

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

Date of Review: April 13, 2021

Names and positions of reviewers:

Member: Sheri Steincamp

Position: Director DEP

Member: Glen Schlee

Position: Professor of Mathematics

Member: Cara Steiner

Position: Professor of Education

Member:

Position:

I. Program Description, Vision and Outcomes

1. Does the program description provide the following information?

a) A synopsis of the program and curricular outcomes

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

b) Program certifications, accreditations and awards

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

c) The skills that graduates from the program will attain

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

Comments on the program's description:

It would be beneficial to include the program accreditation within the program description. If possible, it would be beneficial to include some of the critical skills from the PLOs. Ie: critical thinking, problem solving, collaboration, calculations with math and science concepts and principles, etc.

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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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

It would be beneficial to consider developing a program vision and mission statement and include this on the program CAC website. Alignment to the college vision and mission is stated as a description of how the program is aligned rather than an actual program vision and mission statement.

II. Program Curriculum

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

3	<i>All were included</i>	2	<i>Missing one or more</i>	1	<i>Not included</i>
---	--------------------------	---	----------------------------	---	---------------------

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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

Comments on program curriculum

We appreciate the forward thinking of eliminating the two courses prior to this program review, however, we are somewhat confused by the earlier statement in section one referring to the program as a “one of a kind program” not offered anywhere else in the country. Providing additional information with revisions to the program involving course description, articulation, additions or deletions would have assisted with clarity.

III. Program Outcomes and Assessment

1. Are the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the program provided and are they relevant to the program’s goals?

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>	NA	<i>Not applicable</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------	----	-----------------------

3. *The information in the Assessment Reporting Form attached to the self-study should answer the following questions*

- a) Are the PLO’s or MSLOs that were assessed identified and was department/program strategies for assessing learning outcomes described and information provided on how assessment results are collected, analyzed and discussed?

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

b) Was the assessment method and criteria identified?

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

c) Was data provided on assessment results on how many students were proficient?

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>		1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	--	---	-----------------------------------

d) Is an explanation provided on how MSLO and CSLO assessment results have facilitated changes/improvements to the outcomes of the assessment process?

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

Comments on Program Outcomes and Assessments

- An Assessment Reporting Form is not attached, and it appears none of the PLOs or MSLOs were assessed individually. The committee did not see where the strategies for assessing learning outcomes were collected, analyzed and discussed. Inclusion of the performance review or Assessment Reporting Form would have clarified these points.
- No specifics were provided for student proficiency on individual PLOs or MSLOs. Therefore, it is difficult to determine which areas were identified in need of improvement. It is subjective to include the instructor opinion for why students did not do well and which PLOS and MSLOs needed additional instruction or review. No specific data was provided for measuring PLOs and MSLOs for the decision that no changes or improvements will be made as a result of the assessment process.
- The academic program review committee might need to look at the rubric form and the program review forms for alignment on Section 3.

IV. Program Graduates

1. 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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

2. 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 graduate?

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>	NA	<i>None</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------	----	-------------

3. Are articulation agreements in place for degree graduates?

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

4. 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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

Comments:

Perhaps pursuing an articulation agreement with NAU would be beneficial for your program.
Thank you for clarifying what NCCER represents.

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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

Comments on program effectiveness for graduates

Developing a more formal method for tracking success of graduates utilizing Survey Monkey or similar software would be feasible for the size of this program. A tracking survey would help provide data for measuring success of graduates and the program.

II. Program Enrollment and Graduation Trends

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

3	<i>Increasing</i>	2	<i>Consistent</i>	1	<i>Decreasing</i>
---	-------------------	---	-------------------	---	-------------------

2. Were the factors influencing enrollment trends discussed?

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>No information was given</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	---------------------------------

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

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>No information was given</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	---------------------------------

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

3	<i>Increasing</i>	2	<i>Consistent</i>	1	<i>Decreasing</i>
---	-------------------	---	-------------------	---	-------------------

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	<i>Increasing</i>	2	<i>Consistent</i>	1	<i>Decreasing</i>
---	-------------------	---	-------------------	---	-------------------

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

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>No information was given</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	---------------------------------

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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>No information was given</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	---------------------------------

Comments on the programs enrollment and graduation trends

No data reported for question 5, therefore it was not applicable.

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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

Comments on program's continuous quality improvement

Updating textbooks and moving to online assessment does not represent continuous quality improvement. These processes address the expectations and needs of the program. Establishment of specific goals for feedback from students and graduates, recruitment efforts, and proactive advising would be a few suggestions for continuous quality improvement.

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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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

Enrollment in the program seems to be increasing according to the data presented, however, a focus on graduation rates would be beneficial to sustainability.

X. Overall Evaluation of the APR Self Study

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

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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

3	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

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%) Overall Score of 86	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:

- Having a knowledgeable and experienced Advisory Board in the field that reflects important aspects of the industry
- Summer internships
- Program Accreditation
- Knowledge of what will be needed in the next 5-7 years
- Strong community engagement
- Knowledgeable and experienced professors
- Faculty experience and skills in the industry
- Partnerships with industry
- Uniqueness of the program

Action Plan Recommendations:

- Consider developing vision the mission statements to be specific to the program
- Continue to find ways to track the success of graduates
- Continue to encourage students to graduate with the degree from the program
- Make an Action Plan goal of how to obtain funding for the high cost items needed in 5-7 years
- Continue to find ways to expand program enrollment
- Secure articulation agreements with state universities for transfer at a baccalaureate level

VI. 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	<i>Exemplary</i>	2	<i>Developing</i>	1	<i>Inadequate/Needs Attention</i>
---	------------------	---	-------------------	---	-----------------------------------

Comments on program's alignment with institutional strategic goals

No response for the category of Environment.