**Academic Program Review**

**Review Panel Report for CIS**

|  |
| --- |
| **Date of Review: 10/23/17**  **Names and positions of reviewers:**  **Member Kolette Draegan Position Professor of English, Literature, and Gender Studies**  **Member Devin Fraley Position Interim Science Division Chair/Professor of Biology**  **Member Chris Demaline Position Professor of Business** |
| **Evaluation of Program Description, Vision and Outcomes** |
| Clarity and appropriateness of all program descriptions, mission or vision statements:   * CSLO’s: How do the programs contribute to them? * The mission/vision/description focus on Gainful Employment. However, considering the Curriculum Comparison Charts and the different courses offered by different colleges, can any related coursework be substituted into the program so as to also benefit the transferability of the Degree program? If transferability is not an option, and this degree/certificate will only aim to get students into the workforce, does the degree vs. certificate play a significant difference in students’ opportunities? If so, are both the degree and certificate programs necessary? In other words, how does the mission of the degree program compare/contrast with the certificate program? * Under the Program Effectiveness header, it states that the programming degree is articulated to NAU; in another place, it states that students can transfer to UA Informatics. Can/should transfer pathways be incorporated into the mission/vision/program description of the degree program? |
| Clarity and appropriateness of all degree and/or certificate program student learning outcomes:   * CSLO’s need to be added to: Programing Degree/Certificate. The outcomes listed did not state whether they were for the degree or the certificate. * The individual MSLO’s were well stated. * The appropriateness of the outcomes could be solidified if an authoritative source was identified and used to determine the necessary skills required for an entry-level computer programmer or IT position. Does the Business Division Advisory Board that meets once/year ensure these MSLOs are in agreement with expectations in the industry? |
| **Evaluation of Program Quality** |
| Quality and Appropriateness of Curriculum:   * The comparison charts for the A.A.S Degree and certificate shows that the programs are comparable with other similar college programs. * Would be helpful if the comparable courses in the Certificate & Degree Comparison Charts were aligned horizontally (e.g., CIS 120, Survey of CIS is in the second row for CAC, but on the first row for MCC/CGCC. Difficult for me to assess how comparable the programs are. There appear to be some significant differences between CAC, PCC, and Maricopa Colleges in the types of courses required – does one better match needs of the industry? * In the Degree comparison, CAC requires BUS courses that none of the other colleges do. Are these courses important for the degree? |
| Contribution of Program in Meeting Institutional Strategic Goals:   * Since the programs seem to address areas with significant future job growth in the area (per EMSI report), this program does seem to help the College’s meet its strategic goals – in particular – goal 2. The program review also notes how the program contributes to meeting other institutional goals. These explanations could be expanded to provide more specifics. |
| Success of Program in Engaging in Continuous Quality Improvement:   * The self-study demonstrates that many efforts have been made to recruit students and market the program by the division. May want to seek additional means to have programs more broadly marketed by the college. * Previous assessments for CIS120 provided significant quantitative feedback for the program. So, a similar plan should be implemented in the future. * The QM design methodology and student evaluations are good tools. Is there a way that the program could gather and organize student feedback over time so that future course adjustments can be based on trends that appear? * The report states that the program is consistent with division-level operating goals. More quantitative information should have been provided to support these statements. For instance, what were the results of the Operational Plans in the past 5 years? How successful were you in achieving the goals set? * Since the program description seems to focus on preparing students to enter the IT industry workforce locally, what efforts have been made to obtain feedback from these local employers? If none, how might this be integrated into determining the program’s purpose and effectiveness? |
| **Evaluation of Program Effectiveness** |
| Success of Students in Achieving Appropriate Learning Outcomes**:**   * Previous assessments for CIS120 provided significant quantitative feedback for the program. So, a similar plan should be implemented in the future. * The report states that the program will add an Object-Oriented Design and Programming class will be added. This will serve as the capstone course. So, this course will provide a means to assess all graduating students on the program’s MSLO’s and ensures that the graduates are competent in those areas. * In one place, the self-study indicates that no mechanism is currently in place to track students’ transfer to institutions, but under Program Effectiveness, it states the # of program enrollees or graduates who studied at an in-state baccalaureate level institution – where did this data come from? Your program graduation rate trends also indicate less students graduated than studied at baccalaureate level institutions – are students just taking coursework and just transferring what they can get here to get a baccalaureate degree without an associate’s? * Low numbers of students completing the cert (as opposed to the degree) – only 1 student the past 3 years. Is it necessary to keep the certificate? Perhaps go with the degree only? |
| Success of Students in Completing CAC Program:   * Narrative information discussing why students were successful was presented. * Graduate trends were noted. It would be beneficial to see quantitative data representing success rates of students that started the program. |
| Success of Students Upon Departure from CAC:   * No qualitative or quantitative data was provided. Could surveys be given to former students to see if they went on to get their 4-year degree and if they are employed in the field? * Quantitative data showed the number of enrollees/graduates at an in-state baccalaureate level institution – contrasts with later statements that formal, regularly collected data is not available. * An idea would be to obtain anecdotal information from program graduates. |
| **Evaluation of Program Viability** |
| Evaluation of Enrollment Trends:   * The trends are steady or increasing and the demand for IT graduates is strong. * It was stated that this is the plan anyway, but would like to see # of students ‘declaring’ this cert/degree vs. # of graduates. The first table showing headcount across all CIS courses doesn’t give a strong look at how many are successful in the program and who wants to complete it. |
| Evaluation of Need for Program Based on Economic/Job Market Conditions or Transfer Opportunities:   * EMSI statistics show that there is a strong demand for IT graduates * The self-study does not indicate any specific efforts to connect with Pinal county business to determine specific industry needs locally and ensure curriculum provides students with the skills to fill those needs. Since workforce development is a primary focus of this program, relevant workforce information would bolster the viability of the program. |
| Evaluation of Program Viability Based on Adequacy of Resources:   * The program benefits from strong human capital * The program may benefit from a budget that is separate from the IT department * SPC seems to be well supported with faculty, support staff, and labs. Are there plan to expand or shift resources to other campuses to support district-wide offerings? * Program representatives may want to seek further resources to ensure that curriculum in sufficiently updated. * A detailed budget of short-term and long-term budgetary needs should be drafted as part of the program’s planning process. * Descriptions under “Program Alignment with Institutional Goals” state that the program, “provides current and relevant technology” and “…quality access to education tools…” These descriptions do not appear to align with the descriptions under “Program Specific Resources.” The misalignment is likely a budgetary issue. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Indicate Panel Reviewers Recommendation for Program:** |
| Degree - Score = 2. The review team felt like there were a few missing items in the self-study, but felt that the strengths of the program significantly outweighed any program needs. Therefore, a score of 2 – approval is recommended for the degree.    Certificate - Score = 3. Perhaps the certificate program is no longer viable, rendering it unnecessary at this point. There is evidence that the degree program is gaining momentum; perhaps this should be the focus. Therefore, a score of 3 - conditionally continue a certificate *or* discontinue the certificate. |
| **Panel Reviewers Make One of the Following Recommendations Regarding the Program Under Review:**  **1. Continue a Program of Exceptional Quality:** Continuation of the program is recommended without reservation. The reviewers wish to note the exceptional quality of the program. The program is not only seen as valuable to CAC students, a commitment to student’s academic and personal success is clearly evident. The program demonstrates a commitment to continuous quality improvement. The long term viability of the program appears excellent.  **2. Continue a Program of Quality:** Program approval is recommended. Reviews have identified areas of achievement but also specific areas that need to be further addressed. The program meets all evaluative measures of quality and viability, but nonetheless could improve in substantial ways  **3. Conditionally Continue a Program:** Conditional approval is recommended with identification of specific areas requiring significant improvement. Improvements needed and a reasonable time frame for them to be made will be given. Viability of the program may be in question.  **4. Discontinue a Program:** A recommendation to discontinue a program is made if after receiving a conditional recommendation in the previous academic program review the program has failed to make necessary improvements. A recommendation to discontinue a program can be made even in the absence of a previous conditional recommendation if the quality or viability of a program is dismal. *\*Receiving this recommendation does not automatically mean a program will be discontinued. It is merely the recommendation of the review panel. This recommendation means that the College should seriously evaluate discontinuing the program.* |
| **Panel Reviewers Recommendation for Program Action Plan:** |
| The reviewers noted the strengths of the program in the comments for each section, and would like to recommend the following actions to be considered when working with the dean to develop an action plan as a result of the Academic Program Review process.  **Strengths:**  Refer to the individual feedback sections  **Action Plan Recommendations: (**Refer to the individual feedback sections)   * Consider involvement in the College’s upcoming online certification for instructors to increase effectiveness of online courses. * Consider developing guided pathways to address issue with students being advised incorrectly. Guided pathways will also positively impact program completion and bring the program and college into alignment with current trends in higher education, specifically community colleges. * Develop industry relationships within Pinal County. * The program may benefit from a budget that is separate from the IT department * Obtain anecdotal information from program graduates. * CSLO’s need to be added to: Programing Degree/Certificate. The outcomes listed did not state whether they were for the degree or the certificate. * CSLO’s need to be added to: Programing Degree/Certificate. The outcomes listed did not state whether they were for the degree or the certificate. * There is evidence that the degree program is gaining momentum; perhaps this should be the focus rather than the certificate. |