

REVIEW OF APR PROCESS

PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR THOUGHTS ABOUT THE APRC PROCESS (PAGES 1-4)

1. Provide any feedback about suggested changes to the first pages of the handbook:

Introduction: President not providing reviews (adjust)

Preparation:

Training:

The Report: Benchmarks may need to change based on calendar.

2. Are there any changes or additions needed to suggested benchmarks?

3. Comment on whether you believe changes are warranted to the following dates/timelines:

Self-study due to dean first Monday in February:

Dean's feedback (no later than March 1st): 3 weeks

Faculty's changes based on dean's feedback (no timeline specified): 2 weeks

Academic Program Review Committee feedback (no timeline specified): once on the agenda, 30 days

Faculty's response to APRC feedback (no timeline specified in the handbook, in the email suggested 30 days): 30 days

Vice President of Academic Affairs feedback (no timeline specified): 30 days

Faculty's response to VP feedback (30 days): 30 days

Voting on document/publication/passed on President/Board (no timelines specified):

Please suggest other revisions to the process, or the written explanation of the process, that you think would be beneficial. Please include suggestions on the one-year follow-up (this hasn't been formally initiated). One year follow-up on CurriCUNET, buttons to connect with faculty hiring, technology requests, instructional equipment requests, etc. Goals should align with rubric

REVIEW OF APR PROCESS

PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR THOUGHTS ABOUT THE APRC PROCESS (PAGES 1-4)

1. Provide any feedback about suggested changes to the first pages of the handbook:

Introduction:

Preparation:

Training:

The Report:

This area is fine.

2. Are there any changes or additions needed to suggested benchmarks?

Perhaps at the end of fall something like: Decide upon an editor to review the report a prepare a complete draft in time to distribute it in January

3. Comment on whether you believe changes are warranted to the following dates/timelines:

Self-study due to dean first Monday in February:

Dean's feedback (no later than March 1st):

Faculty's changes based on dean's feedback (no timeline specified):

Academic Program Review Committee feedback (no timeline specified):

Faculty's response to APRC feedback (no timeline specified in the handbook, in the email suggested 30 days):

Vice President of Academic Affairs feedback (no timeline specified): I think the VP should be taken out of the process as a required component. I think the studies should be sent to the VP as a courtesy and there be a deadline for VP comment, but if nothing is heard in 30(?) days, then the self-study can proceed.

Faculty's response to VP feedback (30 days):

Voting on document/publication/passed on President/Board (no timelines specified):

4. Please suggest other revisions to the process, or the written explanation of the process, that you think would be beneficial. Please include suggestions on the one-year follow-up (this hasn't been formally initiated).

EVALUATION RUBRICS

PROVIDE YOUR THOUGHTS ABOUT THE RUBRICS & APRC FEEDBACK (PAGES 5 & 6)

1. Please comment on the document rubric. Any suggestions for improvement?

No suggestions.

2. Please comment on the self-study rubric. Any suggestions for improvement?

Yes—perhaps add the relevant section numbers to each attribute

Attributes →	Program Mission and Planning (Sections 1, 4 and 5)	PLOs and SLOs (Sections 2.1-2.7)	Curricular Offerings (Sections 2.8-2.16)	Co-curricular Activities & Community Integration (Table 1, Goal 3; Sections 2.13, 2.14, and 2.16)	Student Success (Section 3)	Resources: Human, Equipment & Facilities (Sections 4 and 5)
Levels of Implementation ↓						

3. Any thoughts or suggestions to improve the written APRC feedback provided to faculty based on the self-study rubric (the feedback compiled & written by the APRC coordinator). **The feedback is clear, supportive, and specific. No changes recommended, except again perhaps to include the section numbers on the rubric, so faculty can better locate the areas that need improvement.**

EVALUATION RUBRICS

PROVIDE YOUR THOUGHTS ABOUT THE RUBRICS & APRC FEEDBACK (PAGES 5 & 6)

1. Please comment on the document rubric. Any suggestions for improvement?

Change Exceptional to Excellent?

2. Please comment on the self-study rubric. Any suggestions for improvement?

No

3. Any thoughts or suggestions to improve the written APRC feedback provided to faculty based on the self-study rubric (the feedback compiled & written by the APRC coordinator).

EVALUATION RUBRICS

PROVIDE YOUR THOUGHTS ABOUT THE RUBRICS & APRC FEEDBACK (PAGES 5 & 6)

1. Please comment on the document rubric. Any suggestions for improvement?

As I have indicated in practice, the levels here and in the self-study rubric are fine, but I always wished for a more continuous scoring. (Of course, you know I did it anyway!)

2. Please comment on the self-study rubric. Any suggestions for improvement?

3. Any thoughts or suggestions to improve the written APRC feedback provided to faculty based on the self-study rubric (the feedback compiled & written by the APRC coordinator).

I think Amy has done an amazing job with this!

ABRIDGED PROGRAM REVIEW

PROVIDE YOUR FEEDBACK ON THE ABRIDGED PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (PAGE 7)

1. Provide suggestions for the abridged program review process. Specifically:
 - a. Should the abridged CTE program reviews be reviewed by the APRC? If so, all or just some? What criteria should be used?

This is something the Academic Senate should decide, in collaboration with the Dean of CTE.

- b. Should a rubric be established for the abridged reviews? If so, who should complete the rubric (deans or the APRC) and what should it measure?

If the Senate believes the APR committee should review the CTE program reviews, then we should develop a rubric. Otherwise, we could suggest a modified rubric for the Dean to use.

- c. Other suggestions for the abridged process:

2. Provide any content suggestions/changes for the abridged reviews.

In the handbook, I added section numbers to indicate what areas of the complete self-study relate to the abridged, but some areas were a little hazy. A more direct correlation might help clarify which sections of the complete self-study should be extracted, and what sections are unique to the two-year review and not asked in the complete self-study.

ABRIDGED PROGRAM REVIEW

PROVIDE YOUR FEEDBACK ON THE ABRIDGED PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (PAGE 7)

1. Provide suggestions for the abridged program review process. Specifically:
 - a. Should the abridged CTE program reviews be reviewed by the APRC? If so, all or just some? What criteria should be used?

Uncertain – unpaid committee doesn't necessarily have time to review all. They should be collected and stored in a shared drive

- b. Should a rubric be established for the abridged reviews? If so, who should complete the rubric (deans or the APRC) and what should it measure?
 - c. Other suggestions for the abridged process:
2. Provide any content suggestions/changes for the abridged reviews.
Add into the abridged template an analysis of the core indicators

ABRIDGED PROGRAM REVIEW

PROVIDE YOUR FEEDBACK ON THE ABRIDGED PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (PAGE 7)

1. Provide suggestions for the abridged program review process. Specifically:
 - d. Should the abridged CTE program reviews be reviewed by the APRC? If so, all or just some? What criteria should be used?

No. The APRC has enough to do. It's role should be solely to remind programs that it needs to be done and keep track of it being completed.
 - e. Should a rubric be established for the abridged reviews? If so, who should complete the rubric (deans or the APRC) and what should it measure?

If so, the dean can do it.
 - f. Other suggestions for the abridged process:
2. Provide any content suggestions/changes for the abridged reviews.

REVIEW OF TEMPLATE

PROVIDE YOUR FEEDBACK ON THE TEMPLATE (PAGES 8-17)

Mark up the template with your feedback about each question. If you believe the question doesn't need any changes, put a check mark ✓ next to the question. If you think the question should be omitted, X it out. If you believe revisions are necessary write the changes you think would be best next to the question. Finally, if you feel questions should be added, please write them into the template where you think they would fit best. You can either handwrite or track changes.

See tracked changes in Handbook.

Below, please provide suggestions for making the document more user friendly (organization, structure, use of tables, etc.):

REVIEW OF TEMPLATE

PROVIDE YOUR FEEDBACK ON THE TEMPLATE (PAGES 8-17)

Mark up the template with your feedback about each question. If you believe the question doesn't need any changes, put a check mark ✓ next to the question. If you think the question should be omitted, X it out. If you believe revisions are necessary write the changes you think would be best next to the question. Finally, if you feel questions should be added, please write them into the template where you think they would fit best. You can either handwrite or track changes.

Below, please provide suggestions for making the document more user friendly (organization, structure, use of tables, etc.):

Remove table 1 – In its place:

Make sure somewhere it asks how supports student learning, support underprepared students, connect with the community, technology

Section 2.1 add GELOs connections (fix chart)

Consider adjusting charts for 2.1 and 2.3 to make more user friendly

Remove 2.6?

2.11 – Describe how your program supports underprepared students, including fundamental writing and/or mathematic competencies. If your program has designated basic skills courses, say how they prepare students for success in transfer-level courses. Consider moving to student success section

Separate for Course Advisories? Analyze courses with advisories, prerequisites, and or co-requisites to see whether this level of preparation supports student success. Leave this in curriculum section

Something about scheduling? Related to 2.10?

New heading, for co-curricular activities and community integration

Questions about community engagement and campus connection. Retitle and move 4.2 to this section, also move 2.16 to this section. Add a section about counseling and library?

Remove Budget/Fiscal profile 4.5

5.2 Goals align with rubric/categories & have a priority list

Need to add CTE core indicator analysis, which section?

REVIEW OF TEMPLATE

PROVIDE YOUR FEEDBACK ON THE TEMPLATE (PAGES 8-17)

Mark up the template with your feedback about each question. If you believe the question doesn't need any changes, put a check mark ✓ next to the question. If you think the question should be omitted, X it out. If you believe revisions are necessary write the changes you think would be best next to the question. Finally, if you feel questions should be added, please write them into the template where you think they would fit best. You can either handwrite or track changes.

Below, please provide suggestions for making the document more user friendly (organization, structure, use of tables, etc.):

I would make it all a simple Word document without tables or columns. I had lots of complaints about how hard it was to work with.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS FOR SUPPORT MATERIALS (PAGES 18-20)

1. Please check the supporting documentation that you feel would be helpful to faculty going through the program review process:
 - X Overview of where to find data and how to utilize it
 - X Style sheet (including whether or not faculty should erase the prompts, things like that)
 - X Sample student survey
 - X Links to relevant websites (labor market, sample program reviews, assessment, etc.)
 - Tips/suggestions for success
 - Others (please list):
2. What types of trainings do you think would be helpful those going through the program review process?

If we can get a clear picture as to how the self-study will be used, and when it will be useful, and what parts will be useful in what circumstances, I think that would be a good morale-booster in the training process. If this info could be built into the template (“TO BE USED BY SENATE, DEANS IN FORMULATING HIRING PRIORITIES” or “TO BE USED TO SUPPORT INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT PROPOSALS”), that would also be helpful and would add more than dread and fretting to the training process.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS FOR SUPPORT MATERIALS (PAGES 18-20)

2. Please check the supporting documentation that you feel would be helpful to faculty going through the program review process:
 - Overview of where to find data and how to utilize it
 - Style sheet
 - Sample student survey
 - Links to relevant websites (labor market, sample program reviews, assessment, etc.)
 - Tips/suggestions for success
 - Others (please list):

All of the above

3. What types of trainings do you think would be helpful those going through the program review process?

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS FOR SUPPORT MATERIALS (PAGES 18-20)

3. Please check the supporting documentation that you feel would be helpful to faculty going through the program review process:
 - Overview of where to find data and how to utilize it
 - Style sheet
 - Sample student survey
 - Links to relevant websites (labor market, sample program reviews, assessment, etc.)
 - Tips/suggestions for success
 - Others (please list):
 - All the above!

4. What types of trainings do you think would be helpful those going through the program review process?

Perhaps a mid-term training. This would be something that people could do after they have started and realize the scope of it all. I think having the pre-review training is great, but that sometimes folks don't know what to ask until they start. I know Amy works with people during the process, but perhaps something scheduled would make it easier on the chair who could deal with more than one program at a time.

OVERALL FEEDBACK

1. What do you think are the strengths of the APR process?

Provides a thorough analysis of program functioning, helps faculty plan for the future

2. What are the areas most in need of improvement? What are your suggestions for this improvement?

Integrated planning –connect with planning processes

Timelines -tighten

Shorten/Avoid repetition

3. Other ideas, thoughts, suggestions?

Align the template and the goals with the rubric

OVERALL FEEDBACK

1. What do you think are the strengths of the APR process?

Faculty driven. Comprehensive review of programs. Room for a lot of feedback.

2. What are the areas most in need of improvement? What are your suggestions for this improvement?

It would be nice if the process was somewhat simpler without sacrificing the comprehensive nature of the current process.

3. Other ideas, thoughts, suggestions?

OVERALL FEEDBACK

1. What do you think are the strengths of the APR process?

The process is transparent and designed to help faculty produce the best, most complete and useful document possible.

2. What are the areas most in need of improvement? What are your suggestions for this improvement?

The process is molasses-on-a-cold-day slow. A streamlined template and consistent template format (with places for Institutional Planning data charts to be inserted, for example) might make everyone move faster. Deans might review them quicker if all the typical info can be found in all the typical places, and they don't have to adjust to individual styles and approaches.

3. Other ideas, thoughts, suggestions?

Not at this time! : ^)