



**ACHIEVEMENT**

Achieved 95 % = 

**CORE THEME**

Sustainability

**OBJECTIVE**

S.3: Southwestern delivers viable quality instruction

**INDICATOR**

S.3.1: Success Indicator 40 – Program Quality and Design

Measured by the percentage of annually scheduled instructional programs for review that are completed based on internal program review schedule

**Indicator Thresholds**

Green: 85% or greater      Yellow: Between 70% and 84%      Red: Below 70%

**Purpose and Meaning**

Measures the program viability through institutional review of instruction and program design. Program review evaluates program alignment to current industry needs and trends, program enrollments, and completions to assess the viability of the program.

**WHAT WAS ACHIEVED AND WHAT IS PLANNED FOR THE FUTURE**

A new program review report template was designed in 2013-14 for all academic and operational programs in instruction and student services. This template required a common set of review data be produced going back four years. Instead of a three-year cycle, a four-year cycle was implemented. A copy of the revised report template and list of programs to be reviewed each year is attached.

Of 41 programs that are on the 2014-15 program review list, 9 programs were scheduled to be reviewed in 2013-14 and 10 in 2014-15. Since there were complications identifying the best set of data to use in each program review and communicate the new report template and annual schedule, faculty and staff were not given sufficient time to complete the review by the end of spring 2014. The program review templates were finalized for both academic and operational programs in fall 2014. The data set was also finalized in fall 2014 and data reports were created by IR to allow faculty and staff easy access to the data required to complete the program reviews. This allowed faculty and staff responsible for the 2013-14 program reviews to work on their reports. We focused on the 2013-14 program reviews in fall 2014 as a pilot to see how the new report templates and data sets would work.

The 2013-14 program reviews were all completed by winter 2015, and then the faculty and staff responsible for the 2014-15 program reviews were trained to use the new templates and data set reports to complete their reviews. By summer 2015, most of the program reviews were completed. Some modification of the program review schedule was made in summer 2015 to accommodate individual situations. The Perkins grant program review was moved to be incorporated into the CTE Dean program review and therefore removed from the list. Because a new Transitional Education Director was hired late in the year, the Transitional Education/ ABE/GED/ESL program review was not completed until the end of the summer 2015. Tutoring was moved to be supervised by Trans Ed starting in summer 2015, so that program review was moved to the 2015-16 academic year list. We also divided the Science programs into specific science disciplines and did a separate review for Biology, Physics, Chemistry and Geology. So we ended the year including these changes with 11

program reviews scheduled for 2014-15 and completed 10 of them. With that, the completion rate for the program reviews due in 2013-14 and 2014-15 is 95%.

Now that the templates and data set reports are in place, we can have a normal timeline and process for the 2015-16 program reviews. Each fall, all programs will look at their updated program data and make any needed adjustments to their goals/projects for that year and the following year, even if in the middle of their program review cycle. Those programs that are on the list to complete a program review that year will have their program review completed and submitted to IR before the end of the fall term. For fall 2015, that will be 16 programs, 11 academic and 5 operational program reviews. Project goals that require budget expenditures for the following year in all program reviews will then be prioritized by the deans and VPI&SS prior to budget development in winter.

## **FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS/PROGRESS**

There was a large change in the program review process within instruction and student services in 2013-14. A new Vice President of Instruction and Student Services reviewed the process being used for program review and worked with the deans to make changes that were implemented by the end of the academic year. Because SWOCC went from a three-year review cycle to a four-year review cycle and reshuffled timing for each program review, as well as changing the program review template and data being used to analyze program success, the reports themselves did not occur by the end of the academic year. The program reviews due in 2013-14 were completed in fall 2014 and the program reviews due in 2014-15 were completed by the end of summer 2015. Starting fall 2015, the normal schedule will be implemented to have program reviews due that year completed by December.

## **BUDGET IMPACT ASSOCIATED WITH FUTURE PLANNING**

Program reviews will be done by December each year. They will include projects as goals for the next 4 years with budget needs included. Program faculty and staff not being in a review year will still meet to review project list from their most recent program review and make adjustments based on more current data. The project list for all programs with budget needs will be forwarded to the appropriate deans by December. The Deans will then meet with the VPI&SS and develop budget priorities by early winter term to be worked into the budget planning process for the following two years.

## **Success Indicator Changes for 2014-15 supporting NWCCU accreditation standards: 1.B.2; 4.A.1; 4.B.1; 5.B.2**

Solely measuring program reviews that are completed does not provide an adequate way to analyze the effectiveness of program quality. To replace it, we will use the new program viability process which directly measures the health and strength of all academic programs. Programs that receive a viability score lower than the top two quintiles (LE 60 pts) will have to develop a program improvement plan. The scoring rubric is still being finalized and should be ready to implement in fall 2015. Additionally, the title shall now read *Program Quality*.

Programs that score in the top two quintiles (> 60 pts) are considered healthy. Programs that score within the green threshold are considered healthy, strong, and effective.

Measured by the percentage of academic programs/disciplines that score in the top two quintiles (>60 pts) using the SWOCC Program Viability scoring criteria

Thresholds: Green: 85% or more of programs fall within the top two quintiles  
Yellow: 70% - 84% of programs fall within the top two quintiles  
Red: Below 70% of programs fall within the top two quintiles

## Planning Priorities

**Strategic Objective 2** – Southwestern builds and maintains a sustainable infrastructure of human, technology, and facility resources

**Projects – S2.12:** Offer and support employee training and credentialing including professional development opportunities for faculty and staff along with a part-time Faculty support plan.

**S2.17:** Work with faculty and staff to develop a consistent program review process and schedule for the college

**Strategic Objective 3** – Southwestern delivers viable instruction

**Projects – S3.1:** Improve quality control of academic offerings through effective course and program evaluation and faculty evaluation

**S3.4:** Develop a process for evaluating the viability of academic programs at the college

## Unit Planning

In late summer 2015 the list of program reviews was expanded to include all of the Dean office operational reviews and included adjustments in combining some program areas and changing others.

In fall 2015 the program reviews due in 2015-16 will be completed by December. These reviews will include a list of projects prioritized for the next four years. Any project that includes a need to spend money will include a budget request. Programs who have already done program reviews last year or have not yet done them will meet in fall to develop their project list for this year and next year, along with budget requests.

All of these projects and budget requests will go to the appropriate dean. In December, the Deans will bring all the projects and budget requests to a Planning Session of the Deans Team and VPI & SS to prioritize and decide which projects to move forward to next year and what budget requests to include in next year's budget development process.

## Achievement Analysis

The program review process includes a four-year data collection and analysis to evaluate achievement of student learning outcomes, compilation and analysis of a common data set, and review and update of program planned unit accomplishments and proposed projects for the coming four years along with budget requirements to achieve those projects. The common data set that was developed last year will be used in reviews this year and addresses six data points aligning to Success Indicators 11, 12, 13, and 28B: FTE generated, Course offerings, program completion, billing credits, student achievement, and program enrollment data. Most programs reviewed are solid programs with enrollment trends and success rates aligned to the overall campus performance. Annual program review updates will monitor trends. The parallel program viability process completed each fall will further quantify the key data points for each academic program and measure the health of the program. Programs with a low program viability score will develop an improvement plan with the help of the Program Viability Committee and will have a year to implement the plan and then measure the change in data. If the program review process works properly by having faculty and staff review their projects and progress each fall, any issues that would lead to a low viability score will be identified and dealt with prior to getting to that point. This should help keep programs healthy and growing.

In addition to the program review process being revamped, a new program viability process for academic programs was finalized in 2014-15 by working with the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs committee. The goal is to get consensus on the process and scoring formulas at the beginning of fall 2015 and then pilot the process in fall 2015. This process includes a 100 point scale using quantitative data to measure the health and

vitality of each academic program each year. The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate will serve as the Program Viability Committee to review the results. Any program that scores below a set score on the 100 point scale (to be determined by the Academic Affairs committee) will be analyzed to determine the factors involved in producing a low score. The five categories used in the 100 point scale for measuring program health and vitality are program/discipline demand, program assessment, program size, program productivity, and program cost. The process for calculating the scores for each category and performing the review is attached.

It is hoped that this process will help struggling programs to become aware of issues affecting its quality and give it time to correct the deficiencies. The programs in this position would be given a year to implement changes that address the concerns. Then the data will be reviewed again the following fall to look for some progress and improvement. Programs that continue to score in this lowest category could then be subject to closure.

There will be a close connection between the program review and program viability processes. It is hoped that by faculty looking at their comprehensive program data each fall, negative trends can be identified and dealt with prior to the program producing a low program viability score. Starting in 2015-16, Success Indicator 41 measures the program viability score rather than the percentage of faculty evaluation completed. All faculty are going to be trained to look at their program/discipline data often to determine what is happening with the key indicators before one of these processes brings it to the top of the administrative review.

Current [program review schedule](#) accessible from the portal.

---

## DATA DOCUMENTATION

### *Documentation Posted:*

Portal: Resource Center Core Themes – Objectives – Success Indicator Page:

[https://mylakerlink.socc.edu/ICS/icsfs/SI\\_40\\_Program\\_Quality\\_Design\\_2014\\_2015.pdf?target=1e8b104a-ad5c-4959-8924-69f01f483ff3](https://mylakerlink.socc.edu/ICS/icsfs/SI_40_Program_Quality_Design_2014_2015.pdf?target=1e8b104a-ad5c-4959-8924-69f01f483ff3)

### *Data References:*

Program review instructional list file stored on the network located at:

\\itt\institutionalresearch\institutionaleffectiveness\successindicators\SI\_40\_ProgramQualityDesign

## ABOUT THE DATA

The report was prepared and coordinated by Dr. Ross Tomlin, Vice President of Instruction and Robin Bunnell, Institutional Researcher.

Contributions to the narrative were supplied by Dr. Ross Tomlin, Vice President of Instruction and Student.

## DETERMINING MEASUREMENT AND SETTING THRESHOLD LEVELS

Effective in 2015-2016: Solely measuring program reviews that are completed does not provide an adequate way to analyze the effectiveness of program quality. To replace it, we will use the new program viability process which directly measures the health and strength of all academic programs. Programs that receive a viability score lower than the top two quintiles (LE 60 pts) will have to develop a program improvement plan. The scoring rubric is still being finalized and should be ready to implement in fall 2015.

Programs that score in the top two quintiles (> 60 pts) are considered healthy. Programs that score within the green threshold are considered healthy, strong, and effective. The thresholds were determined by setting an expectation that a high percentage of programs fall within the healthy range.

Prior Determination Information: This means of measurement was selected to establish a target for improved completion of effective program review. Historically, completion of comprehensive programs reviews was hindered by the developing nature of the program review parameters and methodologies. Template for program review coupled with a standard data set for evaluation were established and the SI #40 thresholds were set based on our projected target for completion of the scheduled comprehensive program reviews (not to exceed one program failing to complete a review) to ensure the availability of needed data and analysis to assist in the decision making necessary for program planning and budget development. The measurement and thresholds require yearly review to ensure the indicator provides meaningful and applicable data to be used in decision making, specifically for planning and budget development.

## Requirements

NWCCU Accreditation; Program Accreditation; Program Review.

For more detailed information, contact the Institutional Research office - [ir@socc.edu](mailto:ir@socc.edu)

Southwestern Oregon Community College does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, religion, national origin, age, disability status, gender identity, or protected veterans in employment, education, or activities as set forth in compliance with federal and state statutes and regulations.