

**LARAMIE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW MANUAL:
GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES
(Updated November 2015)**

PURPOSE OF PROGRAM REVIEW: Program review generates knowledge about how well programs are transforming our students’ lives through the power of inspired learning (institutional mission). It provides programs a design testing platform that encourages the strengthening of program/unit resiliency through continuous improvement strategies. The aggregation of multiple review cycles based on this principle ensures the sustainability of the College over the long term. Emphasis is placed on developing the self-evaluation capacity of programs/units so that organizational learning intelligently informs continuous improvement and encourages growing alignment and integration of processes. An annual report summarizing program review activity is submitted to the Board of Trustees. All degree and certificate programs undergo program review. Special accreditation processes do not substitute for LCCC program review.

ENCOURAGING EFFECTIVE CHANGE MANAGEMENT: LCCC operationalizes its vision, values, and strategic priorities through its program review process, partly by adjusting its assumed practices statements that express quality expectations. The College annually involves a substantive percentage of its staff and faculty in the review process to ensure a broad spectrum of shared learning about the institution’s assumed practices as well as the quality enhancement efforts and planned change of a diverse cross section of programs. It aligns multiple types of peer review feedback including: 1) Annual assessment plan review, 2) Program review peer-review, 3) Special accreditation feedback, and 4) AQIP Appraisal feedback to verify and strengthen the quality performance of programs and the institution. Annual, short-term operational assessment planning is displayed in review self-studies along with long-cycle program action planning for comparison, and their alignment with institutional strategic planning priorities reinforces change efforts. To give added momentum to change, the College matches the program review format with HLC’s AQIP process—stakeholders, process design, evaluation, and improvement.

Adding a sustainability dimension to change management, program review encourages additional characteristics of resiliency building such as 1) diversity of program/unit composition and functionality 2) adaptive capacity through self-evaluation activity, and 3) organizational learning, where shared learning among program/unit participants reaches across campuses and through the community to accelerate purposeful change for student transformation. This review process develops an integrated learning experience among campus staff and faculty that reveals how programs systematically accelerate the attainment of their values, thereby achieving greater quality

PROGRAM REVIEW TIME LINE

All degree and certificate programs undergo program reviews every five years. Special accreditation processes do not substitute for LCCC program review. The annual review process uses the below time line.

September	2015	Orientation meetings for the program review process and electronic self-studies
Sept thru Mid-Jan	2015	Programs/Units complete the Comprehensive Program Review self-study reports
February	2016	Academic Standards (A.S.) Program Review Subcommittee reviews self-studies & provides online written feedback
March thru Mid-March	2016	Programs/Units provide online written responses to the review committee concerns and questions
Mid-March to April	2016	Programs/Units meet with the A.S. Program Review Subcommittee for a summary interaction
April	2016	Program Review Subcommittee evaluates program responses of underdeveloped sections
May	2016	Academic Standards notifies programs of their review status and follow-up reporting assignments
September	2016	The PRS Chair submits an annual report of program review activity to the BOT

OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAMMATIC SELF-STUDY

- I. Program Summary
- II. Knowledge Distribution
- III. Organizational Effectiveness

- IV. Program Planning
- V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success
- VI. Executive Summary

DETAILED OUTLINE OF SELF-STUDIES

I. Program Summary

- A. Overview
 - 1. Mission and vision
 - 2. Values of program/unit faculty
 - 3. Program objectives, including program level student learning competencies
 - 4. Engagement of LCCC strategic planning strategies
 - 5. Broad summary of program/unit work
 - 6. Significant program achievements over the review cycle
 - 7. Developing Value in Programming

- B. Program Data Presentation: Program Profile Data and Program Review KPIs

II. Knowledge Distribution

- A. Design
 - 1. Process to design the curriculum
 - a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)
(e.g., identified key student sub-groups and needs, advisory boards, professional associations and others)
 - b. Participation in curriculum management process (include MCORS, course mapping, articulation of courses)
 - c. Developmental Education: Effectiveness of Student Placement and Success in College-Level Courses
 - d. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies
 - 2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment (space, class size, others), experiential learning structure with internships, service learning or others, and rigor (include design of even rigor and competencies across modes)
 - 3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career
 - 4. Process to ensure academic integrity
 - 5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions (articulation/evenness of rigor)
 - 6. Learning environment and student success program percentiles: Related KPI indicator(s):

- B. Results: Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform continuous process improvement and adapt to change
 - 1. Process to develop and sustain a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement
 - 2. Program research findings: results and analysis (illustrated with tables and graphs)
 - 3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings

- C. Improvements implemented during the last five years (e.g., how many course changes and their effects).

III. Organizational Effectiveness of Program

- A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors

B. Design of the organization

1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure) (Include communicating the curriculum to potential and current users)
 - a. KPI participation program percentiles average
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: diversity of relationships and ease of Formation.
6. Process to develop and sustain effective communication among program faculty/staff members and with other campus entities.
7. Process for developing efficiencies of operation, enrollment management, and budget planning
 - a. KPI efficiency program percentiles average (D4-cost per FTE)
8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, and technology for students and faculty/staff
9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or areas of concern identified in the previous program review

C. Results: Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform continuous process improvement and adapt to change

1. Process to develop and sustain a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement
2. Program research findings: results and analysis
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings

D. Improvements implemented during the last five years (e.g., list organizational changes & their effects)

(Explain the program’s process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements.)

IV. Program Planning

A. Design of program planning

1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning (e.g., linking of past goals to annual planning, to program review action planning, and to LCCC strategic planning)
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program’s annual planning for both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning. (Include the alignment and integration strategies)
5. Description of program’s engagement in this program review self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities
6. Description of the Program’s Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years

Assumed Program Practices: As a result of the discoveries made during a program’s self-study development and peer review, it develops action goals that respond to actions the program wants to achieve over the next five years, usually three to six goals.

--Below is an example of the action plan template that you will find in the planning area.

Action Plan Goal One
Description of Goal:
Strategies and Actions to Achieve Goal:
Projected Time Line for Goal Attainment:

Feedback Method to Evaluate Attainment Progress Over Time (surveys, IR Data, learning assessments, and others):
Describe Needed Resources with Cost Estimates (personnel, infrastructure, equipment and others):
Describe Planning Opportunities, Obstacles, and Consequences If Not Achieved:
Align Goal to the LCCC Strategic Plan Strategies:

- B. Results: Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform planning process improvement and adapt to change
 - 1. Process to develop and sustain a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement
 - 2. Program research findings: results and analysis
 - 3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings

- C. Improvements implemented during the last five years (e.g. how many planning changes and their impact)
(Explain the program’s process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements.)

V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success

- A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next five years
(features of resiliency include diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)

- B. Program demonstrates that it has the capacity to effectively manage change over the next review cycle (e.g., capacity to forecast or scan the environment for client NEEDS, capacity to design appropriate program responses, capacity to self-evaluate for learning program strengths and concerns in PERFORMANCE, and the capacity for transforming evaluation findings into improvements).

- C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages.

VI. Executive Summary

- A. Mission, vision, values
- B. Brief program summary
- C. Program objectives
- D. Success of past review action goals
- E. Abbreviated data summary
- F. Program achievements over the review cycle
- G. Discovery listing of program strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities, and recommendations
- H. Summary of high impact dialogues among reviewers and program faculty
- I. Summary of review action goals

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT PROCESS: RESPONSIBILITIES AND TIME LINE

September: Preliminary Meetings on Review Process

1. The PRS proposes a review schedule for all programs annually to the Academic Standards Committee for its approval. Approved review schedules become final for the subsequent academic year. Rare exceptions can be granted by the Vice President of Academic Affairs if circumstances support a change. If programs participate in specialized accreditation processes, efforts will be made to align the program reviews with their accreditation cycles.
2. The Deans of programs undergoing program review appoint at least two program faculty (full and/or part-time) to serve as Program Review Leaders for each program being reviewed.
3. The Program Review Subcommittee (PRS) chair meets with the Program Review Leaders and their respective Deans for an orientation to the program review process.
4. External to the College reviews (e.g., invite one or two discipline-specific faculty from another institution) are optional (not required). The Deans of programs wanting to include an external component will report this to the PRS chair for alignment with the internal process. Programs using this component will have their external reviewers make the team report available to LCCC review before April.

September through Mid-January: Completion of the Program Self-Study

5. Program Review Leaders manage self-study development so it addresses the “assumed practices” and matches the template guidelines described in this procedure. Programs will use the College’s online system to develop their self-studies. Program profile data and KPI data will be pre-loaded in the self-study appendix for programs. The review content will describe program activity from its most recent review through the spring semester immediately preceding the current review (spring 2015 of an AY-2015-16 review). All programs operate on a five-year review period. Cycles can be aligned with special program accreditation needs.
6. Using the Academic Standards procedure, the PRS Chair will appoint at least one faculty member from each of the programs undergoing review during the next cycle year to participate with the PRS as supplemental reviewers for familiarization with the program review process.
7. Before mid-January, the program’s completed self-study will be discussed at least once during a meeting of its faculty as a whole (including adjuncts) and then forwarded, along with documentation of the meeting activity, to the respective Deans for review.
8. On or before mid-January, programs will submit their self-studies to the PRS chair and to all program faculty members (can be done using the online system). The PRS chair will distribute programs’ self-studies to their respective reviewers.

February: Program Review Sub-Committee Evaluates Programs’ Self-Studies

9. The PRS chair provides a program review orientation to members and the supplemental faculty appointees. The PRS will assign one program to each of the supplemental reviewers. The PRS may divide into smaller task groups to manage the review workload.
10. From February through April, the program review self-studies will be available for reviewers to evaluate. Evaluation will include review of study section narratives, data resources, and uploaded documents/websites. Help resources and examples are available within the program review template to aid review. When appropriate, reviewers will add online comments to sections of the self-study that include questions, concerns, recommendations,

or observations for the program faculty. As an additional quality assurance practice, reviewers will score programs' self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric of Quality Performance Expectations (see supplemental materials). LCCC will use rubric results to identify institutional strengths and concerns that inform its continuous improvement.

11. If a program uses an external review in conjunction with the LCCC internal process, the program is to make the team report available to the PRS chair for sharing with LCCC reviewers. If delays occur, the PRS will accept team reports up to Mid-March for distribution at the face-to-face meetings of programs and reviewers. This timeline also applies to special accreditation reviews that occur simultaneously with LCCC program reviews.

March through Mid-March: Programs Respond Online to Program Review Sub-Committee Feedback

12. The Program Review Leaders prepare online responses that address the PRS questions, concerns, recommendations, and observations placed in the online self-study. Responses and subsequent adjustment of action plan goals are reported in the program review self-study. Programs can continue editing action plan goals through May.
13. If a program receives PRS rubric section average score(s) at the **underdeveloped level** (below level three), faculty should form program responses that strengthen the evidence showing that the program meets the assumed practices for these sections. Although the original rubric scores remain unchanged, reviewers read the underdeveloped sections a second time in April and provide an additional set of adjusted scores that can be above or below the original scores. See rubric below for added details.
14. The PRS review feedback and the program responses should be discussed in at least one program faculty meeting.
15. The program responses, along with external team reports/findings if applicable, will be made available to the PRS chair in the online platform before Mid-March. The PRS will distribute these to the members of the PRS and supplemental reviewers as a reference resource during the face-to-face April meetings.

Mid-March to April: Program Review Subcommittee and Supplemental Reviewers Meet with the Program Leaders

16. The PRS chair notifies Deans of programs undergoing program review that the respective self-studies are accessible for viewing in the online platform including faculty dialogues concerning program quality and PRS rubric scoring.
17. The Program Leaders and the PRS members with supplemental reviewers hold joint meetings where strengths, concerns, remaining questions, and program responses are discussed. Programs are to use this meeting as a consulting opportunity for discussing hard-to-solve problems, remaining questions, or future planning. Topics may be identified for further study, including those identified by external reviewers.

April: Program Review Subcommittee Reviewers Evaluate Program Responses for Re-Assessment of Underdeveloped Rubric Sections

18. The Subcommittee for Program Review evaluates the underdeveloped sections of self-studies and re-scores those sections in their respective program review rubrics. Reviewers will use programs' online written responses and information from face-to-face meetings to inform their evaluation and scoring.

Late April to Early May: Academic Standards Notifies Programs Identified for Follow-Reporting

19. Academic Standards Committee reviews evaluation information from the Program Review Subcommittee and identifies which programs need to prepare follow-up reports. The Committee will notify programs that 1. their program reviews have been accepted, or 2. their program reviews have been accepted contingent upon completing a follow-up report before the end of the next spring semester. The Committee communicates the report expectations to affected programs. The reports should show the program's progress for accelerated improvement on the related section(s).

20. The action plan goals are used to guide faculty efforts for the next cycle. Programs are encouraged to use their annual operational planning in the online assessment platform to support the incremental change required to attain action plan goals (operational effectiveness).

September: Submission of the Program Review Annual Report

21. The PRS chair submits the LCCC Annual Program Review Report to the President’s Cabinet and the Board of Trustees before the end of September. The report includes an overview of that cycle’s program review activity and the self-study executive summaries of all reviewed programs.

June-December

22. Post-review meetings will be held between the Program Review Subcommittee (PRS) chair and the Program Review Leaders and their respective Deans to discuss the positive gains of the review, methods for improving LCCC’s program review process, and remaining program questions on process, e.g., follow-up reports

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

A. Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

- 1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (**undeveloped processes**).
- 2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (**undeveloped processes**).
- 3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).
- 4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.
- 5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of participants, and number of concentrators).

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in **yellow-shaded cells** make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Section scope is defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

II. Knowledge Distribution		Score
A. Design		
1. Process to design the curriculum		
a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)		
b. Participation in the institution’s curriculum management process (MCORS)		
c. Developmental Education: Effectiveness of Student Placement and Success in College-Level Courses		
d. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies		
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies,		

learning environment	
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	
6. Learning Environment and Student Success: Related KPI indicators	
a. KPI indicator: Learning environment section of program percentiles averaged	
b. KPI indicator: Student success section of program percentiles averaged	
SUBTOTAL	
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change	
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	
SUBTOTAL	
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	
SUBTOTAL	
III. Organizational Effectiveness	Score
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors	
B. Design of the organization	
1. Process for developing and applying policies and procedures	
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	
7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	
a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	
8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	
9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	
SUBTOTAL	
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change	
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	
SUBTOTAL	
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	
SUBTOTAL	

IV. Program Planning					Score
A. Design of program planning					
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)					
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning					
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress					
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning					
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities					
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years					
SUBTOTAL					
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change					
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods					
2. Program research findings: results and analysis					
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings					
SUBTOTAL					
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements					
SUBTOTAL					
V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success					Score
A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)					
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)					
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages					
SUBTOTAL					
Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale					
Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point	Score
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and operational goals.	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units.	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.	

	strategies.				
--	-------------	--	--	--	--

Academic Program Review Policy	Policy Number	10.2
	Effective Date	October 15, 2014

1.0 POLICY & PURPOSE

It is the policy of the Board of Trustees of Laramie County Community College (LCCC) to ensure that the College regularly engages in practices designed to foster the continuous improvement of its programs, services and processes. More specifically, the Board desires mechanisms that encourage academic programs to achieve and maintain their excellence through comprehensive assessment of programmatic efficacy and strategic planning for the future. Academic program review shall be the primary mechanism to assess program quality, facilitate program improvement and development, measure student learning outcomes, and inform continuous improvement, while advancing growing alignment and integration of processes.

Therefore, the purpose of this policy is to direct the President to establish a formal process for the review of the College's academic programs. Further, this process should accomplish the following objectives. Program review should:

- A. Generate meaningful knowledge about how well academic programs are contributing to the attainment of the College's mission;
- B. Provide for regular evaluation of each academic program with enough frequency to establish a cycle of planning and assessment for continuous improvement;
- C. Incorporate objective input, process, and outcomes components to provide a holistic perspective of programs' current efficacy and guide planning for improvement; and
- D. Lead to the development of actionable and appropriate plans for program improvement.



Annually, the results of the current year's program reviews should be provided to the Board of Trustees in enough detail to ensure the process the President deploys for academic program review meets these objectives.

2.0 REVISION HISTORY

Adopted on: 10/15/14

3.0 PERSONS AFFECTED

This policy applies to all faculty, school deans, staff and students, and other entities affiliated with LCCC.

REQUIRED APPROVALS	NAME/SIGNATURE	DATE
Originator(s) Name(s)	Kim Bender, Institutional Effectiveness Associate Vice President	5/27/14
Ratified by College Council	Chad Marley, College Council Co-chair	9/22/14
Recommended by President (Signature)		9/22/14
Approval by Trustees (Signature)		10/15/14

Academic Program Review Procedure	Procedure Number	10.2P
	Effective Date	September 22, 2014

1.0 PURPOSE

In accordance with Board Policy 10.2 Academic Program Review, the purpose of this procedure is to outline the process through which Laramie County Community College (LCCC) conducts the review of its academic program.

2.0 REVISION HISTORY

Adopted on: 9/22/14

3.0 PERSONS AFFECTED

This procedure applies to all faculty, school deans, staff and students, and other entities affiliated with LCCC.

4.0 DEFINITIONS

- A. *Program* – An ordered sequence of instructional coursework that upon completion leads to LCCC conferring a general associate’s degree, a major within an associate’s degree, an applied associate’s degree, a credit certificate, a credit diploma, or granting a non-credit certificate.
- B. *Program Review Leaders* – Faculty members, from programs being reviewed, appointed by their respective deans to coordinate the program review
- C. *Program Review Subcommittee* – A standing subcommittee of the Academic Standards Committee tasked with overseeing and implementing academic program reviews
- D. *Program Review Subcommittee Chair* – Appointed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs to chair the Program Review Subcommittee
- E. *Academic Standards Committee* – The responsible group at the College with the primary functions of promoting and maintaining high academic standards that lead to student success at the institution. This body oversees the development, review and modification of academic programs and curricula.
- F. *Program Review Rubric* – The tool used by internal reviewers to evaluate programs against quality performance expectations. Performance is based on a five-point scale with the minimum acceptable performance rated at level three—Program meets program review template guidelines and performance expectations.
- G. *Program Resiliency* – Refers to the level programs relate networking and collaborative depth to program processes, have a diversity of program/unit composition and functionality, have adaptive capacity through self-evaluation activity, and illustrate organizational learning, where shared learning among program/unit participants reaches across campuses and through the community to accelerate purposeful change for student transformation.

5.0 PROCEDURES

A. Philosophical Approach to Program Review

Academic program review generates knowledge about how well academic programs are contributing to the attainment of the College's Mission - transforming our students' lives through the power of inspired learning. It provides a platform for the examination and design of continuous improvement strategies that strengthen program health and resiliency. Based on the principle of continuous improvement, the evidence derived and actions taken as a result of multiple cycles of program review ensure academic programs contribute to the long-term sustainability of the College, while remaining relevant and effective towards meeting the needs of the community.

LCCC's approach to academic program review places emphasis on assessing and developing the capacity of programs for self-evaluation. This self-evaluation results in organizational learning that intelligently informs continuous improvement while encouraging growing alignment and integration of processes. The program review process develops an integrated learning experience among campus faculty and staff that reveals how programs systematically accelerate the attainment of their goals and values, thereby achieving higher levels of quality.

B. Programs to be Reviewed

All credit bearing degree and certificate programs undergo program review as described in this procedure. In addition, the General Education program at LCCC shall also be reviewed within this framework.

Special accreditation processes do not substitute for LCCC program review, although attempts will be made to schedule internal program review proximate to program accreditation self-studies and/or activities.

C. Typical Program Review Time Line

September	Orientation meetings for the program review process and electronic self-studies
Sept thru mid-Jan	Programs complete the Comprehensive Program Review self-study reports
Mid-Jan thru mid-March	Program Review Subcommittee (PRS) reviews self-studies & provides online written feedback
Mid-March thru March	Programs provide online written responses to the review committee concerns
April	Programs meet with the PRS for a summary interaction
May	Program finalize the Comprehensive PRS executive summaries
August/September	The executive summaries and PRS actions are submitted to the Board of Trustees

D. Overview of Self-Study Sections

The foundation of LCCC's internal program review is the program self-study. It is structured to examine academic programs through multiple lenses associated with different aspects of program health and resiliency. The sections of the self-study include:


- 1) A Program Summary addresses the mission, values and program objectives.
- 2) Knowledge Distribution describes curriculum and instructional design and performance.

- 3) Organizational Effectiveness explains organizational design and its performance.
- 4) Program Planning focuses on planning processes and their alignment and integration.
- 5) A Conclusion discusses programmatic capacity for future success.
- 6) An Executive summary emphasizes findings, e.g., strengths, concerns, recommendations.

Sections two through five each include a component on the capacity for self-evaluation with findings and an improvement component explaining the program's transition of evaluation findings to positive changes in program.

E. Program Review Logistics

- 1) Program Review Schedule: Each fall, the PRS proposes a review schedule for all programs to the Academic Standards Committee for their approval. Program reviews are scheduled over a five-year period to ensure every credit-bearing academic program is reviewed within this timeframe. Approved review schedules become final for the subsequent academic year with exceptions granted by the Vice President of Academic Affairs for extenuating circumstances.
 - 2) Program Review Leaders: The Deans of the Schools with programs undergoing program review in the coming academic year shall appoint at least two program faculty to serve as Program Review Leaders (PRL) for each program being reviewed.
 - a. Orientation: PRLs will meet with the PRS chair and co-chair, when available, along with their respective Dean for an orientation to the program review process, including options for external reviews, if desired.
 - b. PRLs manage the development of the self-study so it matches the guidelines and performance expectations provided in the online self-study area and program review manual.
 - 3) Peer-Review: PRS members will evaluate the submitted self-study reports, provide comments, concerns, or submit questions and score the programs using a review rubric.
 - 4) Programs Respond: Programs offer responses to the PRS that address the PRS feedback.
 - 5) Academic Standards Approval: The PRS will submit their evaluation of programs to the Academic Standards Committee for its approval (as outlined in LCCC procedure 2.12P Academic Standards Committee Procedure).
 - 6) Programs That Are Assigned Follow-up Reports: Based on PRS findings, Academic Standards may require those programs scoring in the underdeveloped level of the scoring rubric to submit a follow-up report on identified sections due in the following spring.
 - 7) Face-to-Face Meetings: Programs (PRL) meet with their respective PRS reviewers during April where program responses, remaining issues, and future planning are discussed.
 - 8) Annual Program Review Report: The PRS chair will submit the Annual Program Review Report to the President's Cabinet and the Board of Trustees before the end of September. This report will include the self-study executive summaries of all programs reviewed. The PRS chair will post the completed program reviews online (pursuant to 2.12P).
 - 9) Future Program Action: Programs will use their action plan goals developed as a result of academic program review to guide faculty efforts during the years leading up to the next program review cycle.
-

REQUIRED APPROVALS	NAME/SIGNATURE	DATE
Originator(s) Name(s)	Kim Bender, Institutional Effectiveness Associate Vice President	6/10/14
Approval by President's Cabinet		9/17/14
Ratified by College Council	Chad Marley, College Council Co-chair	9/22/14
Approval by President (Signature)		9/22/14