

Notes from Dean's Meeting – Feedback on Academic Program Review

August 24, 2016

- Faculty thought in general the feedback form worked. However Dean Morinec asked why it is necessary since faculty don't have to listen to their feedback. A. Obegi said that wasn't true – if the document is complete or has factual or data errors, faculty need to correct. The hope is the dean/faculty relationship is collegial and ideas are discussed and integrated where appropriate.
- Some deans felt the program review was being used as a place to share grievances/gripe. There is a need for training about role/scope of program review and what should be included. A. Obegi mentioned there are more samples now and the goals would be articulated in trainings
- Dean's felt the goals should be prioritized.
- There was a discussion about the Basic Skills Language and whether it should be omitted so more respond to how underprepared students are supported in the program. Dean Mouton thought the language was important to keep in the document.
- There was a discussion about integrated planning and the need to link the program reviews more closely to the hiring process, strategic proposals, etc.
- Since Perkins funds have been linked, it would be a good idea to add a core indicator analysis
- The idea that a shorter, yearly program review would be more useful for planning
- Deans thought it would be a good idea to add a section about counseling and the library to link more to student services.

Dean's Individualized Feedback

Dean's Feedback Health Sciences

1. Faculty members writing the review would like more up front or lead time direction related to document preparation

2. Data expectations are tied to coding and tracking limits of Banner (e.g. Hard for sports medicine to produce data when it doesn't have a Banner code)
3. Template formatting should be updated to maintain consistency throughout the document, especially with tables
4. Some confusion related to program relationship to CTE (e.g., Is the program actually listed as CTE?)
5. What process should be followed when the process is not followed (how to deal with incomplete or incorrect submissions sent to the Dean?)
6. What ramifications exist (if any) for those individuals who fail to complete review by established deadline (if some programs ignore request without consequences, why should anyone submit)
7. Should data section have a more clear mandate related to currency (e.g review must include data up to at least current academic year)

DEAN'S FEEDBACK ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW 2013-2016 CYCLE

School: Math and Science

1. What do you think are the strengths of the current program review process?
The strengths of the current process include the following:
 - Very Thorough
2. What do you think are the areas that need improvement?
 - It's pretty time consuming
3. Comment on the Dean's feedback form and provide any suggestions for improvement
 - The current form is fine
4. After reading faculty's reviews in your area, what do you think are the chief weaknesses of the reports? In other words, what do faculty need the most support or training with?
 - A better understanding of regulations and policies. Making statements based on evidence. Be objective

5. Are there additional questions that you think the program review template should ask? Do you think there are questions that should be omitted or adjusted?

The template is pretty comprehensive. Need to take a look at Title V requirements on Program Review to see what can be eliminated or adjusted.

6. Has conducting program reviews led to any observable changes or improvements for any programs in your area?

Yes, it is very helpful

7. Other comments, thoughts, or suggestions?

The committee is doing a great job

DEAN'S FEEDBACK ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW 2013-2016 CYCLE

School: Applied Technology and Business

1. What do you think are the strengths of the current program review process?

The strengths of the current process include the following:

- It is a comprehensive document that allows for faculty input in all areas.
- Is tied to the goals of the college's educational master plan.

2. What do you think are the areas that need improvement?

- There is limited discussion of the SLOS and how they are being used to implement change in programs and/or courses
- Limited discussion of success rates and differences between online and face-to-face offerings
- No planning involved—by that I mean there are no 3 year plans in the program review and this should be included.
- Timelines should be tightened up with consequences attached to failing to meet timelines—such as funding, new hires, etc.
- Should be a word limit in some of the areas

3. Comment on the Dean's feedback form and provide any suggestions for improvement

- The deans feedback should be meaningful—changes should be made to program review documents based upon feedback from the dean
4. After reading faculty's reviews in your area, what do you think are the chief weaknesses of the reports? In other words, what do faculty need the most support or training with?
- Faculty view the program review process as onerous and just one more thing to do. They see it as a way to blame administration for everything including low enrollments in their programs to facility issues. I think the faculty need additional training on the purpose of program review and the importance of ALL members of a department being involved in the process. It ends to be parsed out with only some members participating in the actual program review.