

## ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW RUBRIC (Updated January 2017)

0	1	2	3	4
Program left the narrative section <b>blank</b>	Program provided evidence for a <b>minority</b> of the criteria.	The program provided evidence for a <b>majority</b> (2 of 3 or 3 of 5, etc.) of the criteria.	The program satisfies <b>all</b> of the criteria and provides supporting evidence.	The program <b>exceeds</b> the criteria with supporting evidence.
<p>*If evidence <u>overall</u> is poorly aligned to support program claims of compliance move towards a lower rating, and if evidence <u>overall</u> is strongly aligned to support program claims of compliance move towards a higher rating. <b>NOTE:</b> If a program does not provide evidence/examples for a standards expectation, <u>but does provide a concise and descriptive plan for developing that evidence</u> (e.g., includes time lines, individuals responsible, and evaluation method to ensure completion of the planning objective) give credit for evidence development for this standards expectation.</p>				
<p>*If evidence of significant barriers unique to the program's structure or historical processes prevent compliance for a standards expectation, remove that expectation from consideration. For example, a credit diploma program's use of general education courses or a requirement to show performance on past action plans when the College's previous process did not specify creation of action plans. Rate these sections as N/A.</p>				
<p>*Give positive weight to sections with discussion about the strengths &amp; concerns of program performance. For example, we do a good job of developing coherency in our curriculum, but we struggle with keeping it current as it is so technology based. Recent feedback from the program's advisory committee shows that we need to introduce at least one new software package.</p>				

### Program Name: Agriculture

#### Academic Program Review Rubric: Performance on Evaluation **Criteria**

Programs will be required to do follow-up reporting for SECTION AVERAGES (**red cells**) with ratings below "3". All ratings of a peer-review committee are averaged to form the section averages. Black-shaded cells will not be scored by reviewers.

I. PROGRAM PURPOSE	Total	Adjusted
A. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM		
B. PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENTS OVER THE REVIEW PERIOD		
C. MISSION AND VALUES		
<b>1a.</b> The program describes its mission and how it relates to the mission of the college.	3.67	3.67
<b>2a.</b> The program provides its values statements.	3.00	3.33
<b>2b.</b> The program describes the process through which it shares its mission and value statements across internal and external stakeholders.	0.67	3.00
<b>2c.</b> The program describes how it aligns its mission and value statements with internal and external stakeholder needs.	0.67	2.33
<b>2d.</b> The program provides at least one example that demonstrates how mission and value statements are used for guiding program activities.	1.00	3.33

<b>D. PROGRAM COMPETENCIES AND OUTCOMES</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program provides a list of its program-level learning competencies and operational outcomes.	3.67	3.67
<b>1b.</b> The program provides at least one example of how its learning competencies align with program values.	3.00	3.00
<b>1c.</b> The program provides at least one example of how its operational outcomes align with program values.	3.00	3.00
<b>SECTION AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>3.17</b>
<b>II. PROGRAM DESIGN</b>		
<b>A. CURRICULUM DESIGN</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program describes its process for developing, reviewing and updating the curriculum ensuring it is current and relevant for the field and level of education.	2.67	3.00
<b>2a.</b> The program describes how it sustains rigor and relevancy in its curriculum both by aligning with professional standards or best practices, and by regularly responding to stakeholder needs.	2.33	3.00
<b>3a.</b> The program provides the program course sequencing as listed in the current college catalog.	3.33	3.33
<b>3b.</b> The program provides a complete current curriculum map.	2.33	2.67
<b>3c.</b> The program describes how course sequencing is derived from logical scaling up of student competencies.	1.67	2.67
<b>4a.</b> The program provides a list of current Academic Standards approved MCORs, and from this list provides at least one example that demonstrates course-level student learning and program-level competency alignment.	2.00	2.67
<b>5a.</b> The program provides a list of General Education courses used in the program, and describes why it has selected the general education coursework or activities that appear in its degree or certificate program course sequencing and how they support learning and program-level competencies.	3.33	3.33
<b>6a.</b> The program describes the process used for ensuring routine involvement of full-time faculty in discussions and actions regarding the curriculum.	2.67	3.00
<b>7a.</b> The program describes how curriculum changes are communicated to all faculty, part-time (adjunct) faculty, and student services entities, such as admissions, financial aid, student records, and advising.	3.00	3.00
<b>B. CURRICULUM DELIVERY</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program describes the relevant instructional methods, such as current technologies, used for the delivery of program curricula and to support students. It also describes the diverse types of instructional methods used, such as lecture, project-based learning, laboratory exercises, and/or integrative technology.	3.33	3.67
<b>2a.</b> The program provides an explanation for the times and modalities in which it delivers program components and courses. The program describes how it evaluates the current and potential options for offering the curriculum so that they match student needs.	2.33	2.50
<b>3a.</b> In addition to existing MCORs, the program describes its process(es) for ensuring consistency in course elements across all modalities of its course offerings and identifies strategies used such as course competencies, summative common course assessments, and standardized syllabi.	3.00	3.00

<b>4a.</b> The program describes how its instructional delivery engages students in learning and identifies a diversity of strategies used such as flipped classroom, group projects, laboratory activities, and research.	3.33	3.33
<b>5a.</b> The program describes the partnerships and resources used to provide co-curricular opportunities for students' engagement with each other, the campus community, and external communities through methods such as service learning, internships, clinicals, study abroad, civic engagement and non-traditional work-based opportunities (e.g., job shadowing).	2.67	3.33
<b>SECTION AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>3.04</b>
<b>C. RESPONSE TO STAKEHOLDER NEEDS</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program provides a listing of its key stakeholder groups. Examples of stakeholders include: students, employers, clinical supervisors, advisory committees, LCCC academic advisers, general education faculty, accreditation agencies, state agencies, four-year institutions, and secondary teachers in concurrent enrollment experiences.	3.00	
<b>2a.</b> The program describes the established process(es) for gathering feedback from their stakeholders.	2.67	
<b>2b.</b> The program has an advisory committee and describes its composition and provides a history of the active advisory committee's activities over the review period.	3.00	
<b>3a.</b> The program describes its process for using its stakeholders' feedback to make adjustments in its curriculum such as faculty curriculum meetings or retreats to structure improvements based on feedback.	3.00	
<b>3b.</b> The program provides at least one specific example of how gathered stakeholder feedback was used to improve or revise the program's curriculum since the previous review.	3.00	
<b>4a.</b> Provide a brief description of effective recruitment strategies the program uses to connect with potential students such as high school visits, website development, association affiliations, and marketing materials based on stakeholder needs.	3.33	
<b>D. BACCALAUREATE INSTITUTION PARTNERSHIP</b>		
<b>Note: This section is required for AA/AS degrees and any other programs, if applicable.</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program provides evidence of partnerships with baccalaureate institutions that result in curricular alignment and efficient student transfer.	3.00	
<b>1b.</b> The program provides rationale for how or why these institutions should be considered primary transfer destinations for the program's students.	3.00	
<b>2a.</b> The program describes a process for sustaining these partnerships and for developing and reviewing articulated curricula on a regular basis.	3.33	
<b>2b.</b> The program provides evidence of how these partnerships have resulted in informed adjustments to the curricula.	3.67	
<b>3a.</b> The program provides at least one current, signed program articulation agreement with a baccalaureate granting institution.	3.00	
<b>E. STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS, COLLABORATIONS AND INDUSTRY ALIGNMENT</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program lists strategic partnerships with members of business and industry sectors, internal campus units, advisory committee, and/or baccalaureate four-year institutions (other than articulation agreements).	3.00	

<b>1b.</b> The program describes its process(es) for sustaining these partnerships.	3.00	
<b>2a.</b> The program describes the process for reviewing program curricula and developing opportunities for associated co-curricular activities, such as internships, clinicals, immersion experiences, service learning, or job shadows within current strategic partnerships.	3.00	
<b>2b.</b> The program provides at least one example of how these partnerships have resulted in informed adjustments to the curricula, and/or enhancements to the students' educational experience.	2.67	
<b>SECTION AVERAGE</b>	<b>3.04</b>	
<b>F. PROGRAM FACULTY</b>		
<b>1a.</b> Program faculty are proficient in instructional delivery, including assessing student learning at all levels. The program uploads its faculty members' curriculum vita(e) and other applicable documents.	3.00	3.00
<b>1b.</b> The program provides at least one example that highlights a faculty member's demonstrated proficiency in instructional delivery.	3.00	3.00
<b>2a.</b> The program has faculty who are engaged in professional development. The program provides at least one example that highlights a faculty member's demonstrated engagement in professional development that supports student learning or program outcomes.	3.00	3.00
<b>3a.</b> The program has faculty who engage in service to the community. The program provides at least one example that highlights a faculty member's service to the community.	3.00	3.00
<b>G. PROGRAM FACILITIES AND RESOURCES</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program provides a description of its current facilities and instructional resources, such as library resources and technology, and explains how they meet the functional needs and goals of the program.	2.00	3.33
<b>2a.</b> The program describes a process for routinely reviewing the facilities and resources for functionality.	3.00	3.00
<b>2b.</b> The program describes the process used to recommend needed changes to facilities and resources, and provides comments on the effectiveness of this method.	3.00	3.00
<b>2c.</b> The program provides at least one example of how the program has improved the facilities and resources based on evidence gathered through its routine review.	3.00	3.00
<b>3a.</b> If the program uses online components, it describes the current program's technology, support, and resources in order to be successful.	3.00	3.00
<b>SECTION AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>3.04</b>
<b>III. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT</b>		
<b>i. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT IN STUDENT LEARNING</b>		
<b>A. FEEDBACK/DATA SYSTEMS</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program lists its program-level student learning competencies (also in Section One of the review).	3.00	3.00

<b>1b.</b> The program provides evidence demonstrating it has identified, and used or developed a feedback/data system that produces information about student proficiency on program learning competencies.	2.50	3.00
<b>1c.</b> The program includes a recent sample of student learning data generated by the program's feedback system(s).	3.00	3.00
<b>2a.</b> The program describes how it analyzes its feedback/data, including trends over time, to inform its assessment planning and improve instructional effectiveness and ultimately student learning.	2.00	3.33
<b>3a.</b> The program describes the process through which it communicates data from the feedback systems to the program faculty/staff and various stakeholders.	2.75	3.00
<b>3b.</b> The program provides at least one example of how this is accomplished.	3.00	3.00
<b>B. ASSESSMENT PLANNING</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program summarizes at least two of the program's current or recently completed assessment plans and identifies which student learning competencies they are targeting.	2.75	3.00
<b>1b.</b> The program provides a rationale of how it has used evidence of student learning from its feedback system to justify the creation of its assessment plans.	3.00	3.00
<b>1c.</b> The program describes how it keeps its assessment planning current or up-to-date in Aquila, and provides one example of a planning change or a reporting finding from the most recent reporting year.	2.25	3.00
<b>C. REVISED PLANS AND STRATEGIES</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program provides a summary of the success it has had in accomplishing the goals or in producing the learning competencies that have been identified in the program's targeted assessment plan.	2.75	3.00
<b>2a.</b> The program provides at least one example of changes implemented to the program and/or its courses as a result of their assessment planning efforts since the last review cycle.	3.00	3.00
<b>2b.</b> The program indicates how student achievement of proficiency on learning competencies has improved over time as a result of the program's assessment planning efforts.	2.50	2.67
<b>2c.</b> The program provides at least one example of how it changed its assessment planning to strengthen its usefulness to the program for monitoring, maintaining, or evaluating performance on student learning competencies.	3.00	3.00
<b>SECTION AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>3.00</b>
<b>ii. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT IN PROGRAM OPERATIONS</b>		
<b>A. FEEDBACK/DATA SYSTEMS</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program lists its operational outcomes (also in Section One of the review).	2.80	3.00
<b>1b.</b> The program includes a recent sample of data generated from non-KPI feedback systems, such as employer surveys, benchmark comparisons, program tracking, meetings with advisory committees, or articulation meetings that the program uses to analyze its operational efficacy.	2.20	3.00

<b>2a.</b> The program provides a recent sample dataset (provided by IR) that the program uses to assess its operational efficacy in these areas: i.) program demand, ii.) student success, iii.) transfer preparation, if applicable, iv.) job readiness, v.) program efficiency and other relevant KPI measures related to program operations. The program analyzes these data and describes how it is meeting or not meeting its expectations for performance on these KPI measures.	3.00	3.20
<b>3a.</b> The program describes the process through which it communicates data from the feedback systems to the program faculty/staff and various stakeholders.	0.00	3.20
<b>3b.</b> The program provides at least one example of how this is accomplished.	0.00	3.00
<b>B. PROGRAM OPERATIONAL PLANNING</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program summarizes at least two operational plans it has implemented and identifies which operational outcomes they are targeting.	2.20	3.00
<b>1b.</b> The program provides a rationale of how it has used evidence of program efficacy from its feedback system to justify the creation of its assessment plans.	2.60	3.00
<b>1c.</b> The program describes how it keeps its operational planning current or up-to-date in Aquila and provides at least one example of a planning change or a reporting finding from the most recent reporting year.	2.60	2.60
<b>2a.</b> The program illustrates how its operational plans are aligned with their institutional or school priorities, and/or accreditation, as appropriate for the growth of the program.	3.00	3.00
<b>C. REVISED PLANS AND STRATEGIES</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program summarizes the success it has had in accomplishing established operational outcomes within the program's operational plans.	1.40	3.00
<b>2a.</b> The program describes how the program's efficacy has improved over time as a result of the program's operational planning efforts.	2.60	3.00
<b>2b.</b> The program provides at least one specific improvement made as a result of operational planning to improve the program's operational efficacy such as program effectiveness, efficiency, or stakeholder satisfaction.	3.00	3.00
<b>2c.</b> Using the assessment plan located here or a plan provided by the program, the program provides at least one example of how it has been changed to strengthen its usefulness to the program for monitoring, maintaining, or evaluating performance on program efficacy.	2.20	3.00
<b>SECTION AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.12</b>	<b>3.00</b>
<b>iii. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT AS A RESULT OF PROGRAM REVIEW</b>		
<b>A. FEEDBACK/DATA SYSTEMS</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program describes how the program used this current program review process and its feedback information to assess how well the program meets the standards.	3.00	
<b>2a.</b> The program provides a summary of how the program has analyzed and synthesized the information from its current program review to shape either one or more of its action plans or shape its section on program review findings (III.iii.D.1).	2.67	

<b>3a.</b> The program describes the process through which it communicates the feedback from this current academic program review to the program faculty/staff and its various stakeholder groups.	3.00	
<b>3b.</b> The program provides at least one example supporting the process.	3.00	
<b>B. ACTION PLANNING</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program provides at least two recommended action plans based on areas identified for improvement over the next five years. The program completes all sections of the Action Planning template including 1) goals; 2) strategies; 3) time lines 4) evaluation process; 5) resources; and 6) opportunities/obstacles.	3.33	
<b>1b.</b> The program describes how each of its action plans are a result of the discoveries made during this program review, including the program's review findings.	3.33	
<b>C. REVISED PLANS AND STRATEGIES - PEER REVIEWERS do not rate this section for programs with no previous program review.</b>		
<b>1a.</b> The program summarizes the success the program has had in accomplishing the goals, and/or in producing the outcomes that have been set within the action plans identified in the program's PREVIOUS program review. <u>If the program is new and/or has no previous program review, the program states this in the narrative.</u>		
<b>1b.</b> The program includes at least one specific accomplishment in goal attainment as a result of implementing those plans from the PREVIOUS REVIEW.		
<b>2a.</b> The program demonstrates how the program has improved over time in meeting the standards as a result of the program's action planning efforts.		
<b>2b.</b> The program provides at least one specific example of changes implemented as a result of previous action plans intended to strengthen the program in regard to meeting the standards.		
<b>2c.</b> Using the program's previous action plans, the program provides at least one example of how it changed its action plans over time to strengthen their usefulness to the program for monitoring, maintaining, or evaluating performance on program efficacy.		
<b>D. SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REVIEW FINDINGS</b>		
<b>1a.</b> Program provides a bullet listing of its 1. Strengths, 2. Concerns, 3, Opportunities, and 4. Challenges for student learning.	3.00	
<b>1b.</b> Program provides a bullet listing of its 1. Strengths, 2. Concerns, 3, Opportunities, and 4. Challenges for program operations.	3.00	
<b>SECTION AVERAGE</b>	3.04	
<b>PROGRAM REVIEW AGGREGATED RATING (Completed by Institutional Effectiveness staff)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Rating</b>