

PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Standards	3
Overview of Program Review	3

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (IEC)

Compton College Institutional Effectiveness Committee.....	4
--	---

PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING

Institutional Policy Regarding Program Review.....	4
Role of Program Review in Institutional Planning.....	5

PROGRAM REVIEW AT COMPTON COLLEGE

Program Review Cycles	7
Program Review Components.....	7
Program Review Processes and Timelines	8

PROGRAM REVIEW RESOURCES

Helpful Links Related to Program Review	11
Resource Contact Information	12

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Compton College Mission and Strategic Initiatives	13
Appendix B: Compton College 2016-2023 Program Review Cycle	15
Appendix C: Academic Program Review Guidelines and Instructions	17
Appendix D: Student Services Program Review Guidelines and Instructions.....	23
Appendix E: Administrative Services Program Review Guidelines and Instructions	27
Appendix F: Career and Technical Education (CTE) Supplemental Questions.....	30
Appendix G: Academic Program Review Feedback Rubric	31
Appendix H: Student Services Program Review Feedback Rubric.....	39
Appendix I: Administrative Services Program Review Feedback Rubric.....	44
Appendix J: Glossary	47

Introduction

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Standards

Compton College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The *ACCJC Accreditation Standards (June 2014)* document provides the following standards related to program review:

ACCJC Standard 1.B.5. “The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.”

ACCJC Standard 1.B. 9. “The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources.”

Compton College adheres to all ACCJC standards regarding program review. The accreditation standards provide the foundation and guidelines for our program review process, and program review is accordingly integrated into the college’s processes for institutional planning and resource allocation.

Overview of Program Review

Program review provides faculty and staff the opportunity to reflect on the accomplishments, challenges, and overall effectiveness of the program they represent. Through the collection and analysis of a variety of quantitative and qualitative data, authors are able to assess program resources and make recommendations for enhancing program effectiveness. Program review informs the future direction of each program by facilitating regular assessment and discussion. In addition, program review affords authors a vehicle to clarify program goals, and incorporate those goals into the planning and budgeting processes at the college, through posting recommendations in the Compton College planning software.

Academic program reviews are the primary vehicle through which programs assess student enrollment trends, retention and completion rates, student equity and course and program-level learning outcomes. Academic program reviews formally document any recommendations related to program resources and/or curriculum. Surveys issued to various stakeholders (students, faculty, clients, or external advisory committees) often assess currency of curriculum, adequacy of instructional resources, and satisfaction with overall program experience. Non academic program reviews are the primary vehicle through which programs review client profiles and delivery of services, assess service area outcomes, and evaluate their performance (in conjunction with the review of client

satisfaction surveys). The result of this process is continuous program improvement, resulting from program recommendations and budget requests, grounded in program data.

Overview of Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)

Pursuant to Title 5 of the Administrative Code of California (Section 53200), Program Review is one of the “10+1” areas within the purview of the Compton Community College District (CCCD) Academic Senate. The CCCD Academic Senate acknowledges the program review process as overseen by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which is co-chaired by the Senate President, or designee, and one management representative. In addition to its Co-chairs, the IEC is comprised of faculty from various disciplines, classified unit representatives, and designated academic and administrative deans.

As a standing committee of the Consultative Council, the IEC is a collaborative delegation by which policies and procedures related to program review are developed and revised. The CCCD Academic Senate must vote on and approve substantive changes to the IEC processes. According to CCCD Board Policy 2520, the Board will rely primarily on faculty expertise on academic and professional matters as defined by Sub-Chapter 2, Section 53200, et seq., California Administrative Code, Title 5.

IEC Role and Function

The purpose of the IEC is to review and provide recommendations about each of the District’s program reviews in order to strengthen and support programs and program analysis. The Committee will also be responsible for reviewing the following: Compton College Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Staffing Plan, and Technology Master Plan, to ensure these plans and all Program Reviews are consistent, aligned, and current. The IEC Committee monitors the status of these documents. In spring 2019, this Handbook as well as the major College Plans (formerly known as the Comprehensive Master Plan) were reviewed and updated to align with the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CO) Vision for Success.

IEC members are expected to review program review documents prior to monthly scheduled meetings, so they can provide feedback before sending the committee recommendations to program review authors. Each program’s document is thoroughly reviewed by members of the committee. IEC members are assisted by the Program Review Coordinator, who organizes meetings, sets timelines, develops the program review process, assists authors, leads trainings, and provides general and data-specific support. The Program Review Coordinator is available for consultation throughout the program review process.

Program Review and Planning

Institutional Policy Regarding Program Review

Compton College has a long-standing policy regarding program review. The policy requires that every program offered at the college conduct a self-study and external review every four (4) years. The policy and related procedures are flexible and evolving to ensure that the program review process continues to comply with applicable standards and guidelines established by the college's accrediting body, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The current program review process meets accreditation standards and is reviewed on an ongoing basis by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC).

Role of Program Review in Institutional Planning

The current program review process includes the collection and analysis of a variety of course- and program-level assessment data. These data often reflect information related to student outcomes, program resources, and stakeholder satisfaction. As assessment results are generally used to inform and justify recommendations for program improvements, the program review process plays an important role in institutional planning and budget prioritization. Compton College's institutional planning process is based on the college mission and strategic initiatives (see Appendix A) and is guided by a variety of college-wide processes, including program review. These integrated processes serve to guide resource allocation to ensure institutional effectiveness and student success.


During the program review process, a variety of quantitative and qualitative data are reviewed to identify any opportunities for addressing student equity, enhancing student learning, and promoting overall success in the program. Final program review documents include formal recommendations for program improvement. The program faculty may recommend curricular changes (e.g., course revisions, course requirements for certificates/degrees) which are proposed to the Division and College Curriculum Committees. Other recommendations may be instructional in nature, or operational and may be directly implemented without additional cost. Program review recommendations that will incur a cost are prioritized at multiple levels of planning and considered in terms of their alignment with one or more of the College's strategic initiatives. Funding requests that originate from program review are accordingly considered within the context of the college's planning and budgeting process each year (see Figure 1 below).

The Program Review informs but is distinct from the annual plan that each discipline and department creates. Program Review is a comprehensive review of student success and services over several years, while the annual plan identifies goals, priorities, and recommendations for the next academic or fiscal year. Annual plans start at each program or department and roll up into unit, then area, and finally into the overall college plan for the next academic/fiscal year. This College Plan should be aligned with the proposed budget for the upcoming fiscal or academic year.

At the program level, recommendations from program review are documented in the Program Plan which is submitted to the Division Dean or the Department Director. The Dean or Director, along with relevant stakeholders (faculty, staff and administrators) consider the funding requests from each program's Annual Plan as they develop the Unit Plan which includes a prioritized list of recommendations at the division level. Upon review of each division's Unit Plan, the Dean determines the top priorities to incorporate into the Area Plan for academic affairs. The same process captures recommendations from student services, administrative services, human resources and departments under the President's office.

The Vice Presidents then collaborate to prioritize the requests in each of their area plans and to determine the college's top priorities within each of the following funding categories: 1) Staffing, 2) Software/Hardware, 3) Instructional Equipment, 4) Non-instructional Equipment, Furniture, 5) Facilities, and 6) Other. These prioritized funding requests are then presented to the Compton College Planning and Budgeting Committee, which reviews them to ensure that they align with the college mission and strategic initiatives. The final list of proposed funding allocations is incorporated into the college budget and forwarded to the President/CEO and the Board of Trustees for their approval.

Figure 1.



Program Review at Compton College

Program Review Cycles

Pursuant to institutional policy, all programs at Compton College are required to conduct a full program review every four (4) years. Program review is a self-study process designed to facilitate the following objectives:

1. Recognize and acknowledge program/department performance.
2. Assist in program/department improvement through self-reflection.
3. Enhance student success by offering recommendations to improve their performance in program and student learning outcomes.
4. Provide program members the opportunity to discuss and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of their programs/departments.

Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs conduct a full program review every four years, which includes Supplemental Questions for CTE programs. In addition, every two years (once between full reviews) CTE programs must conduct a mini-review and respond to Supplemental Questions for CTE programs.

The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for supporting and monitoring the overall academic program review process. Division Deans are responsible for designating particular faculty members who will provide program-level leadership for completing a scheduled review in any given year. The Vice President of Student Services is responsible for identifying and designating authors of student service program reviews, while the Vice President of Administrative Services is responsible for assigning and monitoring the program reviews of administrative departments. The Vice President of Human Resources is responsible for the Human Resources review, and the Director of Institutional Research and Planning manages the program reviews assigned under the President's Office. Included is the Program Review Cycle for 2016-2023 for academic programs at Compton College (see Appendix B).

Program Review Components

Program review is designed to represent a comprehensive self-study and examination process. To ensure thorough consideration of various aspects of program effectiveness, full academic program review at Compton College includes the following components:

- Overview of the Program
- Analysis of Research Data (including completion and transfer data in alignment with Vision for Success)
- Curriculum
- Assessment and Student Learning Outcomes
- Analysis of Student Feedback
- Facilities and Equipment
- Technology and Software
- Staffing

- Future Direction and Vision
- Prioritized Recommendations

Student Service program reviews include the following components:

- Program Description
- Program Environment
- Service Area Outcomes
- Program Improvement
- Customer Service
- Conclusions and Recommendations

Administrative Service and President's Office program reviews include the following components:

- Program Overview
- Program Data
- Program Requirements
- Recommendations

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) maintains updated program review guidelines and instructions (see Appendix C, D and E) which provides a detailed description of and guidelines for addressing each of the components identified above. During the year for which a program/department is scheduled for program review, the faculty compiles a final program review document which addresses each component.

As Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs are required to complete a CTE Review every two years (once between full reviews), the full review for such programs also includes the CTE Supplemental Questions (see Appendix F for the full list of questions and required documentation).

Program Review Process and Timeline

Compton College follows a structured process which provides guidance, resources, and other support for the development of the final program review document by program faculty. The Program Review Coordinator ensures that the most updated Program Review materials are available on the college website. The Program Review Coordinator also conducts training sessions each semester to provide faculty an overview of the program review components, process, and timeline for completion. When applicable, training sessions will give special emphasis to data analysis.

Academic Program Review Process. Accessible via the academic program review website, the process document is presented below, which provides an overview of the academic program review process.

Step	Action	Time
1	Programs due for review will be notified. The faculty coordinator will email templates to program authors.	February/March
2	Authors attend program review trainings, and begin working on first drafts.	February/March
3	Authors complete first drafts. Student surveys are administered during this time. Collaboration with program faculty, SLO Facilitators, Deans and the Program Review Coordinator, are encouraged.	March-June
4	Drafts are submitted to Deans for review. Deans will comment, and return drafts to faculty within 2 weeks.	June-August
5	Faculty finalize program reviews, taking the Dean's comments into account.	June-August
6	Faculty authors submit program reviews to the Program Review Coordinator (jmills@elcamino.edu), who forwards them to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC).	September 1
7	The IEC reviews submissions utilizing a rubric, with an emphasis on both content and form. Submissions are deemed "exemplary," "proficient" or "needs improvement."	October-November
8	Program submissions receiving a "proficient" or "needs improvement" will be provided a list of suggested revisions by the IEC. Authors with documents deemed "proficient" may make changes before final submission to the Program Review Coordinator within 30 days. Authors receiving a "needs improvement" must address the comments and resubmit to their division Dean or Supervisor within 30 days.	November-December
9	Documents which "need improvement" must be approved by the Dean/Supervisor. If not approved by the Dean within 30 days, delinquent programs will lose funding priority, and faculty may lose overload privileges.	N/A
10	Following acceptance, authors will send final drafts to the Program Review Coordinator to be posted to the website, and upload their program review into the campus planning software. Finally, faculty will incorporate recommendations into their annual plan(s).	N/A

Non-Academic Program Review Process. The following document provides an overview of the non-academic program review process.

Step	Action	Time
1	The semester prior to the program review due date, authors should request applicable data from Institutional Research, and design their client/customer satisfaction survey.	Prior Semester
2	Authors will be asked to attend program review trainings, where they will begin working with the template and their data.	First Month of Current Semester
3	Authors begin working on drafts. Client/customer satisfaction surveys are administered during this time, and returned to IR for analysis. Collaboration with program employees, Deans, Supervisors, and the Program Review Coordinator, are encouraged.	First Month of Current Semester
4	Drafts are submitted to Deans/Supervisors for review (if applicable). Administrators will comment, and return drafts to faculty within 2 weeks.	TBD By Dean or Supervisor
5	Authors finalize program reviews, taking Administrator comments into account.	TBD By Dean or Supervisor
6	Authors submit program reviews to the Program Review Coordinator (jmills@elcamino.edu), who forwards them to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC).	End of Semester
7	The IEC reviews submissions utilizing a rubric, with an emphasis on both content and form. Submissions are deemed “exemplary,” “proficient” or “needs improvement.”	Following Semester
8	Program submissions receiving a “proficient” or “needs improvement” will be provided a list of comments by the IEC. “Proficient” programs may address these comments. Program documents that “need improvement” must address these comments and resubmit to their Dean or Supervisor within 30 days.	Following Semester
9	Documents originally deemed “needs improvement” must be approved by the Dean/Supervisor.	N/A
10	Following acceptance, authors will upload their program review into the campus planning software (Nuventive).	N/A

Finalizing the Program Review Document. As described in a previous section of this document, the Program Review Coordinator as well as the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) is available throughout the program review process to offer guidance and support to programs scheduled for review in any given year. Additionally, program review training workshops are offered according to the schedule on the program review website. By the date identified in the current year’s timeline, each program must submit a formal program review document which addresses the required components described in the previous section. Upon receipt of program review drafts, IEC members review each document and use a standard rubric (see appendix G, H or I) to provide feedback to every program regarding how the draft document addresses each program review component. Program submissions are deemed either “exemplary,” “proficient,” or “needs improvement” (Program submissions receiving a “needs improvement” will be provided a list of comments by the IEC and may request a meeting with the reviewers or Program Review Coordinator for further clarification. These programs have 30 days to address these issues and resubmit to their Vice President. Once approved, the Program Review Coordinator will post the document to the website. Programs whose documents do not meet proficiency will not be eligible to submit budget or faculty requests until the deficiencies are addressed.

Final Steps in the Program Review Process. Upon submission of the final program review document to the IEC, each program must also: 1) upload a PDF of the document to the Document Repository of the college’s data management system for program review and planning (i.e., Nuventive, which the college also uses to store information related to the assessment of learning outcomes), and 2) copy text from each component section of the final program review into the respective section of the program review and planning module of the system (the module currently does not support charts or graphs). Within Nuventive’s program review and planning module, program information can be updated during the four years between formal program reviews. Programs should update on an ongoing basis so that the information in the module represents a snapshot of program outcomes, resources, and recommendation statuses at any given time.

Program Review Resources



Helpful Links Related to Program Review

Compton College Academic and Student Service Program Review Webpages:

<http://www.compton.edu/Academics/program-reviews/>

<http://www.compton.edu/student-services/ProgramReview.aspx>

The Program Review webpages provides general information regarding the program review process and contains links to regularly updated information such as:

- *Program Review Cycles*  *Program Review Manual*
- *Program Review Timelines*  *Program Review Training Schedule*
- *Completed Program Reviews from the Current and Previous Years*

Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) Webpages:

<http://www.compton.edu/academics/ir/>

The IRP webpages features a dashboard which provides access to a variety of institutional and program-specific data supporting program review, including: 1) student demographics, 2) success and retention rates, and 3) survey results.

Nuventive

<https://myapps.microsoft.com/>

Compton College uses the Nuventive data management system to support its learning assessment, program review, and planning processes. Users must log in to Nuventive to enter and/or update data, recommendations, and other information related to these processes. From within the system, users may view program review and planning information (depending on approved level of access). Nuventive also includes reporting features which facilitate monitoring various review cycles and tracking specific action items.

Resource Contact Information

Program Review Coordinator

Jesse Mills, Professor of Political Science

jmills@compton.edu

(310) 900-1600, x2213

Institutional Effectiveness Committee Chair

Katherine Marsh, Professor of Biology

kmarsh@compton.edu

(310) 900-1600, x2438

Office of Institutional Research and Planning

Lauren Sosenko, Director, Research and Planning

Lsosenko@compton.edu

(310) 900-1600, X2791

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Facilitators

Each academic division designates at least one SLO Facilitator to assist with the coordination of course- and program-level learning outcomes assessment for the division. SLO Facilitators are a valuable resource for completing the “Assessments and Student Learning Outcomes” component of program review. As faculty assignments are subject to change for a variety of reasons, each division office maintains the most updated information regarding its SLO Facilitator(s).

APPENDIX A

CCCD COLLEGE VISION & MISSION AND STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

Vision

Compton College will be the leading institution of student learning and success in higher education.

Mission Statement

Compton College is a welcoming and inclusive community where diverse students are supported to pursue and attain student success. Compton College provides solutions to challenges, utilizes the latest techniques for preparing the workforce and provides clear pathways for completion of programs of study, transition to a university, and securing living-wage employment.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES for 2015-2020

In order to fulfill the mission and make progress toward the vision *from 2017 to 2024*, Compton College will focus its efforts on the following Strategic Initiatives. Strategic Initiatives represent the areas of focused improvement. Objectives are college-wide plans to make progress on each initiative–

Improve recruitment, enrollment, retention, and completion rates for our students.

Objective 1. Tailor degree and certificate programs to meet the needs of our students.

Objective 2. Educate students about pathways to graduation.

Objective 3. Enhance student preparation for academic success and completion.

Objective 4. Provide a student-centered environment that leads to student success.

Support the success of all students to meet their education, and career goals.

Objective 1. Attract and retain traditional students, and focus on retaining non-traditional students.

Objective 2. Minimize the equity gap for access, retention, and graduation rates.

Objective 3. Identify and provide clear pathways for traditional and non-traditional students to meet their goals.

Support the success of students through the use of technology.

Objective 1. Implement an early alert program to identify and notify students of support services and programs in a timely manner.

Objective 2. Provide robust distance education course and service offerings.

Objective 3. Enhance technology for teaching and learning through professional development.

Offer excellent programs that lead to degrees and certificates in Allied Health and Technical fields.

Objective 1. Increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded in the Allied Health and Technical fields.

Objective 2. Implement a plan to target outreach of working professionals in Healthcare and Advanced Manufacturing.

Objective 3. Create collaborative partnerships with industry leaders in the Allied Health and Technical fields.

Establish partnerships in the community and with the K-12 schools.

Objective 1. Establish faculty to faculty partnerships with K-12 feeder schools to better align curriculum between the two segments, and to improve student preparation.

Objective 2. Continue to develop more Career and Technical Education programs that meet the needs of the community.

Objective 3. Strengthen the broader needs of the community served by Compton Community College District.

APPENDIX B
Compton College

Program Review Timelines
2016 – 2023

Program	Division	Year Due	CTE 2 Year	Year Due	CTE 2 Year
Child Development	1	2016	2018	2020	2022
Communication Studies	3	2016		2020	
English	3	2016		2020	
English as a Second Language	3	2016		2020	
History	2	2016		2020	
Life Sciences	1	2016		2020	
Political Science	2	2016		2020	
Social Science: Sociology, Anthropology, Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, Economics	2	2016		2020	
Auto Collision Repair and Painting	2	2017	2019	2021	2023
Auto Technology	2	2017	2019	2021	2023
Business	2	2017	2019	2021	2023
Computer Information Systems	2	2017	2019	2021	2023
Fine Arts: Art, Dance, Film/Video, Theatre	2	2017		2021	
Heating, Ventilation, A/C & Refrigeration (HVACR)	2	2017	2019	2021	2023
Kinesiology, Physical Education, First Aid, Recreation	1	2017		2021	
Learning Resources Unit	SS	(Spring 2017)		2021	
Music	2	2017	2019	2021	2023
Nursing	1	2017	2019	2021	2023
Welding	2	2017	2019	2021	2023
Administration of Justice	2	2018	2020	2022	2024
Chemistry	1	2018		2022	
Earth Science	1	2018		2022	
Human Development	3	2018		2022	
Languages: Spanish, ASL	2	2018		2022	
Mathematics	3	2018		2022	
Physics/Astronomy	1	2018		2022	
Psychology	1	2018		2022	
Cosmetology*	2	2019	2021	2023	2025
Distance Education	SS	Revised to Spring 2020		Revised to Spring 2024	

Machine Tool & Manufacturing Technology	2	2019	2021	2023	2025
CalWORK's	SS	Spring 2016		Spring 2020	
EOPS & CARE	SS	Spring 2016		Spring 2020	
Upward Bound	SS	Fall 2016		Fall 2020	
Counseling	SS	Fall 2016		Fall 2020	
Institutional Research	PRES	Spring 2017		Spring 2021	
Special Resource Center	SS	Fall 2017		Fall 2021	
Child Development Center	SS	Fall 2017		Fall 2021	
Athletics	SS	Spring 2018		Spring 2022	
Assessment/Testing	SS	Spring 2018		Spring 2022	
Financial Aid & Scholarship	SS	Revised to Spring 2019		Spring 2023	
First Year Experience	SS	Spring 2019		Spring 2022	
Outreach & School Relations	SS	Revised to Fall 2019		Fall 2023	
Student Life	SS	Fall 2018		Fall 2022	
Admissions & Records	SS	Revised to Fall 2019		Fall 2023	
Foster Care	SS	Revised to Fall 2019		Fall 2023	
Business Services (Accounting, contracts)	AS	Spring 2018		Spring 2022	
Human Resources	AS	Spring 2018		Spring 2022	
Facilities, Planning and Operations	AS	Spring 2018		Spring 2022	
Purchasing	AS	Spring 2019		Spring 2023	
Information Technology Services	AS	Revised to Spring 2020		Spring 2024	
Community Relations	PRES	Spring 2019		Spring 2023	
Police Services	SS	Fall 2019		Fall 2023	
Auxiliary Services (Facilities rental))	AS	Fall 2019		Fall 2023	

**New Program*

All academic program reviews due to the IEC September 1.

Student service and administrative program reviews due to the IEC by the end of the semester.

APPENDIX C
COMPTON COLLEGE ACADEMIC PROGRAM
REVIEW GUIDELINES AND INSTRUCTIONS

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions
<p>1. <u>Overview of the Program</u></p> <p>a) Provide a brief narrative description of the current program, including the program’s mission statement and the students it serves.</p> <p>b) Describe the degrees and/or certificates offered by the program.</p> <p>c) Explain how the program fulfills the college’s mission and aligns with the strategic initiatives. (see Appendix A)</p> <p>d) Discuss the status of recommendations from your previous program review.</p>	<p><u>Overview of the Program</u></p> <p><i>If someone asked you about your program, what would you tell them? Use this opportunity to “brag” about your program offerings, accomplishments, and contributions to the college and/or the community. Describe the students and other stakeholders that you serve.</i></p> <p><i>In your response, include the number of units or courses required to complete the program.</i></p> <p><i>How do program offerings and services contribute to the college mission? In what way do program objectives align with the college’s strategic initiatives?</i></p> <p><i>What happened with the requests you had before? Are they completed, active, on hold, abandoned? How did any action or inaction on the past recommendations impact your program?</i></p>
<p>2. <u>Analysis of Research Data (include data provided by Institutional Research & Planning)</u></p>	<p><u>Analysis of Research Data</u></p> <p><i>The Program Review Coordinator in conjunction with Institutional Research will provide authors with the research data, embedded in the program review template.</i></p> <p><i>Beginning in the 2019-20 academic year, the data will include completion and transfer data aligned with the California Community College Chancellor’s Office Vision for Success.</i></p>

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions
<p>Provide and <u>analyze</u> the following statistics/data.</p> <p>a) Head count of students in the program</p> <p>b) Course grade distribution</p> <p>c) Success rates (Discuss your program’s success rates, addressing any performance gaps and setting a success standard for your program.)</p> <p>d) Retention rates (Discuss your program’s retention rates, addressing any student equity issues as applicable.)</p> <p>e) A comparison of success and retention rates in face-to-face classes with distance education classes</p> <p>f) Enrollment statistics with section and seat counts and fill rates</p> <p>g) Scheduling of courses (day vs. night, days offered, and sequence)</p> <p>h) Improvement rates (course success by placement method, if applicable)</p> <p>i) Completion counts</p> <p>j) Transfer data</p> <p>k) Additional data compiled by faculty</p>	<p><i>If your program has a data set distinct from that given by IRP that must be interpreted for outside accreditation, please address any discrepancies between data sets.</i></p> <p><i>Identify and address any enrollment trends. Any increase or decrease in enrollment during the review cycle?</i></p> <p><i>Are there some courses that stand out in one way or another in terms of grades?</i></p> <p><i>Success is defined as a student completing the course with an A, B or C.</i></p> <p><i>In discussing success, address any performance gaps if your success rates are lower for disproportionately impacted students. What is your program doing or planning to do to close performance gaps and address student equity?</i></p> <p><i>Institutional Research and Planning will provide programs with a proposed percentage for their success standards and a rationale for that number. In addition, faculty will be given topics for discussion and consideration as they finalize the standards for their program. Please explain changes to the proposed percentage.</i></p> <p><i>Retention is defined as the percentage of students who remain enrolled through the end of a course out of all students enrolled at census date. In essence, it is the percentage of students who did not withdraw or drop. What is your program doing or planning to do to retain students who are disproportionately impacted?</i></p> <p><i>Are there any differences in success and retention rates across delivery method?</i> <i>In discussing success and retention rates, consider using SLO assessment data as a complement, especially in cases where success is low due to large numbers of drops.</i></p> <p><i>Identify and address any trends in fill rates. Are there particular sections that are consistently over/under filled?</i></p> <p><i>Are the times and frequencies that courses are scheduled fulfilling the need or demand for the courses?</i></p> <p><i>Improvement rates, sometimes called persistence, measure the progress of students through a sequence of courses. Do students progress through the sequence successfully?</i></p> <p><i>What number of students earn degrees and/or certificates? What number of students transfer?</i></p> <p><i>The following websites contain rich data resources about your program and the college:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Compton College Institutional Research and Planning http://www.compton.edu/academics/ir/</i> <i>2. Chancellor’s Office DataMart http://datamart.cccco.edu</i>

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions
<p>j) List any related recommendations.</p>	<p><i>Additional data may include survey data, test scores, career placement, etc. Requests for specific data collection can be made at the Institutional Research and Planning website, or by speaking with IRP staff. If you have any questions about data or its collection, please contact IRP.</i></p> <p><i>If the recommendation requires funding, provide a cost estimate.</i></p>
<p>3. Curriculum Review and discuss the curriculum work done in the program during the past four years, including the following:</p> <p>a) Provide the curriculum course review timeline to ensure all courses are reviewed at least once every 6 years.</p> <p>b) Explain any course additions to current course offerings.</p> <p>c) Explain any course deletions and in activations from current course offerings.</p> <p>d) Describe the courses and number of sections offered in distance education. (Distance education includes hybrid classes.)</p> <p>e) Discuss how well the courses, degrees, or certificates meet students' transfer or career training needs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have all courses that are required for your program's degrees and certificates been offered during the last two years? If not, has the program established a course offering cycle? 2. Are there any concerns regarding program courses and their articulation to courses at other educational institutions? 	<p><u>Curriculum</u></p> <p><i>Curricunet is the database for curriculum. Log in through the MyCompton portal.</i></p> <p><i>For curriculum questions and timelines, consult your division representative to the College Curriculum Committee.</i></p> <p><i>Course deletions permanently eliminate a course, whereas in activations put a course "on hold." An inactivated course does not appear in the college catalogue but can be <u>relatively easily reactivated through the curriculum process.</u> It is much easier to reactivate a course than to create a new one. Some courses are currently being inactivated because they have not been offered in the past several years</i></p> <p><i>Articulation</i> refers to an official agreement between Compton College and other institutions. If a course has been "articulated" it means that the institution acknowledges that the course is equivalent to the course offered on their campus and agrees to accept it in lieu of their course.</p> <p><i>Transferable</i> means that an institution will accept a course as elective credit but does not guarantee course-to-course credit.</p>

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions
<p>3. How many students earn degrees and/or certificates in your program? Set an attainable, measurable goal related to student completion of the program's degrees/certificates.</p> <p>4. Are any licensure/certification exams required for program completion or career entry? If so, what is the pass rate among graduates? Set an attainable, measurable goal for pass rates and identify any applicable performance benchmarks set by regulatory agencies.</p> <p>f) List any related recommendations.</p>	<p><i>Set a specific, realistic goal for degree/certificate completion rates based on your data. Discuss any factors that may impact student attainment. Discuss any program modifications (e.g., revised program criteria) that may be considered based on the data.</i></p> <p><i>As applicable, set a specific, realistic goal for licensure/certification exam pass rates based on your data. Discuss factors that may impact student pass rates. Discuss any curriculum revisions or other program modifications that may be considered based on the data. As applicable, address any action plans for maintaining/improving performance relative to standard benchmarks.</i></p> <p><i>If the recommendation requires funding, provide a cost estimate.</i></p>
<p>4. <u>Assessment and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</u></p> <p>a) Provide a copy of your alignment grid, which shows how course, program, and institutional learning outcomes are aligned.</p> <p>b) Provide a timeline for your course and program level SLO assessments.</p> <p>c) State the percent of course and program SLO statements that have been assessed.</p> <p>d) Summarize the SLO and PLO assessment results over the past four years and describe how those results led to improved student learning. Analyze and describe those changes. Provide specific examples.</p> <p>e) Describe how you have improved your SLO/PLO assessment process and engaged in dialogue about assessment results.</p> <p>f) List any related recommendations.</p>	<p><u>Assessment and Student Learning Outcome (SLOs)</u></p> <p><i>Discuss the SLO process and assessment results. Please note that according to the ACCJC rubric, a "sustainable" level of assessment is evidenced when student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement; there is dialogue about student learning that is ongoing, pervasive, and robust; and student learning improvement is a visible priority in the program.</i></p> <p><i>Please contact your SLO facilitator and/or the SLO coordinator for SLO alignment grids.</i></p> <p><i>Tabulate the number and percent of course and program SLO statements assessed.</i></p> <p><i>What has your program learned by assessing its SLOs and PLOs? What changes you have made after considering assessment results? In the response, describe the changes and the impact they have had on student learning and program effectiveness.</i></p> <p><i>Is the program making improvements to the SLO assessment process and raising SLO awareness with faculty and students? Have SLO assessment results been shared and discussed in meetings (e.g., faculty meetings, brown-bag lunches)? Is information about SLOs distributed via email, bulletin boards, or some form of update?</i></p> <p><i>If the recommendation requires funding, provide a cost estimate.</i></p>

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions
<p>5. Analysis of Student Feedback Provide a copy of any feedback reports generated by Institutional Research and Planning or your program. Review and discuss student feedback collected during the past four years including any surveys, focus groups, and/or interviews.</p> <p>a) Describe the results of the student survey in each of the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Student support ii. Curriculum iii. Facilities, Equipment, and technology iv. Program objectives <p>b) Discuss the implications of the survey results for the program.</p> <p>c) Discuss the results of other relevant surveys.</p> <p>d) List any related recommendations.</p>	<p><u>Analysis of Student Feedback</u> <i>How were the surveys distributed? What was the response rate?</i></p> <p><i>Are there any noteworthy patterns of student feedback? Analyze areas where student perceive the program is performing well and areas where students perceive the program could use improvement. Attach survey report from IRP as an appendix to the final program review document.</i></p> <p><i>Does the student feedback correlate with any of your findings in other program review areas (e.g., Curriculum, Facilities)? Are students asking for courses, services, or other items which require additional resources? If the recommendation requires funding, provide a cost estimate.</i></p>
<p>6. <u>Facilities and Equipment</u></p> <p>a) Describe and assess the existing program facilities and equipment.</p> <p>b) Explain the immediate (1-2 years) needs related to facilities and equipment. Provide a cost estimate for each need and explain how it will help the program better meet its goals.</p> <p>c) Explain the long-range (2-4+ years) needs related to facilities and equipment. Provide a cost estimate for each need and explain how it will help the program better meet its goals.</p> <p>d) List any related recommendations.</p>	<p><u>Facilities and Equipment</u> <i>In the response, identify and fully justify any facilities and equipment needs. Discuss the viability of consolidating or sharing equipment and facilities to satisfy needs.</i></p> <p><i>What impact would not meeting these needs have on your program?</i></p> <p><i>If the recommendation requires funding, provide a cost estimate.</i></p>
<p>7. <u>Technology and Software</u></p> <p>a) Describe and assess the adequacy and currency of the technology and software used by the program.</p> <p>b) Explain the immediate (1-2 years) needs related to technology and software. Provide a cost estimate for each need and explain how it will help the program better meet its goals.</p> <p>c) Explain the long-range (2-4+ years) needs related to technology and software. Provide a cost estimate for each need and explain how it will help the program better meet its goals.</p> <p>d) List any related recommendations.</p>	<p><u>Technology and Software</u> <i>In the response, identify and fully justify any technology and software needs. Discuss the viability of consolidating or sharing technology and software to satisfy needs.</i></p> <p><i>What impact would not meeting these needs have on your program?</i></p> <p><i>If the recommendation requires funding, provide a cost estimate. Be sure to include the cost of maintenance and upgrades.</i></p>

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions												
<p>8. <u>Staffing</u></p> <p>a) Describe the program’s current staffing, including faculty, administration, and classified staff.</p> <p>b) Explain and justify the program’s staffing needs in the immediate (1-2 years) and long-term (2-4+ years). Provide cost estimates and explain how the position/s will help the program better meet its goals.</p> <p>c) List any related recommendations.</p>	<p><u>Staffing</u></p> <p><i>In the response, identify and fully justify any current staffing needs. Discuss any options for addressing the needs.</i></p> <p><i>What impact would not meeting these staffing needs have on your program?</i></p> <p><i>If the recommendation requires funding, provide a cost estimate for classified staff and faculty.</i></p>												
<p>9. <u>Direction and Vision</u></p> <p>a) Describe relevant changes within the academic field/industry. How will these changes impact the program in the next four years?</p> <p>b) Explain the direction and vision of the program and how you plan to achieve it.</p> <p>c) List any related recommendations.</p>	<p><u>Direction and Vision</u></p> <p><i>What are the emerging trends within the academic field or discipline? What changes have occurred in the industry since the last review cycle?</i></p> <p><i>What do you envision as in ideal future direction for your program? What is the future of your program and how do you hope to get there?</i></p>												
<p>10. <u>Prioritized Recommendations</u></p> <p>a) Provide a single, prioritized list of recommendations and needs for your program/department (drawn from your recommendations in sections 2-8). Include cost estimates and list the college strategic initiative that supports each recommendation (see Appendix A). Use the following chart format to organize your recommendations.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Recommendation</th> <th>Cost</th> <th>S.I.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>b) Explain why the list is prioritized in this way.</p>	Recommendation	Cost	S.I.	1.			2.			3.			<p><u>Prioritized Recommendations</u></p> <p><i>All the prioritized recommendations appearing in this list should be discussed and justified earlier in the review.</i></p> <p><i>Be sure to include the cost estimates for pertinent recommendations. The recommendations that carry a cost will be entered into the college’s data management system for program review and planning (i.e., Nuventive) and must be linked to one of the college’s strategic initiatives to be considered for funding.</i></p>
Recommendation	Cost	S.I.											
1.													
2.													
3.													

APPENDIX D
COMPTON COLLEGE STUDENT SERVICES
PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES AND INSTRUCTIONS

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions
<p>1. <u>Program Description</u></p> <p>a) Describe the program. How does the program link to the College’s mission statement, statement of values, or strategic initiatives?</p> <p>b) Describe the student population served by the program using data. Please note the source of the data. If necessary, please contact the Office of Institutional Research & Planning to obtain data.</p> <p>c) Describe how interaction with the program helps students succeed or meet their educational goals.</p> <p>d) How does the program interact with other on-campus programs or with off-campus entities?</p> <p>e) List notable achievements that have occurred since the last Program Review.</p> <p>f) What prior Program Review recommendations were not implemented, if any, and why? What was the impact on the program and the students?</p>	<p><u>Program Description</u></p> <p><i>If someone asked you about your program, what would you tell them? Explain what the program does. What are its goals? Who is eligible? How does its function further the goals of the college (be specific and link it to the mission statement or strategic initiatives)?</i></p> <p><i>If the program does not gather this data, please contact Institutional Research to request it. This should be done the prior semester, to allow IR time to compile the data. Provide descriptive statistics such as age, ethnicity, year in college, etc.</i></p> <p><i>Explain how the program is designed to help students. For example, what service is provided, and how does that help students (if you cover this in section 1, just briefly summarize). If possible, utilizing data, demonstrate the program’s impact on student success or other student goals.</i></p> <p><i>Does this program work with others in order to meet a larger goal? Who are these partners and what are their roles?</i></p> <p><i>What are some of the program’s successes? Describe them.</i></p> <p><i>Explain why some recommendations weren’t implemented. Were they ultimately not necessary? Are they going to be implemented in the future? Please provide justification for recommendations not implemented.</i></p>
<p>2. <u>Program Environment</u></p> <p>a) Describe the program environment. Where is the program located? Does the program have adequate resources to provide the required programs and services to staff and students? If not, why?</p> <p>b) Describe the number and type of personnel assigned to the program. Please include a current organizational chart.</p> <p>c) Describe the personnel needs for the next four years.</p> <p>d) Describe facilities needs for the next four years.</p>	<p><u>Program Environment</u></p> <p><i>Describe the physical facilities. Is the equipment and/or technology adequate to meet the program’s needs? In the response, identify and fully justify any facilities and equipment requests. Discuss the viability of consolidating or sharing equipment and facilities to satisfy needs.</i></p> <p><i>List all personnel and their roles.</i></p> <p><i>Is current staffing adequate, or are new hires necessary? Are there anticipated departures that will need to be addressed? Is the program expanding?</i></p> <p><i>Are new facilities necessary? If so, what kinds/types and why.</i></p>

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions
<p>e) Describe the equipment (including technology) needs for the next four years.</p> <p>f) Describe the specific hours of operation of the program. Do the scheduled hours of operation meet the needs of staff and students?</p> <p>g) Describe the external factors that directly affect the program. Take into consideration federal and state laws, changing demographics, and the characteristics of the students served by the program. How does the program address the external factors?</p>	<p><i>Is existing equipment adequate, or do new purchases need to be made Are there ongoing equipment needs?</i></p> <p><i>Justify the program’s operating hours. Please support with data from customer satisfaction survey.</i></p> <p><i>Are there external factors that must be taken into account with regards to funding, students served, service delivery, or any other aspects of the program?</i></p>
<p>3. <u>Service Area Outcomes</u></p> <p><i>Please attach SAO assessment results as an appendix to the program review</i></p> <p>a) List the program’s SAOs.</p> <p>b) How were the SAOs developed? Who was engaged in the creation of the SAOs?</p> <p>c) How often are the SAOs assessed and who is engaged in the discussion?</p> <p>d) What has been done if the SAO assessment results were not as anticipated?</p> <p>e) Where are the SAOs assessment results shared with staff, students, and the public?</p> <p>f) Have the SAO assessment results indicated the need to change or modify components of the program? If so, were the changes implemented?</p>	<p><u>Service Area Outcomes</u></p> <p><i>Describe the process by which the SAO’s were developed. How did the program decide on this set of SAO’s? Was there data involved?</i></p> <p><i>What actions have been taken to address SAO’s that weren’t as expected? If SAO’s were as expected, what is being done to ensure continued success?</i></p> <p><i>After analyzing the findings, were there areas that the program could improve? If so, what changes were made to address program shortcomings?</i></p>

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions
<p>4. Program Improvement</p> <p><i>Information should help determine where program resources should be dedicated</i></p> <p>a) What activities has the program engaged in to improve services to students?</p> <p>b) How have program personnel used metrics to improve program services? Provide metrics from the last four years.</p> <p>c) If applicable, explain any patterns in student success, retention, persistence, graduation, and transfer in terms of student characteristics and program objectives and discuss planned responses or changes.</p>	<p><u>Program Improvement</u></p> <p><i>How can services be improved? Data derived from SAO's and the customer service survey can be addressed, as well as other data sources.</i></p> <p><i>Has the program used data to improve program services? If so, explain the data sources.</i></p> <p><i>Identify trends in the data (if any exist). Did certain groups of students perform better than others? Was the program more effective for certain students than others? If these trends exist, explain how they can be addressed.</i></p>
<p>5. Customer Service</p> <p>a) How was the survey conducted? Please include a copy of the survey in the appendix.</p> <p>b) What were the major findings of the customer service survey?</p> <p>c) Describe exemplary services that should be expanded or shared with other programs.</p> <p>d) What aspect of the program's service needs improvement? Explain how the program will address service improvements.</p>	<p><u>Customer Service</u></p> <p><i>Who was it administered to (who was included in the sample)? What type of survey questions were administered (open ended questions, multiple choice questions, likert scale, etc.)? How was the survey administered (face-to-face, online, paper questionnaire, etc.)?</i></p> <p><i>Were there any trends? What did customer satisfaction look like overall? Were there any significant differences in satisfaction between respondents?</i></p>

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions
<p>6. <u>Conclusions and Recommendations</u> <u>(Include only information previously referenced in the program review)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Summarize the program’s strengths. b) Summarize the program’s areas that need improvement. c) List the program’s recommendations in a prioritized manner to help better understand their importance to the program. 	<p><u>Conclusions and Recommendations</u></p> <p><i>All the prioritized recommendations appearing in this list should be discussed and justified earlier in the review.</i></p> <p><i>Be sure to include the cost estimates for pertinent recommendations, as well as which strategic initiative they support. The recommendations that carry a cost will be entered into the college’s data management system for program review and planning (i.e., Nuventive) and must be linked to one of the college’s strategic initiatives to be considered for funding.</i></p>

APPENDIX E

COMPTON COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND PRESIDENT'S OFFICE PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES AND INSTRUCTIONS

Program Review Component	<i>Guidelines and Instructions</i>
<p>1. <u>Overview</u></p> <p>a) Program profile.</p> <p>b) Status of previous recommendations.</p> <p>c) Continuing recommendations</p>	<p><u>Overview</u></p> <p><i>The program profile should contain the program name, primary objectives, funding source(s), a profile of the students or clients served, and any other information that will provide the reader with a more complete understanding of the program. Please contact Institutional Research to obtain some of this preliminary data if you do not already have access to it. This should be done the prior semester, to allow IR time to compile the data. (If possible) Provide descriptive statistics such as age, ethnicity, year in college, etc.</i></p> <p><i>List the current status of recommendations that were provided in the last program review.</i></p> <p><i>List the recommendations that are expected to continue as a result of the program review.</i></p>
<p>2. <u>Program Data</u></p> <p>a) Customer/student/client satisfaction data.</p> <p>b) Customer/student/client outcome data.</p> <p>c) Campus/community collaboration</p> <p>d) Program data recommendations</p>	<p><u>Program Data</u></p> <p><i>List and analyze the results of the student or client satisfaction survey. Based upon the analysis what program improvements should be made. Assistance from Institutional Research and Planning will be necessary to create, distribute, and tally the survey. Please make arrangements for the survey one semester prior to your due date.</i></p> <p><i>This section requires the analysis of customer, student or client program data (i.e., metrics) that has been collected over the past three years. Metrics should be thought of as program specific data such as the <u>number</u> of customer/students/clients who utilized various segments of your service over a specific period of time. Based upon the trends and performance indicator data (e.g., metrics) what changes, if any, should be made to improve the program? All program improvement must be tied to the data.</i></p> <p><i>List collaborative efforts with the campus and external community that are designed to benefit the program. Describe the effectiveness of each collaboration or partnership. Describe how the collaborative efforts can/should be strengthened and what new collaborations or partnerships should be pursued to improve the program.</i></p> <p><i>Compile all program data recommendations from A-C.</i></p>

Program Review Component	Guidelines and Instructions
<p>3. <u>Program Requirements</u></p> <p>a) Program support.</p> <p>b) Facilities and equipment.</p> <p>c) Staffing</p> <p>d) Planning</p> <p>e) Program requirement recommendations</p>	<p><u>Program Requirements</u></p> <p><i>List campus departments that are essential to the success of this program, the impact of those departments on the program, and what is being done to strengthen the partnership between each.</i></p> <p><i>Provide a summary of the current state of the program’s facilities and equipment and list recommendations if appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>Describe the adequacy/inadequacy of the program’s current staffing level and the training needs of program personnel. Provide a personnel chart * like one that follows. Discuss how the data in the chart impacts the program and its future. Are program personnel current in their field? If not, describe what is needed to maintain currency and how it will improve the program. List recommendations based upon question responses.</i></p> <p><i>Analyze external (advisory committee input, academic/trade journal articles, or other appropriate sources) and internal information to determine changes or trends that will impact the program within the next five years. Explain how the program’s planning process (1) involves program staff, (2)ties into the institution’s goals and student learning outcomes, and (3) is linked to budgeting.</i></p> <p><i>What data, not currently provided, would be needed to improve program development planning? Explain the type of data desired, why it will be useful, and list the possible sources, if known.</i></p> <p><i>Describe how program personnel are made aware of what is happening in the program, future program plans, external/internal changes affecting the program, and changes that need to be made to enable the program to adapt and continue to be successful.</i></p> <p><i>List all recommendations made in the Program Requirements section.</i></p>
<p>4. <u>Recommendations</u></p>	<p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p><i>Provide a prioritized list of all recommendations made throughout this program review and the cost associated with each recommendation, as well as a corresponding success indicator. List the strategies program personnel will pursue to aid in the achievement of each recommendation. Enter this section into the campus planning software.</i></p>

***Personnel Chart**

Name	Reassigned time (show in %)	Currently on leave*	Retired in the las 2 years	F/T hired in the last 3 years	Anticipated to retire in the next years

APPENDIX F

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION (CTE) SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

CTE programs must conduct a full program review every 4 years. The comprehensive program review includes responses to the CTE supplemental questions below. Every two years (once between full program reviews) these supplemental questions must be answered and submitted to Academic Affairs for posting on the College website.

Use labor market data, advisory committee input/feedback, and institutional and program-level data to respond to the following questions:

- 1. How strong is the occupational demand for the program?** In your response, describe any changes in demand over the past 5 years and discuss the occupational outlook for next 5 years. Provide applicable labor market data (e.g., US Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment Development Department) that address state and local needs.
- 2. How does the program address needs that are not met by similar programs in the region?** In your response, identify any distinctive components of the program (e.g., curriculum, facilities, resources) and/or describe any unique contributions the program or its students/graduates make to the community served.
- 3. What are the completion, success, and employment rates for students in the program?** In your response, identify the standards set by the program and discuss any factors that may impact completion, success, and employment rates among students in the program. Describe the status of any action plans for maintaining/improving rates relative to such benchmarks
- 4. List any licensure/certification exam(s) required for entry into the workforce in the field of study and report the most recent pass rate(s) among program graduates.** In your response, identify any applicable performance benchmarks set by regulatory agencies and describe the status of any action plans for maintaining/improving pass rates relative to such benchmarks.
- 5. Are the students satisfied with their preparation for employment? Are the employers in the field satisfied with the level of preparation of program graduates?** Use data from student surveys, employer surveys, and other sources of employment feedback to justify your response.
- 6. Is the advisory committee satisfied with the level of preparation of program graduates? How has advisory committee input and feedback been used in the past two years to ensure employer needs are met by the program?** Describe the status and impact of any advisory committee recommendations.

California Education Code 78016 requires that the review process for CTE programs includes the review and comments of a program's advisory committee. **Provide the following information:**

- a. Advisory committee membership list and credentials
- b. Meeting minutes or other documentation to demonstrate that the CTE program review process has met the above Education Code requirement.

APPENDIX G

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (IEC) ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW FEEDBACK RUBRIC

This rubric is used by Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) members to provide feedback on submitted program review drafts.

Program Reviewed _____

Review Date _____

Reviewer Name (optional) _____

Recommendation _____

Section 1 – Overview of the Program

- Does the overview succinctly describe the program and its degree and/or certificate offerings? Yes No
- Is the program and its objectives aligned with the college mission and strategic initiatives? Yes No
- Does the program overview sufficiently address the status of recommendations from previous reviews? Yes No

Comments/Questions:

Section 2 – Analysis of Research Data

	<i>Check here if item is sufficiently addressed in the data analysis?</i>	<i>Do the data appropriately support any related program recommendations?</i>	<i>Comments/Questions</i>
Head Count	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Course Grade Distribution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Success Rates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Retention Rates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Distance Education (success and retention)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Enrollment Statistics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Scheduling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Improvement Rates (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Completion Counts (Associate degrees, Associate degrees for transfer, certificates)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Transfer data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	

Additional Data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
-----------------	--------------------------	---	--

Does the analysis of institutional research data set a standard for success and provide an explanation? Yes No

Comments/Questions:

Section 3 – Curriculum

Does the program review include an updated timeline for reviewing all courses on a 6-year cycle? Yes No

Does the review describe any curriculum revisions related to course offerings (e.g., new courses, course deletions and/or inactivations)? Yes No

Does the review address courses offered via distance education? Yes No

Does the review describe and set goals for any degrees and/or certificates offered by the program? Yes No

Does the review describe any applicable licensure/certification exams, graduate pass rates, and any action plans for maintaining/improving performance relative to standard benchmarks? Yes No

Comments/Questions:

Section 4 – Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Does the program review include a representation of the alignment of course SLOs, PLOs, and ILOs? Yes No

Does the program review include an updated timeline for course- and program-level outcomes assessment? Yes No

Does the review report and address the % of course- and program-level outcomes assessed? Yes No

Does the review sufficiently discuss how assessment results have led to changes in instruction, curriculum, and/or other aspect of the program? If *No*, please explain. Yes No

Does the review sufficiently discuss how the program assesses the effectiveness of any changes that have been implemented as a result of assessment? If *No*, please explain. Yes No

Does the review describe how the program has refined and improved its SLOs and assessment process (including a description of how the program dialogues about SLO assessments)? If *No*, please explain. Yes No

Other Comments/Questions:

Section 5 – Analysis of Student Feedback

- Does the review analyze the results of IRP data and accurately describe the results of student feedback? Yes No
- Does the propose review actions and/or resources needed by the program that are based on student feedback? Yes No

Comments/Questions:

Section 6: Facilities and Equipment

- Does the program review identify immediate (1 – 2 years) needs related to facilities and equipment? Yes No
- Does the program review identify long-range (2 – 4+ years) needs related to facilities and equipment? Yes No
- Do all recommendations related to facilities and equipment which require funding include cost estimates? Yes No
- Does the review provide sufficient evidence to justify recommendations and funding requests? Yes No

Comments/Questions:

Section 7: Technology and Software

- Does the program review identify immediate (1 – 2 years) needs related to technology and software? Yes No
- Does the program review identify long-range (2 – 4+ years) needs related to technology and software? Yes No
- Do all recommendations related to technology and software which require funding include cost estimates? Yes No
- Does the review provide sufficient evidence to justify recommendations and funding requests? Yes No

Comments/Questions:

Section 8: Staffing

- Does the program review identify immediate (1 – 2 years) needs related to staffing? Yes No
- Does the program review identify long-range (2 – 4+ years) needs related to staffing? Yes No
- Do all staffing recommendations which require additional funding include cost estimates? Yes No
- Does the review provide sufficient evidence to justify recommendations and funding requests? Yes No

Comments/Questions:

Section 9: Direction and Vision

Does the program review explain relevant changes in the academic field/industry using evidence?

Yes

No

Does the review describe how those changes will impact the program?

Yes

No

Comments/Questions:

Section 10: Prioritized Recommendations

Does the program review present a prioritized list of recommendations?

Yes

No

Does the review explain the process or manner by which the recommendations were prioritized?

Yes

No

Are costs included for each recommendation, when necessary?

Yes

No

Is each recommendation linked to at least one of the college's strategic initiatives?

Yes

No

Is each recommendation discussed and justified in a previous section of the review?

Yes

No

Comments/Questions:

CTE Supplemental Questions (if applicable)

Rating of Program Review

Exemplary

The program review was extremely well written; concise and grammatically correct with few to no spelling errors. A model program review that is ready to be posted online for a public audience.

Proficient

The program review was adequately written; lengthy or vague at times or included some grammatical and spelling errors. Corrections may be made prior to posting online for a public audience.

Needs Improvement

The program review was poorly written or incomplete; too lengthy or vague or too many grammatical and spelling errors throughout the document. The program review needs to be rewritten and resubmitted.

Appendix H
Compton College Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)
Student Services
Program Review Feedback Rubric

Program Description	Excellent	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Comments
Description of program. Linkage to College’s mission statement, statement of values, or strategic initiatives.				
Description of students served by the program. Source of data referenced.				
Description of how interaction with program helps students succeed or meet their educational goals.				
Description of program interaction with other on-campus programs or with off-campus entities.				
Listing of notable achievements that have occurred since last Program Review.				
Listing of prior Program Review recommendations not implemented and its impact on the program and students.				

Program Environment	Excellent	Meets	Needs Improvement	Comments
Description of program environment including the program's location and resources to provide required programs and services to staff and students.				
Description of personnel assigned to the program. Inclusion of organizational chart.				
Description of program personnel needs for the next four years.				
Description of program facilities needs for the next four years.				
Description of program equipment needs for the next four years.				
Description of program hours of operation and explanation if hours of operation meet the needs of staff and students.				
Description of external factors that affect the program. Explanation of how the program addresses external factors.				

Service Area Outcomes (SAOs)	Excellent	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Comments
Listing of program's SAOs.				
Description of how SAOs were developed and who engaged in their development.				
Description of how SAOs were assessed and who engaged in the discussion.				
Discussion of SAO assessment results especially if they were not anticipated.				
Description of where SAO assessment results are shared with staff, students, and the public.				
Discussion on SAO assessment results that indicate the need to change or modify components of the program.				

Program Improvement	Excellent	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Comments
Description of program activities aimed at improving services to students.				
Description of how program personnel have utilized metrics from the last four years to improve program services.				
Explanation of patterns in student success, retention, persistence, graduation, and transfer as they relate to student characteristics and program objectives including planned responses or changes.				
Customer Service	Excellent	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Comments
Explanation of how the customer service survey was conducted. Inclusion of survey in appendix.				
Explanation of major findings of customer service survey.				
Description of exemplary services that should be expanded or shared with other programs.				
Description of the programs' services that need improvement including how the program will carry out the improvements.				

Conclusions and Recommendations	Excellent	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Comments
Summarization of program's strengths.				
Summarization of program's areas needing improvement.				
Listing of program's recommendations in a prioritized manner.				

Rating of Program Review

- Exemplary**
The program review was extremely well written; concise and grammatically correct with few to no spelling errors. A model program review that is ready to be posted online for a public audience.

- Proficient**
The program review was adequately written; lengthy or vague at times or included some grammatical and spelling errors. Corrections may be made prior to posting online for a public audience.

- Needs Improvement**
The program review was poorly written or incomplete; too lengthy or vague or too many grammatical and spelling errors throughout the document. The program review needs to be rewritten and resubmitted.

Appendix I
Compton College Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)
Administrative Services and President’s Office
Program Review Feedback Rubric

This rubric is used by the Administrative Services Program Review Committee to provide feedback on program review drafts.

Section 1 – Overview of the Program

Does the overview succinctly describe the program and status of past recommendations? Yes No

Is the program aligned with the college mission and strategic initiatives? Yes No

General comments for section 1:

Section 2 – Analysis of Program Data

	How thoroughly are issues discussed in the data analysis?	Is data used to effectively and accurately support recommendations?
Customer/ Student/Client Satisfaction		
Customer / Student / Client Outcome Data		
Customer / Campus / Community Collaboration		
Customer / Program Data Recommendations		

Does the review set a standard for success and provide an explanation? Yes No

General comments for section 2:

Section 3 – Program Requirements

	How thoroughly are programs requirements discussed?	Is data used to effectively and accurately support the program?
Program Support		
Facilities and Equipment		
Staffing		
Planning		
Program Requirement Recommendations		

Does the review set a standard for success and provide an explanation? Yes No

General comments for section 3:

Section 4 – Recommendations

Is the list of recommendations prioritized? Yes No

Is the prioritization explained? Yes No

Are costs included for each recommendation, when necessary? Yes No

Is each recommendation linked to a strategic initiative? Yes No

Is each recommendation discussed and justified in a previous section of the review? Yes No.

General comments for section 4:

Rating of Program Review

- Exemplary**
The program review was extremely well written; concise and grammatically correct with few to no spelling errors. A model program review that is ready to be posted online for a public audience.

- Proficient**
The program review was adequately written; lengthy or vague at times or included some grammatical and spelling errors. Corrections may be made prior to posting online for a public audience.

- Needs Improvement**
The program review was poorly written or incomplete; too lengthy or vague or too many grammatical and spelling errors throughout the document. The program review needs to be rewritten and resubmitted.

APPENDIX J

Glossary of Terms

Headcount (Students)

The number of individual students enrolled in at least one program course after census date. Individuals are counted only once (referred to as an *unduplicated headcount*).

Student Demographics (Gender, Ethnicity, Academic Level, Educational Goal, etc.) Student-reported demographic data from their admissions application. This data does not get updated unless the student reapplies.

Age/Age Group

Age of the student, calculated at the beginning of the given term.

Class Load

Full-time status is indicated for any students who are enrolled in 12+ units for the semester, as of the first census date. Part-time status is indicated for any students with less than 12 units.

Time of Classes

Daytime classes are any classes beginning on weekdays before 4:30PM. Night classes are any classes beginning after 4:30PM. Classes are considered Weekend classes if they include a Saturday or Sunday meeting time. Classes are considered Unknown if there is no set meeting time, as in Distance Education or Work Experience courses.

Course Grade Distribution

The statistical distribution of all grades received for a given course. From left-to-right, the columns in this table represent: calendar **Year** the course was taught, **Course** abbreviation, instruction **Method** (lecture, laboratory, distance education, etc.), number of **Weeks** the course is held, **Grade** counts, the **Total** number of grades for the course, and the **Success** and **Retention** rate for the course.

Success Rate

The percentage of students enrolled at first census who receive an A, B, C, or P as a final course grade. Inc P grades (IA, IB, IC, IPP) are also considered passing success by the Chancellor's Office. Inc NP (ID, IF) are not considered success but are still included in retention rates. The **Program Success Standard** is calculated as the average between the lowest program success rate over the past five years and the average program success rate over the past five years.

Retention Rate

The number of students who remain enrolled through the end of a course, out of all students who were enrolled at census date. This is essentially the percentage of students who *did not withdraw or drop*.

Program Participation

Graph showing the annual number of sections (bars) and students (blocks) for a given program.

Course Fill Rate

The number of seats taken by students in a course section divided by the capacity of the section (multiplied by 100).