

Heartland Community College, IL

Project: Program Review Process Revision

Version 2.0- Project

Q: What is the current status of your project?

A: In-progress

Q: Please indicate the original project start date, original project end date, and anticipated completion date if project is not completed. Please list dates on separate lines.

A: Original Project Start Date: 9/1/15

Original Project End Date: 9/24/18

Anticipated Project End Date: 9/24/18

Q: Briefly describe the current status of the project. Explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's most recent or soon-to-be submitted systems portfolio, if applicable.

A: As detailed below, all of the original project goals from the declaration, as well as the added project goals from Version 1.0 have been completed. However, we are updating and continuing the project as the Illinois Community College Board has revised its program review process such that we need to make adjustments to our process to align to the new guidelines. Additionally, the College has just completed a major overhaul of its strategic planning process as a result of that being an area identified for needed improvement as we were preparing submission of our next systems portfolio. As part of that, we developed a new operational planning template, and we would like the program review process/submission template to align with that as well.

List the project goals as stated in the original project declaration along with the Q: metrics/measures for assessing the progress for each goal.

A: The original project goals in the declaration were as follows:

1. Revise “Six Fundamental Questions” documents to align with ICCB and AQIP requirements and connect with available data sets;
2. Revise Business Intelligence Site Program Review data to align with “Six Fundamental Questions”
3. Develop and deliver Program Review training for Review leads (as indicated by Division) each Fall term
4. Establish and conduct an internal review process via the Assessment Committee
5. Interview Program Review leads upon completion to see what adjustments need to be made to ensure the process is clear and that supports are aligned
6. Measure completed Program Review documents each year for timeliness and completeness

The following additional goals were added in the last project update in November 2016:

1. Develop a program review data template that will contain completed numbers for all programs and deliver that at the program review training. This is in response to the fact that many program review leads reported feeling overwhelmed by the data in the BI Site (we went from complaints of too little data to too much data!).
Deadline: August 2016
2. Complete additional revisions to the Six Questions template to ensure clarity (consider reducing number of questions given that all programs will now receive a completed data sheet). Deadline August 2016.
3. Revise the timeline for program review training, submission to Assessment Committee, submission to Vice President, and meeting with Vice President to discuss so that all can be completed while faculty leads are on Contract (current process has last step occurring during the summer months when faculty are off-contract). Deadline August 2016.
4. Develop a clear process for program termination should that be the recommendation following the program review. Deadline January 2017.

Describe what has been accomplished with this project over the past year, specifically referring to quantifiable results that show progress. You may need to Q: include a discussion clarifying how the original goals and anticipated outcomes may have shifted during the year.

A: Our last program review cycle was our most successful ever due to our work on completing the original project goals as well as the adjustments made over the last year from the goals listed in Version 1.0. Specifically:

1. Goal: Develop a program review data template that will contain completed numbers for all programs and deliver that at the program review training. This is in response to the fact that many program review leads reported feeling overwhelmed by the data in the BI

Site (we went from complaints of too little data to too much data!). Deadline: August 2016.

Result: 100% of our program review leads completed training and data templates were provided at training for 100% of the programs up for review. Program review leads indicated that being given specific data tables to address each question was very helpful. Many still explored other data available on the site, but all appreciated being given the exact data to narrowly answer the questions at hand.

2. Goal: Complete additional revisions to the Six Questions template to ensure clarity (consider reducing number of questions given that all programs will now receive a completed data sheet). Deadline August 2016.

Result: The Six Questions Template contains six questions with many subparts. We did not reduce the number of questions, but we did re-word some questions and also provided tables for programs to enter their information in to increase consistency in the way they were reporting the data and ensure clarity. Program review leads indicated the new tables were very helpful in answering the questions.

3. Goal: Revise the timeline for program review training, submission to Assessment Committee, submission to Vice President, and meeting with Vice President to discuss so that all can be completed while faculty leads are on Contract (current process has last step occurring during the summer months when faculty are off-contract). Deadline August 2016.

Result: We revised the process and completed all program review meetings while faculty were still on Contract. Having the faculty leads present during the meeting to discuss program review with the Vice President and prepare the recommendation for the final State report resulted in a much more transparent process.

4. Goal: Develop a clear process for program termination should that be the recommendation following the program review. Deadline January 2017.

Result: We worked with the Records Office and Enrollment Services to develop a process for communicating with students enrolled in a program should the program be terminated. We did cull several programs this year during program review and the process was followed for each of those program culls.

Q: Describe how various members of the learning community have participated in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration, particularly during the past year.

A: This Action Project involves revising our internal process for academic program review, which has oversight by the Vice President for Learning and Student Success and the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. The College has placed emphasis on peer review, and for program review, that is handled through our Assessment Committee, a broad-based, shared-governance, standing committee at the College. Those administrators and that committee have been heavily involved in this program review process revision

project. We have also tested revisions and sought input to drive improvements from the academic administrators and faculty who served as program review leads during the timeframe of this project.

Describe the effect that this project has had on the institution, students, and others in the learning community. What has the institution learned that can be identified as a good practice to use in other aspects of its quality work or from which other institutions might benefit?

A: As noted in our last project update, our work on program review has definitely had an impact on HCC's culture. As a relatively young institution, we had placed most of our focus on developing programs to meet community need. We did not really have the process and data infrastructure to systematically review programs for improvement or to make informed decisions on program continuation. Development of the right questions to ask during each program review cycle as well as the data infrastructure to support informed decision-making has been key, but just as important has been the development of a culture of data consultation, and critical, systematic program review. We continue to work to make that process open, transparent and engaging of faculty and instructional staff. Involvement of one of our key shared governance committees (Assessment Committee) in the review process is a good practice. It not only involves the Committee in the review, but assessing other programs' reviews also is informative to the members of that Committee, who in turn will be reviewing their own programs.

Describe the anticipated challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.

A: Two key challenges:

1. Program review can be threatening: Going from a culture of no review outside of the discipline to review by peers through the Assessment Committee and a review by the Vice President has been challenging, especially in a budget climate that calls for cuts. One thing we learned in the first round of the project was to limit the Assessment Committee's review to the areas that Committee has expertise to review (learning outcomes and program outcomes assessment as well as measuring student success). The more focused review by the Assessment Committee in the second year led to more quality comments.

The meeting with the Vice President to discuss program enrollments and results continues to be challenging in cases where the program is not performing well. Dealing with difference in opinion on the recommendation to the State (continue or cull the program) is also challenging. Thus far, in the two cases where that has happened, both programs have been given specific items to address and called back for review the following year.

2. Creating a meaningful but manageable review process: Creating a process that is meaningful to faculty, addresses all the areas the State asks us to report

on, informs decisions on the program status (continue, continue with significant revision, put on hold, or terminate) and drives improvements that is also not overwhelming to complete is another challenge. We hope to address this by continuing to focus the questions, and also make it align with our strategic planning process for operational planning.

In light of the project goals, current circumstances, institutional learning from this project, and anticipated barriers to success, list the next steps to be taken over the course of the next 12 - 24 months in order to complete or institutionalize the results of this action project. Provide a timeline for completing each next step.

- A:**
1. Revise the program review questions again to align with the new State guidelines and adjust the program review data packets accordingly. Timeline for completion: August 2017.
 2. Revise the program review questions and template to align with the College's new operational planning template so that one process works for both needs. Timeline for completion: August 2017.
 3. Provide training for all program review leads and instructional administrators on the new process. Timeline for completion: September 2017.
 4. Conduct the 2018 Program Review process and interview program review leads regarding strengths and weaknesses of the new process. Timeline for completion: July 2018.
 5. Make any needed adjustments based on feedback. Timelines for completion: August 2018.

Provide any additional information, inquiries, or concerns that the institution wishes reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project. Enter N/A if not applicable.

A: N/A

Version 2.0- Update

Q: I certify that this project is ready for review.

A: I agree.

Version 2.0- Review

**Please comment on anything that is omitted or incomplete in the project status,
Q: dates and summary field. Enter N/A if not applicable.**

A: The Action Project is in-progress. The Project started in September 2015 and is expected to end as planned in September 2018. Changes by the Illinois Community College Board that concern the program review process caused the College to make adjustments to its process to align to the new guidelines.

**Check for accuracy and completeness against the original Project Declaration. Are
Q: the right metrics or measures included for each goal? If not, what revisions to the metrics/measures would you suggest that the institution consider?**

A: The Update accurately reflects the originally stated goals as well as the goals identified in the previous update. The goal of the Action Project is to redesign the College's internal Program Review process.

Metrics were not included in the Declaration or in the updated goals identified in Version 1 which carried over to Version 2. As stated in the prior Review, the deliverables at a minimum, indicate completion as a metric. However, completion does not inform the College on the level of performance or success. Additionally, identifying the metrics for each goal may help the College and the Reviewer differentiate between items that lead to progress and those that are just activities. The College is encouraged to identify the metrics that will inform the success of the work accomplished through the Action Project. As the Project is entering its third year, perhaps the College will consider using the identified metrics as part of its evaluation of the outcomes experienced through the Project.

Q: Has the institution acted in meaningful ways to pursue project success, making progress as anticipated in the original project declaration? If meaningful progress or project success has not been achieved, has the institution made appropriate revisions to the goals or anticipated outcomes for this project? • Are descriptions of resources, organization, concrete results, and reaching milestones included? • Make a statement of global judgment. (i.e. "The institution is making

[excellent/good/satisfactory/ acceptable/slow/ casual/no] progress in this action project.”).

A: The College is making good progress in this Action Project, and has acted in meaningful ways to pursue Project success. Qualitative results were provided for each of the four updated goals, along with scant quantitative results. Though the information provided indicates the progress made and achievements, it might benefit the College and the Review if additional details and results were provided.

Are the appropriate people involved sufficiently for the nature and scope of the project?

• **Is there sufficient breadth of involvement?**

Q: • **Are the right people involved? • Emphasize the roles of those who can enhance the impact, success, or effectiveness of the project.**

• **Tactfully call attention to any people that appear to have been omitted or bypassed.**

A: It appears that the appropriate departments and people are involved with the work of the Action Project to achieve the goals. It is evident that there is the support of leadership which is reflective of the Principle of High Performing Organizations Leadership. The College may consider elevating the role and involvement of faculty due to the focus on Program Review. This may be the case through the Assessment Committee however, the members of the Committee were not identified.

Does the institution show evidence of learning from what it did well?

Q: • **Acknowledge any practice that could be replicated internally in future projects.**

• **Encourage the sharing of best practices with other institutions.**

A: The College has realized a positive change in its culture as a result of its approach and deployment of the Action Project. It appears that the College has reflected on what occurred to allow for this change. Additionally, an effective practice of involving the Assessment Committee in the review process was identified. The College is commended on recognizing the importance of its practices as it moves toward a successful completion of the Action Project.

Q:

Does the institution have a realistic understanding of what it needs to address in order to achieve progress and, ultimately, project success? Does it assess its internal and external environments, recognizing the potential forces that could hinder success? Is anything overlooked?

A: Based on what was stated in the Update, the challenges stem from the very core of this Action Project; the program review, it's processes, and evaluation. This fact gives significant justification to chartering the Action Project. It appears that the College has the support in place to address these challenges and continue the momentum of the Action Project. The College is commended on realizing that limiting the focus of the Assessment Committee might return improved responses. The College is encouraged to review how other institutions addressed similar concerns through the Action Project Directory.

Does the institution understand the current status of its project and know how it intends to pursue project success?

A: The College identified five steps or goals for the next year. While these steps are logical and continue the work of the Action Project, no metrics were identified. Additionally, evaluation methods and the process for institutionalizing the outcomes of the Action Project were not included as next steps. The College may want to determine its plan for evaluation and institutionalization before it reaches the end of the Action Project, allowing sufficient time to respond to improvements.

Overall, does the institution demonstrate a good faith effort in its pursuit of continuous quality improvement through this action project? Is there anything of concern that should be brought to the attention of AQIP via your mentor?

A: Heartland Community College demonstrates its commitment to continuous quality improvement through the work and achievements of the Action Project. The College may need to address how it measures the outcomes and results to inform its performance.

Version 1.0- Project

Q: What is the current status of your project?

A: In-progress

Q: Please indicate the original project start date, original project end date, and anticipated completion date if project is not completed. Please list dates on separate lines.

A: Original Project Start Date: 9 / 1 / 15

Originally Projected End Date: 9 /24 / 18

Anticipated Completion Date If Not Completed: 9 / 24/18

Q: Briefly describe the current status of the project. Explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's most recent or soon-to-be submitted systems portfolio, if applicable.

A: In HCC's last Systems Portfolio (2013), we noted we planned to develop and AQIP Action Project focused on revising our program evaluation/review process. Additionally, in our Systems Appraisal (Feb 2014), an opportunity was identified: "to take into consideration the program termination process which is tied to program evaluation. At this point, the program termination process does not appear to be well defined. A well-defined process for program closure is necessary to ensure that everyone understands the process and the need to maintain a current and effective curriculum."

Therefore, we developed the following purpose for this project: To redesign HCC's internal Program Review process to ensure that Divisions are regularly reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary and that they have the appropriate supports (e.g., data) and feedback to ensure a quality review (AQIP Category 1, Process 3).

Q: List the project goals as stated in the original project declaration along with the metrics/measures for assessing the progress for each goal.

- A:**
1. Revise "Six Fundamental Questions" documents to align with ICCB and AQIP requirements and connect with available data sets;
 2. Revise Business Intelligence Site Program Review data to align with "Six Fundamental Questions"
 3. Develop and deliver Program Review training for Review leads (as indicated by Division) each Fall term
 4. Establish and conduct an internal review process via the Assessment Committee

5. Interview Program Review leads upon completion to see what adjustments need to be made to ensure the process is clear and that supports are aligned

6. Measure completed Program Review documents each year for timeliness and completeness

Describe what has been accomplished with this project over the past year, specifically referring to quantifiable results that show progress. You may need to
Q: include a discussion clarifying how the original goals and anticipated outcomes may have shifted during the year.

A:

1. We did revise the Six Fundamental Questions documents to align better with ICCB and AQIP requirements and connected those questions to available data sets;
2. We continued to revise our BI Site Program Review data to align with the Six Fundamental Questions. We have additional data (e.g. cost per credit hour, transfer rates, employment rates) that we have not been able to collect yet.
3. We developed a program review training and met with all the leads in Fall 2015 and again in Fall 2016 and Assessment Committee division representatives were also trained and actively contacted program review leads during the academic year to offer assistance or advice as the leads worked on their program review.
4. We developed a rubric for the Assessment Committee to use when evaluating program reviews and process for that Committee to complete its reviews and discuss back with program review leads and appropriate administrators.
5. We made adjustments based on lessons learned from round #1 in Spring 2015.
6. All Program Reviews were completed on time in Spring 2015 for the first time; however there were varying degrees of specificity.

Describe how various members of the learning community have participated in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration, particularly during the past year.
Q:

A: The projects involves the Assessment Committee, a broad-based, shared-governance, standing committee at the College. It also involved academic administrators and faculty who served as program review leads. After the first year of revisions, all those involved in the program reviews were asked to provide feedback, which generated revisions for AY16-17. We will continue that for the following year

Q: Describe the effect that this project has had on the institution, students, and others in the learning community. What has the institution learned that can be identified as a good practice to use in other aspects of its quality work or from which other institutions might benefit?

A: Our work on program review has definitely had an impact on HCC's culture. As a relatively young institution (just celebrated our 25th anniversary), we had placed most of our focus on developing programs to meet community need. We did not really have the process and data infrastructure to systematically review programs for improvement or to make informed decisions on program continuation. Development of the right questions to ask during each program review cycle as well as the data infrastructure to support informed decision-making has been key, but just as important has been the development of a culture of data consultation, and critical, systematic program review. We continue to work to make that process open, transparent and engaging of faculty and instructional staff. Involvement of one of our key shared governance committees (Assessment Committee) in the review process is a good practice. It not only involves the Committee in the review, but assessing other programs' reviews also is informative to the members of that Committee, who in turn will be reviewing their own programs.

Q: Describe the anticipated challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.

A: Taking a process for which there was no accountability and turning in to one that required accountability and review has not been without its challenges. The first year (Spring 2015), program review leads felt their work was being questioned by those outside their discipline (it was – that was part of the process) and they reported feeling attacked in the meeting where feedback was delivered. In order to better channel the constructive comments of the Assessment Committee, this year we are collating Committee member responses into one document to be shared and instead of having the program review leads come before the Assessment Committee, the Chair of the Assessment Committee and the head of Academic Affairs will meet individually with each area to discuss the feedback in a positive manner. We did not anticipate that program leads would feel defensive, but in an era of budget cuts, we can certainly understand the stakes and the need to ensure appropriate and positive delivery of any criticisms.

Q: In light of the project goals, current circumstances, institutional learning from this project, and anticipated barriers to success, list the next steps to be taken over the course of the next 12 - 24 months in order to complete or institutionalize the results of this action project. Provide a timeline for completing each next step.

A:

1. Develop a program review data template that will contain completed numbers for all programs and deliver that at the program review training. This is in response to the fact that many program review leads reported feeling overwhelmed by the data in the BI Site (we went from complaints of too little data to too much data!).
Deadline: August 2016
2. Complete additional revisions to the Six Questions template to ensure clarity (consider reducing number of questions given that all programs will now receive a completed data sheet). Deadline August 2016.

3. Revise the timeline for program review training, submission to Assessment Committee, submission to Vice President, and meeting with Vice President to discuss so that all can be completed while faculty leads are on Contract (current process has last step occurring during the summer months when faculty are off-contract). Deadline August 2016.
4. Develop a clear process for program termination should that be the recommendation following the program review. Deadline January 2017.

Provide any additional information, inquiries, or concerns that the institution wishes Q: reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project. Enter N/A if not applicable.

A: no answer at this time

Version 1.0- Update

Q: I certify that this project is ready for review.

A: I agree.

Version 1.0- Review

Please comment on anything that is omitted or incomplete in the project status, Q: dates and summary field. Enter N/A if not applicable.

A: The Action Project is appropriately listed as in-progress. The Project started in September 2015 and is expected to end in September 2018. Though the Project is scheduled for three years, an early completion might be experienced based on the deliverables and progress made, along with the anticipated completion dates for the identified next steps. The College is encouraged to remain focused on the goal of the Action Project so that the deliverables remain aligned and do not become activities to fill in the third year.

The Project was chartered in response to a lack of an institutional process for program review as well as feedback received in the last Systems Portfolio.

Q: Check for accuracy and completeness against the original Project Declaration. Are the right metrics or measures included for each goal? If not, what revisions to the metrics/measures would you suggest that the institution consider?

A: The Update accurately reflects the originally stated goals. The goal of the Action Project is to redesign the College's internal Program Review process. This is supported by six deliverables that address the purpose of the goal, to ensure that Divisions are regularly reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary and that they have the appropriate supports (e.g., data) and feedback to ensure a quality review. An approximate timeline for achieving the goals was not included in the Declaration. Metrics were not established for the accomplishment of the deliverables. As stated, the deliverables, at the minimum, indicate completion as a metric. However, completion does not inform the College on the level of performance or success. For example, #3 "Develop and deliver Program Review training for Review leads..." might include the measurement of the number of Review leads trained which represents X% of all leads, by X date, and the number of training sessions. The College is encouraged to develop specific methods of measuring effectiveness for each deliverable so that it may understand its performance, and identify areas for improvement.

Q: Has the institution acted in meaningful ways to pursue project success, making progress as anticipated in the original project declaration? If meaningful progress or project success has not been achieved, has the institution made appropriate revisions to the goals or anticipated outcomes for this project? • Are descriptions of resources, organization, concrete results, and reaching milestones included? • Make a statement of global judgment. (i.e. "The institution is making [excellent/good/satisfactory/ acceptable/slow/ casual/no] progress in this action project.").

A: The College is making excellent progress in achieving the deliverables identified to accomplish the goal of the Action Project. The accomplishments indicate that the College is intentional in achieving the goals and deliverables, and is responsive to the discoveries and feedback received. The College is encouraged, as stated above, to develop specific metrics for each of the six deliverables to better determine the level of performance and success of the accomplishments.

Q: Are the appropriate people involved sufficiently for the nature and scope of the project?

• Is there sufficient breadth of involvement?

• Are the right people involved? • Emphasize the roles of those who can enhance the impact, success, or effectiveness of the project.

• Tactfully call attention to any people that appear to have been omitted or bypassed.

A: The Project has involved appropriate administration, faculty and committee members. The broad-based involvement demonstrated by this Action Project may serve to encourage better decisions and strengthen individual and group ownership of the process for program review that is being developed. The College may want to consider including members of the program advisory committees or other external stakeholders and students on the Action Project team itself to gain a broader perspective. The College is commended for soliciting feedback and acting on that feedback, reflective of the Principles of High Performance Organizations Fact-based Information Gathering and Responsiveness.

Does the institution show evidence of learning from what it did well?

Q: • Acknowledge any practice that could be replicated internally in future projects.
• Encourage the sharing of best practices with other institutions.

A: The College has realized several key practices and effective approaches from the Action Project. These include the development of the right program review questions, the data infrastructure for informed decisions, the development of a culture of data consultation, systematic program review, and the involvement and engagement of faculty, staff, and committee. The College is commended on realizing and articulating the learning that was experienced and is encouraged to replicate the process on other Action Projects as well as institutional strategic initiatives. Additionally, the College is encouraged to share these best practices and approaches with other institutions.

Does the institution have a realistic understanding of what it needs to address in order to achieve progress and, ultimately, project success? Does it assess its internal and external environments, recognizing the potential forces that could hinder success? Is anything overlooked?

A: It appears that the College understands the challenges it faces as the Action Project continues. Though it experienced an unexpected challenge, the College took appropriate action to mitigate the negative impact of a defensive attitude. The inclusion and engagement of faculty and staff, identified as an effective practice, requires continuous interaction and use of quality-based tools to build buy-in.

Two anticipated challenges were identified in the Project Declaration, however, these challenges were not specifically addressed in the Update. Were these challenges

realized, and if so, how were they overcome? If not, how did the College intercept? These challenges involved communication of the process including deadlines and expectations, and training new chairs and faculty on how to access and analyze program review data.

Q: Does the institution understand the current status of its project and know how it intends to pursue project success?

A: The College identifies the Action Project as in-progress and has identified four deliverables as the next steps. However, three of these have August 2016 as the anticipated completion date with the remaining step to be completed in January 2017. This timeline of next steps does not take the Action Project out to the end of the second year, or the anticipated completion date of September 2018.

The College indicated that it has additional data (e.g. cost per credit hour, transfer rates, employment rates) that it has not been able to collect yet. Is the collection of this data included in the next steps?

Metrics are not identified for the next steps. The College is again encouraged to develop specific metrics for the measurement of success to better inform the progress of the Action Project. Along with the measurement of success, the College may want to identify an evaluation method for the overall success of the Action Project.

Lastly, institutionalization of the outcomes of the Action Project is encouraged. The College is encouraged to identify ways in which it will ensure that the program review process being developed through the Action Project is sustained and effectively continued.

Q: Overall, does the institution demonstrate a good faith effort in its pursuit of continuous quality improvement through this action project? Is there anything of concern that should be brought to the attention of AQIP via your mentor?

A: Heartland Community College demonstrates a good faith effort in the pursuit of continuous quality improvement through its commitment to the Action Project, concern for involvement and engagements, and response to feedback.

Concerns about the development of specific metrics have been addressed throughout the Review.

There remains a concern about the identified four next steps being sufficient to extend the work of the Action Project through the end of the second year.

Declaration

Q: Briefly describe the project in less than 100 words. Be sure to identify the key organizational areas (departments, programs, divisions, units, etc.) and key organizational processes that this action project will affect, change, and/or improve.

A: The purpose of this project is to redesign HCC's internal Program Review process to ensure that Divisions are regularly reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary and that they have the appropriate supports (e.g., data) and feedback to ensure a quality review (AQIP Category 1, Process 3).

Q: Describe your institution's reasons for initiating this action project now and how long it should take to complete it. Why are this project and its goals high among your institution's current priorities? Also, explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's recent or soon-to-be submitted Systems Portfolio.

A: There was no internal process for ensuring quality Program Review which resulted in Program Reviews often being completed without faculty engagement, data to support conclusions, or review by the Shared Governance structure that approved the Programs initially. There was a strong desire to improve the process and to support programs with actionable data.

Q: List the project goals, milestones, and deliverables along with corresponding metrics, due dates, and other measures for assessing the progress toward each goal. Be sure to include when you anticipate submitting the project for formal reviews.

A:

1. Revise "Six Fundamental Questions" documents to align with ICCB and AQIP requirements and connect with available data sets;
2. Revise Business Intelligence Site Program Review data to align with "Six Fundamental Questions"
3. Develop and deliver Program Review training for Review leads (as indicated by Division) each Fall term
4. Establish and conduct an internal review process via the Assessment Committee
5. Interview Program Review leads upon completion to see what adjustments need to be made to ensure the process is clear and that supports are aligned
6. Measure completed Program Review documents each year for timeliness and completeness

Q: Describe how various members of the learning community will participate in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration.

A: The members who will participate will include...

- Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee Chair and members
- Assessment Committee Chair and Members
- Institutional Research Office
- Division Deans, Chairs, Directors, and appropriate staff
- Faculty

Q: Describe how the institution will monitor project progress/success during, and at the completion of this project. Be sure to specifically state the measures that will be evaluated and when.

A: The project will be reviewed by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs for completion status and the Action Project will also be reviewed on a regular basis by the AQIP Coordinating Committee at its monthly meetings. Progress on the deliverables listed in question #3 will be assessed, and the success of the project will also be monitored by evaluating the clarity and effectiveness of our program review efforts each year after submissions are completed by discussing strengths and weaknesses of the project with Department Chairs, lead faculty reviewers, and the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Q: Describe the challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.

A: One of the major challenges of program review is that new faculty are chairs are involved each year, so communicating the process, deadlines, and expectations each year will be important. Also, training new chairs and faculty on how to access and analyze program review data, given variable comfort level with that endeavor, is also a challenge.

Q: Provide any additional information that the institution wishes reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project.

A: no additional information

