Levels of Implementation	Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review	Evidence
Awareness	1. There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review. 2. There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research. 3. There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals. 4. The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.	1. Program Review Handbook; IPRC Governance Committee 2. Handbook 3. Handbook 4. Handbook
Development	1. Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness. 2. Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness. 3. Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin. Etc.) 4. Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality. 5. Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement. 6. Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.	1. Annual process; all programs; leadership and supervisor evaluation of effectiveness based on data against standards; planning to improve 2. Stage 2 of process 3. IPRC is a governance committee 4. Annual commitment; form-driven, web-based 5. Fundamental to Review>Reflect>Plan process 6. Identified in Integrated Planning Manual
Proficiency	1. Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly. 2. Results of all program review are integrated into institution- wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making. 3. The program review framework is established and implemented. 4. Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.	1. Annual frequency, all programs 2. Plans development in program reviews are fundamental to planning 3. Defined in Handbook 4. Encourages discussion within programs and with program supervision; the voice

	5. Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples. 6. The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.	of the program is further heard through resource allocation process 5. Fundamentally inform planning and resource allocation; Faculty hiring most recent example 6. Handbook requires process evaluation annual; Integrated Planning Manual describes bi-annual evaluation
Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement	1. Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. 2. The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness. 3. The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	1. Annual; fundamental cog in planning model; explicitly identifies advancing District Mission and supporting student learning and achievement; standards regarding SLOs and SLO-related data are included in all instructional program reviews 2. Handbook requires process evaluation annual; Integrated Planning Manual describes bi-annual evaluation; IPRC dedicates spring semester to improvement 3. A key aspect of the final piece of Review>Reflect>Plan: programs use authentic reflection based on inclusive dialogue to improve their programs and student success