Program Review Handbook

Revision 3, Spring 2013

Developed by the MiraCosta College
Institutional Program Review Committee, Spring 2011

Approved by the Administrative and Academic Senate Councils, Spring 2011

PREAMBLE

The Institutional Program Review Committee (IPRC) of MiraCosta Community College District developed a collegial program review process that was guided by the following philosophical pillars:

1. **Meaningful Review** – As a critical driver of planning and budget/resource allocation, in addition to other college processes, the committee recognized the need for a process that encouraged meaningful review of relevant data that appropriately reflects fulfillment of stated standards. Given sufficient reflection on the comparison of data against program standards, the process encourages robust planning to improve, expand, or maintain programs. To this end, the program review process can be summarized as following a format of *Review -> Reflect -> Plan.*
2. **Data integrity** – For all programs, this process strives to document appropriate measures (quantitative and qualitative) that demonstrate achievement of program standards. For instructional programs, institutional infrastructure already exists so that these programs will be provided with the appropriate data to assess their programs with no action on the part of the program review authors. For support programs and hybrids of the two, this process will drive the standardization of data for their respective programs and develop the appropriate means to generate, store, and report relevant data.
3. **Scalable** – In order to make Program Review scalable – as meaningful on a college-wide level as a smaller scope– there needs to be a measure of standardization. An expected structure is needed and, within that, consistent application of standards to the diversity of programs present at the college. Further, this necessitates succinct reviews of program performance to allow for adequate consideration of budget and resource allocation, among other college needs, across all programs.
4. **Clear Expectations** -- With an annual frequency, the process needs to eliminate ambiguities in what we expect of authors and what we expect of programs.
5. **Defendable** – We have to be able to defend our work as part of Program Review as meeting the standards of accreditation and our own standards of excellence and support the validation of programs and institutional effectiveness.
6. **Inform Processes** – As a comprehensive review of program performance, the program review packets that authors will assemble will serve a variety of downstream processes, including budget and planning.

With these principles in hand, IPRC developed the process that follows to reinforce and advance the district's mission.

MiraCosta College Mission Statement

The MiraCosta Community College District mission is to provide educational opportunities and student-support services to a diverse population of learners with a focus on their success. MiraCosta offers associate degrees, university-transfer courses, career-and-technical education, certificate programs, basic-skills education, and lifelong-learning opportunities that strengthen the economic, cultural, social, and educational well-being of the communities it serves.

1. Purpose

1.1. To detail the steps involved in conducting the Program Review process at MiraCosta College. Program review is the process through which constituencies on a campus take stock of their successes and shortcomings and seek to identify ways in which they can meet their goals more effectively.

2. Scope

2.1. The process applies to all programs, instructional, support, and any combination thereof, that perform annual Program Review to assess effectiveness in meeting college standards and in advancing the district's mission.

3. Responsibilities

3.1. Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Grants – This Office will have primary responsibility for storage and retrieval of program review-related data. It is the responsibility of those with program supervision to ensure this Office is empowered to collect, store, and report any needed program data.

3.2. Program Authors – These individuals are responsible for ensuring that appropriate data is collected to sufficiently complete review, reflection, and planning required of Program Review. Authors are also responsible for ensuring adherence to the Program Review timeline.

3.3. Program Supervisors– Program supervisors represent the various levels of administration and supervision in effect around the college and they are responsible for working with Program Authors to ensure adequacy of data for Review and Reflection and that these data can sufficiently demonstrate fulfillment of program standards. Supervisors are also responsible for ensuring adherence to Program Review timeline.

3.4. Institutional Program Review Committee (IPRC) – In coordination with other committees (as required), IPRC will define the process and its associated standards, assist in the execution of the process, validate programs, and collect feedback to act on process improvements.

4. References

10.1. AP3250 – Institutional Planning

4.1. AP4102 – Career and Technical Education

4.2. MiraCosta College Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Handbook

4.3. Integrated Planning Manual

4.4. MiraCosta College Comprehensive Master Plan

4.5. MiraCosta College Mission/Institutional Goals/Institutional Student Learning Outcomes

4.6. MiraCosta College Strategic Plan

4.7. MiraCosta College Technology Plan

4.8. MiraCosta College Online Education Plan

4.9. AP4020 – Program Discontinuance

4.10. Institutional Program Review website: http://www.miracosta.edu/governance/iprc/index.html

4.11. Standards from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) and Western Association of Schools and Colleges

4.12. State of California Education Code

- 4.12.1. Title 5 §53200 – Academic and professional matters; Standards and policies regarding student preparation and success
- 4.12.2. Education Code Title 5 §51022 – Instructional Programs
- 4.12.3. Title 5 §54200 – Student Equity Plans

4.13. MiraCosta College Budget and Planning Committee Resource Allocation Rubrics for BPC and Division

5. Definitions

5.1. Program -- A program is any logical unit within the college that combines resources, staff/faculty, and curriculum (as appropriate) to deliver a service towards a stated outcome.

5.2. Areas of Review – There are five areas of review that contain standards whose fulfillment represents the effective programmatic advancement of the college mission.

- 5.2.1. Program Performance
- 5.2.2. Program Resources – Equipment, supplies, and facilities

5.2.3. Program Personnel – Staff, faculty, and administration
5.2.4. Program Curriculum – Specifically, the curriculum managed by Courses and Programs Committee
5.2.5. Program Students – Specifically students appropriately identified through an instructional program

5.3. Program Categories – Programs are categorized strictly according to the applicable Areas of Review and this categorization has no bearing on existing organizational or divisional structures.

5.3.1. Instructional Programs – A category of programs that combine resources, personnel, curriculum, and students that lead to measurable outcomes of performance, including student learning outcomes. *See Attachment 1.*

5.3.2. Support Programs – A category of programs that combine resources and personnel that lead to measurable outcomes of performance, including student learning outcomes, service area outcomes, or administrative unit outcomes. As such, only three of the Areas of Review apply to programs in this category. *See Attachment 1.*

5.3.3. Hybrid Programs – A category of programs that combine resources, personnel, curriculum, and students that lead to measurable outcomes of performance, including student learning outcomes and/or service area outcomes, or administrative unit outcomes. *See Attachment 1.*

5.4. Supervisors – Supervision can vary across different programs but, in all cases, refers to the individual assigned to program oversight for more than one program. Examples of supervisor titles include dean, manager, director, vice president.

6. Procedure

6.1. Review

10.1.1. It is the responsibility of all programs to ensure there is appropriate data (qualitative and quantitative) to measure program performance. Programs will develop plans (see section 6.3) to ensure these measurements occur and are suitably documented in this process.

6.1.1. Instructional Programs

6.1.1.1. These programs will be provided with data tracking their performance against the standards identified in *Attachment 2*. Certain data related to student learning outcomes (SLO), such as specific results, must be accessed through TracDat.

6.1.1.2. As a relatively homogenous category in terms of performance measures, all programs will be provided with data identified in *Attachment 5*. Some performance measures are only relevant for Career and Technical Education programs. Peer groups refer, respectively, to General Education and Career and Technical Education.

6.1.1.3. Comparisons are provided to give some context to the data. At times, these comparisons will be targets identified in the appropriate chapter of the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) or the three-year Strategic Plan (SP). At other times, there will be peer group (CTE/GE), college-wide, and regional/state comparisons. Aside from the targets in the CMP or SP, these other comparisons are provided only for informational ranking.

6.1.1.4. Data, where appropriate, is disaggregated based on the various forms of in-person and online offerings.

6.1.2. Support Programs

6.1.2.1. These programs will be provided with data tracking their performance against the standards identified in *Attachment 3* with the exception of service area outcome (SAO) or administrative unit outcomes (AUO), which authors must access from their respective repositories.

6.1.2.1.1. In some cases, this performance data is not collected and independently stored. In these instances, these programs will develop plans to ensure that relevant measures are being made and that they are being stored in an appropriate location to ensure data integrity.

6.1.2.2. *Attachment 6* will document the various performance measures that exist for each of the programs in this category. It is expected that *Attachment 6* will be updated on an annual basis as programs identify and implement appropriate performance measures.

6.1.2.3. Comparisons are provided to give some context to the data. At times, these comparisons will be targets identified in the appropriate chapter of the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) or the

three-year Strategic Plan (SP). At other times, there will be peer group, college-wide, and regional/state comparisons. Aside from the targets in the CMP or SP, these other comparisons are provided only for informational ranking.

6.1.3. Hybrid Programs

6.1.3.1. These programs will be provided with data tracking their performance against the standards identified in *Attachment 4*. Certain data related to student learning outcomes (SLO) or service area outcomes (SAO), such as specific results, must be accessed through TracDat.

6.1.3.1.1. In some cases, this performance data is not collected and independently stored. In these instances, these programs will develop plans to ensure that relevant measures are taken and that they are stored in an appropriate location to ensure data integrity.

6.1.3.2. *Attachment 7* will document the various performance measures that exist for each of the programs in this category. It is expected that this *Attachment 7* will be updated on an annual basis as programs identify and implement appropriate performance measures.

6.1.3.3. Comparisons are provided to give some context to the data. At times, these comparisons will be targets identified in the appropriate chapter of the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) or the three-year Strategic Plan (SP). At other times, there will be peer group (CTE/GE), college-wide, and regional/state comparisons. Aside from the targets in the CMP or SP, these other comparisons are provided only for informational ranking.

6.1.3.4. Data, where appropriate, is disaggregated based on the various forms of in-person and online offerings.

6.1.4. Additional Data Form

6.1.4.1. All programs have the ability to provide additional data not included in provided data packets.

6.1.4.2. This form can be used to can be used to identify additional data not found in the Review section and can include such information as grant awards, partnerships, intra- and extramural activities, and student learning outcomes, administrative unit outcomes, and service area outcomes relevant to the program.

6.1.4.3. This additional data can be added most directly as text but also supports the attachment of data files.

6.2. Reflect

6.2.1. All programs will reflect on the data provided in Step (6.1) in relation to their respective standards and fill out the respective form.

6.2.2. Each Area of Review will have, at most, one page for succinct reflection.

6.2.2.1. There is an exception for Hybrid Programs, which may submit up to two Program Performance forms, one each for instructional and service area performance.

6.2.3. The reflection will focus on the analysis and discussion of the data in relation to the program standards and will represent the unique perspective of the program authors and their intimate connection to the program.

6.2.4. Reflection will prompt, in part, any necessary or requested planning to expand, improve, or maintain performance.

6.3. Plan

6.3.1. **Plan Sources:** Program plans will derive primarily from two sources:

6.3.1.1. Three year Strategic Plan based on the Comprehensive Master Plan

6.3.1.2. Reflection of program data against standards

6.3.2. **Plan Format**: All plans will have the following format and authors will use a standardized form to document their plans. The plan forms provide authors with a SMART framework (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound) that also aligns with BPC resource allocation rubrics.

1.0 PROGRAM AND PLAN INFORMATION
1.1 Program (select your program)
1.2 Program Review Year: (select year)
1.3 Division (select your division within the college)

1.4 Plan Title (Identify your plan with a unique name. The name will uniquely identify this plan within the greater college planning database and will be used to track progress on the plan until it is closed. Titles should be succinct – less than 110 characters.):
1.5 Plan Objective (State the **specific** objective of this plan and cite the supporting program review data with analysis results – less than 330 characters):
1.6 Action Plan (If this plan addresses a specific Action Plan identified in the Strategic Plan and *identifies you as the responsible party*, indicate which Action Plan.)
2.0 PLAN ALIGNMENTS AND MOTIVATION
2.1 District Mission Alignment (How well does this plan align with the District Mission Statement? – less than 330 characters):
2.2 District Mission Rubric (Indicate alignment)
2.3 Institutional Goals Alignment (How well does the plan align with the Institutional Goals?)
2.4 Strategic Plan Objectives Alignment (How well does the plan align with the Strategic Plan Objective?)
2.5 Divisional Criteria Alignment (How well does this plan align with Division criteria? - less than 220 characters):
2.6 Legal or Regulatory Requirements (Does this plan detail legally mandated actions or regulatory requirements? [If YES, then this box and text appear] Detail these requirements here – less than 220 characters)
2.7 Outcomes Alignment (The District is fundamentally focused on student success. Student learning outcomes (SLO) at the course and program level and their various counterparts in support areas (AUO, SAO) are a strategy towards ensuring that success. Provide the specific program SLO, AUO, or SAO that motivates this plan and include the specific gap or need that this plan addresses as identified through program review data analysis – less than 330 characters)
2.8 Program Review Reflect Motivation (select the Areas of Review from this program review that motivate this plan)
2.9 Outcomes Alignment Rubric (Indicate alignment)
2.10 Measurable Results Alignment (The expected results of this plan must be **measureable**. Provide the specific, measureable statement that details the expected results of this plan – less than 220 characters)
2.11 Measurable Results Alignment Rubric (Indicate alignment)
3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES
3.1 Responsible Individuals (Identify **responsible** individuals within the program and any partnering individuals/programs)
3.2 Partnering Programs (If this plan is submitted on behalf of another program or collection of programs, indicate those here.)
4.0 PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND RESOURCES
4.1 Implementation Plan (Provide an **attainable** implementation plan that outlines the steps needed to accomplish this plan, including a clear timeline of how it will be implemented – less than 330 characters)
4.2 Expected Completion Date (Indicate the expected date of completion -- **time-bound --** of the plan)
4.3 Implementation Plan Rubric (Indicate degree of planning)
4.4 Plan Resource Needs (Provide when, how, and for what the resources will be used to accomplish expected plan results – less than 330 characters)
4.5 Plan Resource Needs (Identify any resources that are needed beyond those already provided to the program: Equipment, Technology, Facilities, Personnel, Curriculum
4.6 Plan Resources Rubric (Indicate funding detail on rubric)
5.0 PLAN ASSESSMENT
5.1 Assessment Plan (Provide an assessment plan and specify the method(s) that will be used and how they will be employed to evaluate the effectiveness of this program review plan – less than 440 characters):
5.2 Assessment Plan Rubric (Indicate degree of assessment planning)
6.0 PROGRESS AS OF THIS PROGRAM REVIEW
6.1 Plan Status (What is the status of this plan?)
6.2 Plan Funding Status [This section is not user-selectable. This is automatically indicated based on BPC funding.] This plan has received funding through BPC This plan has not received funding through BPC
6.3 Plan Progress (Update progress based on the documented assessment plan. To what extent have the plan objectives been achieved? To what extent has such achievement improved the program? Describe the effect and impact any approved funding requests from prior program review cycles had on your program – less than 770 characters):
6.4 Percent Complete (Indicate the percent completion of this plan)
6.5 Plan Close-Out (Do you recommend the close-out of this plan) [Pop-up narrative if YES: To what extent was it completed? Partial, or full?]

6.3.3. **Number of plans**

6.3.3.1. Programs are allowed to have as many plans as they can capably manage.

6.3.3.2. All programs should develop plans to address either (1) institutional objectives in the Strategic Plan or (2) expansion, improvement, or maintenance of their programs as supported in the Reflection portion of the program review.

6.4. Validation

6.4.1. The program review process will document each program's reinforcement and advancement of the district's mission statement.

6.4.2. The responsibility of validation rests with the Institutional Program Review Committee but their evaluation will be based on the assessment of program authors and program supervisors.

6.4.3. After submission of the final program review, program authors and program supervisors will assign scores to the program.

6.4.3.1. Program authors and supervisors are strongly encouraged to work collaboratively during the program review process to reflect and plan to a level that meets the expectations of all program stakeholders.

6.4.3.2. In the instances where this scoring is not in agreement, IPRC will reconcile discrepancies in consultation with the program through Instructional, Support, or Hybrid subcommittees.

6.4.4. **Program Evaluation**

6.4.4.1. Program is effectively meeting the mission of the college in all areas of review. Program development plans appropriately address areas to improve or expand.

6.4.4.2. Program is effectively meeting the mission of the college. In three or more areas of review, the program needs significant improvements to performance against standards. Program development plans appropriately address areas to improve.

6.4.4.3. Program is not effectively meeting the mission of the college in three or more areas of review. Program development plans do not sufficiently address areas to improve.

6.4.5. **Program Validation**

6.4.5.1. At the end of the program review process, a cover sheet will be generated that reports the programs that have effectively met the mission of the college.

6.4.5.2. Programs found to not effectively meet the mission of the college will not be listed and, by exclusion, this informs any relevant downstream processes.

6.4.5.3. A sample of the cover sheet is included in *Attachment 8*.

6.4.5.4. Program Validation will be routed to appropriate Councils (Administrative and Academic Senate) for approval.

6.5. Program Review Timeline

6.5.1. Stages of Review: There are five stages of review as part of the program review process.

6.5.1.1. **Stage 1 Review-Reflect-Plan**: This stage is the work of the program review author to assemble the first draft of the program review packet. IPRC is available as a resource during this time. This stage begins as soon as Review data is available.

6.5.1.2. **Stage 2 Local Revision:** This stage is a formal step to invite and encourage discussion with other individuals within the program and develop any revisions to the program review packet. Stage 2 duration is two weeks.

6.5.1.3. **Stage 3 Supervisory Revision**: This stage is a formal step to invite and encourage discussion with individuals who have oversight of the program. At the conclusion of this stage, the final program review packet is submitted. Stage 3 duration is four weeks.

6.5.1.4. **Stage 4 Program Evaluation**: During this stage, the program author and the program supervisor document their evaluation of the program as detailed in section 6.4 *Program Validation*. Stage 4 duration is two weeks.

6.5.1.5. **Stage 5 Program Validation**: This final stage represents the documented act of validating all of the programs that effectively reinforce and advance the mission of the college. IPRC is the body responsible for documenting this outcome. Stage 5 duration is four weeks.

6.5.2. **Timeline** The following timeline will be updated on an annual basis:

Stage No.	Stage Name	Stage Begin	Stage End	Stage Responsibility	Stage Outcome
1	Review-Reflect-Plan	Summer 2013	20Sep13	Program Author	Draft *Review*, *Reflect*, and *Plan* Forms
2	Local Revision	23Sep13	04Oct13	Program and Dept Members	Draft *Review*, *Reflect*, and *Plan* Forms
3*	Supervisor Revision	07Oct13	01Nov13	Author and Supervisor	Final Program Review *Review*, *Reflect*, and *Plan* Forms
4	Program Evaluation	04Nov13	15Nov13	Author and Supervisor	Author and Supervisor Evaluations
5	Program Validation	18Nov13	13Dec13	IPRC	Reconcile evaluations; Validate

*For programs planning to hire full-time faculty, the Stage 3 end is accelerated to allow time to feed hire requests into an AAC subcommittee for initial prioritization.

6.6. Program Review Documents

6.6.1. Each program review will be compiled as a packet containing all of the program's Review, Reflect, and Plan documents.

6.6.2. Programs that have all of their Review measures documented in this procedure will have the annual Review portion of the program review provided to them via the web-based *Program Review* site.

6.6.3. The forms needed for the Reflect and Plan portions of program review can be found in the web-based *Program Review* site.

6.6.4. The details for program review submission to meet the deadlines identified above can be found in the web-based *Program Review* site.

6.7. Continuous Improvement

6.7.1. In an effort to improve the program review process, IPRC will solicit feedback from all program authors to inform continuous quality improvements. The following questions will be asked of all program review authors:

6.7.1.1. How can the program review process improve and better serve your program and its stakeholders?

6.7.1.2. How easy was it to access data?

6.7.1.3. Was the process useful? How?

6.7.1.4. How widespread was participation within the program?

6.7.1.5. How robust was participation with program supervisors?

6.7.1.6. How was this program review cycle compared to the previous cycle?

6.7.2. These questions will be updated with this handbook as the program review process matures and improves.

7. Attachments

7.1. Program Categorization
7.2. Instructional Standards
7.3. Support Standards
7.4. Hybrid Standards
7.5. Review Data for Instructional Programs
7.6. Review Data for Support Programs
7.7. Review Data for Hybrid Programs
7.8. Program Validation Cover Sheet

8. History

8.1. Spring 2011, *Initial release, v.1.*

8.2. Spring 2012, v.2. Update mission statement, simplify stage submission outcomes, simplify and align Plan forms with Integrated Planning, simplify Reflect forms, update Hybrid Programs with two reflect forms in Program Performance area, update program name list, clarify standards with appropriate language related to SLO/AUO/SAO.

8.3. Spring 2013, v.3. Review data dis-aggregated for online formats; SLO data provided in Review packets and request for authors to include this in Standards language removed; references to Blackboard removed; Plan forms updated to have more logical flow, use SMART framework, and align with BPC; New programs added: Religious Studies, IGETC, CSU GE, Liberal Arts, and Online Education; Reflect form “Additional Data” moved to Review data forms; Review data packets updated and streamlined.

Attachment 1 **Program Categorization**

Instructional Programs		
Accounting	Economics	Kinesiology
Administration of Justice	Education	Liberal Arts
Anthropology	Energy Technology	Linguistics
Architecture	Engineering	Literature
Art	English as a Second Language	Mathematics
Astronomy	English, Pre-transfer	Media Arts and Technologies
Automotive Technology	English, Transfer	Medical Administrative Professional
Biology	Film	Music
Biotechnology	French	Noncredit ESL
Business	Geography	Noncredit Short Term Vocational
Business Office Technology	German	Nursing and Allied Health
Chemistry	Gerontology	Philosophy
Child Development	Health	Physical Science
Chinese	History	Physics
Communication Studies	Honors Scholar Program	Political Science
Community Service	Horticulture	Psychology
Computer Science	Hospitality Management	Reading
Computer Studies and Information Technology	Humanities	Real Estate
CSU General Education	IGETC	Religious Studies
Dance	Interdisciplinary Studies	Sociology
Design Drafting	International Languages	Spanish
Drama/Theatre	Italian	Special Education
Earth/Ocean/Geol	Japanese	

Support Programs		
Academic Information Services	Financial Aid	Office of Student Services
Academic Senate Council	Fiscal Services	Office of the President
Admissions and Records	Foundation and Development Office	Public Information Office
Athletics and Intramurals	Health Services	Purchasing and Material Management
Campus Life and Activities	Human Resources	Risk Management and ADA Compliance
Classified Senate	Institute for International Perspectives	San Elijo Campus
College Police	Institutional Research, Planning, and Grants	School Relations and Diversity Outreach
Community Learning Center	Matriculation and Testing	Service Learning
Extended Opportunity Programs and Services	Office of Business and Administrative Services	Student Accounts
Facilities	Office of Instruction	

Hybrid Programs		
Adult High School	Disabled Students Programs and Services	Retention Services
Career Studies and Services	Library	Transfer
Counseling	Online Education	Writing Center

Attachment 2 **Instructional Standards**

Review Area	Standards
Program Performance	Have program enrollments across the range of curricular offerings been in line with expectations, relative to college-wide trends and/or to enrollment trends in comparable programs at other educational institutions? Are the student/faculty ratios and class capacities in this program consistent with college expectations, disciplinary norms, and with sound educational practice? How effective is the program in attending to and promoting the success of its students in terms of course completion rates, course grade distributions, degrees and certificates awarded, transfers to other institutions, assessment of course-based student learning outcomes, objective evaluation of student preparedness (assessment, placement, course pre- and co-requisites), market and industry trends, advisory board feedback, and other comparable issues? Were Student Learning Outcome Assessment Cycles (SLO* ACs) conducted as specified in the timeline? How have the results of completed SLO ACs been used to provide continuous improvement to the operation of the program? (i.e. were any action plans developed based on Course SLO &/or Program SLO assessment data?) What progress was made with respect to any action plans implemented in prior years that were directed towards improving student success? If resources were provided to implement an action plan, how were they utilized and relate any follow-up SLO assessment data?
Program Resources	Are the offices, work areas, intranet and enterprise technology resources, storage, and other spaces assigned to the program sufficient in terms of square footage, location, quality, and upkeep to optimize departmental performance? Of what quality are the facilities that currently house this program and in what ways to these affect the ability of the program to achieve its objectives? Is the program provided with supplies, software, and equipment appropriate in kind, amount, accessibility, and quality to address the needs of staff and students in the program and to meet program requirements and objectives?
Program Personnel	Is the program provided with sufficient resources and opportunity to allow its staff to remain abreast of current trends and requirements, to develop job proficiency and expertise, to serve onsite and online students, to learn new skills and to explore new initiatives, or to make innovative contributions to the functioning of the department? Is the program provided with sufficient administrative and staff support to meet its objectives and to perform to the standards that it and the college expects? What actions have the faculty members appointed to the program taken to remain current in the discipline? What change to the program faculty in terms of new appointments, promotions, retirements, or resignations have occurred since the last review of the program? Is the distribution of tenured and untenured, permanent and temporary, full-time, part-time, and overload assignments appropriate and in keeping with college or disciplinary standards?
Program Curriculum	Has the curriculum in this program been kept current and contemporary through regular reviews of and modifications to approved courses, contents of course outlines, modes of instructional delivery, degree and certificate paths, pre-and co-requisites, course sequencing, student learning outcomes, articulation agreements, and other comparable issues? Have student learning outcomes (SLOs) been written for this program? Are the discipline and program SLOs still relevant? Were any Course or Program SLO revised/deleted in the past year based on assessment evaluations or revision of the Course Outline of Record?
Program Students	Consider the profiles of students in your program and address whether this is changing over time, if there is an underlying cause driving the change, if you expect the trend to continue, and how the profiles compare to your peer-group and the entire college.

Attachment 3 **Support Standards**

Review Area	Standards
Program Performance	*Program Relations* Is the program held in high regard within the institution and by those to whom it is responsible for providing functions and services? Are clients satisfied with respect to the program's responsiveness, effectiveness, expertise, efficiency, innovation, and professionalism? Are improvements necessary within the program to enhance the satisfaction of the district's employees, external contacts and colleagues? *Processes and Procedures* Are the program's internal processes and procedures sufficient to attend to the tasks for which the program is responsible? Are these procedures and processes current, clear, coherent, consistent, and comprehensive? Are the procedures and processes well understood and routinely observed? Would changes to any of these procedures or processes improve institutional efficiency or better address the needs they seek to address? *Regulatory Compliance* Does the program attend to and meet the various local, state, and/or federal statutory and regulatory requirements and guidelines by which it is bound, including board policy? Are audit procedures sufficient to insure compliance? Is the program effective at explaining these requirements to other programs throughout the institution and seeing that those programs do not act in ways that would compromise institutional compliance? *Effectiveness and Initiative* Is the program encouraged to seek out, to explore, and, when practicable, to implement effective ways of accomplishing its functions or fulfilling its responsibilities? Does the program promote and make use of new ideas and new initiatives designed to enhance its performance and/or efficiency? If appropriate, is the department at the leading edge among its peers at other comparable institutions? *Program Outcomes* Have administrative unit outcomes (AUOs), or their equivalent, been written for this program? Are the program's AUOs still relevant? Were the Administrative Unit Outcomes Assessment Cycles conducted as specified in the assessment timeline? How have the results of completed AUO ACs been used to provide continuous improvement to the operation of the program?
Program Resources	Are the offices, work areas, intranet and enterprise technology resources, storage, and other spaces assigned to the program sufficient in terms of square footage, location, quality, and upkeep to optimize departmental performance? Of what quality are the facilities that currently house this program and in what ways to these affect the ability of the program to achieve its objectives? Is the program provided with supplies, software, and equipment appropriate in kind, amount, accessibility, and quality to address the needs of staff and students in the program and to meet program requirements and objectives?
Program Personnel	Is the program provided with sufficient resources and opportunity to allow its staff to remain abreast of current trends and requirements, to develop job proficiency and expertise, to serve onsite and online students, to learn new skills and to explore new initiatives, or to make innovative contributions to the functioning of the department? Is the program provided with sufficient administrative and staff support to meet its objectives and to perform to the standards that it and the college expects?

Attachment 4 **Hybrid Standards**

Review Area	Standards
Program Performance	*Instruction-related Standards* Have program enrollments across the range of curricular offerings been in line with expectations, relative to college-wide trends and/or to enrollment trends in comparable programs at other educational institutions? Are the student/faculty ratios and class capacities in this program consistent with college expectations, disciplinary norms, and with sound educational practice? How effective is the program in attending to and promoting the success of its students in terms of, as appropriate, course completion rates, course grade distributions, degrees and certificates awarded, transfers to other institutions, assessment of course-based student learning outcomes, objective evaluation of student preparedness (assessment, placement, course pre- and co-requisites), market and industry trends, advisory board feedback, and other comparable issues? *Program Relations (Service Area-related)* Is the program held in high regard within the institution and by those to whom it is responsible for providing functions and services? Are clients satisfied with respect to the program's responsiveness, effectiveness, expertise, efficiency, innovation, and professionalism? Are improvements necessary within the program to enhance the satisfaction of the district's employees, external contacts and colleagues? *Processes and Procedures (Service Area-related)* Are the program's internal processes and procedures sufficient to attend to the tasks for which the program is responsible? Are these procedures and processes current, clear, coherent, consistent, and comprehensive? Are the procedures and processes well understood and routinely observed? Would changes to any of these procedures or processes improve institutional efficiency or better address the needs they seek to address? *Regulatory Compliance (Service Area-related)* Does the program attend to and meet the various local, state, and/or federal statutory and regulatory requirements and guidelines by which it is bound, including board policy? Are audit procedures sufficient to insure compliance? Is the program effective at explaining these requirements to other programs throughout the institution and seeing that those programs do not act in ways that would compromise institutional compliance? *Effectiveness and Initiative (Service Area-related)* Is the program encouraged to seek out, to explore, and, when practicable, to implement effective ways of accomplishing its functions or fulfilling its responsibilities? Does the program promote and make use of new ideas and new initiatives designed to enhance its performance and/or efficiency? If appropriate, is the department at the leading edge among its peers at other comparable institutions? *Program Outcomes (Both Instructional and Service Area-related)* What types of outcomes have been written for this program? Service Area Outcomes? Administrative Unit Outcomes? Student Learning Outcomes? Have Assessment Cycles (ACs) been established and have assessments been conducted according to a timeline? How have the results been used to provide continuous improvement of the program?
Program Resources	Are the offices, work areas, intranet and enterprise technology resources, storage, and other spaces assigned to the program sufficient in terms of square footage, location, quality, and upkeep to optimize departmental performance? Of what quality are the facilities that currently house this program and in what ways to these affect the ability of the program to achieve its objectives? Is the program provided with supplies, software, and equipment appropriate in kind, amount, accessibility, and quality to address the needs of staff and students in the program and to meet program requirements and objectives?
Program Personnel	Is the program provided with sufficient resources and opportunity to allow its staff to remain abreast of current trends and requirements, to develop job proficiency and expertise, to serve onsite and online students, to learn new skills and to explore new initiatives, or to make innovative contributions to the

	functioning of the department? Is the program provided with sufficient administrative and staff support to meet its objectives and to perform to the standards that it and the college expects? What actions have the faculty members appointed to the program taken to remain current in the discipline? What change to the program faculty in terms of new appointments, promotions, retirements, or resignations have occurred since the last review of the program? Is the distribution of tenured and untenured, permanent and temporary, full-time, part-time, and overload assignments appropriate and in keeping with college or disciplinary standards?
Program Curriculum	Has the curriculum in this program been kept current and contemporary through regular reviews of and modifications to approved courses, contents of course outlines, modes of instructional delivery, degree and certificate paths, pre-and co-requisites, course sequencing, student learning outcomes, articulation agreements, and other comparable issues? Have student learning outcomes (SLOs) been written for this program? Are the discipline and program SLOs still relevant? Were any Course or Program SLO revised/deleted in the past year based on assessment evaluations or revision of the Course Outline of Record?
Program Students	Consider the profiles of students in your program and address whether this is changing over time, if there is an underlying cause driving the change, if you expect the trend to continue, and how the profiles compare to your peer-group and the entire college.

Attachment 5 **Review Data for Instructional Programs**

Review Area	Data / Measures	Measure comparison	Trend
Program Performance	WSCH	CMP target, College, Peer group	Y
	WSCH/FTEF	CMP target, College, Peer group	Y
	Fill Rate	CMP target, College, Peer group	Y
	FTES	College, Peer group	Y
	Student headcount	College, Peer group	Y
	Total Course Enrollments	College, Peer group	Y
	Avg Enrollment per Section	College, Peer group	Y
	# of Course offerings per AY	College, Peer group	Y
	# of Course Sections per AY	College, Peer group	Y
	# of Unduplicated Courses in Catalog	College, Peer group	N
	Successful Course Completion	College, Peer group	Y
	Retention	College, Peer group	Y
	Avg Units Attempted per AY	College, Peer group	Y
	Avg Units Earned per AY	College, Peer group	Y
	Avg Term GPA	College, Peer group	Y
	Avg Cumulative GPA	College, Peer group	Y
	# of Completed SLO Assessment Cycles this academic year.	College, Peer group	N
	Degrees and Certificates awarded	College, Peer group	Y
	Grade Distribution	College, Peer group	N
	Student Equity	College, Peer group	Y
	Budget	College and Peer group	Y
	# of classified staff, FTE	College and Peer group	Y
Program Resources	FTEF	College and Peer group	Y
Program Personnel	FTEF FT/PT	College and Peer group	Y
	Reassigned Time	College and Peer group	Y
	FTEF FT/PT (w/o reassigned)	College and Peer group	N
	Untenured Faculty	College and Peer group	N
	Compliance with 6-yr updates	College and Peer group	N
	% (#) of Approved Program Catalog Online/Hybrid	College and Peer group	N
Program Curriculum	% (#) of Courses with CSU [UC] transfer articulations	College and Peer group	N
	Proportion of catalog courses with lab component	College and Peer group	N
	Student Enrollment Status Profile	College and Peer group	Y
	Student Goal Orientation	College and Peer group	y
Program Students	Student Demographics - Ethnicity	College and Peer group	Y
	Student Demographics - Gender & Age	College and Peer group	Y
	Student Education Attainment Level	College and Peer group	Y

Definitions

WSCH is the total Weekly Student Contact Hours resulting from all enrollment within the program.
FTES is the total Full Time Equivalent Student value resulting from all enrollment within the program.
FTEF is the Full Time Equivalent faculty associated with the Program's course offerings for that term.
WSCH to FTEF is a standard measure of department efficiency.
Student Headcount is the count of individual students (no duplicates) enrolled in all courses within the Program
Total Course Enrollments is the sum of all course enrollments (filled seats) within the Program.
# of Course Offerings is the number of courses offered within the program for that term.
# of Section Offerings is the number of course sections offered within the program for that term.
Ave Enrollment per Section is the average number of students per section (Average Class Size).
Success Rate is the percentage of students receiving a passing grade (A, B, C or CR) relative to all students receiving a grade.
Retention Rate is the percentage of students receiving any grade other than W relative to all students receiving a grade.
Ave Units Attempted this Term is the average number of units associated with students enrollment for the term after the add/drop deadline.
Ave Units Earned this Term is the average number of course units awarded to the student at the end of the given term.
Ave Term GPA is the average current term GPA of all students taking courses in the program for the given term.
Ave Cumulative GPA is the average cumulative GPA of all students taking courses in the program for the given term.
Student Enrollment Status measures:

- **First Time Student** A student that has never attended this college, but may have attended or may be currently attending another college.
- **Continuing Students** are those that attended the college in immediately previous academic year.
- **Returning Student** is returning to this college and has not attended another institution since the last academic year here or is returning to this college after attending another college.
- **Concurrent Enrollment** is a student that is attending high school during the term for which he/she is applying.

Student Equity looks at success and retention rates within a program disaggregated by various demographic profiles such as ethnicity, age, and gender.
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLO AC): Includes both the collection of assessment data for a particular SLO as well as the evaluation of that data with corresponding connections to course/program improvements.
Administrative Unit Outcomes Assessment Cycle (AUO AC): Includes both the collection of assessment data for a particular AUO as well as the evaluation of that data with corresponding connections to course/program improvements.

Additional Program Specific Measures

Career and Technical Education Programs			
Review Area	**Data / Measures**	**Measure comparison**	**Trend**
Program Performance	Employment rates	Peer group	Y
Program Resources	Perkins Funding	Peer Group	Y
Program Personnel	No additional measures		
Program Curriculum	Labor Market Data	None	N
	Advisory Board Meeting(s)	None	N
Program Students	No additional measures		

Definitions

Perkins Funding is the amount of money this program received through the annual Perkins Fund.
Labor Market Data is information similar in type and scope to the data presented in the appropriate section of the Comprehensive Master Plan, Chapter 3.
Employment Rates is a measure of the number (and proportion) of students seeking employment after completing a certificate or degree program and the number and proportion successfully gaining employment in their area of study.

Attachment 6 **Review Data for Support Programs**

This section will be updated as this varied information becomes available. Programs are expected to develop plans to define and develop appropriate measures of performance to demonstrate fulfillment of standards. This information, as necessary, will then be included in the next update of this Program Review Handbook.

Attachment 7 **Review Data for Hybrid Programs**

Core Hybrid Measures

The core data to be used by Hybrid Programs is the same as those measures that appear in Attachment 5 for Instructional Programs.

Additional Program Specific Measures

Library			
Review Area	**Data / Measures**	**Measure comparison**	**Trend**
Program Performance	Database usage	College, Peer group	Y
	Circulation statistics	College, Peer group	Y
	Student survey responses	College, Peer group	Y
	Faculty survey responses	College, Peer group	Y
Program Resources	Volumes	Professional standards (ALA, ACRL); Statewide comparisons	Y
	Databases		Y
Program Personnel	No additional measures		
Program Curriculum			
Program Students			

Attachment 8 **Program Validation Cover Sheet**

Program Validation

MiraCosta College Mission Statement

The MiraCosta Community College District mission is to provide educational opportunities and student-support services to a diverse population of learners with a focus on their success. MiraCosta offers associate degrees, university-transfer courses, career-and-technical education, certificate programs, basic-skills education, and lifelong-learning opportunities that strengthen the economic, cultural, social, and educational well-being of the communities it serves.

The following programs have been shown to effectively meet the mission of the college as evidenced by their rigorous and thoughtful reflection on performance against broad and comprehensive standards:

[Insert Validated Program Names]

_____ _____

IPRC Co-Chair Signature and Date IPRC Co-Chair Signature and Date