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

**Date of Review: 10/22/18**

**Names and positions of reviewers:**

**Member: Melanie Schneeflock Position: Librarian**

**Member: Michelle Young Position: Professor of Communication Studies**

**Member: Karen Hindhede Position: Professor of English, LA&L Div. Chair**

**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***

* The program description is clear and specific. The website link to the list of Common Courses is helpful.
* The program certification by INTASC is listed and the statement that AGEC course are transferable to all three Arizona public university also demonstrates the courses are university-accepted.
* Are there any awards the program would like to highlight?
* The self-study demonstrates that AAEE courses are designed to prepare students in a variety of courses and innovative curriculum, though this is listed under the Mission and Vision area. It seems appropriate here, but it is not listed under the program’s description, which is where the question was being asked. We feel this is more of a disconnect with the rubric rather than a problem with the self-study.

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***

* The Vision Statement is clear and comprehensive. The review panel commends the self-study for including student examples and course examples. This was an exemplary section.
* The review panel wonders if the statement “meet the needs of every learner through innovative….” is accurate. The review panel found this phrase confusing and wondered at first who the statement applied to. Perhaps changing the phrase to be “meets the variety of needs for every learner—whatever the needs may be.” Additionally, how can this be demonstrated?
* The mission/vision are effective and there is a strong connection to the college’s former mission and vision statement. Given that the college recently revised its mission/vision, the panel encourages the AAEE Program to mimic the college’s new format and identify the Student Goals.

**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 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***

* Effort was made to note when data was not available and why. Additionally, description was helpful in identifying recruitment methods and strategies with local high schools and transition efforts with Baccalaureate programs.
* Under the Graduation trends section, information was provided about the declining graduation rates. Perhaps more could be shared here to provide a sense of what might be done now that the lead faculty position has been filled.
* Effort was made to explain the slight decrease in enrollment and graduation trends. The review panel wonders why there a more noticeable difference in FTSE and Head Count in 2016-2017 compared the relatively consistent enrollment in the previous years?
* The panel also wonders if the declining graduation rates with ASU needs comment and needs to be addressed in the recruiting goals. This school saw the largest drop in CAC transfer students. Is there a particular reason? Should or can this trend be reversed?
* For full clarity, the panel encourages the program to explain/spell out FTSE the first time it’s being used and all other acronyms.

**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***

* The panel believes AAEE Program Director is critically assessing the courses objectives, the content, and quality of the courses. Efforts to revise the courses, align information with INTASC standards, and engagement in a capstone assessment program for students are well underway.

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

1. Are the student learning outcomes for the program provided and are they relevant to the program’s 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***

* Information is clear and relevant. Efforts are being made to improve in areas where no assessment data was collected.
* The review panel wonders if LIT 291 should be listed in the section “Specific courses for transferability and applicability to state universities?”
* The section about feedback on its program seems more reactive than pro-active. Is there a feedback form or rubric being developed?

**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 review panel finds this section also clear and specific.
* The panel suggests that the section about resources be split to emphasize the areas where support has been adequate and the areas where resources for students have been less than adequate. This would help highlight the support from the college that is still needed.

**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 review panel is aware of the desire to measure the success of program graduates. As the program is experiencing a decrease in enrollment, though, it becomes necessary to evaluate effectiveness in the area of graduate success.

**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**

* A description was provided about the operational planning goals, but specific examples on how the quality improvement has or would be achieved would be helpful in several of the areas such as course scheduling, student recruitment, etc.
* The partnerships with multiple associations demonstrate the program’s emphasis on preparing future educators.

**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**

* The information is present and well developed, but given that the college has recently changed its Institutional Strategic Goals, the program will need to update this section to be in line with the phrasing of the revised seven goals.

**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**

* The review panel feels the program evaluator has a thorough understanding of what needs improving.
* It would be helpful to better understand the strengths of the program if their assets, awards, recognitions are highlighted.
* The review panel suggests the portion about working with graphic design students is explained a little more to indicate this would assist with a branding of the program. This area is not done in bullet points the way the Action Plan is listed.
* The Action Plan is thorough, comprehensive, and well done.

**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* |

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

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

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

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

**Final Score on the Quality of the APR Self Study: 92 Exemplary**

**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:** * The program recognizes its weakness and has goals and plans to address these areas.
* The program’s community partnerships seem strong.
* The review generally was detailed, clear, and specific. Kudos on the hard work and effort—both in the program running and the program self-review writing process.
* The program has a solid, strong curriculum for students.
* The program clearly assigns with the college’s mission and vision.

**Action Plan Recommendations:*** The review panel wonders if the program needs to identify or address why the program seems to lose students the second year and hence does not have completer success rates as desired despite the strong enrollment initially. This seems like an important aspect to study further.
* The panel recommends the program identifies ways in which program goals align with Dept. of Ed, Federal and State goals for sustainability.
* The panel suggests highlighting the value and successes of the program.
* Continue to explore ways to improve the collection of assessment data.
 |