**Academic Program Review Peer Review Panel Report - Rubric, Comments and Recommendations**

**Date of Review: 9/14/18**

**Names and positions of reviewers:**

**Member Beverly Demaline Position Math Faculty**

**Member Carl Tidwell Position CIS Faculty**

**Member Samuli Rauhalammi Position Biology Faculty**

**Member Position**

**I. Program Description, Vision and Outcomes**

1. Does the program description provide the following information?

1. A synopsis of the program and curricular outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

c) Program certifications, accreditations and awards

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

d) The skills that graduates from the program will attain

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

***Comments on the program’s description***

Program of study maps are posted on the CLA webpage. Although I see the program learning outcomes listed in the program review, I was unable to locate them on the CLA webpage or any place accessible to students.

(1a) General description of clinical laboratory assistant’s (CLA’s) role is provided in the self-study. It might be worthwhile to include the program synopsis/description from the web-site[[1]](#footnote-1). *This is an excellent piece of text that can be well re-used in this context.*

(1c) Please, also include in self-study that the program prepares students to be eligible for the national CLA certification exam. *This is something that the program surely wants to highlight.*

(1d) Adding the program synopsis/description from the web-site, as recommended in (1a) will help to address this point. *This is something that the program may want to clarify/boast about.*

2. Does the program have a mission and/or a vision statement? If so, are the program’s mission or vision statements clear and reflective of the program?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

3. Is the program aligned with the college’s mission, vision, and strategic goals?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

***Comments on the program’s mission/vision statement and alignment to college’s mission/vision statement***

While the catalog description explains what is a CLA and the CLA webpage states students will be prepared for a career in healthcare, there is not a specific mission or vision statement listed in either. It would be helpful to have a specific program mission statement that aligns with CAC’s mission statement.

*Very restrictive in that pathways to four year degrees are not discussed. MLT have the opportunity to continue work towards a bachelors in Medical Technology. No discussion of this option is covered.*

(2) While this is a good general statement (and, matches directly that from the web-site), it is not clearly specified as a mission and/or vision statement. It seems to be further considered in the following (3) question. *Please, clarify as mission/vision.*

In self-study, no indication given where the mission and vision appear!

(3) The alignments of program & CAC’s mission and vision is sufficient. Especially, considering that College’s previous vision and mission were wordy and somewhat ambiguous. *Please, note that College has a new mission and vision.*

**II. Program Enrollment and Graduation Trends**

1. Has the program enrollment trends for the program increased, remained consistent or decreased?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Increasing* | 2 | *Consistent* | 1 | *Decreasing* |

2. Were the factors influencing enrollment trends discussed?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *No information was given* |

3. Was information given on how the program typically recruits students and markets the program?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *No information was given* |

4. Have the graduation rates increased in the past 5 years?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Increasing* | 2 | *Consistent* | 1 | *Decreasing* |

5. Has the number of program enrollees or graduates who studied at an in-state baccalaureate level institution during the past 5 years increased, stayed consistent or decreased?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Increasing* | 2 | *Consistent* | 1 | *Decreasing* |

6. Were graduation trends and efforts to help students to help students achieve completion addressed?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *No information was given* |

7. Was a summary of the Program Enrollment and Graduation Trends provided and was there a reflection of areas of strengths and improvement for the program.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *No information was given* |

***Comments on the programs enrollment and graduation trends***

The program advises and registers their own students and meets with current students monthly to counsel and keep student focused on their career and educational goals. The program’s recruitment efforts are limited to “word of mouth and networking”.

(1) Program is steadily growing, indicating a positive trend. *Excellent work!*

(2) Although the self-study indicates ‘employment market, media and networking/word-of-mouth’ as
the factors influencing the enrollment trends, further details could be provided.

For example: • What is happening with the employment market?

 • What type of networking? Where?

 • Is networking/word-of-mouth a typical method of program recruitment in this field?

 *Please, provide further clarifying details.*

(3) Program identifies as recruiting through ‘word-of-mouth and networking.’ However, this is a very general comment. Who does the networking, where? Whose word-of-mouth? Students? Faculty?

 *Based on the answers, there might be room for improving recruitment strategies here. Collaborating with the marketing/recruitment and advisors may be an avenue to explore. This would make a good addition to the operational plan, and a justification for resources invested in this.*

(4) Graduation rates increasing – calls to be commended! *Excellent work!*

(5) Unclear what to comment here. Consistent?

(6) Self-study addresses the graduation trends in a general level as being due to: ‘student’s personal conflicts in staying connected.’ This is rather vague, and with as small cohorts as in CLA, one could expect that
the program Faculty/administration would be able to provide further clarification. *Please, specify further.*

New efforts put in to help students appear outstanding; especially through improved advising (of tutoring and other assistance). *Please, be proud of this and continue the great work!*

(7) These comments provide more in-depth clarification for question(s) (e.g. 6) addressed rather vaguely before, this calls to be commended. Could still do possibly expand a bit further, for example: What were the Financial Assistance issues – and, importantly, what can CAC do to help with them? *Good start, keep expanding.*

Great reflection in the improvements achieved through advising. Seems like the CLA program is well in charge of their own advising. *Keep up the great work!*

**III. Program Curriculum**

1. Was a curriculum comparison chart provided for each degree and certificate in the program?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *All were included*  | 2 | *Missing one or more*  | 1 | *Not included*  |

2. After reviewing the Curriculum Comparison Charts of the other institutions was information given into courses that could be added, combined or deleted for the certificate and/or the degree?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

3. Was any information given as to possible revisions to the courses description, articulation, additions, revisions or deletions anticipated?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

***Comments on program curriculum***

A table was included but it wasn’t clear which column represents CAC. I assumed the first column was CAC but the course codes didn’t match the courses listed in the catalog or program of study so I was confused.

*Under stresses the opportunities for further education. Bechelors, Masters and PhDs in Clinical Pathology.*

(1) Provides a curriculum comparison for three institutes and four certificates in total. This exceeds
the requirement of self-study, suggesting the program being well aware of what other institutions are offering/doing. *Excellent!*

It could have been beneficial to include CAC’s course offerings to the comparison table as an additional column, rather than just addressing this verbally. *Add a column for CAC.*

(2) Slightly unclear answer to this question, but from what I can gather, it appears that the certificate program offered by CAC has a benefit of allowing students to have transferrable credits for University level studies. However, solely based on the self-study, it remains unclear as for how does this compare to other institutions. *Please, clarify.*

(3) Self-study mentions that none are relevant. *OK.*

**IV.** **Program Outcomes and Assessment**

1. Are the student learning outcomes for the program provided and are they relevant to the programs goals?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

2. Are any of the program outcomes determined or influenced by any external organization, agency or accreditor identified and explained. If not, mark not applicable (NA)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* | *NA* | *Not applicable* |

3. Are department/program strategies for determining how to assess learning outcomes described and is information provided on how assessment results are collected, analyzed and discussed?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

4. Is a common assessment being conducted to assess the MSLO’s for a common course in the program?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

5. Is a common assessment being conducted to assess the CSLO’s for a common course in the program? Is data included on the results?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

6. Is an explanation provided on how MSLO and CSLO assessment results have been used to improve instruction and/or student learning over the past 5 years?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

7. Was information given on how the program supports current or future needs for the job market in Pinal County, the state and/or the United States?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

8. Was information provided on whether there are any specific in-state baccalaureate programs into which this program is particularly suited for transfer, and/or if there are any articulation agreements in place for a degree graduates?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

9. Was information given on how the program gets feedback on its program and curriculum from external sources such as advisory boards, employers, articulation task forces, accreditors, etc.?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

***Comments on Program Outcomes and Assessments***

Are the program outcomes aligned with the national certification exam (NAACLS)? How can we get CAC listed as an approved program on the NAACLS website?

<https://www.naacls.org/Find-a-Program.aspx>

 The primary method for assessing the program is through clinical evaluations. While this sounds like an excellent assessment it is not clear how the data is compiled and used to make program improvements.

 It’s not really discussed but the job outlook for a CLA looks good.

<https://www.bls.gov/ooh/healthcare/medical-and-clinical-laboratory-technologists-and-technicians.htm>

<https://learn.org/articles/Clinical_Lab_Technician_Career_Profile_Job_Outlook_and_Training_Requirements.html>

<https://www.azeconomy.org/data/pinal-county/>



 Arizona State has an established bachelors program for Medical Technologist. No discussion covered this.

(1) Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are defined on a general level, but not reflecting the level of detail that is typical in other CAC programs. *Please, see example and consider having more detailed SLOs.*

(2) The self-study refers to National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences (NAACLS), which certainly seems to be a key influencer/determination for CAC’s CLA program outcomes. However, rather than using copy-paste (to a level of formatting!) to include sections from NAACLS document (p.79), it might be more beneficial to explain this agency’s major role for our program outcomes.

 *Consider re-writing this section.*

No reference made as for if there are other accrediting agencies. *Please, consider clarifying.*

(3) Generic phrase provided. However, please provide concrete description(s) as for what assessment method(s) is/are used, how data is collected/analyzed/acted upon.

For example: using a capstone test to collect qualitative and/or quantitative data – one learning outcome assessed by each test question.

This is something that VP of Academic Affairs has asked each Division to do, and it will become increasingly more important in future. *Please, consider coming up with a specific strategy for this.*

(4) From the answer given it is unclear if a common assessment is being conducted to assess Measurable Student Learning Outcomes (MSLOs). *Please, clarify.*

(5) From the answer provided it is impossible to know if common assessment is being conducted to assess Common Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs). *Rather than repeating the same answer four times (as
a copy-paste), please clarify.*

(6) These general statements may be good and valid, but fail to answer the question presented:
If assessments have been conducted at CAC4, how results have been used to improve instruction and/or student learning. *Please, address the question asked. – This is CAC specific, not a general field relevant question.*

(7) Answer provided in the self-assessment addresses the hiring rate (%) of graduates. Further discussion of the job market would significantly strengthen this answer. *Consider working more on this answer.*

(8) Answers the question of in-state transfer programs are fairly general, but good. *Use of actual examples (of transfer program course codes etc.) would significantly improve this answer.*

(9) Self-study mentions an advisory board and collecting written input from site supervisors. This is strong evidence of an aim for a continuous improvement. *I am left unconvinced if it goes beyond the required level. (Maybe there are further aspects that could be addressed to showcase this?)*

**V. Program Specific Resources**

1. Was the adequacy of the budgetary resources, human resources, technological resources, classrooms, labs and space, academic support for students over the past 5 years evaluated?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

2. Were future goals identified along with the extra resources and funding that would be required to achieve it?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

***Comments on program specific resources***

The program lists several future goals including opening a lab at the Casa Grande Center using CAC

CLA students to collect and run samples and CAC HIM students to register patients.

(1) Self-study addresses all aspects of resources. Answers are provided on a general level. *Sufficient; to become exemplary more detail would be needed.*

(2) This is an exemplary answer, showing clear evidence of a long-term plans to develop the program both in size and scope. Especially delightful to see plans for cross-program collaborations. *Fantastic plans, I am thrilled to see them taking place!*

Could address how/where extra monies needed could be acquired from.

**VI. Program Effectiveness for Graduates**

1. Was information provided on how the program measures the success of the degree and certificate program graduates?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

2. Was any qualitative or quantitative information provided to determine the success of graduates in obtaining a job in the field of study?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

3. If the program serves to prepare students for an external certification or licensure, was it identified, and were percentages provided for the amount of students who earn/achieve it?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* | *NA* | *Not applicable* |

***Comments on program effectiveness for graduates***

The program has identified 80% job placement right out of clinicals. It wasn’t entirely clear whether the remaining 20% earned jobs later, didn’t seek employment, continued at the university or something else.

I believe the number of students passing American Medical Technologist National Certification is provided (e.g. 7 students in 2016-2017). It’s not clear what percentage of students passed.

How does the program prepare students for further education?

(1) There is clear system for on-site evaluations from clinical rotations. This is directly relevant for
the degree and program evaluation. *Great work!*

No mention of other measures.

(2) CAC certificate and national certification mentioned. *Good.*

No quantitative evaluation of graduates’ success in finding a job.

(3) Data was provided. However, surprisingly small % of the students earn/achieve external certification/
licensure. *OK. Working on it.*

**VII. Program Continuous Quality Improvement**

1. Was a description given on how the program has used operational planning goals to achieve quality improvement over the past 5 years?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

2. Was a description provided on the ways the program has engaged in continuous quality improvement?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

***Comments on program’s* continuous quality improvement**

 It seems the continuous quality improvement goals are all future goals. It wasn’t clear if the program had incorporated CQI over the past 5 years.

How will the program address the underlying quality indicators and plan for improvement?

(1) It appears that some plans are in place for the future, but unclear if this has been done in the past 5 years.

 *Maybe could be clarified?*

(2) It seems from the self-study that the improvements are either very recent or in the plans.

 *Maybe could add something, if work has been already done?*

**VIII. Program alignment with institutional strategic goals**

1. Was a description provided on how the program has directly or indirectly assisted the college in achieving its strategic goals?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

***Comments on program’s* alignment with institutional strategic goals**

(1) It appears that there is a number of alignments with the College’s strategic goals. *Good/OK.*

**IX. Evaluation of Program Strengths, Viability and Areas for Improvement**

1. Were areas of strengths and areas for improvement identified? Is an evaluation provided on whether or not the program is still viable? Were the next steps for the program and possible action plans identified?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

***Comments on program’s* evaluation of strengths, viability and areas for improvement**

This program needs commitment from the college by providing FT faculty member to dedicate to program instruction, recruitment, and retention.

From self-study it is clear that the program needs more support from the College, in order to keep growing and developing further. *Good work done, now time to get support.*

**X. Overall Evaluation of the APR Self Study**

1. Are key findings that arose from the analysis and review process clearly presented?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

*This analysis could benefit from further work. There are areas of great excellence and insight, but also areas where what question asks has been completely overlooked – and copy-paste method applied. That likely is not for the benefit of any party.*

2. Does the review provide a clear direction and vision for the program moving forward?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

 *It seems that plans are being developed. However, there is little to none evidence on self-study about previous work that has been done*

3. Does the review present specific strategies and recommendations for moving the program forward?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | *Exemplary* | 2 | *Developing* | 1 | *Inadequate/Needs Attention* |

*Perhaps the biggest strength of this self-study is especially in the areas of future plans and goals. It is obvious that support and commitment from the college is now needed to achieve those.*

**Final Score on the Quality of the APR Self Study:**

**If all sections were applicable:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * **Exemplary 108 – 91 (85% and above)**
 | **Good 90 - 76 (70 – 84%)**  | **Needs Attention 75 and less (69% and below)** |
| * The program self-study fully addressed the core criteria in their self-study and review process. It discussed how goals and objectives are linked to the college mission and strategic goals. The program's student learning outcomes, curriculum comparison and assessment results have informed changes in curriculum, pedagogy, and instructional resources. Action Plans for continuous quality improvement were identified based on the results of the self-study process
 | The program self-study addressed the core criteria in their self-study and review process, but some information was missing. It discussed how goals and objectives are linked to the college mission and strategic goals, and included action plan strategies, but more data, statistics and specific goals could have been identified. The program's student learning outcomes, curriculum comparison and assessment were given but specific information on how it would affect pedagogy and instructional resources was not provided. | Not all of the core criteria were addressed and there was information and statistics missing in many of the self study areas. A reflection of how the self study will lead to the development of an Action Plan for continuous quality improvement was not provided.  |

**If 2 of the sections were not applicable:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary 102 – 87 (85% and above)**Same criteria as above | **Good 86 - 71 (70 – 85%)**Same criteria as above | **Needs Attention 70 - Below (69% and below)**Same criteria as above |

|  |
| --- |
| **Identified Strengths and Recommendation for Program Action Plan:** |
| The reviewers noted the strengths of the program, 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:** Phlebotomist training is adequate; however, preparing MLTs for further education and specialization is lacking, Autonomous systems are replacing many of the functions and there is no discussion on implementing courses to familiarize students with these technologies.*Outstanding plans and vision for the future.***Action Plan Recommendations:**Implement course in introduction to lab automation technologies.*Several of the questions unanswered or answer did not correlate with what asked. With some more work this could be clarified – which would be beneficial for the CLA program as it tries to become more established and better supported by the College.* |

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)