Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

EMP Objective #2:

"Review and revise academic offerings to ensure appropriate student learning and academic quality as directed by federal, state and accrediting agencies."

Administrator in Charge:

Martin Orlowski

Target removal date:

February 2015

Completed action plan:

Appendix A

Questions for Removal:

1. <u>Have the desired outcomes been accomplished</u>?

   Yes, the desired outcomes have been accomplished, a revise process has been revised and includes an annual process to evaluate the effectiveness of the review process itself.

2. <u>Are action steps complete and the action plan in final format</u>?

   Yes. The action steps are complete and the action plan is in its final format. The remaining action steps in the plan indicate to implement the established process. The process will be implemented annually indefinitely, regardless of whether it remains an EMP objective. See: www.infomart.oaklandcc.edu/curriculumreview for documentation of review process, reviews, action strategies, and updates on the annual evaluation of effectiveness of the review.

Evaluation of Effectiveness of Objective:

Appendix B- Process to evaluate

Appendix C- Evaluation from most recent year

Submitted: December 2014

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

Appendix A- Completed action plan

Objective #2: Review and revise academic offerings to ensure appropriate student learning and academic quality as directed by federal, state and accrediting agencies. Administrator in Charge: M. Orlowski					
Accountability Measures	**Milestones/Action Steps**	**Team Member Responsible**	**Milestone Completion Dates**	**Status** OT = On track D = Delay (Explanation needed in Notes) C = Complete	**Notes**
Year 1 Finalize the revised review process	1. Present the review process to the College Senate 2. Map the alignment between the State of Michigan's Program Review of Occupational Education (PROE) process and the OCC review process. Apply to replace OCC's PROE requirement with the OCC review process 3. Create a framework to evaluate the effectiveness of review process on an annual basis, which includes feedback from faculty reviewed in the pilot, measures of faculty engagement, and an objective evaluation of the review reports 4. Update internal websites and databases to support an electronic review process and disseminate information about the review	1. M. Orlowski, K. Perez 2. M. Kramer, M. Orlowski 3. Curriculum Review Committee members and K. Perez 4. K. Perez	1. January 2014 2. June 2014 3. June 2014 4. September 2014	1. C 2. C 3. C 4. C	Senate has approved review process revisions. PROE no longer requires a separate application to supplant the internal process with the PROE process. Framework to evaluate has been implemented. CRC and CSL have created a website.

Submitted: December 2014

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

	process and review schedule				
Year 1 Address the issue of orphaned curriculum	1. Establish a definition of 'orphaned' curriculum 2. Prepare report of orphans 3. Establish a plan of how to review orphaned curriculum	1. K. Perez (all steps)	1. May 2014 2. June 2014 3. August 2014	1. C 2. C 3. C	Orphans have been defined and solutions identified. Deans will continue to address orphan courses as they review curriculum in phases 1 and 5 of the CLC.
Year 1 Implement the review process	1. Supply review action strategies for budgeting considerations (e.g. general fund, Perkins) 2. Ensure all scheduled reviews are fully completed including signed action strategies and report 3. Conduct an evaluation of the review process and refine	1. M. Orlowski 2. K. Perez 3. K. Perez, Curriculum Review Committee members	1. March 2014 2. March 2014 3. June 2014	1. C 2. C 3. C	Deans are receiving action strategy summary reports and are following up with faculty. Reviews are complete, cases with incomplete reviews are noted as such in the database. Evaluation of review process was conducted and was used to improve process.
Year 2 Implement the review process	1. Implement the review process according to the established procedures 2. Conduct a follow-up of action strategies at least annually 3. Conduct an evaluation of the review process and refine	1. K. Perez 2. K. Perez 3. K. Perez, Curriculum Review Committee	1. December 2014 2. Varies by strategy 3. May 2014	1. OT 2. OT 3. OT	
Year 3 Implement the review process	1. Implement the review process according to the established procedures 2. Conduct a follow-up of action strategies at least annually	1. K. Perez 2. K. Perez 3. K. Perez, Curriculum Review	1. December 2015 2. Varies by strategy 3. May 2015	1. OT 2. OT 3. OT	

Submitted: December 2014

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

	3. Conduct an evaluation of the review process and refine	Committee			
Year 4 Implement the review process	1. Implement the review process according to the established procedures 2. Conduct a follow-up of action strategies at least annually 3. Conduct an evaluation of the review process and refine	1. K. Perez 2. K. Perez 3. K. Perez, Curriculum Review Committee	1. December 2016 2. Varies by strategy 3. May 2016	1. OT 2. OT 3. OT	

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

Appendix B- Process to Evaluate Review Process

Overview

The purpose of this document is to detail the procedures for evaluation of the review process, which will in turn ensure that the review process leads to actionable strategies that improve the issue they are meant to address.

Objectives

1. Identify weakness and challenges in the review process.
    a. Ensure the review data, information and questions elicit a thoughtful review of the extent to which the program/discipline is meeting institutional priorities.
    b. Ensure that the reviews result in measurable action strategies that impact issues that need improvement.

Evaluation of Process

1. Order of Tasks/Actions
    a. Draft report
    b. Pre-review meeting
    c. Revised report
    d. Final report
    e. Action strategies
    f. Post-review meeting
    g. Signatures and ballots
        i. Reason to review: Ensure that the process flows in a logical order that avoid creating bottlenecks or other barriers to process completions.
        ii. How to review: CRC members survey, reviewer survey, CSL records.
2. Clarity in Communication
    a. Posting and award letter
        i. Reason to review: Ensure that the posting and award letter reflects the nature of the task to appropriately prepare faculty for the task ahead.
        ii. How to review: Changes may be informed through all evaluations described herein. Informal review is also appropriate.
    b. Summary materials for lead reviewers
        i. Reason to review: Ensure clarity and understanding of process.
        ii. How to review: CRC members survey, reviewer survey.
    c. Summary materials for deans
        i. Reason to review: Ensure clarity and understanding of process.
        ii. How to review: Request dean feedback.
    d. Summary materials for participating faculty
        i. Reason to review: Ensure clarity and understanding of process.
        ii. How to review: Changes may be informed through all evaluations described herein. Informal review is also appropriate.
3. Support
    a. Support from CSL
        i. Reason to review: Ensure CSL meets CRC and reviewer expectations.

Submitted: December 2014

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

      ii. How to review: Reviewer survey, request information regarding level of involvement and satisfaction. CRC member survey.
- b. Support from Dean
  - i. Reason to review: Ensure Dean is adequately supporting faculty.
  - ii. How to review: Reviewer survey, request information regarding level of involvement and satisfaction.
- c. Support from CRC
  - i. Reason to review: Ensure CRC is playing appropriate role in review process.
  - ii. How to review: Reviewer survey, request information regarding level of involvement and satisfaction.
- d. Support from Fellow Faculty
  - i. Reason to review: Ensure that discipline faculty are engaged in the review.
  - ii. How to review: Reviewer survey, CRC survey, CRC rurbics.

Evaluation of Report

1. Past & Present Initiatives
2. Program Learning Outcomes (programs only)
3. Common Course Outcomes
4. Enrollment
5. Completions (programs only)
6. Curriculum Design
7. Community Need & Student Interest
8. Strengths, Challenges & Future Directions
   - a. Reason to review: Ensure that questions are clear, that data/information easy to interpret, that synthesis of data and responses are what we expected.
   - b. How to review: CRC survey, reviewer survey, CSL rubric, CSL records.

Review outcomes

1. Synthesis and Conclusions
   - a. Reason to review: Understand the extent to which materials are being synthesized and the appropriateness of the conclusions drawn across the whole review.
   - b. How to review: Reviewer survey, CRC survey, CRC rubric.
2. Action Strategy Outcomes
   - a. Reason to review: Understand the extent to which the report leads to action strategies for improvement, and ensure action strategies are appropriate to address the issue presented. Also, to ensure implementation of actions and overall impact of review process on program/discipline improvement.
   - b. How to review: Reviewer survey, CRC survey, CRC rubric, CSL records.

Submitted: December 2014

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

Appendix C- Most recent evaluation of review process

Objectives

2. Identify weakness and challenges in the review process.
    a. Ensure the review data, information and questions elicit a thoughtful review of the extent to which the program/discipline is meeting institutional priorities.
    b. Ensure that the reviews result in measurable action strategies that impact issues that need improvement.

Contents

Submitted: December 2014

EVALUATION OF PROCESS

Order of Tasks/Actions

Draft report- Draft reports take around 8 hours to prepare for each review. Reviewers and deans are provided with a draft as far in advance as possible, but at times they are not given a draft prior to their pre-review meeting. However, reviewing the draft prior to the meeting should not affect the pre-review meeting. After the pre-review meeting, reviewers are asked to communicate their concerns and requests for changes for the report within two weeks. However, this year we found that four reviewers indicated concerns about the review data in their responses in drafts seen prior to the post-review meeting. These issues should be communicated and changed immediately following the pre-review meeting.

- Action- In the pre-review meeting, we need to emphasize that reviewers should contact CSL within two weeks after the pre-review meeting to address concerns.
- Action- Add a stated step to the review process that says the reviewers will submit drafts to their deans.

Pre-review meeting- The review process started late, pushing the overall timeline back by two months. Scheduling meetings was difficult. While contacts were made in September to schedule meetings, some pre-review meetings occurred in early November. Pre-review meetings were the faculty and dean's first introduction to the review process. There was a limited amount of time to go through the process and draft report. Also, there were no documents provided to faculty or deans regarding the review process, with the exception of the first page of the review report.

In the survey of reviewers, six reviewers indicated that this part of the process worked well while two indicated that it did not work well. One open-ended comment that addressed an issue with this step of the process indicated:

"First, give all the data at the initial meeting - don't sandbag it later. Second, just because data exists does not mean it is accurate. Stop fighting for a preconceived agenda. If you want to kill a program off, just do it. Don't try and back door it through misleading data. The process is only as good as the political agenda behind it. If that agenda is improvement and honesty - it works great. If that agenda is destruction and deception - how can you expect us to approve?"

This comment again reflects the lack of communication about the review process, as the comment makes a clear assumption that the goal of this process is to lead to the deactivation of a program. As stated in the actions steps below, a FAQ document has been created to address this issue, but broader communication with the college may be necessary to avoid perpetuating this rumor. The responses to the FAQ dealing with this major issue are as follows:

1. Does administration use the review to make decisions about programs or courses?

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

The review gives a summary of trends in a program or discipline that is easy to read and contains a lot of information. However, this information is always available to the administration and this information, along with other input, is considered by the administration when making choices about the direction of a program or discipline. The review offers faculty a chance to respond to the data. Administration can then take Faculty input into consideration as they look at performance data.

2. Is the review used as a basis for sun setting courses or programs?

The CRC review process is only undergone by programs and disciplines that are not in danger of deactivation. Many of the metrics used in the review process are the same as those used to make decisions regarding the deactivation of a program, but again, curricula undergoing review are in the review process so that improvements can be made. **Curricula at risk for deactivation will not undergo the regular curriculum review process,** as more intensive research and collaboration is warranted.

CRC members agree for the most part with reviewers regarding whether this step worked well or not (five indicated it worked well and one indicated it did not).

- Action- Review meeting times will be block scheduled in the first two week of September.
- Action- Documents were created to communication information about the process: dean and faculty checklist's, FAQs page, letters for discipline faculty (non-lead reviewers), and a handbook describing the review process.
- Action- A workshop will be offered in the fall to help introduce the relevant information earlier in the process.
- Action- Discuss process updates with deans.

Revised report- See draft report comments above. Revised reports were sent late (4-6 weeks after pre-review meeting) for the few disciplines who met first in the fall. This was due to the process revisions which were still being finalized in early September. About half of the revised review reports were sent within one week following the pre-review meeting. This is not expected to be an issue moving forward.

Reviewers were more split on this step of the process, likely for the reasons identified above regarding timing, lack of documentation, and the miscommunication between deans, faculty and CSL regarding requests for additional data (i.e. some requests were for data that would be unethical to generate). Three reviewers indicated that this did not work well and five indicated that it worked well.

CRC members appeared more positive about the step with five indicating it worked well and one indicating it did not. No additional actions are needed for this step to address these issues beyond those described above.

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

Final report- Drafts of the final report were not seen by most deans until a few days or hours before the post-review meeting at the end of the process; some of these reports had major issues or listed major concerns with the review process, which should have been communicated to CSL and the dean within two weeks after the pre-review meeting. This partly was related to the changeover in the dean's positions in December/January, but also because there was never a set expectation that deans will review a draft. Final reviews had some issues in the interpretation, synthesis of evidence and relevancy of action strategies to the issue identified (evidence of this is provided in the next section of this evaluation).

Seven reviewers indicated that seeking input from the discipline faculty regarding the draft report worked well while one indicated that it did not work well. All eight reviewers who responded to the survey indicated that sending the draft final report to the dean for feedback worked well. In regards to balloting the full time faculty in the discipline, seven reviewers indicated that this worked well and one indicated it did not. Finally, all eight reviewers indicated that the signature process worked well. CRC member respondents showed similar responses patterns to reviewers for this section with all members indicating that these steps worked well. There was one exception where a CRC member indicated that seeking input for all discipline faculty did not work well

- Action- Add a stated step to the review process that says the reviewers will submit drafts to their deans.
- Action- Discuss review process and expectations with deans.

Action strategies- According to some preliminary coding of action strategies, 12% of actions did not appear to directly address the issue identified (e.g. create a certificate program when the enrollment for a single course is low). Very few action strategies listed measures of the effectiveness of the action strategies (see post-review meetings below for more detail addressing this issue).

When reviewers gave feedback via survey, we found that while they in general thought that involving other faculty worked well for preparing the responses to the main report, more were split when asked about preparing the action strategies. Five reviewers indicated that seeking input from faculty for action strategies worked well while two said it did not work well. The remaining steps relating to action strategies were reported as working well overall. The exception is that one reviewer thought that the balloting full time faculty for approval of action strategies did not work well.

CRC member responses reflected the reviewers. Three indicated that seeking input from faculty worked well while two indicated that it did not work well. All five responses to the remaining action strategy step questions indicated that these steps worked well.

Submitted: December 2014

- Action- Academic deans may need to help reviewers elicit feedback from discipline faculty regarding action strategies.
- Action- Reviewers should be advised to attach a deadline for balloting so that they may count non-responses as such after a reasonable amount of time has passed, to ensure the process is not held up by faculty who do not intend to participate.

Post-review meeting- Academic deans in some cases had little time to review the reports before the post-review meeting (see final report comments above). This meeting should focus on the action strategies of the review.

- Action- Set the expectation that each question on the action strategy forms will be carefully considered at the post review meetings.
- Action- Request that deans establish due dates with lead reviewers at the start of the process for draft report due dates to ensure there is ample time for dean feedback.

Signatures and ballots- The paper signature process took several months as the forms were sent around, lost, and resent. Nonresponse was reportedly widespread when balloting. Reviewers CC'd CSL on several voting communications that served as reminders as much as 4-6 weeks after the initial request to ballot was made. The same slow response time was seen for the CRC voting process. Overall, these issues caused the reviews to linger out into the summer months.

- Action- Graphic services has created an electronic signature page for the review report. The entire action strategy form including signatures is now in electronic PDF as well.
- Action- Request that the CRC voting process be attached to a deadline for voting to ensure timely processing of reports.
- Action- Recommend that reviewers indicate a voting deadline for the final report and action strategies and that anyone who has not voted by that deadline will be counted as a 'no response'.

Clarity in Communication

Posting and award letter- The posting and award letter were updated by CSL to include clarification regarding the expectation to attend a pre-review meeting, emphasis of organizing and leading discussions with fellow faculty, inclusion of more steps of the review process for general introduction, and the expectation to attend a post-review meeting. No additional actions are needed at this time.

Summary materials for lead reviewers- None were previously provided, with the exception of the steps listed on the cover page of review report. When lead reviewers were asked how easy or difficult it was to understand the process overall, 5 indicated somewhat or very easy and 3 indicated somewhat or very difficult. In contrast, the CRC members overall indicated that it was somewhat or very easy to understand the steps in the review process. This is an encouraging

result that suggests with additional communications to lead reviewers, they will likely be able to understand the review process, as the CRC members have had access to such information and reported ease in understanding the steps to the review process.

- Action- Created a lead review checklist, FAQ page, review handbook, and collaboration hints document. Will provide workshop for faculty, in addition to deans for added support for faculty. CRC members will also attend pre-review meetings to provide contact details for additional access to support.

Summary materials for deans- None were previously provided, with the exception of the steps listed on the cover page of review report. See actions listed under pre-review meeting.

- Action- Created a dean's checklist for review. Deans will also have access to the review handbook and will attend a workshop.

Summary materials for participating faculty- none were previously provided, with the exception of the steps listed on the cover page of review report. See actions listed under pre-review meeting.

- Action- Created a summary document for participating faculty with links to additional information.

Support

CSL-When asked about the level of collaboration reviewers had with CSL, 6 indicated a moderate to high level while two indicated that they did not collaborate with CSL. When asked about their satisfaction with their level of collaboration, 3 indicated dissatisfied and 5 indicated satisfied. One reviewer gave feedback regarding their dissatisfaction indicating that they would have liked to get the additional data they requested for use during the review process. CRC members were also asked about their satisfaction with their interactions with CSL. Four responded and indicated satisfied or very satisfied. As noted in other areas of this evaluation, one reviewers indicated that they did not get a timely response from CSL regarding requests for additional data. CSL discussed these issues with the reviewers at the post-review meeting to clarify the reasons why the requested data was not provided.

- Action- CSL will work to improve the clarity of communication throughout the review process and provide clear rationales of why additional data cannot be provided (via email with the dean cc'd) to help alleviate these miscommunications.

Dean- Seven reviewers who responded to the survey indicated they had a high level of collaboration with their dean and one indicated moderate. All reviewers who responded indicated that they were satisfied with the level of collaboration with their dean.

CRC- Four reviewers indicated that they had a high level of collaboration with the CRC, two indicated moderate, one indicate low and one indicated that they did not collaborate with the CRC. Six reviewers indicated that they were satisfied with the level of communication and one

indicated they were dissatisfied. One reviewer indicated that they felt as if the CRC was not involved in the review process, noting that they only saw CRC at the pre-review meeting. No actions are needed at this time.

Fellow Faculty- Some reviewers had difficulty getting input from fellow faculty while others were highly successful. On average across reviews scored by the CRC (by May 23, 2014), CRC members gave a 3.8/5 on their rubric item that states "There is evidence of discipline engagement". Between reports, average scores given by the CRC ranged from 2 to 5.

Survey responses from the lead faculty reviewers supported this notion that engagement varied by discipline. When asked if the pre-review meeting (with all discipline faculty) step worked well, two reviewers (25% of respondents) indicated it did not work well. When asked if the step to seek input from all discipline faculty worked well or not, only one of the eight respondents indicated that it did not work well. When asked about seeking input from all discipline faculty for action strategies, two of the seven responses indicate that it did not work well. In open comments section of the survey, one lead reviewer notes that:

"When asking for discipline feedback I ran into several problems. Mostly the discipline was reluctant to read a 28 page document. Also, not a single adjunct faculty gave their input after the initial meeting."

Another reviewer shared a similar sentiment, noting a lack of full-time faculty to assist with the review.

When asked about their level of collaboration with faculty in their discipline, 6 reviewers indicated a moderate to high level, one indicated low and one indicated that they did not collaborate with faculty in their discipline. Seven reviewers indicated that they were satisfied with the level of collaboration and one indicated dissatisfied. When asked why they were dissatisfied, one reviewer replied:

"Let it be stated that one member of the discipline was outstanding with their feedback. The rest of the discipline was split into two groups. One group helped marginally. The other group did not help until the action strategies were being developed."

When the CRC members were surveyed, five indicated that the pre-review meeting worked well and one indicated it did not work well. Four indicated that seeking input from discipline faculty worked well and one indicated that it did not work well. Again when asked about seeking input from faculty regarding action strategies, two members indicated that it did not work well and three indicated that it worked well. When asked why these steps didn't work well, one member indicated that:

"More faculty [are needed] at pre-review meeting, greater input from all faculty in the discipline/program"

Submitted: December 2014

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

- Action- A letter for fellow faculty has been created and will be passed on through the lead reviewer or dean to help explain the review process and where to go for additional information. The FAQs will also be available to this group.
- Action- Review documentation will clearly define an expectation for involvement of all faculty and hints for increasing collaboration will be shared with reviewers.
- Action- FMA language will be reviewed and recommendations made to communicate the expectation that all faculty participate in the review process.
- Action- Deans will be alerted of this potential issue early on in the review process and during their review workshop.

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

EVALUATION OF REPORT

Section 1 Past Initiatives

This section varied depending on the program or discipline under review. The goal of this section was to insert any accrediting agency or advisory committee recommendations, or recommendations from past curriculum reviews. This section was intended to 'close the loop' on past initiatives. However, very few programs and disciplines have past reviews and some of these reviews did not result in a list of action strategies. Also, moving forward with the revised review process, action strategies from review will be tracked on an ongoing basis and will not need to be followed-up on in the actual review (although reviewers are welcome to reference these anywhere in the report). Disciplines typically do not have accreditation or advisory committees and so most disciplines were offered an open-ended question to simply describe past initiatives and impacts. Also, very few programs have external accreditation and many may not have advisory committees (and if they do, they may decide not to act on recommendations made by this group).

Based on CSL rubric scores from 11 reviews, section one had some of the lowest rubric scores overall (62% of possible points earned on the CSL rubric). It appeared that reviewers had trouble linking actions to the impact on an issue.

Reviewers responded to survey questions regarding clarity of questions in each section and the ease of interpreting data. For this section of the review report, four reviewers indicated that the questions were very clear, three indicated somewhat clear, and one indicated somewhat unclear. Three indicated that the data/information was very or somewhat easy to interpret while five reviewers indicated that it was difficult. Interestingly, out of all reviews in 2013-14, only four were provided with data/information in this section of the report. Because the survey is anonymous, we do not know if the reviewers who indicated that it was difficult actually saw data in this section, but the discrepant numbers (i.e. five reviewers indicated it was difficult to interpret data but only four reviewers were given data in this section) indicate that the survey questions used to collect this data may have confused respondents. In other words, respondents may have been speaking more generally about data in their response to these questions instead of focusing specifically on section 1. One reviewer had an informative comment:

"The data was difficult to interpret because I have been a full time faculty member here for only X years and I feel that I do not know the history of the that discipline well. So, these numbers sometimes need to be interpreted with a historical perspective to understand what is truly occurring from a social or economic perspective."

Again though, the reviewer mentions numbers and no numbers were shown in section one. Still yet, this comment indicates the importance of considering the historical context when interpreting data.

Submitted: December 2014

CRC members (via survey) did not indicate any clarity or interpretation concerns for this section.

- Action- Emphasis needs to be placed on the *impact* of the actions on the program, address in the workshop.
- Action- Consistent with other reviewer comments later in this report, responses may improve in this section is more probing questions are provided.

Section 2 Student Learning Assessment

Alignment of outcomes

The lowest CSL rubric scores (54% points earned on CSL rubric) were seen for the alignment of outcomes with employer, transfer and professional organizations. Overall, evidence of alignment was lacking. Questions did not ask faculty to cite language from these sources. Responses were highly anecdotal. CRC members did not indicate any clarity or interpretation concerns for this section.

- Action- Discuss review process and expectations with deans.

Trends and Impact

Rubric scores were low in the section as well (69% of points earned on CSL rubric). Faculty seemed to have difficulty interpreting trends in student learning, most likely because assessment outcomes and plans were out of date and data may not have been collected for several years. In other words, the assessment plan and implementation needed revision before faculty would be able to use these results to draw conclusion.

Reviewers were asked in general to rate the clarity of the questions for section 2. Two reviewers indicated that they reviewed program student learning outcomes in their review. When asked about the clarity of questions both indicated either somewhat or very clear. Both also indicated that the data/information was somewhat difficult to interpret. However, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the question sin this section since they varied by report. Standardization would help improve this issue.

CRC members did not indicate any clarity or interpretation concerns for this section in their survey.

- Action- Discuss how to interpret trends in student learning in the workshop.
- Action- Allow reviewers to review their plans and implementation when plans are non-compliant (i.e. no results submitted, plan out of date).The SOAC rubric can be used to

score the assessment plans. The assessment coordinator may need to meet with the reviewers to assist with this activity. Action plans then would be to improve implementation and the overall plan.

Section 3 Common Course Outcomes

Rubric scores were higher in this section on the CSL rubric (76% of points were earned). Sometimes, the reviewer states that there are outcomes, but they do not insert the outcomes into the review as requested. Responses regarding the next steps for creating outcomes were fairly incomplete for most reviews.

Reviewers were split on their feelings about this section in the survey. Five indicated the questions were clear and three indicated unclear. Four indicated the data/information was difficult to interpret and four indicated it was easy. One reviewer provided a helpful bit of feedback about the "questions" asked in this section:

"There was no data. Also, there were no questions - there were statements. I think that other people would have a difficult time filling in this section because they are not used to writing discussions. The way these are written I bet you get a lot of reviewers who write very simple answers."

One CRC member indicated that the data in this section was difficult to interpret. No other concerns arose from CRC members regarding this section.

Finally, reviewers were able to simply state that they did or did not have outcomes, benchmarks, and assessment methods. Future reviews could ask that these be created as a part of the review, which will help the college reach its goals for assessment and meet accreditation requirements.

- Action- For any areas of the review that ask for a general discussion, more discussion prompts should be provided to aid the reviewer in generating their response.
- Action- Request that reviewers create outcomes or benchmarks & methods as a part of this review.

Section 4 Enrollment

Rubric scores were strong in this section on the CSL rubric (80% of points were earned). Some reviewers were able to pull together many pieces of information to help identify reasons for enrollment trends, while others cited popularity and lack of marketing as reasons for low fill rates.

Submitted: December 2014

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

In the reviewer survey, six reviewers indicated that the questions were very or somewhat clear and one indicated unclear. Three indicated that the data was easy to interpret and four indicated that it was difficult. One reviewer indicated that it was difficult to interpret because the *"data were not consistent and congruent"*, although the meaning of this comment is not fully clear.

CSL did have three reviewers ask questions about this section and it was realized that reviewers thought that the academic year used in the review included both summer sessions from the same calendar year when it in fact did not. Perhaps this is the context for this reviewer's comment above. Another reviewer provided a comment about this section in the survey:

"The graphs were very easy to read. The purpose behind the number of seats offered by academic year is not easy to read and should be re-worked if possible so that people who are not used to reading data can be successful in this section. When asked if the questions are clear - no they are not. There is one question in this section, "What are the possible factors that helped these courses meet the benchmark?". If you ask this question you are going to get a list from most people. Somewhere through this process you need to tell people what you expect. That this needs to be more than just a list. There needs to be a discussion as to WHY the discipline believes some factor is helping courses meet the benchmark."

CRC members did not indicate any clarity or interpretation concerns for this section.

- Action- In the workshop, address interpretation and consider likely factors that impact course fill rates and connect to the reason of why the factors are believed to be impacting the course fill rates.
- Action- In the workshop, emphasize practical solutions that will impact course fill rates directly.
- Action- Revise data tables and show by term. Revise academic year definition to include fall, winter and both summer sessions.

Section 5 Completions

More assistance may be needed here as well (77% of points earned on CSL rubric). When benchmarks are not met, there needs to be a clear action strategy that will typically identify multiple factors that are affecting the rates. Marketing was commonly cited as the reason for lack of graduates, along with graduation application fees. Some faculty misinterpreted completions to mean 'number of students who took all the program-specific courses'.

Three reviewers indicated that they had program completions in their review. All three indicated that the questions were clear, but two indicated that the data was difficult to interpret (one indicated easy).

Recommendation for Removal of EMP Objective

Objective #2 – Program Review Process

CRC members did not indicate any clarity or interpretation concerns for this section.

- Action- Additional language is needed to communicate that completion in this review refers to 'number of degrees granted'.
- Action- CSL is preparing a marketing worksheet for faculty that shows all the ways in which they can market their programs independently of the marketing department at OCC. This list of options is expected to strengthen marketing action strategies.
- Action- Academic deans need to clearly communicate to programs that OCC is <u>NOT</u> expecting all programs to continuously increase in size. Ideal operating sizes need to be addressed, perhaps even identified in the review. When actions to increase size are listed, perhaps faculty could be asked to consider total cost to increase sections, support services and equipment to accommodate the increase in students.

Section 6 Curriculum Design

This section had the highest CSL rubric scores overall (91% of points earned), likely because it required review of familiar information (e.g. course descriptions rather than enrollment data). A need for syllabi review has been expressed around the college, whether it could be included here or not is undetermined.

Seven reviews indicated that the questions were clear in this section and one indicated somewhat unclear. Seven indicated that the data/information was easy to interpret and one indicated very difficult. One reviewer gave feedback about why it was difficult to interpret the data/information noting that the focus of the section is a bit narrow and suggested to:

"Tell the lead reviewer that the questions are just a starting point - that they are encouraged to use this as a basis for discussion and extend beyond these canned questions."

CRC members did not indicate any clarity or interpretation concerns for this section.

- Action- Clarify in workshops and in the review instructions that faculty are welcome to go beyond the questions asked and that these questions are just a starting point for the discussion.

Section 7 Community Need

The reviewer survey asked in general about the community need section questions and data/information, because this area of the report varied by program/discipline. Reviewers were split in their feelings about this section. Five indicated the questions were clear and three indicated unclear. Three indicated that data was easy to interpret and five indicated that it was difficult. Unfortunately, we were unable to collect any more detail about this area. However, the open-ended responses from lead reviewers regarding this section provide a bit more detail:

1. *"Some of the data offered did not seem relevant to the program regarding community needs. Also, I found the data offered not to be representative of the true employment/workforce needs."*
2. *"First of all the questions on here related only to transferability. They did not touch on student interest and I think that transferability is only one facet of community need. Doesn't community need also encompass the need for new courses? Are we currently meeting student need with what we have now? Are non-majors interested in taking our courses? Also, the only part of the data that I found difficult to interpret was the section where the courses were listed as prerequisites for other classes or programs. First of all this section is not clear because the the program titles are not given (just the abbreviations). Also, I was surprised to see that one of our classes is a prerequisite for another. I asked someone in that discipline if our class is a prerequisite for theirs and they said no! Thus, I would have liked to have seen more than a YES/NO in one of the*

tables (which need titles buy the way or at least numbers) so that I could learn more about where these classes are being used."

3. *"This data was grossly inaccurate, and if were to be used as a leveling of the community need it would skew the data."*

4. *"Agenda driven, no hard numbers ins ales graph only. No methodology. Inconsistent with all other available data. Any questions to OSA treated as personal insults to them."*

Based on this feedback, it is clear that some reviewers had difficultly believing the accuracy of the data presented and failed to see the connection of this data to community need and student interest.

CRC members did not indicate any clarity or interpretation concerns for this section (all four responses indicated somewhat easy to interpret data in this section). This was surprising considering the feedback from the reviewers who indicated that this section was difficult. It may be that the concerns regarding the alleged political agenda of the curriculum review biased reviewers toward this section and affected their feedback. It is likely that with more outreach and education about review and this section in particular will help alleviate these issues. These actions are already defined in other areas of this evaluation.

Employment Prospects

This area resulted in some of the poorest rubric scores (63% of points were earned on the CSL rubric). Several faculty challenged the data shown in their responses (rather than brining this concern to their dean, CRC, or CSL) and failed to respond to the questions presented. Overall, it seemed that a lack of detailed information made the data more questionable than helpful.

- Action- Revisions will include additional details regarding the data shown in the review and more information will be covered in the workshop and to the dean as well.
- Action- Faculty will be asked to review the program CIP and occupational SOCs linked to the program for appropriateness; this will reduce suspicion of the data since faculty will have more information about what is included.

Transferability

This section saw some of the highest rubric scores (93% of points were earned on the CSL rubric for transferability). Faculty came up with interesting reasons for why courses may not transfer and all created an action strategy for improvement of transferability as relevant. One reviewer expressed concerns about the data presented in this section of the review report in conversation during the review process. This reviewer was offered the option to remove this data from the report initially. The reviewer may not have understood this option clearly, because they opted to leave this data in the report, but still expressed concerns to the college community about the relevancy of this data that they were being held accountable for. The reviewer was reminded again that they may choose to eliminate this information from their

report or they are welcome to provide a rationale of why this data is not suitable to their program. Currently at the college, there is no clear positions regarding which courses and programs should and should not transfer. Faculty should consider whether transfer is an intention of their program and if so, transfer to which institutions.

- Action- CSL will communicate this more clearly during the pre-review meetings and to the deans. CSL will prepare relevant transfer data upon request for reviews.

Program Requirements

This section had two foci. Some faculty were asked to address the community need of personal interest courses, although responses consistently addressed the course content and not how the credit is applied by students. The second aspect of this section was the collaboration with other disciplines that use the courses under review. Faculty seemed pleased to be provided this information overall and many created action strategies for increasing collaboration. This section also saw high rubric scores (94% of points were earned on the CSL rubric).

- Action- Discuss with deans; encourage faculty to consider credit and not content.

Section 8 Strengths, Challenges & Future Directions

For this section, 71% of points were earned on the CSL rubric. CSL observed that some faculty gave detailed plans while others gave brief summaries of a few future directions with no indication of prioritization. All lead reviewers who responded to the survey indicated that the questions in this section were clear. However, the actual responses to these questions differed from what CSL and CRC intended. This indicates that additional clarity in the questions is needed to elicit future plans that consider a broad range of issues. One reviewer who provided open-ended feedback at the end of the survey said this about section 8:

"The last set of questions in the strengths, challenges and conclusions sections are not clear because someone who is not used to writing discussions is going to give you some silly list. The way to get what you want is to make sure the expectation is communicated appropriately. If you want more than a list then you need to put something like, "From this review, discuss the major strengths of the discipline. Elaborate using examples from the review and reference those examples." Do you see how the question above is different from, "What are the major strengths of this discipline?""

CRC members did not indicate any clarity or interpretation concerns for this section.

- Action- Revise instructions in section 8 to communicate more specific expectations that disciplines consider future directions relating to a variety of priority areas.

REVIEW OUTCOMES

Synthesis & Conclusions

All eight reviewers that responded to the survey indicated that they strongly agree to the statement, "I was able to discover areas that needed improvement because of this review". This is an encouraging response to observe. It indicates that while we have demonstrated through this evaluation that improvements can be made to the process and reports, that overall the faculty reviewers believed the process helped them discover what needed to be improved. It appears that the CRC members shared this sentiment. Four members agreed that "lead faculty reviewers were able to discover areas that needed improvement because of this review. No members disagreed with this statement.

Using the CRC member rubrics, we averaged the rubric scores for each review and took an overall average for all reviews. For the item 'data were used to support responses where appropriate', which addresses in part the level of synthesis of available materials, CRC members gave an average score of 4/5 to the reviews, with the average score for the various reviews ranging between 2.6 and 4.5. The average indicates that overall, reviewers used data to support their responses with a few exceptions in certain reviews where overall reviewers received low scores on this item.

CRC members also scored a rubric item, "answers were focused on the needs of the student and the community." The average score across all reviews was again 4/5, but the range was higher this time (3-5) across the different reviews. Taken with the above result, we might conclude that reviewers were able to maintain a broad perspective, but some reviewers lacked the ability to synthesize data to inform these perspectives.

Finally, CRC members scored the item "answers given to questions were relevant and focused." While this item score may vary by report section, overall scores provided by CRC show that there are some reviewers who could have benefited from some additional support (average overall scores 3.97/5 with a range 2.6-4.75).

- Action- The review workshop needs to address the way in which data should be used to answer questions within the review. Examples from past reviews that synthesized information in their responses should be shared with future reviewers.
- Action- Involvement of the dean will be beneficial for eliciting more focused responses. Previously described actions in this report will address this issue.

Action Strategy Outcomes

Seven of the eight reviewers who responded to the survey indicated that they strongly agree that "the action strategies that came out of this review will most likely lead to improvement in

my program or discipline". One reviewer indicated that they somewhat disagree with this statement.

All four CRC members (who responded to this question in the survey) agreed with the statement that "The action strategies that came out of the reviews will most likely lead to improvement in programs and disciplines."

CRC member rubric scores to the item "responses provide basis for development of measurable action strategies" averaged again around 4/5 across all reviews. The range was wider than seen for other rubric items (1.6 to 5), suggesting that some reviewers specifically had trouble describing issues in such a way that lead to an obvious action strategy.

More time is needed to continue to review the action strategies and their impacts. Action strategies from previous years have not been tracked to date, so no conclusions can be drawn as of today. CSL is currently meeting with academic deans to review these strategies. Deans will be meeting with the faculty to check in on the progress or determine any revisions needed. Deans will provide these updates to CSL in the next 12 months.

Submitted: December 2014