report on the number of certificates and degrees awarded in the last two years. Assess whether students are gaining employment upon completion of coursework.

Labor Market Data – Report on labor market projections for occupations in discipline area

Advisory Meetings – Describe membership on the advisory committee and summarize recommendations from committee members. Attach minutes (2 meetings per year)

PLO/SLO Analysis (Optional) – Review status of program and student learning outcomes. Have there been any changes over the last two years, are assessments being completed, and have any of the findings led to programmatic and/or course level actions changes.

Duplication of Services – State if the program provides any unnecessary duplication of other state funded manpower training programs in the college's service area

Perkins Funding – Provide a summary of how your program utilized Perkins funding over the last two years

Planned Actions – Include any short or long term goals based on current analysis of data, industry changes/recommendations, etc.

SELF-STUDY TEMPLATE

1.1 Introduction. Introduce the program. Include the program’s catalogue description, its mission, the degrees and certificates offered, and a brief history of the program. Include the number and names of full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and classified staff. Discuss any recent changes to the program or degrees (*limit to 2-3 pages max*).

1.2 Relationship to College Mission and Strategic Goals. Describe the program’s relationship to the overall mission of the college: “Solano Community College educates an ethnically and academically diverse student population drawn from our local communities and beyond. We are committed to help our students to achieve their educational, professional and personal goals centered on thoughtful curricula in basic skills education, workforce development and training, and transfer level education. The College accomplishes this three-fold mission through its dedicated teaching, innovative programs, broad curricula, and services that are responsive to the complex needs of all students.”

Using the matrix provided in Table 1, describe which of SCC’s Strategic Directions and Goals the program supports. Address only the goals relevant to the program. *Limit evidence to one paragraph per objective.*

Table 1. SCC’s Strategic Directions and Goals

Goal 1: Foster Excellence in Learning
Obj. 1.1 Create an environment that is conducive to student learning <i>Program Evidence:</i>
Obj. 1.2 Create an environment that supports quality teaching <i>Program Evidence:</i>
Obj. 1.3 Optimize student performance on Institutional Core Competencies <i>Program Evidence:</i>

Goal 2: Maximize Student Access & Success

Obj. 2.1 Identify and provide appropriate support for underprepared students

Program Evidence:

Obj. 2.2 Update and strengthen career/technical curricula

Program Evidence:

Obj. 2.3 Identify and provide appropriate support for transfer students

Program Evidence:

Obj. 2.4 Improve student access to college facilities and services to students

Program Evidence:

Obj. 2.5 Develop and implement an effective Enrollment Management Plan

Program Evidence:

Goal 3: Strengthen Community Connections

Obj. 3.1 Respond to community needs

Program Evidence:

Obj. 3.2 Expand ties to the community

Program Evidence:

Goal 4: Optimize Resources

Obj. 4.1 Develop and manage resources to support institutional effectiveness

Program Evidence:

Obj. 4.2 Maximize organization efficiency and effectiveness

Program Evidence:

Obj. 4.3 Maintain up-to-date technology to support the curriculum and business functions

Program Evidence:

1.3 Enrollment. Utilizing data from Institutional Research and Planning (ITRP), analyze enrollment data. In table format, include the number of sections offered, headcounts, the full-time equivalent enrollment (FTES), and the WSCH for each semester since the last program review cycle. If data is available for the number of declared majors in the discipline, please include as well. Compare the enrollment pattern to that of the college as a whole, and explain some of the possible causal reasons for any identified trends.

1.4 Population Served. Utilizing data obtained from Institutional Research and Planning, analyze the population served by the program (gender, age, and ethnicity) and discuss any trends in enrollment since the last program review. Explain possible causal reasons for these trends, and discuss any actions taken by the program to recruit underrepresented groups.

1.5 Status of Progress toward Goals and Recommendations. Report on the status of goals or recommendations identified in the previous educational master plan and program review.

Table 2. Educational Master Plan

Educational Master Plan	Status
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

Table 3. Program Review Recommendations

Program Review Recommendations (Previous Cycle)	Status
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

1.6 Future Outlook. Describe both internal and external conditions expected to affect the future of the program in the coming years. Include labor market data as relevant for CTE programs (limit to one page or less).

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT, AND OUTCOMES

Program Learning Outcomes

2.1 Using the chart provided, list the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and which of the “core four” institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) they address. In the same chart, specifically state (in measurable terms) how your department assesses each PLO. For example, is there a capstone course (which one), is it a passing grade on certain assignments or exams that demonstrate acquisition of the PLO, is it acquiring specific skills necessary for a licensing exam, completing a portfolio, etc.?

Table 4. Program Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes	ILO (Core 4)	How PLO is assessed
1.		
2.		
3.		

2.2 Report on how courses support the Program Learning Outcomes at which level (introduced (I), developing (D), or mastered (M))

Table 5. Program Courses and Program Learning Outcomes

Course	PL01	PL02	PL03	PL04

2.3 Utilizing table 6, describe the results of program learning assessments and any planned actions to increase student success where deficits were noted. Results should be both quantitative and qualitative in nature, describing student strengths and areas of needed improvement. Action plans should be specific and link to any needed resources to achieve desired results.

Table 6. Program Learning Assessments

Program Learning Outcomes	Date(s) Assessed	Results	Action Plan
1.			
2.			
3.			

2.4 Describe any changes made to the program or courses that were a direct result of program learning assessments.

Student Learning Outcomes

2.5 Describe the current status of SLOs in your program. Are SLOs being updated as necessary? What is the planned assessment cycle (need to be assessed at least twice during the program review cycle)? Are assessment results driving course level planning? If deficiencies are noted, describe planned actions for change. Address how courses with multiple sections have been aligned so that a common tool is utilized to assess student learning outcomes; describe any steps taken to standardize measures.

2.6 Review the course level SLOs completed by the program in the last year to ensure accuracy of information provided (core four, level of mastery, assessment tool, etc.). Note if any changes are needed.

2.7 Describe any changes made to the program or courses that were a direct result of student learning outcomes assessments.

Curricular Offerings

2.8 Course offerings. Attach a copy of the course descriptions from the most current catalogue. Describe any changes to the course offering since the last program review cycle (course content, methods of instruction, etc.) and provide rationale for deletion or addition of new course offerings. Also state whether a transfer degree has been established in accordance with SB 1440. Include a discussion of courses offered at Centers (Vacaville, Vallejo, Travis) and any plans for expansions/contraction of offerings at the Centers.

2.9 Fill rates/Class size. Based on data from ITRP, discuss the trends in course fill rates and possible causes for these trends (include comparison/analysis of courses by modality if applicable). Address how the size of classes affects courses and if there are any necessary adjustments to course classroom maximums. If there are courses that are historically under-enrolled, discuss strategies that might increase enrollment.

2.10 Course sequencing. Report on whether courses have been sequenced for student progression through the major, how students are informed of this progression, and the efficacy of this sequencing. Report on whether curriculum is being offered in a reasonable time frame (*limit to one or two paragraphs*).

2.11 College Preparedness/Basic skills. Describe the basic skills component of the program, including how the basic skills offerings prepare students for success in transfer-level courses. If your program doesn't have designated basic skills courses, then explain how your courses support fundamental writing and/or mathematic competencies. Analyze courses with course advisories, prerequisites and/or co-requisites to see whether this level of preparation supports student success.

2.12 Student Survey. Describe the student survey feedback related to course offerings. In terms of the timing, course offerings, and instructional format, how does what your program currently offer compare to student responses?

2.13 Four-year articulation (if applicable). Utilizing the most current data from the articulation officer, and tools such as ASSIST.org, state which of your courses articulate with the local four year institutions and whether additional courses should be planned for articulation (*limit to one or two paragraphs*).

2.14 High school articulation (if applicable). Describe the status of any courses with articulation/Tech Prep agreements at local high schools. What (if any) are your plans for increasing/strengthening ties with area high schools and advertising your program to prospective students? (*limit to one or two paragraphs*).

2.15 Distance Education (if applicable). Describe the distance education courses offered in your program, and any particular successes or challenges with these courses. Include the percentage of courses offered by modality and the rationale for this ratio.

Then:

- 1) Discuss your program's plans to expand or contract distance education offerings;
- 2) State how you ensure your online courses are comparable to in-class offerings

2.16 Advisory Boards/Licensing (CTE) (if applicable). Describe how program curriculum has been influenced by advisory board/licensing feedback. How often are advisory board meetings held, provide membership information and what specific actions have been taken. Attach minutes from the past two years.

STUDENT EQUITY & SUCCESS

3.1 Student Success. Anecdotally describe how the program works to promote student success. Include teaching innovations, use of student support services (library, counseling, DSP, etc), community partnerships, etc.

Then, utilizing data from the office of Institutional Research and Planning, report on student success through course completion and retention data. Then, analyze by discipline success by gender, age, ethnicity, and on-line (may analyze other variables such as disability, English as a second language, day vs. night courses, etc. as appropriate).

Provide possible reasons for these trends *AND planned action to equalize student success.*

3.2 Degrees/Certificates Awarded (if applicable). Include the number of degrees and certificates awarded during each semester of the program review cycle. Describe the trends observed and any planned action relevant to the findings.

3.3 Transfer (if applicable). Describe any data known about students in your program who are transfer eligible/ready (have 60 transferable units with English and math requirements met). Include how your program helps students become aware of transfer opportunities (*limit to one or two paragraphs*).

3.4 Career Technical Programs (if applicable). For career technical programs, describe how graduates are prepared with the professional and technical competencies that meet employment/licensure standards. State if there are any efforts made to place students in the workforce upon graduation, including any applicable placement data.

PROGRAM RESOURCES

4.1 Human Resources. Describe the adequacy of current staffing levels and a rationale for any proposed changes in staffing (FTES, retirements, etc.). Address how current staffing levels impact the program and any future goals related to human resources.

4.2 Current Staffing. Describe how the members of the department have made significant contributions to the program, the college, and the community. Do not need to list all the faculty members' names and all their specific activities, but highlight the significant contributions since the last program review cycle.

4.3 Equipment. Address the currency of equipment utilized by the program and how it affects student services/success. Make recommendation (if relevant) for technology, equipment, and materials that would improve quality of education for students.

4.4 Facilities. Describe the facilities utilized by your program. Comment on the adequacy of the facilities to meet program's educational objectives.

4.5 Budget/Fiscal Profile. Provide a five year historical budget outlook including general fund, categorical funding, Perkins, grants, etc. Discuss the adequacy of allocations for programmatic needs. This should be a macro rather than micro level analysis.

PROGRAMMATIC GOALS & PLANNING

This section will be submitted to the governing board as an overview of programmatic strengths and areas of growth.

5.1 Summarize what you believe are your program’s strengths and major accomplishments in the last 5 years. Next, state the areas that are most in need of improvement.

5.2 Based on the self-study analysis, prioritize the program’s short (1-2 years) and long term goals (3+ years). Check whether the goal requires fiscal resources to achieve.

Table 7. Short-Term and Long-Term Goals

Short-Term Goals	Planned Action	Target Date	Person Responsible	Source
1.				
2.				
3.				
Long-Term Goals	Planned Action	Target Date	Person Responsible	Source
1.				
2.				
3.				

In the source column denote “SP” for Strategic Proposals, “DB” for Department Budget, “P” for Perkins or “NR” for No Additional Resources Needed.

SIGNATURE PAGE

6.1 Please include a signature page with all full-time faculty and as many part-time faculty as you are able. The signature page should include lines with the signatures and then typed names of the faculty members.

Example:

The undersigned faculty in the _____ program, have read and concur with the finding and recommendations in the attached program review self-study, dated

_____.

Faculty Name

Faculty Name

FINDING DATA FOR SELF-STUDY

Samples of completed Program Reviews can be found at:

http://solano.edu/research_planning/program_review.php

To receive a word document of the template contact: amy.obegi@solano.edu

SECTION 1:

1.3 and 1.4 Enrollment data can be found in the SCC Drop-box:

<http://dropbox.solano.edu>

With Username: coursedata

Password: coursedata

There is a program review report section on the left, you must download to your computer and then open.

If you want to compare data to the college as a whole, you can mine the Chancellor's office MIS data mart:

<http://datamart.cccco.edu/> (also accessible through the research and planning website)

Choose queries, student headcounts, and then search by Solano College and the terms you are looking for. Once you have run the initial search, you can filter by ethnicity, age, etc.

1.5 Your dean (or you) may have a copy of the Educational Master Plan to refer to. There is also a copy online (found under administration, district plans):

http://www.solano.edu/district_plans/1213/Solano_EMP_Revised_Draft_052312_reduced2.pdf

Previous program reviews may be stored by faculty and or deans. They should also be found on the program review webpage: http://solano.edu/research_planning/program_review.php (Can be found under Administration, research and planning, program review).

1.6 CTE programs should utilize labor market data as part of their future outlook summary. California labor market data can be found here:

<http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/Content.asp?pageid=1011>

This link will take you to a page where you can type in an occupation (fire fighter, preschool teacher, etc.) and get the California labor market projections.

SECTION 2:

2.1 PLOs should be listed in the college catalogue (if they are not will want to make this a short-term goal to submit them for inclusion). The last program review should also have them or your dean/fellow faculty. You should have linked them to the ILOs in your last program review. If not, you need to do this now; the ILOs are the Core 4 and they are listed here:

http://solano.edu/research_planning/1112/SCC_Core_Competencies_rev2.pdf

You can also get to them on the Solano webpage, by going to: Administration, Research and Planning, then Assessment.

2.2 Curriculum maps are in the SLO Drop-box. To access:

<http://dropbox.solano.edu>

Using Username: slodata
Password: SLod@ta1

If one hasn't been completed, it should be done.

2.3 When filling out the table, make sure to report the strengths and weaknesses of students and make actions plans to support student success.

2.6 SLO data from the database is available in the dropbox.

<http://dropbox.solano.edu>

Using Username: slodata
Password: SLod@ta1

They are also available on the college webpage:

<http://solano.edu/slo/>

2.9 Program review reports and efficiency reports provide data about courses offered at the Centers:

<http://dropbox.solano.edu>

With Username: coursedata
Password: coursedata

2.10 In the Drop-box (with coursedata password), you will find a link to institutional reports. In this report you can open course data and analyze data related to course sequencing. I recommend searching in the find box, as the reports are VERY long.

2.13 Go to Assist.org and our articulation officer for more information.

2.14 Charlie Monahan is the contact for high school articulation agreements.

2.15 Data from the drop box can be used to look at courses offered by modality.

2.16 Contact the faculty member who keeps the advisory board minutes for this portion.

SECTION 3:

3.1 The program review reports in the Drop-box includes success data by department and course:

<http://dropbox.solano.edu>

With Username: coursedata
Password: coursedata

3.2 Awards can be found in the drop box under the heading institutional reports.

<http://dropbox.solano.edu>

With Username: coursedata
Password: coursedata

SECTION 4:

4.5 Budget/Fiscal information will be provided in the drop box by TOP code. You can contact Pei-Lin Van't Hul if you additional questions.

<http://dropbox.solano.edu>

With Username: coursedata
Password: coursedata