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

**Date of Review: 10/7/19**

**Names and positions of reviewers:**

**Member: Susan Horn Position**

**Member: Deanna Diwan Position**

**Member: Shelley Decker Position Professor of English**

**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* |

b) Program certifications, accreditations and awards

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

c) 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 makes it clear what is expected of students and what they can expect to achieve with through this degree, such as opportunities to be licensed. The skills students will gain in radiology are clearly identified.

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 mission statement is widely available and published in a number of student documents, such as the handbook. The mission/vision statement aligns with CAC’s vision and mission.

**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***

The program has done a great job compiling information on the graduation and enrollment trends with a great focus on the reasons for enrollment and graduation variations, such as medical issues. The discussion of strengths and improvements indicates that “a mastery of English is a necessity” to complete board certification. The response to this issue indicates that the interview process will help “assess dropout risks” but there is no direct address to this issue. Excluding people for whom English is a second language is not appropriate since many such people demonstrate a mastery of English. Further, interview processes can be misleading regarding someone’s proficiency in written English (versus spoken English). What steps will the program take to address this issue? They need to gather data to determine the scope of the problem. Any solution should be designed to ensure that there is no bias against ESL students.

**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 program curriculum was evaluated and suggestions for continuous improvement are linked appropriately to accreditation requirements.

**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. ***The information in the chart or attached to the self-study should answer the following questions***

a) 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* |

b) 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* |

c) 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* |

d) 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* |

4. 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* |

5. 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* | *NA* | *None* |

6. Are articulation agreements in place for degree graduates?

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

7. 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***

The program runs adequate assessments to ensure students are meeting benchmarks. The failure to meet a benchmark was examined closely to determine the cause and follow-up steps noted.

We did not see where the assessment tied to CSLOs.

The articulation agreements are not necessary since most students don’t progress to a bachelor’s program.

**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***

**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 conducts a 6-month post-graduation survey, which seems to enjoy a 100% response rate, though this is not expressly noted.

**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**

The program takes multiple steps to ensure continuous improvement, including surveying students, monitoring job placement and other data, and professional development

**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**

This is blank. They seem to meet all the goals but did not fill out the form.

**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 program has the highest retention, employment, and pass rates in Arizona. No opportunities for improvement are noted

**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:**

**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.  **Score: 101 - Exemplary**  **Strengths:**  The program seems well run with detailed processes for evaluating the progress of the program, including ensuring the attainment of accreditation requirements, state laws and statutes, and students’ academic needs. The program has established procedures for regular professional development and self-evaluation that seem to effectively address issues that arise and ensure continuous improvement. The self-review states that this is the best program in Arizona and we can see that the data and description support this finding regarding the quality of the program.      **Action Plan Recommendations:**  We suggest expanding the program beyond just 20 students to offset the additional capital investment required to update the equipment. Perhaps they could have multiple blocks or staggered blocks of student groups. |