Academic Program Review
Guidelines 2019/20

Updated July 2019

Yavapai COLLEGE
life explored

Data packages provide information from 2014/15 to 2018/19

Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Research
Office of Instructional Support

Table of Contents

Program Review Planning and Committee Members 2018/19 and 2019/20

Membership	Representative
Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Research	Tom Hughes (Co-Chair)
District Assessment Director	Molly Beauchman (Co-Chair)
Dean of Instructional Support	Stacey Hilton
Director of Scheduling	Dean Holbrook
Finance Representative	Duane Ransom
Community Education Representative	Patricia Berlowe
Curriculum Coordinator	Patti Schlosberg
Faculty Association Representative	Matt Pearcy
Department Chair (Transfer)	Jeri Hamilton
Department Chair (Occupational)	Elizabeth Peters
Academic Dean (CATE)	John Morgan
Academic Dean (ARHU, SOSC, BUCS)	Joani Fisher
Academic Dean (HEWE, SCEN)	Scott Farnsworth
Administrative Assistant	Christine Hardin

Introduction

The Higher Learning Commission requires institutions to meet standards of quality using five criteria:

Criterion 1: Mission. *"The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations."*

Criterion 2: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct. *"The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible."*

Criterion 3: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support. *"The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered."*

Criterion 4: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Assessment. *"The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement."*

Criterion 5: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness. *"The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future."*

This document provides information about Yavapai College's guidelines and processes with respect to Academic Program Review, which contains components of each of the criteria listed above.

Academic Program Review Guidelines & Purpose

Academic Program Review is central to Yavapai College's overall process of planning, assessing and budgeting. The review process is designed to provide each academic department and occupational program with timely information to identify strengths and areas in need of improvement. Information will be provided in the data report about each program/department in the following areas:

Demand: Yavapai College offers occupational and transfer programs that reflect the demands of the job market and needs of students in the community.

Employability: Yavapai College offers occupational programs that provide students with the skills needed to gain employment in a job that has a livable wage and/or that meet the needs of the community.

Transferability: Yavapai College offers transfer degrees and certificates that align with AZ Transfer and state university guidelines and meet standards for rigor.

Completion: Yavapai College offers occupational and transfer programs that students complete in a timely manner.

Resources: Yavapai College offers occupational and transfer programs in which resources are allocated equitably and used efficiently.

The Academic Program Review process provides an opportunity for staff and faculty to actively participate in the growth and improvement of their programs or departments and provides a vehicle for accountability and transparency. Institutional planning and budgeting will be based on recommendations and evidence provided by the process.

Academic Program Review Process

All academic departments and occupational programs will be reviewed comprehensively once every three years, followed by annual program reviews to report progress. Each academic department and occupational program will form a Review Team composed of administration (including the Academic Dean), faculty (both full and part time), and staff members in the department or program being reviewed and designate a person to represent/organize activities related to completion of the Program Review Report each fall. Review Teams should have the majority of program and department members actively participate and use quantitative and qualitative data as a basis for preparing and completing the components of the review.

The Program Review Committee will review the program/department Comprehensive Program Review data and provide feedback and comments before the program/department receives the data package and report template.

Each component of the Program Review will have the following designations with point values assigned. These will then be used to determine the overall health of the program/department in each area.

3 = *Healthy* indicates a component of the program/department is in good standing

2 = *Cautionary* indicates a component of the program/department is in need of further investigation or action may be necessary to improve.

1 = *Unhealthy* indicates a component of the program/department that is in need of action for improvement.

Accountability and Transparency

To ensure accountability and transparency, completion of each step in the program review process will be tracked by members of the Program Review Committee ensure Review Teams in each department/program are following the process and meeting deadlines.

Departments and programs who do not meet established deadlines or who do not complete the Program Review may risk not being included in the budget process for that year and may result in administrative intervention.

Academic Program Review 3-Year Schedule

The schedule below is for the 2018/19-2020/21 Academic Years and will be updated each year based upon program changes. All programs and departments in Group 1 will be starting the 3-Year Comprehensive Program Review Cycle during the 2018/19 Academic Year and all programs and departments in Group 2 will be completing Planning Year activities.

Program Review Schedule (3-Year Cycle)							
Group	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Group 1:	Planning Year: (Fall) Review Mission, Outcomes, Curriculum Map and Submit Changes to Curriculum. (Spring) Create 3-year outcomes assessment plan and submit to SLOA.	Year 1: IER Comprehensive Review Data; Goals and Budget Request, Collect Year 1 Outcomes Assessment Data	Year 2: IER Annual Review Data; Progress towards Goals; Report Year 1 and Collect Year 2 Outcomes Assessment Data	Year 3: IER Annual Review Data; Progress Towards Goals; Report Year 2 and Collect Year 3 Outcomes Assessment Data; Submit Curriculum Changes	Repeat Cycle Starting From Year 1: Comprehensive Review		
Group 2:		Planning Year: (Fall) Review Mission, Outcomes, Curriculum Map and Submit Changes to Curriculum. (Spring) Create 3-year outcomes assessment plan and submit to SLOA.	Year 1: IER Comprehensive Review Data; Goals and Budget Request, Collect Year 1 Outcomes Assessment Data	Year 2: IER Annual Review Data; Progress towards Goals; Report Year 1 and Collect Year 2 Outcomes Assessment Data	Year 3: IER Annual Review Data; Progress Towards Goals; Report Year 2 and Collect Year 3 Outcomes Assessment Data; Submit Curriculum Changes	Repeat Cycle Starting From Year 1: Comprehensive Review	
Group 3:			Planning Year: (Fall) Review Mission, Outcomes, Curriculum Map and Submit Changes to Curriculum. (Spring) Create 3-year outcomes assessment plan and submit to SLOA.	Year 1: IER Comprehensive Review Data; Goals and Budget Request, Collect Year 1 Outcomes Assessment Data	Year 2: IER Annual Review Data; Progress towards Goals; Report Year 1 and Collect Year 2 Outcomes Assessment Data	Year 3: IER Annual Review Data; Progress Towards Goals; Report Year 2 and Collect Year 3 Outcomes Assessment Data; Submit Curriculum Changes	Repeat Cycle Starting From Year 1: Comprehensive Review

Schools	Group 1:	Group 2:	Group 3:
Arts & Humanities	AA Fine Arts - Art Concentration AA Fine Arts - Music Concentration English Department	Graphic Design Photography Art Department Humanities Department	Associate of Arts AA Fine Arts - Performing Arts
Business & Computer Systems	AAS/Cert Management AAS/Cert Video Game Developer	Associate of Business AAS/Cert Administrative Professional AAS/Cert Computer Systems and Applications NEW 2018/19: Cert Programming	AAS/Cert Accounting AAS/Cert Computer Networking Technology NEW 2018/19 Cert: Cyber Security
Social Science	Associate of Elementary Education AAS/Cert Early Childhood Education Communication Department	AAS Social and Human Services	AAS/Cert Administration of Justice AAS/Cert Paralegal Studies Social Science Behavioral Science
Career and Technical Education	Cert Auto Body Paint and Collision AAS/Cert Electrical and Instrumentation Technology Cert Welding AAS/Cert Agriculture Technology Management AAS/Cert Viticulture and Enology	AAS/Cert Automotive Technology AAS/Cert Diesel Technician AAS Applied Pre-Engineering AAS/Cert Industrial Machine Mechanic Cert Equine Care and Management	AAS/Cert Aviation Technology AAS/Cert Gunsmithing AAS/Cert Fire Science Cert Canine Care, Service Dog, Team Skills Certs Culinary Arts and Hospitality Certs Animation, Production and Screenwriting
Health & Wellness	AAS/Cert Health Information Technology Cert Pharmacy Technician Athletic Coaching Fitness Trainer/Instructor	AAS/Cert Paramedicine and Cert EMT AAS/Cert Medical and Med Office Assistant Cert Phlebotomy HPER Activity Courses	AAS Nursing Cert Nursing Assistant AAS/Cert Radiologic Technology
Science and Engineering	Mathematics Department	Associate of Science Science Department	

June 2018 Updated

Academic Program Review Timeline

Planning Year before the first 3-Year Comprehensive Review Cycle:

Fall – Review department/program mission statement, learning outcomes –submit changes and a curriculum map to the Curriculum Committee before the end of October.

Spring – Complete a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan and submit to the SLOA committee before Spring Break.

Year 1 Comprehensive Review:

August	Institutional Effectiveness and Research (IER) compiles data sets for Comprehensive reviews including data through the summer session. Program Review Committee (PRC) reviews data and provides feedback on the Program Review form.
September	Professional Development for Comprehensive Review participants during Assessment Day. Templates of the form and data packages for Academic Program Review and feedback from the PRC are provided and posted in each school's SLOA Canvas shell.
September-October	Review Team in each department/program completes the review.
October (2nd week)	Designated representative from the department/program submits completed review to Program Review Committee for technical review (check to see if document is complete).
October	Program Review Committee members meet with representatives from each department/program if the technical review results in revisions that need to be made- final Comprehensive Review due in October.
November 1	Completed Comprehensive Reviews forwarded to Vice President of Instruction and Student Development.
November –December	Budget request planning process utilizes information from Comprehensive Program Reviews.

Year 2 and Year 3 Annual Reviews:

August   Institutional Effectiveness and Research (IER) compiles data sets for annual review including data from summer session and posts in each school's SLOA Canvas shell.

September   Review Teams in each department/program analyze annual data at Assessment Day (Sept 6th) and submits completed annual review by the end of September.

October (1st week)   Program Review Committee members meet with representatives from each department/program if the annual review needs revisions final Annual Review due in October.

November 1st   Completed Annual Program Review forwarded to Vice President of Instruction and Student Development

November –December   Budget request planning process utilizes information from Annual and Comprehensive Program Reviews.

Academic Program Review Content

The Comprehensive and Annual Program Review Reports contain the following sections:
- Program Planning and Communication Strategies
- Section I: Curriculum and Learning Outcomes Assessment
- Section II: Institutional Effectiveness and Research Data (Demand, Employment or Transfer, Success Rates)
- Section III: Resources (Staffing, Facilities, Technology and Marketing)
- Section IV: Proposed New and Current Initiatives
- Section V: Prioritized Budget Requests

Program Planning and Communication Strategies

The intent of the program review process is to involve members of the department/program in the analysis of data and decisions about plans for improvement. In this section, please identify members of a **Review Team** that has representation from faculty, staff and administration in your program/department and describe the communication methods and interaction strategies used by your **Review Team** to discuss program-level planning, learning outcomes assessment processes, institutional effectiveness and research performance data, curriculum and program development with all members of the program/department. **The academic dean is a member of all program review teams in their schools.**

Each program and department will have a designated contact person (department chair, program director, associate dean, designated faculty member) who is responsible for the following actions:

- Organizing activities and interactions among the Review Team and program/department members and the academic dean to discuss data and plans for completing the Program Review Report.
- Communicating questions about completing the report or requesting additional data from the Program Review Committee.
- Submitting the Program Review Report and receiving feedback.

Section I: Curriculum and Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program/Department Mission, Student Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Map, and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment 3-Year Plan and Yearly Reports.

Reviewing curriculum and creating a Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan are scheduled during the Planning Year. After a program/department has started the 3-Year Program Review cycle, curriculum review and learning outcomes assessment planning will be incorporated into the cycle.

Curriculum: The planning year includes a review of the program/department mission statement, learning outcomes at the program/department and course levels and creation of a curriculum map. The Curriculum Committee will review the mission statement and student learning outcomes for each program/department during the fall semester of the planning year and provide feedback. Each program/department in the Planning Year will submit program/department and course changes along with a curriculum map to the Curriculum Committee by the October deadline so changes can be made in the academic catalog effective the following academic year. A detailed description of how to construct measurable learning outcomes, a curriculum map, and forms to complete for the Curriculum Committee are contained in the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Handbook on the SLOA Website.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: After changes to program and/or course curriculum are approved by the Curriculum Committee, the next step is to create a 3-Year Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan to assess outcomes at the program/department, course, and institutional levels. Submit 3-Year Learning Outcomes Assessment Plans to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA) Committee before Spring Break. The SLOA Committee will review and provide feedback before the end of the spring semester. A detailed description of the components of 3-Year Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan along with resources are in the SLOA Handbook posted on the SLOA website.

After curriculum maps have been approved by the Curriculum Committee and 3-Year SLOA Plans are reviewed by the SLOA Committee, they will be copied/pasted into the Comprehensive Program Review template forms for each department/program.

Section II: Institutional Effectiveness and Research Data

Academic Program Review Outcomes and metrics used to measure progress in each of the outcomes are described in the table below. Complete descriptions of the metrics and classification system of each (Healthy, Cautionary, or Unhealthy) are defined on the second page of your department/program data package.

Program Review Outcomes and Metrics (AAS/Certificate and Transfer Programs)

Program Review Outcomes	Metrics (5-Years of Data)
Outcome 1: Demand Yavapai College offers occupational and transfer programs that reflect the demands of the job market and needs of students in the community.	Student Credit Hour (SCH) Growth Trend
	Average Class Size or Fill Rate
Outcome 2: Employability Yavapai College offers occupational programs that provide students with the skills needed to gain employment in a job that has a livable wage and/or that meet the needs of the community. **Transferability** Yavapai College offers transfer degrees and certificates that align with AZ Transfer and state university guidelines and meet standards for rigor.	**Employment Indicators**
	-Five-year job growth rate -Graduate to Jobs Demand Ratio -Entry Education Level -One Year Employment Rate -Living Wage
	Transfer Indicators
	-Number of Transfers to 4-Year Colleges -Courses offered in AGEC categories align with university general/liberal education using the AZ Transfer Course Equivalency Guide. - Courses offered in AA degrees align with AZ Transfer Major Guides
	Quality Indicators
	Curriculum Alignment: Mission Statement, Program Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: 3-Year Assessment Plan and Yearly Reports on course, program and institutional assessments.
Outcome 3: Completion Yavapai College offers occupational and transfer programs that students complete in a timely manner.	Course Success Rates
	Number of Students who Complete a Degree (Included in Employment Indicator)
	Hours to Award (included in data package but not a health indicator)
Outcome 4: Resources Yavapai College offers occupational and transfer programs in which resources are allocated equitably and used efficiently.	Program Cost per Student Credit Hour (SCH) Previous Year's Budget (line item) (included in data package but not a health indicator).

Benchmarks and Scoring Guidelines for Occupational Programs (also included in the 2nd page of your EXCEL data package from IER)

CTE Program Health Scores

Area (Demand)	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Student Credit Hour (SCH) Growth Trend	Healthy: 0.00 to 1.00 Cautionary: <0.00 to -.59 Unhealthy: -.60 to -1.00	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	

Methodology: Pearson r coefficient using the SCH for the past five academic years. SCH calculated at the end of the drop/add period.

Source: Banner.

Area (Demand)	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Average Class Size	Healthy: >=19 Cautionary: 15 to 18 Unhealthy: <15	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	For programs with size restrictions, like Radiology, fill rate will be substituted for average class size.

Methodology: Average class size as of the end of the drop/add period for most recent academic year. Combines crosslisted courses; excludes independent study, private music, and internship courses.

Fill Rate	Healthy: >=76% Cautionary: 75% to 60% Unhealthy: <=59%	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	

Methodology: Fill rate as of the end of the drop/add period for most recent academic year. Combines crosslisted courses; excludes independent study, private music, and internship courses.

Source: Banner.

Area (Completion)	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Employment Indicators	Average of the five employment indicator scores listed below.	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	Employment indicators consist of the average health rating for employment demand, job growth, entry education level, emploment rate and wage data.
Methodology Job Growth Rate Projected five-year job growth rate in Arizona.	Healthy: >=1% Cautionary: 0% Unhealthy: <=1%	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	
Methodology Entry Education Level Required entry-level education.	Healthy: Certificate to AAS Cautionary: Bachelor's Unhealthy: On Job Training	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	
Methodology Employment Rate Percent of completers employed one year after graduation.	Healthy: >=80% Cautionary: 60% to 79% Unhealthy: <=59%		Test item in 2018-19; not scored for group 2 programs
Methodology Living Wage DES or YC Graduate Follow-Up wage one year after graduation.	Healthy: >= County Median Wage Cautionary: 1% to 10% below CMW Unhealthy: More than 10% below CMW	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	
Methodology Advisory Boards CTE areas provide evidence that advisory boards are active and meet at least once annually.	Healthy: >= Meets one or more time a year Cautionary: Formed, but did not meet in the prior year Unhealthy: No advisory board	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	New item for 2018-19

Source: Banner for YC graduates; EMSI for job forecast and entry education level; DES for employment and wage data.

Area (Success)	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Enrollee Course Success Rate	Healthy: > Median of AZ CC Cautionary: 26th percentile to median Unhealthy: <=25th percentile	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	Success rates are defined by primary subject area provided by AZ Transfer ASSIST.

<u>Methodology</u>: Enrollee success consists of a letter grade of A, B, C, or S. Three-year average of YC success rate is compared to the three-year average of AZ community college success rate (by subject area) provided by AZ Transfer ASSIST. If AZ Transfer is not available, then NCCBP college level enrollee success rate will be used.

<u>Source</u>: Banner for YC success rates; ASSIST for AZ community college comparisons.

	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Curriculum	Healthy: > Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map approved Cautionary: Learning Outcomes or Curriculum Map approved Unhealthy: Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map not completed or approved	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	

<u>Methodology</u>: Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map must be approved by the Curriculum Committee.

<u>Source</u>: YC Curriculum Committee.

	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Assessment	Healthy: 3-Year Student Outcomes Assessment Plan (reviewed by SLOA) Cautionary: N/A Unhealthy: No completed Student Outcomes Assessment Plan	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	

<u>Methodology</u>: 3-Year cycle assessment plan for program, course, and institutional learning outcomes. Plan must be reviewed by SLOA.

<u>Source</u>: YC SLOA Committee.

Area (Resources)	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Program Cost Per SCH	At or below the median 3 = Healthy Above the median but below the 75th percentile=Cautionary At or above the 75th percentile = Unhealthy	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	

<u>Methodology</u>: Cost per student credit hour (SCH) based on the program's course prefixes. Based on cost per SCH standard deviation for the most recent fiscal year.

<u>Source</u>: Banner.

Benchmarks and Scoring Guidelines for Transfer Programs/Departments (also included in the 2nd page of your EXCEL data package from IER)

Transfer Program Health Scores

Area (Demand)	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Student Credit Hour (SCH) Growth Trend	Healthy: 0.00 to 1.00 Cautionary: <0.00 to -.59 Unhealthy: -.60 to -1.00	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	
Methodology: Pearson r coefficient using the SCH for the past five academic years. SCH calculated at the end of the drop/add period. Source: Banner.			

Area (Demand)	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Average Class Size	Healthy: >=19 Cautionary: 15 to 18 Unhealthy: <15	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	For programs with size restrictions, like Radiology, fill rate will be substituted for average class size.
Methodology: Average class size as of the end of the drop/add period for most recent academic year. Combines crosslisted courses; excludes independent study, private music, and internship courses. Source: Banner.			
Fill Rate	Healthy: >=76% Cautionary: 75% to 60% Unhealthy: <=59%	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	
Methodology: Fill rate as of the end of the drop/add period for most recent academic year. Combines crosslisted courses; excludes independent study, private music, and internship courses. Source: Banner.			

Area (Completion)	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Transfer to Four Year Methodology: Ratio of transfers attending public AZ university to program graduates. Uses three-year average for for transfers and YC graduates. Source: Banner for YC graduates; ASSIST for transfers.	Healthy: >=80% Cautionary: 60% to 79% Unhealthy: <60%	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	Only score where a YC program has a companion program at ASU, UA, or NAU (i.e., Associate of Business)
General Education Course Transfers Methodology: General Education courses reflect the best interest of the student in transferring to Arizona public universities. Source: AZTransfer	Healthy: course transfers as a general education/ liberal studies requirement in a similar category to at least two of the three state universities. Cautionary: course transfers as a general education/ liberal studies requirement to at least two of the three state universities, but is not in a similar category. Unhealthy: courses does not transfer as a general education/ liberal studies requirement to at least two of the three state universities	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	If a course is rated cautionary - it could be moved to a different list - if it is rated unhealthy, the ATF representative can bring it up at the ATF meeting.

Area (Success)	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Enrollee Course Success Rate Methodology: Enrollee success consists of a letter grade of A, B, C, or S. Three-year average of YC success rate is compared to the three-year average of AZ community college success rate (by subject area) provided by AZ Transfer ASSIST. If AZ Transfer is not available, then NCCBP college level enrollee success rate will be used. Source: Banner for YC success rates; ASSIST for AZ community college comparisons.	Healthy: > Median of AZ CC Cautionary: 26th percentile to median Unhealthy: <=25th percentile	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	Success rates are defined by primary subject area provided by AZ Transfer ASSIST.
Curriculum Methodology: Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map must be approved by the Curriculum Committee. Source: YC Curriculum Committee.	Healthy: > Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map approved Cautionary: Learning Outcomes or Curriculum Map approved Unhealthy: Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map not completed or approved	3 = Healthy 2 = Cautionary 1 = Unhealthy	

Assessment	Healthy: 3-Year Student Outcomes Assessment Plan (reviewed by SLOA)	3 = Healthy
	Cautionary: N/A	2 = Cautionary
	Unhealthy: No completed Student Outcomes Assessment Plan	1 = Unhealthy

Methodology: 3-Year cycle assessment plan for program, course, and institutional learning outcomes. Plan must be reviewed by SLOA.

Source: YC SLOA Committee.

Area (Resources)	Benchmark	Scoring	Notes
Program Cost Per SCH	At or below the median 3 = Healthy	3 = Healthy	
	Above the median but below the 75th percentile=Cautionary	2 = Cautionary	
	At or above the 75th percentile = Unhealthy	1 = Unhealthy	

Methodology: Cost per student credit hour (SCH) based on the program's course prefixes. Based on cost per SCH standard deviation for the most recent fiscal year.

Source: Banner.

Section III: Resources

Personnel, Capital (Facilities: Space Modification, Furniture, Equipment), Supplies, and Other (Marketing, Technology, etc.)

In this section, provide a description of the personnel, physical working space, location, equipment, technology, etc. across the program. Provide a 3-year projection plan for the department/program anticipated needs in each area.

Section IV: Proposed New and Current Initiatives

Description of Current Initiatives and Action Plan for New Initiatives

In this section, provide a brief description of any current or recent initiatives your department/program has been implementing and a description of new initiatives you would like to propose based on the data provided or trends in the field/discipline.

Current Initiatives: Summarize the status, progress and results of any current or recently completed initiatives your department/program has been implementing.

New Initiatives: Include a brief description of how each new initiative supports the Program Review goals, Yavapai's planning documents, evidence that the initiative will result in improvement, anticipated resources and a target completion date.

Section V: Prioritized Budget Requests (3-Year)

This section is for the department/program to identify and prioritize any budget and planning requests related to the initiatives projected for the entire cycle (3-years). Include in your description of each prioritized item the type of request (Personnel, Capital/Equipment, Supplies/Other) with a description of the estimated cost, alignment to YC planning documents, and persons responsible.

Academic Department/Occupational Program
Program Review: Comprehensive 2019-2020
For Associate's Degrees, Certificates and Academic Departments
Due Date: On or before October 11, 2019

Yavapai COLLEGE

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program/Department (For AAS Degrees, include all embedded certificate programs)	
Program/Department Review 3-Year Cycle Dates	
Program Director, Department Chair, Associate Dean or Faculty Contact Signature (include email)	
School/Academic Dean Signature	
Date Submitted to Program Review Committee (due on or before October 11, 2019) Submit as an assignment in the Program Review Canvas site.	
Date Reviewed by Program Review Committee	
Date Forwarded to Vice President of Academics and Student Development	

Program Planning and Communication Strategies: The intent of the program review

process is to involve members of the department/program in the analysis of data and decisions about plans for improvement. Please select a **Review Team Leader** and form a **Review Team** with representation from faculty, staff and administration in your program/department and describe the communication methods and interaction strategies used by your Review Team to discuss program-level planning, learning outcomes assessment processes, institutional effectiveness and research performance data, curriculum and program development with all members of the program/department. **The academic dean is a member of all program review teams in their schools.**

.

Review Team Leader (job title):

Review Team Members (job titles):

Describe the process for completing your Review and how all members of the department/program were involved:

Section I: Curriculum and Learning Outcomes Assessment

1. **Curriculum: Program/Department Mission, Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map:**
   The Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map have been approved by the Curriculum Committee

Copy/Paste curriculum map here –approved by Curriculum Committee

If curriculum review not completed – feedback is provided here

Please provide a summary of curriculum changes submitted during the planning year (Fall 2018) or a summary of curriculum activities planned for Fall 2019 if you did not complete a review of curriculum during the planning year.

Summary of curriculum changes submitted Fall 2018:

OR summary of curriculum activities for Fall 2019:

---

2. **Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Year 1: 3-Year Cycle Assessment Plan for Program, Course, and Institutional Learning Outcomes.**

Complete 3-Year Assessment Plan and Submit to SLOA Committee. After SLOA review, the 3-Year Student Outcomes Assessment Plan will be copied/pasted here.

A. 3-Year Program/Department Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan							
Academic Year	Program or Department Outcome(s) (list the outcome #)	Courses for Program Assessment (include all modalities)	Assessment Method(s) and Tool(s)	Type : place an "x" in the appropriate box		Scoring Method(s) and Performance Target(s)	Faculty/staff involved in assessment tasks.
				Direct	Indirect		
Year 1 2018/19							
Year 2 2019/20							
Year 3 2020/21	Submit any changes (program modifications) to curriculum committee based on Year 1 and Year 2 results in Fall 2020.						
B. 3-Year Course Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan							
Academic Year	Course(s) Assessed (include all modalities)	Course Outcomes Assessed (list the outcome #)	Assessment Method(s) and Tool(s)	Type: place an "x" in the appropriate box		Scoring Method(s) and Performance Target(s)	Faculty/staff involved in assessment tasks.
				Direct	Indirect		
Year 1 2018/19							
Year 2 2019/20							
Year 3 2020/21							
Resources needed to complete program and/or course student learning assessment activities:							

C. 3-Year Institutional Outcomes Assessment Plan (outcomes for 2019/20 and beyond to be determined during 2018/19 academic year.)			
Year 1: 2018/19 GECCO Outcomes Assessed	Course(s) in which GECCO Outcome is Assessed	Describe your Assessment Tool(s). Assessment Method(s) is a 4-point rubric with data collected through Banner.	Faculty/staff involved in assessment tasks.

Section II: Institutional Effectiveness and Research Data: Demand, Employment/Transfer and Success.

1.   Demand

Insert summary data for Demand here – from IER Data Summary spreadsheet

Provide an analysis of the five-year trend in demand below along with strategies/initiatives to address a "Cautionary" or "Unhealthy" rating.

> **Analysis of Demand data:**
>
> **Brief description of Strategies/initiatives to address a "cautionary" or "unhealthy" rating.**

2.   Employment or Transfer

Insert summary data for Employment or Transfer here – from IER Data Summary spreadsheet

Provide an analysis of the five-year trend in employment or transfer here along with strategies/initiatives to address a "Cautionary" or "Unhealthy" rating.

> **Analysis of Employment OR Transfer Data:**
>
> **Brief description of Strategies/initiatives to address a "cautionary" or "unhealthy" rating.**

3.   Success Rates

Insert summary data for Success Rates here – from IER Data spreadsheet

Provide an analysis of the five-year trend in success here along with strategies/initiatives to address a "Cautionary" or "Unhealthy" rating.

> **Analysis of Success Rate Data:**
>
> **Brief description of Strategies/initiatives to address a "cautionary" or "unhealthy" rating.**

Section III: Resources: Personnel, Capital (Space Modification, Furniture, Equipment or Technology), Supplies and Other (Marketing, etc.)

Resource Cost per SCH (Instructional Costs)

Insert summary data for Resources here – from IER Data spreadsheet

Provide an analysis of the five-year trend in Cost per SCH here along with strategies/initiatives to address a "Cautionary" or "Unhealthy" rating.

Analysis of Cost per SCH data: **Brief description of Strategies/initiatives to address a "cautionary" or "unhealthy" rating.**

1. **Personnel:** Describe the organizational structure and list staff/faculty in the program/department. Include professional development participation.

Current Staffing and Professional Development Activities

Name	Job Title (Program Director, Faculty, Adjunct, Lab Technician, Clinical Specialist, etc.)	Professional Development Activities last year (Date)

Provide a 3-year projection of personnel and professional development needs based on trends in the discipline/field, demand and current staffing.

3-Year Projection of Personnel and Professional Development Needs:

2. **Capital (Facilities: Space Modification, Furniture, Equipment and/or Technology):**

   Consider the physical working space, location, equipment and technology across the program.

   Provide a 3-year projection of capital needs (space modification, furniture, equipment and technology).

Current Capital (Facilities, Equipment and/or Technology): **3-Year Projection of Capital (Facilities, Equipment and/or Technology Needs):**

3. **Supplies and Other (such as Marketing):**

   Consider current supplies and other areas not listed above. Provide a 3-year projection of supplies and other (such as marketing) needs.

3-Year Projection of Supplies and Other Needs:

Section IV: Summary of Current Initiatives and Proposed New Initiatives for Program Improvement:

1. **Summary Table of Current Initiatives:** Provide a brief description of any current or recently completed initiatives/activities your program/department is working on in the table below.

Summary Table of Current Initiatives

Initiative(s) – describe current initiatives in your program/department.	Status *(Not Started, In Progress, Completed)*	Description of Progress	Result

2. **Proposed New Initiatives:** Provide a description of any actionable new initiatives you would like to propose to improve your program/department based on the "cautionary" or "unhealthy" ratings of data provided in the program review or describe new initiatives that align with trends in industry/transfer discipline. Use a separate table for each proposed new initiative.

Brief Description of Proposed New Initiative #1:	
What Program Review outcome does the new initiative support? (Demand/Enrollment, Employability/Transferability, Completion/Retention or Allocation of Resources).	
What YC planning documents does the new initiative align with? (strategic plan, pathways initiative, educational master plan, etc.)	
What evidence supports the initiative will result in improvement? Describe. (Learning Outcomes Assessment, Student Surveys, Advisory Board Recommendation, Industry standards, Transfer degree information, Internal research, External research, etc.)	
Describe the resources needed to support the new initiative. (Personnel?, Professional Development? Space Allocation? Equipment?, Technology? Marketing?, etc.)	
Describe the anticipated result(s) of the new initiative. How will the program/department improve and how will you know?	
Estimate a timeline for completion of the new initiative.	

Create a separate table for each proposed new initiative

Section V: Prioritized Budget Requests for 3 Years

List 4 to 6 recommendations for program/department improvement and prioritized funding for each.

Year 1 Budget Requests: 2020 - 2021

	Program or Department	Type of Resource Request Capital- Space Modification, Furniture, Equipment or Technology, Personnel, Supplies, Other (describe).	Approximate Cost Use any reliable source for your estimate.	Funding Type One-Time or Ongoing	Program Review Outcome Demand, Employability or Transferability, Completion	Strategic Initiative Which college initiative is this supporting?	Persons Responsible	Academic Dean Support Yes or No (Deans fill out this portion of the budget request)
Priority 1								
Priority 2								
Priority 3								
Priority 4								

Year 2 Budget Requests: 2021 - 2022

	Program or Department	Type of Resource Request Capital- Space Modification, Furniture, Equipment or Technology, Personnel, Supplies, Other (describe).	Approximate Cost Use any reliable source for your estimate.	Funding Type One-Time or Ongoing	Program Review Outcome Demand, Employability or Transferability, Completion	Strategic Initiative Which college initiative is this supporting?	Persons Responsible	Academic Dean Support Yes or No
Priority 1								
Priority 2								
Priority 3								
Priority 4								

	Program or Department	Type of Resource Request Capital- Space Modification, Furniture, Equipment or Technology, Personnel, Supplies, Other (describe).	Approximate Cost Use any reliable source for your estimate.	Funding Type One-Time or Ongoing	Program Review Outcome Demand, Employability or Transferability, Completion	Strategic Initiative Which college initiative is this supporting?	Persons Responsible	Academic Dean Support Yes or No
Year 3 Budget Requests: 2022 - 2023								
Priority 1								
Priority 2								
Priority 3								
Priority 4								

Yavapai COLLEGE
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Academic Department/Occupational Program
Program Review: For Associate's Degrees, Certificates and Academic Departments
Year 2 Annual Update 2019-2020

Due Date: On or before October 11, 2019

Program/Department (For AAS Degrees, include all embedded certificate programs)	
Program/Department Review 3-Year Cycle Dates	**2018-19 through 2020-21** Year 2 Annual Review 2019-20
Program Director, Department Chair, Associate Dean or Faculty Contact Signature (include email)	
School/Academic Dean Signature	
Date Submitted to Program Review Committee (due on or before October 11, 2019) Submit as an assignment in the Program Review Canvas site.	
Date Reviewed by Program Review Committee	
Date Forwarded to Vice President of Academics and Student Development	

.

Section I: Curriculum and Learning Outcomes Assessment

3. **Curriculum: Program/Department Mission, Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map:**
   The Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map have been approved by the Curriculum Committee

Please provide a summary of any curriculum changes submitted Fall 2019.

Summary of curriculum changes submitted Fall 2019:

4. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Year 2:

Reporting Assessment Results. To be completed in Year 2 and Year 3 of the 3-Year Program Review Cycle in the Annual Reviews. Results from the previous year's assessment data are reported on the Program Review form. Please summarize the results of your assessment activities at the program, course and institution level in the appropriate section in the table below. If preferred, you can summarize results for each level in paragraph form.

Results: Learning Outcomes Assessment			
Academic Year	Level of Assessment (Course, Program, GECCO)	Strengths and areas in need of improvement based on student performance. Include comparison of student performance in courses taught in different modalities (online, F2F, hybrid, dual or concurrent enrollment, etc.)	Faculty/staff involved in the analysis.
Year 1 2018/19 **Results**	**Program/Department Outcomes Assessment Results**	Strengths: Needs Improvement:	
	Course Outcomes Assessment Results	Strengths: Needs Improvement:	
	GECCO Outcomes Assessment Results **Digital Literacy** **Information Literacy**	Strengths: Needs Improvement:	

Action for Improvement Based on Results: Identify any actions needed for improvement based on Student Learning Outcomes Assessment results: changes to curriculum, instruction, assessment process, professional development needs, etc.			
Action for Improvement	Resources Needed	Completion Date	Faculty/staff involved in action

Section II: Institutional Effectiveness and Research Data: Demand, Employment/Transfer and Success.

4. Demand

Provide an analysis of any changes in Demand from last year (increase or decrease).

Demand Data:

5. Employment or Transfer

Provide an analysis of any changes in Employment or Transfer from last year (increase or decrease).

Employment OR Transfer Data:

6. Success Rates

Provide an analysis of any changes in Success Rates from last year (increase or decrease).

Success Rate Data:

Section III: Resources: Personnel, Capital (Space Modification, Furniture, Equipment or Technology), Supplies and Other (Marketing, etc.)

Resource Cost per SCH (Instructional Costs)

Provide an analysis of any changes in Cost per SCH from last year (increase or decrease).

Cost per SCH data:

Section IV: Summary of Progress on Current and Proposed Initiatives:

3. **Summary Table of Current Initiatives:** Please update the table below to reflect progress on last year's current and proposed initiatives.

Summary Table of Current Initiatives will be copied/pasted here from Comprehensive Review

Initiative(s) – describe current initiatives in your program/department.	Status *(Not Started, In Progress, Completed)*	Description of Progress	Result

Section V: Prioritized Budget Requests for 3 Years

Please report on the following budget requests from last year.

Last year's budget requests will be copied/pasted here along with a table to report whether items were funded or not.

Please complete budget requests for the next two budget cycles.

Budget Requests: 2020 - 2021

	Program or Department	Type of Resource Request Capital- Space Modification, Furniture, Equipment or Technology, Personnel, Supplies, Other (describe).	Approximate Cost Use any reliable source for your estimate.	Funding Type One-Time or Ongoing	Program Review Outcome Demand, Employability or Transferability, Completion	Strategic Initiative Which college initiative is this supporting?	Persons Responsible	Academic Dean Support Yes or No
Priority 1								
Priority 2								
Priority 3								
Priority 4								

Budget Requests: 2021 - 2022

	Program or Department	Type of Resource Request Capital- Space Modification, Furniture, Equipment or Technology, Personnel, Supplies, Other (describe).	Approximate Cost Use any reliable source for your estimate.	Funding Type One-Time or Ongoing	Program Review Outcome Demand, Employability or Transferability, Completion	Strategic Initiative Which college initiative is this supporting?	Persons Responsible	Academic Dean Support Yes or No
Priority 1								
Priority 2								
Priority 3								
Priority 4								