

EVIDENCE 4.2

Program reviews completed for the 2000-2006 accreditation cycle were subsequently evaluated. The following items are a sampling of the initial series of those evaluations planned for 2006-2007.

Program Review Report Feedback

Program: PE, Health and Wellness/ APE Date of Report: 2005

This feedback is intended to assist programs in the process of continuous improvement. Evaluations are not a reflection on the program, but on the program review process.

Ratings:

- 1 - Meets or exceeds expectations
- 2 - Contains elements, some areas are weak
- 3 - Missing elements

I. Review Documentation

- A. *Collect and review Unit Plans since last Comprehensive Program Review.*
- B. *Comparing present with past unit plans, identify changes, improvements, accomplishments, and continuing concerns.*
- C. *Update all Course Outlines*
- D. *Include any sample syllabi with identified Student Learning Outcomes in the program review document file.*
- E. *Ensure course descriptions in schedules and catalogues are correct and include confirmation in the program review document file.*

Evaluation Comments: Current 2005-06 unit plan includes status updates from presumed past plans.

Rating: 2 and 3

C--Course Outlines update not stated in report; D--no sample syllabi with SLOs were provided; E--there is no statement or evidence of correct schedules and catalogs.

II. Evaluate Data

- A. *Review data for enrollment, successful completion, retention, and awards by Discipline from the Research Databook.*
- B. *Consider other data available in annual Research Databook and identify areas of accomplishment and concerns.*
- C. *Consider community, workforce, and/or transfer needs*
- D. *Assure student participation through methods such as surveys or other widespread feedback.*
- E. *Identify student, faculty, staff, and community/workforce concerns and discuss and document results.*
- F. *Compile results after completing the above activities.*

Evaluation Comments:

Rating: 2 & 3 (rating of 1 for the APE analysis of data and recommendations--nice job)

Item A: Some data were presented for the PE, Health and Wellness department but they were not analyzed. Data in the APE program review were thoroughly analyzed and APE recommendations were included in the Division unit plan. C--there is no mention of needs assessment.

Items D & E. Some generic student surveys were included in the report; however, they were not used, nor were they specific to the Division. They need to be deleted from this report.

Program Review Report Feedback

Program: PE, Health and Wellness/ APE Date of Report: 2005

III. Target Areas of Concern or Interest

- A. *Determine whether additional dialogs/groups (such as advisory committees or focus groups) are needed. Record justification if they are not needed. Include minutes of meetings.*
- B. *Determine specific courses or concerns for questions to faculty, staff, and students in surveys or focus group discussions. Include justification of choices.*

Evaluation Comments: No reference to student surveys, focus groups or community advisory committees. Mention was made regarding community recruitment efforts for APE program but no mention of community concerns were made. Areas of concern and interest were addressed in both the PE, Health and Wellness and Adaptive PE reviews.

Rating: 3

IV. Propose Recommendations and Implementation

- A. *Create a new unit plan to address community, faculty, and student concerns and needs.*
- B. *Ensure all revised course outlines or other documents are filed with appropriate bodies. (Course outlines provided to Curriculum Committee and new course descriptions to Academic Affairs, for example.)*

Evaluation Comments: The new unit plan addresses many targeted needs.

Rating: 1 and 3

B is not provided in the report.

V. Create Report

- A. *Create files of documentation for the Program Review process and report. Include:*
 1. *the minutes from meetings and notes from focus group discussions (not included)*
 2. *samples of outlines and syllabi with stated student learning outcomes (not included)*
 3. *narrative summary for incorporation into future unit plans*

Evaluation Comments: The narrative summaries of both reviews address several target areas. Some of these are mentioned in the Unit Plan but others are missing.

Rating: 2

An overview of the program review report.

While reading this report, it was unclear as to how the Division is organized. There are two separate reviews one for Adaptive PE and the other for everything else in the Division. Forms included in the review indicate plans for who will participate in the review process but no documentation exists to indicate inclusive participation of the division faculty.

The APE review was very thorough and focused. The SLOs for APE are well written but probably too specific for Discipline level SLOs. These are more specific to courses or even to individual student's objectives. The subheading "Objectives" for the PE/Health review should be changed to SLOs. The division has a good start on their SLOs, but there is a need to refine them. In order to address and simplify this task, the division needs to consider how the SLOs are going to be assessed (measured).

The Unit Plan has addressed many objectives and prioritized them for the Division. Some of the objectives, however, address more than one item. Priority #1 for example addresses 3 different objectives. These and objectives for priorities # 2 and #3 in the plan need to be separated into individual objectives and the whole unit plan needs to be re-prioritized. It is not clear as to how the list of sports for Athletics is to be included into the Division Unit Plan. Also, the activities/tasks need to be

Program Review Report Feedback

Program: PE, Health and Wellness/ APE Date of Report: 2005

more specific to the objectives. (e.g. for the objective to meet Title IX guidelines an activity is to "Hire a PE women's coach")

Reviewing members of ASPR:

Date of Review: July 10, 2006

J. Thomas-Siegel

J. G. Berry

M. J. D.

Sally Fasteau

Program Review Report Feedback

Program: Math, Phys. Sci., and Technology Date of Report: 2005

This feedback is intended to assist programs in the process of continuous improvement. Evaluations are not a reflection on the program, but on the program review process.

Ratings:

- 1 - Meets or exceeds expectations
- 2 - Contains elements, some areas are weak
- 3 - Missing elements

I. Review Documentation

- A. *Collect and review Unit Plans since last Comprehensive Program Review*
- B. *Comparing present with past unit plans, identify changes, improvements, accomplishments, and continuing concerns.*
- C. *Update all Course Outlines*
- D. *Include any sample syllabi with identified Student Learning Outcomes in the program review document file.*
- E. *Ensure course descriptions in schedules and catalogues are correct and include confirmation in the program review document file.*

Evaluation Comments:

Rating: 1 to 2

While the unit plans seem well developed, there are a few items that would increase their effectiveness. First, if a division does not choose priorities (having multiple #1 priorities for example), this encourages people outside the division to make the decision of what is most important. It behooves each division to set their own priorities.

Secondly, the unit plans focus on objectives that are really tasks or ways to complete objectives. Objectives should be student centered. For example, in order to increase enrolment in a science course needed for transfer (the objective), the division might propose the activity of hiring faculty or purchasing up-to-date equipment for a lab. Restructuring the unit plan in terms of student needs and student outcomes provides a clearer link between the plan and college budget.

The changes in unit plans were clearly indicated by color-coded entries. The course outline sample is well done and addresses current standards of SLOs. Course descriptions are provided and documented in the report.

While some syllabi were well done and included SLOs from the course outline (Math 275, e.g.), one sample did not include SLOs (Math 121, e.g.).

II. Evaluate Data

- A. *Review data for enrollment, successful completion, retention, and awards by Discipline from the Research Databook.*
- B. *Consider other data available in annual Research Databook and identify areas of accomplishment and concerns.*
- C. *Consider community, workforce, and/or transfer needs*
- D. *Assure student participation through methods such as surveys or other widespread feedback.*
- E. *Identify student, faculty, staff, and community/workforce concerns and discuss and document results.*
- F. *Compile results after completing the above activities.*

Evaluation Comments:

Rating: 2

While data is presented, it is not always labeled (WSCH/FTEF years) or consistent (adjunct FTEF on page 3 does not match that on page 9). It is also unclear whether data includes all of the division or just mathematics. The next version should clearly label the data and include all disciplines as well as the division totals. Of greater concern is the lack of analysis of the data. For example, retention in math has increased over five years and to a small degree so has successful completion. This is quite an

Program Review Report Feedback

Program: Math, Phys. Sci., and Technology Date of Report: 2005

accomplishment since all too often when retention increases it is because students are not correctly evaluating their chances of passing a class (and thus successful completion decreases). This positive interpretation of data is food for thought as it supports some activities. Only the division/discipline can answer why this may be happening. Further, WSCH/FTEF has increased dramatically in the three years presented (which ones?). What is the impact of such a large change on students and faculty? Is it a sign of a thriving program, or a sign of instructors who may feel this is too great of a change? Since successful completion remains stable, it would seem the students are not being short-changed by what appears to be increases in class size. Might this be a topic for a discipline or division meeting?

There is no data or minutes of meetings that included students, staff, or community (other colleges and workforce) input. What are the division's plans to address that lack?

III. Target Areas of Concern or Interest

- A. *Determine whether additional dialogs/groups (such as advisory committees or focus groups) are needed. Record justification if they are not needed. Include minutes of meetings.*
- B. *Determine specific courses or concerns for questions to faculty, staff, and students in surveys or focus group discussions. Include justification of choices.*

Evaluation Comments:

Rating: 3

No minutes or responses to student surveys or other groups have been included.

IV. Propose Recommendations and Implementation

- A. *Create a new unit plan to address community, faculty, and student concerns and needs.*
- B. *Ensure all revised course outlines or other documents are filed with appropriate bodies. (Course outlines provided to Curriculum Committee and new course descriptions to Academic Affairs, for example.)*

Evaluation Comments:

Rating: 1

With the stipulation that the structure of unit plan objectives be reexamined, this section is completed.

V. Create Report

- A. *Create files of documentation for the Program Review process and report. Include:*
 - 1. the minutes from meetings and notes from focus group discussions
 - 2. samples of outlines and syllabi with stated student learning outcomes
 - 3. narrative summary for incorporation into future unit plans

Evaluation Comments:

Rating: 3 and 2

A mission statement and discipline SLOs are missing.
The report is well documented and organized. Since no sample minutes were included and no input from students or other parties included, it is difficult to tell how the review feeds into meeting student needs and learning outcomes.

An overview of the program review report.

While it is understandable that the breadth of disciplines in this division is difficult to combine into one report, the program review report should combine all the areas under the direction of the division chair. These may be presented in separate sections to some degree, but the division should have a mission, SLOs, and a unit plan that incorporate all areas.

Program Review Report Feedback

Program: Math, Phys. Sci., and Technology Date of Report: 2005

Physical sciences does not appear in this report or on the website as a separate report. It should also be noted, that although there is a discipline review on file with administration for technology, it needs to be included with the division's program review as well.

Reviewing members of ASPR:

Date of Review: July 13, 2006

J. Thomas Spigal
J. Stanley
Mike
Sally Jostean