



# Academic Program Review Handbook

---

2018-19

## **Phase I Self Study**

Use data to conduct an historically-informed, future-focused inquiry into your program

## **Phase II Peer Review**

Get an outside peer perspective on your inquiry results from a peer in your discipline.

## **Phase III Implementation Planning**

## Contents

1. Overview: Contexts for Academic Program Review
2. Academic Program Review Year 1 At-a-Glance (APR)
3. Checklist: Benchmarks for Self-Study and External Peer Review Phases of APR
4. Suggestions for Organizing Your Inquiry
5. Sample 1: Narrative Reflection Structure
6. Sample 2: Outline Structure
7. Themes to Develop Your Focused Inquiry Questions
8. Questions for Inquiry
9. Completing Your Report
10. Phase 2: External Peer Review
11. Phase 3: Action Plan and Implementation
12. Phase 4: Mid-Cycle Progress Check-In
13. Phase 5: Implementation Continued Year 5 with Beginning Plan for Self-Study Year 6

# Overview<sup>1</sup>

---

## **Institutional Contexts for Academic Program Review:**

Academic Program Review at Lane is the primary construct for academic planning, improvement and resource-allocation. Through an inquiry process developed collaboratively between faculty, administration, program review provides a transparent cycle of institutional improvement across areas, with programs providing critical feedback into the system.

The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), our accrediting body, has recently made explicit review of all programs a standard of accreditation, and this prompted systematic development of program review. This is the NWCCU recommendation at the last accreditation visit:

*Recommendation 5: In order to ensure quality and relevancy of its program and service offerings, the evaluation committee recommends that the college administration, faculty, and staff continue to engage in establishing and **implementing comprehensive program and service review processes that are informed by data and connect to planning and institutional effectiveness processes** (Standard 2.C and 4.A).*

## **Board Policy:**

The college has reaffirmed its Board Policy regarding program review: “The program review will evaluate: whether educational or service objectives are consistent with the college's mission or purpose; the achievement of students in relation to the intended educational outcomes identified; the extent to which the college regularly uses the results of program or service review for improvement of its programs and services.” <https://www.lanec.edu/board/policies/bp035>

## **Learning Plan:**

Lane’s Learning Plan integrates program review into its focus on improvement of the teaching and learning environment.

**Faculty Association:** A [Memorandum of Agreement](#) reached with the LCC Education Association defines roles and authority for APR and provides for reassigned time/compensation for program review committee lead work. Once a Program Review Committee (PRC) lead has been identified, they should contact their dean and the APROC chair to begin the process for course reassignment or make stipend arrangements.

## **Purpose of Academic Program Review:**

Academic Program Review at Lane is the primary construct for academic planning, improvement, and

---

<sup>1</sup> This handbook is compiled from Lane’s Guiding Principles of Academic Program Review and also adapted from several APR documents from colleges nationally (Boston College, Knox College, Cal Poly, University of Vermont, PSU, PCC) and from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges’ document, *Program Review: Setting a Standard* 2009. Web.

resource allocation at the college. It is a faculty-led collaboration with administration that engages faculty, staff and administrators in 5-year continuous improvement cycles. The **purpose** of the Academic Program Review process is to systematically and critically assess Lane’s programs for effectiveness, to identify necessary adjustments, and to provide a mechanism to institute and evaluate proposed changes.

Desired **outcomes** from the program review process include:

- clarifying program mission and goals,
- improving the learning environment and student achievement of learning outcomes,
- optimizing program development and improvement,
- and creating systematic links between course-, program- and college-level planning and resource allocation

## Self-Study Year-at-a-Glance

Academic Program Review (APR) is the primary construct for academic planning, improvement and resource allocation at the college.

APR is a faculty collaboration with administration that begins with inquiry and analysis and results in a program-level action plan tied to improved outcomes for students, the learning environment, and the institution.

The centerpiece of the self-study is a set of six Inquiry Questions—3 developed by program faculty; an assessment inquiry question plus up to one other question provided by the administrative management team (AMT), and a third question provided by the Academic Program Review Oversight Committee (APROC).

See the APR Handbook for detailed instructions for all phases of APR.  
lanecc.edu/academicprogramreview

[List of Acronyms Below](#)

[Key Resources Listed Below](#)

[Meetings to Schedule in Your Calendar 2018-19 Below](#)

### Early October 2018

- Identify PRC Lead**, PRC faculty committee if applicable
- Complete** Paperwork for Course Reassignment Time for Lead Faculty
- [Schedule Meetings and Events](#)

## **Attend APR Orientation**

Overview of APR and resources, first appointments with APR coach, schedule of [Database for Academic Program Review](#) (DAPR) Training; introduction to Assessment coach & Institutional Research (IR) staff, review of handbook, timelines & website ([www.lanecc.edu/academicprogramreview](http://www.lanecc.edu/academicprogramreview))

## October-November-Dec 2018

## **Kick Off Program Review in Your Dept/Div and meet with Dean, APR Coach, Assessment Coach, IR Staff, other resources.**

Schedule meetings with IR early - data requests may take significant time to prepare.

PRC Leads and program faculty begin program review work. Create scope of work considering time available, create outline of work to be completed. **For assistance consult templates online at [lanecc.edu/academicprogramreview](http://lanecc.edu/academicprogramreview) and contact APROC or Coach.** ) PRC Lead carries out bulk of the writing, collaborating with program faculty & dean on data collection and inquiry development. Faculty & Dean should stay in contact throughout the process to relay important developments; your coach will help with processes involved in inquiry—e.g., data collection and liaising with key resources.

## **Attend Database for Academic Program Review (DAPR) Training Session**

The DAPR houses APR documents so you can track your program review progress from Year 1 through all its phases of implementation. Tammie Stark will contact you to schedule your training.

## **Send a short-list of External Peer Review Candidates to [APROC\\_Chair@lanecc.edu](mailto:APROC_Chair@lanecc.edu)**

It's important to get on your peer—reviewer's calendar as soon as possible. Send a short-list to the APROC Chair who will formally invite your top choice and move down the list. Ideally, in May 2019 you will complete your self-study and send it to your peer reviewer.

## **Inquiry Questions: The Center of APR Inquiry**

**Faculty Produce 3 Questions. *As soon as possible and by Nov. 15.*** Work with faculty colleagues to identify key questions for your program. Distill key issues into 3 questions for inquiry. For examples of previous PRC questions, consult the Appendix.

**AMT Produces 2 questions, including an assessment question. *As soon as possible and by Dec. 1.*** Administrative Management Team Reviews Faculty Inquiry Questions; Drafts & Sends Up to 2 Questions to PRC Lead and APROC. One question requires you to evaluate your program's assessment plans and processes.

**APROC sends 1 question. *As soon as possible and by Dec. 1.*** APROC reviews all self-study questions and sends up to 1 inquiry question.

## January 2019

### Organize Your Inquiry

Templates to support your self-study organization are available on the Academic Program Review Website, from your coaches and from colleagues in your field. Many programs have found an environmental scan and SWOT analysis (***Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats, and Priorities***) to be a key step in providing context for their work. Mission and vision statements are part of this scan, and can help your program articulate program goals for current work (your current intentions, what you do, your ***mission***) and program goals for future work (what you ultimately aim to do, your program's ***vision***).

### Draft Your Self-Study

Work with colleagues and data sources (including Standard Data Package, Department Data Sheets, other data from IR and other sources) to answer your inquiry questions. Based on your self-study questions, draft your self-study.

### Continue to Collaborate

Stay in contact with your Dean, who can provide important information about the shifting environment at the college, regional and state levels. Stay in contact with your coach who has experience shepherding PRCs through the multiple stages of APR and helping you keep your project right-sized. Stay in contact with your program faculty—share findings as you uncover them, using regular department meetings or other mechanisms to keep the program faculty apprised.

### Report Barriers/Challenges

Report barriers, concerns or issues in person, during gatherings, email [APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu](mailto:APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu) or use online form at: <https://www.lanecc.edu/academicprogramreview/questions-and-suggestions>.

## February 21 & 22<sup>nd</sup> 2019

### Winter APR Check-In of PRCs

Mark your calendar for one of these two “Winter Check-In” meetings. This event for the current cohort of PRCs is a roundtable where each program undergoing self-study talks about where they are in their self-study, asks questions and gets help in removing barriers to successful completion. Each PRC lead invites all available PRC members and any other department members they wish to be present. APROC coaches will be there as well as IR representatives to trouble-shoot data issues and help you move forward with your project.

### Plan to Revisit Your Self-Study

In-depth study of your program provides an important opportunity to study the critical issues for your program now and plan for future improvements. But ideally the self-study is a living document that will

continue to evolve over the course of the APR five-year cycle. Expect that there will be some changes in your inquiry as you move through the process. Don't worry about this development—just keep working!

## March 2019

### Confirm your External Peer Reviewer and Set Site Visit Itinerary.

Work with Mai Mathers [mathersm@lanecc.edu](mailto:mathersm@lanecc.edu) to schedule this day. See the APR Handbook for a sample itinerary for your External Peer Reviewer site visit. If you want the visitor to attend a class and/or meet with students and faculty, timing will be a key consideration. Work with your coach to set expectations for what the Site Visit and External Peer Reviewer's report entails.

Send the itinerary to the site visitor and share with your dean, APROC, and the VP for ASA.

## April 25 & 26<sup>th</sup> 2019

### Spring APR "Round-Up" of PRCs

Mark your calendars for one of these two "Spring Round-Up" days Academic Program Review. This event provides a final opportunity for PRC leads and deans to gather collectively with IR and APROC before completing self-studies. APROC, IR and deans will offer support and guidance to PRCs with the goal of helping each program complete its self-study phase, including compiling the External Peer Review Recommendation report with the PRC report, by the end of spring term. During the meeting, PRC leads discuss self-study progress, share discoveries, and address obstacles to completing self-study reports. We also introduce the Implementation Planning process (Phase 3 of APR).

## May 2019

### Submit your Revised Self-Study to your external peer reviewer, APROC, and ASA.

We encourage you to complete your self-study by early May in order to share it with your external peer reviewer in time for them to read it before the site visit

## Late May/Early June 2019

### Host your External Peer Review Site Visit (Phase 2 of APR)

Use your itinerary to organize the day's activities.

### Implementation Preview: Meet with Planning Mentor Jen Steele

Once your self-study is complete and you've sketched out your recommendations for improvement, Jen Steele will meet with you to mentor you as you develop an Action Plan (Phase 3 of APR). This plan will

guide your implementation for the next 4 years. Final Implementation Plans are due in ASA and the Budget Office by November 30, **2019**. For more on Implementation, see the Guidance on Implementation in the Handbook.

### Write Executive Summary of APR Report

Use template to synthesize major findings from PRC and Peer Reviewer; Submit to APROC and VP ASA

### Meet with your coach to plan your Poster Session poster for Fall Inservice

Coordinate with your APR coach and APROC to get help designing your poster for Fall Inservice.

## Tips for the Process

### Create the Space for Program Review

It's important to spend this time gathering and analyzing data. This is not the time to begin major assessment projects or to clear up old work your program never got around to until now. When you discover work that needs doing, write it as a recommendation so that you can implement improvements in future. Programs that have spent valuable self-study time trying to accomplish neglected tasks inevitably find it impossible to complete the self-study in a timely fashion and stretch the initial year-long process into multiple years.

**Resist the temptation** to jump to implementation. You'll be tempted to solve problems/issues you identify in your self-study. Don't begin implementation during the self-study phase: put major findings into recommendations and put initiatives into next year's plan.

**Draft the whole document first before revising sections. This will help you manage the document size and scope of the project.** Don't get each section "perfect" before moving to the next. The earlier you hammer out an entire draft from beginning to end the easier it will be to see the scope of your work and revise accordingly.

**Anticipate unmet data needs. You may need to fold longer research projects and surveys into your implementation phase. Please inform APROC of these as they emerge but continue with your self-study in the meantime.** IR continues to improve and expand its support for APR but it may not be able to generate the precise data you need this year. Some survey development/administering may be part of your implementation plan.

## Meetings for PRC to Schedule and Track 2018-19

### Fall 2018

1. October APR Orientation Meeting (Oct 11/12)
2. Ongoing Meetings with Program Review Committee
  - to do environmental scan and prep for Inquiry Question
  - to agree on inquiry questions
  - to begin research on all inquiry question from program, AMT, APROC
3. Data Inquiry Meeting(s) with IR

4. Meetings with Coach
  - Talk strategies for beginning
  - Meet with IR
  - Follow-up meeting when data arrives
  - Check-ins as needed
  - Feedback on draft

### Winter 2019

5. Winter 2018 Roundup Feb 21<sup>st</sup> 22<sup>nd</sup> 2019

### Spring 2019

6. Spring Check-in April 25<sup>th</sup> 26<sup>th</sup> 2019
7. Spring 2019 External Peer Evaluator Site Visit (coordinate with Mai Mathers [mathersm@lanecc.edu](mailto:mathersm@lanecc.edu))
8. Spring 2019 Planning Mentor Meeting (coordinate with Mai Mathers [mathersm@lanecc.edu](mailto:mathersm@lanecc.edu))

### Fall 2019

9. Fall 2019 Poster Session/Lightning Round APR Presentation
10. Fall 2019 Implementation Steering Team (Meeting Oct-Nov. Deadline to submit plan Nov. 30, 2019. Coordinate IST meeting with Mai Mathers [mathersm@lanecc.edu](mailto:mathersm@lanecc.edu))

**Acronyms** for more detail visit our website [lanecc.edu/academic program review](http://lanecc.edu/academic-program-review)

- **PRC:** Program Review Committee
- **APR:** Academic Program Review
- **APROC:** Academic Program Review Oversight Committee
- **AMT:** Administrative Management Team (VP Designee who represents the administration in the APR collaboration with faculty)
- **DAPR:** Database for Academic Program Review
- **IST:** Implementation Steering Team
- **IR:** Institutional Research

### Support Resources for Common Areas of Inquiry and Themes

**For General Questions about any aspect of APR:** Anne McGrail [mcgraila@lanecc.edu](mailto:mcgraila@lanecc.edu)

**Administrative Coordinator for Academic Program Review:** Mai Mathers [mathersm@lanecc.edu](mailto:mathersm@lanecc.edu)

**Your APR Coach:** Kate Sullivan [sullivank@lanecc.edu](mailto:sullivank@lanecc.edu) or Anne McGrail [mcgraila@lanecc.edu](mailto:mcgraila@lanecc.edu)

**Assessment Coach and Curriculum Questions:** Tammy Salman [salmant@lanecc.edu](mailto:salmant@lanecc.edu)

**For Institutional Research (IR):** Cathy W. Thomas [thomascw@lanecc.edu](mailto:thomascw@lanecc.edu)

**Resource for Database for Academic Program Review (DAPR) and ASA Special Projects:**

Tammie Stark [starkt@lanecc.edu](mailto:starkt@lanecc.edu)

**Resource for Academic Technology/Online Learning Environments:** Kevin Steeves

[steevesk@lanecc.edu](mailto:steevesk@lanecc.edu)

**Resource for Open Educational Resources (OER:)** Meggie Wright [wrightm@lanecc.edu](mailto:wrightm@lanecc.edu)

**For questions regarding Marketing:** Andy McNamara [mcnamaraa@lanecc.edu](mailto:mcnamaraa@lanecc.edu)

**For questions regarding High School Connections:** Deron Fort [fortd@lanecc.edu](mailto:fortd@lanecc.edu)

**For questions regarding Articulation and Transfer:** Jennifer Frei [freij@lanecc.edu](mailto:freij@lanecc.edu)

**For questions regarding Advising:** Lida Herburger [herburgerl@lanecc.edu](mailto:herburgerl@lanecc.edu)

**For questions regarding Planning and Strategy:** Jen Steele [steelej@lanecc.edu](mailto:steelej@lanecc.edu)

# Checklist

## Benchmarks for PRC Lead

### Completing Self-Study and External Peer Review of APR<sup>2</sup>

- ☐ PRC Lead chosen by program; PRC Lead recruits a faculty work group/team
  - ☐ PRC Lead schedules regular work sessions for the rest of the term and academic year if possible
  - ☐ PRC meets in work session(s) for initial comprehensive program scan using available data
  - ☐ PRC Creates External Peer Reviewer List for Invitation Committee (APROC and VP/Designee)
  - ☐ Invitation Committee invites External Peer Reviewer
  - ☐ PRC Lead Sends draft PRC Questions to coach for feedback
  - ☐ PRC Lead Sends PRC questions to APROC
  - ☐ PRC Lead Sends PRC questions to AMT
  - ☐ PRC Receives AMT questions
  - ☐ PRC Receives APROC question
  - ☐ PRC Lead Meets with IR to determine queries, feasibility of data needs, etc
  - ☐ PRC Communicates with IR on data needs (cont'd—this is often an iterative process)
  - ☐ PRC distributes work among program faculty if needed to work on sections of APR Report
  - ☐ PRC Lead communicates with coach and dean about ongoing developments
  - ☐ PRC Lead Completes first draft of Self Study
  - ☐ PRC Meets with coach for revision of draft of Self Study, liaise with IR if necessary
  - ☐ PRC Prepares exhibits/evidence/appendices
  - ☐ Revised draft of Self Study complete
  - ☐ May 1<sup>st</sup>: Send revised draft of self-study to APROC for distribution to External Peer Reviewers and AMT/VP designee
  - ☐ Confirm site visit date with External Peer Reviewer (Communicate with IC)
  - ☐ External Peer Reviewer itinerary complete, arrangements in place
  - ☐ External Reviewer visits site
  - ☐ External Reviewer provides report to [APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu](mailto:APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu)
  - ☐ PRC Lead Drafts an Executive Summary of the Self-study and Peer Review Report
  - ☐ Complete Program Review Document triggers convening of Implementation Steering Team
  - ☐ Implementation Steering Team meets to develop Action/Implementation Plan
  - ☐ Annual Planning Process provides occasion for continued implementation/promotion of recommendations
  - ☐ Implementation Action Items are added to Department Plans annually
  - ☐ Mid-Cycle Check in in Year 3
-

# Distribution of Your Self- Study

---

## Printing and Distribution of the Self-Study Report

When the PRC Lead has completed their self-study, they should send it to [APROC\\_Chair@lanecc.edu](mailto:APROC_Chair@lanecc.edu) and Administrative Coordinator for APROC for distribution and archiving. The self-study should also be sent to the External Peer Reviewer(s), the AMT, and shared with program faculty.

# Suggestions for Organizing Your Inquiry

---

In developing your questions for focused inquiry, you may wish to examine in a summary fashion some of the preliminary findings you come to as you answer Guiding Questions for Inquiry below. You should access the [Standard Data Package](#) and [Department Data Sheets](#) as a starting point; they provide some but not all of the common criteria for evaluating your program.

**Templates:** Below you will find two suggested templates for organizing your program review. One involves a narrative/reflective structure and one involves an outline structure. Your disciplinary association or colleagues in your field may have already developed discipline-specific models for program review and we invite you to use any framework for organizing your report. Ask your coach or [APROC\\_Chair@lanecc.edu](mailto:APROC_Chair@lanecc.edu) for help finding models.

## Inquiry Model

Whichever model you choose, the focus of your self-study will be a series of questions (more below).

# Guiding Questions for Inquiry

---

## Before You Begin Using the Outline Structure

When you first begin self-study, the narrative or outline structure below may help your program review team scan major areas for focused inquiry. But adding answers/inputting data into these sections will not constitute a robust self-study. Your first program review goal is to develop 3 (three) high-level synthesis **questions** whose answers will provide the foundation for a strategic plan for improvements at the program level. This questioning process is at the heart of the inquiry model of APR. The Administrative Management Team (AMT) will also ask up to two data-informed questions including one on assessment, and APROC will add up to one.

### A. Program Faculty Questions

What are the critical issues your program faces? How do they impact the department and program? After answering as many of the narrative outline questions as possible, what themes emerge that might be reframed as major questions for your academic faculty to answer?

## B. AMT Question(s)

The Administrative Management Team questions are also developed with strategic focus on the critical administrative issues the program and college face. The college now requires assessment to be a part of every self-study and so the AMT will ask an assessment question. Other questions may be guided by gaps in your program's questions, or by college strategic directions, accreditation mandates or other areas of college inquiry. AMT questions will be accompanied by data that supports the questions.

## C. APROC Question

The Academic Program Review Oversight Committee may also submit up to 1 data-informed question for your program's self-study inquiry.

## Developing Program-Specific Questions for Focused Inquiry (Program Questions)

The APR website has a list of previous program review self-study questions which can serve as models for your own inquiry. These questions are only examples and each discipline should develop local questions that will be the most useful for planning and improvement.

### Forward thinking:

Program reviews should emphasize *forward planning informed by analysis of recent data trends* with units identifying, through the self-study and the review process, the necessary steps in the form of recommendations to maintain excellence and to correct deficiencies.

**Separate self-study from addressing issues:** Program review should develop plans and recommendations in the self-study to address issues in a timely fashion *following the review*, rather than addressing issues in the course of the self-study phase.

### Importance of developing questions:

For some programs that engage in regular planning, questions for in-depth inquiry may present themselves quickly. For other programs the initial comprehensive scan may reveal trends and suggest questions for inquiry that had been obscured by the short-term exigencies of teaching and annual planning. For many programs, developing three questions for focused inquiry may be a combination of clear directions and unforeseen exploration.

**Core Themes: Connect your thinking to the college mission.** Program review self-study gives you the opportunity to reflect intentionally on the role that your program plays in mission fulfillment for the college. The college's Core Theme Objectives and Indicators articulate how the college understands its mission and seeks to fulfill it. Finding your program's place in mission fulfillment at the question-development stage of inquiry will help you to integrate your findings into an action plan that supports mission fulfillment; resources for development are now directly linked to college core themes, objectives and strategic planning documents.

Here are Lane's Core Themes that together reflect the college's vision for mission fulfillment.

- Core Theme 1: Responsive Community Engagement
- Core Theme 2: Accessible and Equitable Learning Opportunities
- Core Theme 3: Quality Educational Environment
- Core Theme 4: Individual Student Achievement

Find out more about Lane's Core Themes, Objectives, and Indicators of achievement here:

<https://www.lanec.edu/planning/core-themes>

### **Meaningful questions are strategic:**

The key to developing meaningful inquiry questions lies in strategic thinking. APR occurs once in five years, with the goal of developing long-term plans and implementing improvements that will have lasting impact for up to eight years.

### ***Tips for developing productive inquiry questions:***

- **Scope:** Think deep and long-term: Choose questions the answer to which could provide strategic plans for your program for 5-8 years.
- **Focus:** Develop questions that together examine multiple dimensions of your program while each having a clear, researchable focus: e.g., how much you already know or want to know about student learning in your program (assessment practices), Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in your discipline, impact of facilities on program development, efficacy of curriculum development, building faculty expertise in a changing field, etc.
- **Inquiry:** Choose questions to which you don't already know the answer.
- **Scholarly:** Choose questions that are open to research.

## **Developing Institutional Questions for Focused Inquiry (AMT Questions)**

The AMT questions have the potential to be strategic in their scope especially if AMT members are aware of emerging **themes** in higher education as they are shaping college strategic directions. Alternatively, AMT questions could anticipate a college strategic focus of a particular year. The college now requires that all programs address assessment in their APR self-studies, and so a question regarding program assessment plans will now be a feature of AMT questions.

**Data-Informed:** The AMT will provide data that supports their inquiry. This data can be used by PRCs to address the nature, source and scope of the questions and to support initial inquiry into the questions. Such data is also essential for efficient response to questions. The college is building capacity for the necessary infrastructure for programs to respond effectively to questions.

A feedback loop could be useful if AMT questions are predictable as well as responsive, connecting **college themes to program focus**. Questions should be responsive to program concerns/foci but also strategically anticipate future directions of the college so that PRCs can use self-study to anticipate future directions.

## Developing APROC Questions

The oversight committee brings a college-wide review perspective to the APR process. Upon receipt of the (up to 5) questions from PRC and AMT, the APROC may ask a question whose answer will provide important information about the role that program review plays in continuous improvement.

## Plan Your Executive Summary

Whatever structure you use to organize your self-study, please provide an executive summary when your self-study and external peer review report are complete.

## Guidelines for Your Executive Summary

Provide a 1-2 page summary of key findings including program strengths and challenges, current status of program, and priorities the program has identified for improvement. Templates are available on the [APR Resources page](https://www.lanecc.edu/academicprogramreview/review-resources) <https://www.lanecc.edu/academicprogramreview/review-resources>

### Template for Executive Summary

Lane Community College

Academic Program Review: Executive Summary of the APR Report

Program or degree name:

Year program review cycle started:

Date:

Program Review Committee Lead:

You may submit your executive summary electronically via the [Database for Academic Program Review](#) (DAPR) or via email. If you upload it to DAPR, an automated message will alert APROC that it is available.

To submit via email, use this template, if desired. Submit executive summary to the APROC Chair at [APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu](mailto:APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu) and [DAPR@lanecc.edu](mailto:DAPR@lanecc.edu).

The executive summary should cover the Self Study & External Peer Review Phases and should have a high-level analysis including:

- A synthesis response to inquiry questions and your analysis of the data
- A statement addressing how the program does or will reflect current disciplinary and industry standards and workforce needs through the review process or external accreditation
- A note to discuss how feedback from advisory boards or other external sources will be integrated. For some programs this will be responses to accreditors or external peer reviewers.
- Progress toward program-level improvement measures, if applicable. This may be relevant in Mid-Cycle reports.
- List your program recommendations
- List external peer reviewer's program recommendations

## Sample 1: Narrative Reflection Structure

---

Looking at each of the themes below will help you to develop a picture of your program—its character, functioning, its achievements and challenges. Clusters of issues may emerge and ***these can develop into the high-level synthesis questions of your self study***. Answers to these questions will provide the foundation for a strategic plan for improvements at the program level. This questioning process is at the heart of the inquiry model of APR.

Early in your preliminary program review, it may be valuable to draw up a summary narrative. Describe what **issues emerge** from your preliminary analysis of the data. In your committee's *early* assessment, at what does your program excel? What are the challenges to academic quality and student learning in your program? These questions may lead you to your focused inquiry questions.

### **A. Looking at Mission and Goals<sup>3</sup>**

Place your program in its larger context: college-wide, discipline-wide, peer departments at other programs

How does your program define its mission?

- Its discipline focus
- Its areas of excellence
- Its service to other departments, community, \_\_\_\_\_
- Who benefits from your program?

In developing your mission statement, you may wish to check out the resource “How to Develop a Mission Statement” (a pdf from UCentral Florida’s APR guide).

What are the current, relevant, critical issues in your discipline—how are they reflected in your mission statement and in curriculum present and future?

What are your program’s short and long-term goals and how do they connect to your mission?

How does your program know the extent to which it is achieving its short and long-term goals?

In what ways does your program contribute to the college’s overall mission?

How do you explicitly communicate your mission to students, to faculty, to advisors, to administrators, to the community?

#### **1. Summary and Reflection**

***What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?***

### **B. Looking at Improvement and Implementation**

- What are your program’s enrollment goals?

---

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from *Boston College Program Review Guide*. August 2016, Web.

- What are your program's quality goals?
- What are your program's Assessment goals?
- What are your program's Teaching and Learning goals?
- What are your program's Diversity goals?
- What are your program's Student success goals?
- What are your program's Student life/mentorship goals?
- What are your program's Other goals (characterize)?

### 1. Summary and Reflection

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

## C. Looking at Assessment

Communicate with your Assessment Coach and use the [Assessment Resources](#) on Lane's Assessment website to guide you.

Describe how your program's **curriculum** supports different degree/certificate programs for students.

Describe **changes** in your program. What drove these changes and what effect have they had on your program? How do you know? What evidence do you have for these effects?

Describe any **interdisciplinary** work in your program. What are its effects on student learning/engagement/success?

How does your program **assess** Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for majors or concentrators?

- How does your program make these outcomes explicit to students?
- How does your program set appropriate criteria with which to evaluate achievement of expectations?

Describe your **methods** for gathering, analyzing and interpreting evidence to determine performance and expectations.

How are SLOs **communicated** to faculty? To staff? To students?

What are the major **successes** and **shortcomings** of your program with respect to SLOs and student satisfaction? What is your evidence for this?

How does your program contribute to student growth broadly conceived—how does it facilitate the integration of intellectual life with everyday experiences? What opportunities for formal and informal interactions among students, with students and faculty and staff are there?

Does your program actively recruit students? How?

Do you have programmatic *targets and benchmarks*?

Some other assessment issues you may want to address in developing your APR:

- What are your data elements for assessment?<sup>4</sup>
- Do you have a long-term assessment strategy?
- What measures and indicators do you use to assess?
- How does your program align with external criteria?

## 2. Summary and Reflection

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

## D. Looking at Teaching, Advising, Mentoring<sup>5</sup>

Other than course evaluation, what **evidence** for effective teaching and student learning does your program use?

Does your program engage in activities in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (**SoTL**)?

What steps have faculty taken to **improve teaching and learning** and how effective have these been?

What efforts does your program make to stay apprised of pedagogical **best practices** in the discipline or field?

How does your program support **part-time faculty development**?

What are the **advising** strengths of your program? (Consider the formal advising program, communication with majors/concentrators, Moodle sites, and also informal advising occurring through faculty interaction etc.)

Describe the **relationship** between faculty and the counselor and advisor embedded/assigned to your program. Describe the communication loop among faculty with counseling and advising. What are the strengths of this relationship? Where and how might it be improved?

Describe the **path** students take to your program and through your program (if applicable). How are students advised?

Describe the professional achievements in your program and relate to how they are connected to the culture of teaching and learning in your program.

## 3. Summary and Reflection

---

<sup>4</sup> From PSU Program Review Guidelines

<sup>5</sup> Adapted from *Boston College Program Review Guide*. August 2016, Web.

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

## **E. Looking at Faculty Life and Collegiality**

What is the current shape and character of the faculty: full-time/part-time ratio, areas of expertise, range of methodologies/teaching approaches etc.?

How would you characterize the culture of the program for faculty? Does it have a collegial environment? What efforts are made to mentor new faculty within the program? Are there specific pedagogical approaches that faculty are expected to adopt? Specific content areas that faculty are expected to teach?

Are there any transitions anticipated in the program faculty within the next five years? What impact will these transitions have on the program?

### **4. Summary and Reflection**

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

## **F. Looking at Diversity, Equity and Inclusion**

Looking at your student demographics, are there elements of race, ethnicity, gender or other elements of student identity that are over- or underrepresented? Can you locate the causes of these disparities? Is there a national conversation about such disparities of representation in your discipline? How has/could your program responded to these disparities?

Beyond representation (e.g., classroom climate, environmental adaptations, universal design, language inclusiveness), what does your program do to actively ensure equity and inclusiveness?

What are your program's current hiring plans for the next five years? How does your program actively participate in the recruitment of diverse faculty?

How would you characterize the intellectual life of your program and what is being done to improve or maintain it? How does this intellectual life proactively engage with diversity?

Describe how diverse perspectives are integrated into the curriculum in your program. How could this integration be improved?

### **2. Summary and Reflection**

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

## **G. Looking at Service, Coordination and Administrative Work**

Is your program adequately represented on department, division and college-wide committees?

How is service shared among full-time faculty and staff? Are faculty and staff satisfied with this distribution? How could this be improved?

What are the roles, responsibilities and compensation for faculty engaged in coordination or administrative work? How are these roles communicated to the program faculty and staff?

What committees exist within your program and what are their responsibilities?

How would you characterize the working relationships of program faculty and staff? Are there opportunities for improving these relationships?

### **3. Summary and Reflection**

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

## **H. Looking at Program Governance**

How does your program operate? Describe how decisions are arrived at, communicated and implemented. How does it relate to its home department and division? Is there a charter or clear set of guidelines for faculty, staff and administrators to set expectations and guide working relationships?

### **4. Summary and Reflection**

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

## **I. Looking at Resources**

Describe how effective the physical plant is for your program's goals.

Is the equipment available to your program adequate for the current mission and goals?

### **5. Summary and Reflection**

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

## **J. Looking at Students**

What efforts are made to attract and retain students in your program?

Looking at course offerings: what are the optimum course offerings for your program's student constituencies present and future? What evidence do you have for this claim? How can your program maintain this optimum offering?

6. Summary and Reflection

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

# Sample 2: Outline Structure

---

## Table of Contents<sup>6</sup>

I. Executive Summary .....	14
II. Identity.....	21
A. History and Context .....	21
B. Program Mission and Goals.....	21
C. Progress on Action Plan (for Year 3 Programs) .....	21
III. Program Elements and Resources .....	21
A. Academic Program .....	22
B. Faculty .....	22
C. Department Staff and Administration .....	22
D. Facilities, Equipment, and Information Resources .....	22
E. Funding and Expenditures.....	23
IV. Program Effectiveness .....	23
A. Student Learning Assessment .....	23
B. Student Success: Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation.....	24
C. Student Engagement and Satisfaction .....	24
D. Graduate Success if available .....	24
V. Future Trends and Capacity .....	25
A. Future of the Field and Career Opportunities .....	25
B. Program Capacity.....	25
VI. Questions for Focused Inquiry .....	
A. Program Faculty Questions .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
B. AMT Question(s).....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
C. APROC Question .....	

---

<sup>6</sup> Adopted and abbreviated From Cal Poly *Program Review Self-Study Template*. Web. August 2016

VII. Conclusions ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

    A. Taking Stock: significant findings..... 26

    B. Looking Forward: Strategic Thinking..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

VIII. Appendices..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

## **I. Identity**

Who are you as a department and program? Whom do you serve? What is your plan and purpose?

### **A. History and Context**

1. Provide a brief history and description of your program and department, including concentrations/specializations and minors.
2. Include the year that the program was implemented, the accrediting agency (if applicable), and the year of the most recent program/accreditation review.

### **B. Program Mission and Goals**

1. State and then evaluate the department mission, vision, values, and goals to the degree that these elements are developed.
2. How current and relevant are these elements?
3. How do these elements align with the mission, vision, values, and goals of the college?
4. How do these elements shape the decisions and direction of the department and program?

### **C. Progress on Implementation and Action Plan (future report element)**

1. Briefly describe the results of the previous self-study and site visit as represented by the Implementation Plan and action plan — issues identified, recommendations made, and actions proposed.
2. Describe significant achievements and progress made since the last program review.
3. What proposed changes have not been made and for what reasons?

## **1. Summary and Reflection**

- a. State the major findings of this section. What improvements do they inspire?*

## **I. Program Elements and Resources**

---

*How are you achieving your plan and purpose? How effectively are elements and resources being used?*

## **A. Academic Program**

1. What are your Program's Learning Objectives
2. Describe the Program Curriculum
3. Describe the Program Co-Curriculum, if applicable
4. Characterize your Program's Pedagogy

## **2. Summary and Reflection**

***b. State the major findings of this section. What improvements do they inspire?***

## **C. Faculty**

1. Faculty Profile
2. Faculty Workloads
3. Describe Faculty Scholarship and Professional Engagement, Teacher-Scholar Model
4. Describe New Faculty Recruitment, Mentoring, Retention
5. Describe Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Efforts

## **3. Summary and Reflection**

***Reflecting on your faculty, teaching contributions, scholarship, service, diversity and equity, and areas of expertise of the current faculty, how well are the overall needs of the program being met?***

***What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?***

## **D. Department Staff and Administration and Governance**

1. Describe Staff
3. Describe Administration
4. Describe Program Governance and Decision Making
5. **Summary and Reflection**

***What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?***

## **E. Facilities, Equipment, and Information Resources**

1. Describe Facilities
2. Describe Equipment, Technology, and Information Resources
3. **Summary and Reflection**

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

## **F. Funding and Expenditures**

1. Revenues/ Funding
  - a. Provide a summary of total budget revenues and program expenditures (salaries, benefits, operating expenses) for the last 2-3 years as available. Describe any significant increases or decreases in the cost of the program over the review period, noting factors that may be influencing costs. Include copies of annual budgets, as available, in appendix.
  - b. How are decisions about program funding and expenditures made? Describe your department budget process, and engagement of faculty and staff in that process.
2. Other Funding
3. **Summary and Reflection**

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

## **II. Program Effectiveness**

---

*How Well Do You Achieve Your Plan and Purpose?*

### **A. Student Learning Assessment**

1. **Assessment Process**
  - a. Include a copy of the program's current assessment plan in appendix. Evaluate the current status of assessment in your program using the [Resources in the Assessment Website](#). Describe your current status. What are your next steps?
  - b. Are you getting meaningful results from your annual assessments? Explain how you know.
  - c. What improvements need to be made to your process or methods (if any) to improve your ability to obtain meaningful results?
2. **Assessment Results**
  - a. How many of your program's SLOs have you assessed in the last cycle of program review? Provide copies of assessment reports or details of results in appendix.
  - b. Based on the annual assessment results for PLOs, is there evidence of how well students are achieving the learning standards established for the PLOs? Describe to what degree students fall short of, achieve, or exceed benchmarks within each PLO.
  - c. How have assessment results been used to guide program improvements? Provide specific examples.
3. **Assessment Plans**

- a. Briefly describe your plan for the next cycle of assessment (provide plan in appendix). Include any details that have already been determined including: the PLOs to be assessed, methods of assessment including artifacts, etc.
- b. Describe areas of assessment support and/or training needed for your department.

#### **4. Summary and Reflection**

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

### **B. Student Success: Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation**

1. Enrollment, Retention (Persistence), and Graduation
2. New Transfer Students (NTS): Enrollment, Retention (Persistence), and Graduation
3. Policies for Student Success
4. Describe how the implementation of any new campus policies has impacted student success in your program:

#### **5. Summary and Reflection**

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

### **C. Student Engagement and Satisfaction**

1. Describe and discuss Student Perspectives and Engagement
2. What questions about student engagement and satisfaction does your program have?

#### **6. Summary and Reflection**

*What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?*

### **D. Graduate Success**

The evidence cited in this section will vary greatly by department. Address the sections below for which you have evidence.

1. Recent Program Graduates (if applicable)
  - 1) How have the results changed over time?
  - 2) What do they suggest about graduate success in terms of employment, salary, position, employer, and upper division transfer education?
- b. Describe feedback from graduates or any other measures of graduate success used by the program, e.g., the results of professional exams, certification/ licensing/ registration rates, and numbers of graduate degrees awarded. What do these measures suggest about the program and its graduates?
2. Alumni

- a. Analyze the results of any alumni surveys from the last six years.
    - 1) What was the percentage response rate (number of responses/number of invitations to participate)?
    - 2) To what extent do alumni respondents report that their experience of the program has helped them to succeed in their personal and professional lives? What do they suggest about graduate success in terms of employment, salary, position, employer, and graduate education?
    - 3) How have alumni perceptions changed over time?
    - 4) How do their perceptions compare to department expectations?
  - b. Describe any other measures used to obtain feedback from alumni. What do these measures suggest about the program and its graduates?
3. Employers
- a. Analyze the results of any employer surveys from the last six years.
    - 1) What was the response rate?
    - 2) What do the results suggest about graduate success in terms of PLO achievement, industry readiness, employer values, salary scales, etc.?
    - 3) How have employer perceptions changed over time? How do they compare to department expectations?
  - b. Describe any other measures used to obtain feedback from employers. What do these measures suggest about the program and its graduates?

## 7. Section Summary & Reflection

**What are the major findings of this section? What improvements might they inspire?**

## III. Future Trends and Capacity

---

How are current and future trends being taken into account by the program?

### A. Future of the Field, Educational and Career Opportunities

How is the program meeting the current and potential future needs and trends in education, the labor market, industry, and society? What is the bureau of labor statistics (as well as other sources) predicting? What other new areas/fields do you predict will be developing in the future related to your discipline? What will be the jobs of the future? How will your program prepare students?

### B. Program Capacity

1. What is the program's capacity to educate more students? Are there adequate faculty, staff, facilities and other resources to meet the demand? If not, describe what additional resources are required.
2. Conversely, how has your program been impacted by recent enrollment declines and what plans do you have to address these?

## Conclusions

1. **What are your PRC Questions emerging from your initial comprehensive scan?**
2. **What are the AMT Questions? What data are these questions emerging from? How do they complement/ respond to your own questions?**
3. **What is the APROC Question? What is it in response to?**

## Completing Your Report

---

Once you have worked on an initial scan, developed your PRC questions and received the AMT's and APROC questions, you can complete your report. Some of your questions may be readily answered with research into available data, but some data and queries may need to be tailored to meet your program's biggest concerns and issues. Meet early with IR and stay in contact with your coach and APROC to get your queries answered in a timely fashion. For some programs, data collection and program assessment may be complex enough to require a recommendation and implementation. Don't get stalled out by projects that don't fit within the academic year. Rather, using available data make recommendations for how your program can improve—including improved assessment data and analysis.

It's a good idea to collect your self-study recommendations into a section of your report—perhaps your conclusion. This will facilitate writing your executive summary and Implementation plan.

Once you've completed your report, you can load it into the [Database for Academic Program Review](#) (DAPR) or send it to send it to the APROC Chair at [APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu](mailto:APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu) They will send it to the External Peer Reviewer. Then you may begin final arrangements for your External Review.

## Phase 2: External Peer Review (Year 1)

---

### Overview

The Invitation Committee, comprised of VP (or designee), the PRC chair (or designee) and the APROC liaison (or designee) craft a joint request for an External Peer Reviewer for a site visit and evaluation. The External Peer Reviewers provide high quality feedback concerning the Self-Study with explicit reference to expected in-depth examination of the specific identified issues. If any invitation committee party doubts the ability of the chosen Peer Reviewers to do an adequate job, the letter may request that if the reviewers do not believe they can do an adequate job within the time constraints that they contact the IC about engaging additional support or reviewers.

**Choose an External Reviewer ASAP:** Begin the process of selection at the start of your self-study. Consult the Self-Study Year at a Glance. The peer review phase affords programs a unique external perspective in identifying their strengths and weaknesses, assessing their ability to meet program learning outcomes, and evaluating the effectiveness of curricular design.

## Criteria and Selection of Peer Reviewer

It is expected that PRC leads, in consultation with their departments, will identify peers to act as reviewers. Professional ethics dictate that reviewers provide a disinterested and candid review to programs. Reviewers should not have close personal ties or other conflicts of interest that would prevent them from providing an objective review. They should be familiar with the discipline under review and have some experience with the assessment of student learning outcomes. Experience of the community college context is an advantage.

## Reviewer Responsibilities

Peer Reviewers are responsible for reading the program's self-study, participating in a site visit, and writing a report documenting their findings and recommendations.

Peer Reviewers prepare a brief and concise report of their findings after the site visit is complete. The report is submitted electronically to the APROC Chair who distributes it to the AMT and the PRC chair and archives it. Errors of fact should be addressed within ten days of receipt. The complete report then triggers the convening of the Implementation Steering Team.

In developing their report, peer reviewers should assess the quality of the program's mission and goals and the effectiveness of the program's learning objectives, curriculum, and pedagogy. Reports should examine the quality and extent to which program self-studies have answered program review questions. Recommendations should address improvement of the educational environment and student learning.

## Site Visit

Be sure to arrange for the date of your site visit early in the academic year. Schedules get very tight; plan early to arrange for the maximum participation and the most fruitful visit

## Site Visit Checklist

1. Peer reviewer arrives having read the report
2. Informal meeting with PRC lead
3. Peer reviewer meets with dean and other administrators, staff and faculty with budgetary responsibility
4. Reviewer meets with faculty and students, may attend a class.
5. Program lunch with dean, faculty and student (if feasible).
6. Exit interview: with PRC lead, dean, others as appropriate to share recommendations.

## Key Features of External Peer Reviewer Report: Conclusions, Recommendations, Analysis

The review team will produce a written document of their key findings and recommendations.

### 1. Conclusions

Peer reviewers should take account of the inquiry questions that organize the Self-Study and the program's concerns and recommendations in drawing its conclusions. Reviewers may also bring their own external focus/framework in their observations about the current state

of the program: the teaching and learning environment, number and quality of the faculty, capacity, appropriateness, quality of assessment practices, relationship of assessment to improvements, national discipline trends, etc.

**2. Recommendations**

Specific actions with rationale if possible that will address challenges and findings from self-study and site visit

**Sample Itinerary of External Peer Reviewer**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Escort/Host</b>	<b>Location</b>
Day prior to review	Peer Reviewer arrives to Eugene (if out of town). Checks into hotel. May arrange for dinner with program faculty.		Eugene
Day 2	Breakfast at hotel then arrangements for travel to LCC		LCC
8:30-9:00	First appointment: with PRC lead, AMT, Ex Dean, Dean		
9:15-10:00 10:15-11:00 11:15-12:00	Individual 30-45 minute meetings with members of the program including PRC lead. Alternatively, attend a class and meet with students.		
12:15-1:15	Lunch with students, dean, faculty etc.		
1:30-2:15	Meetings with program faculty		
2:30-3:00	Meetings with program staff and/or program faculty from related (outside) programs.		
3:00-4:15	Visit to facilities if appropriate		
4:15-5:00	Peer reviewer has time and space to gather their observations, ask questions of PRC lead and get any questions answered etc.		
5:00	Concluding meeting with PRC lead and Dean/AMT representative to recap visit and provide next steps (planning for report)		
5:30	WRAP UP AND CLOSE		

**Details of Site Visit Planning**

Arrange for site visit and external reviewer in Fall term for a Spring term review. Work with APROC Chair to arrange for support for:

- Travel and lodging
- Food

- Getting around campus
- Transportation to campus
- Arranging a schedule: ensuring that all Program faculty and staff are aware of site visit and plans are made in advance to schedule all meetings with reviewer.
- Pay attention to students' degree cycle when arranging site visits: for some CT programs with Spring graduates, for example, Fall Site Visits prove difficult for interviews with students experienced in the program.

### **Reviewer Report Submission Process and Honorarium/Stipend**

Upon completion of the site visit, the peer reviewer has up to one month to submit a draft report to the APROC chair, ([APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu](mailto:APROC-Chair@lanecc.edu)) who distributes it to the PRC and the AMT for correction of factual errors and transfer to Implementation Steering Team consideration. The College will pay a \$500.00 stipend to offset travel and time investments for peer reviews. Disbursement of the stipend follows college receipt of final Peer Reviewer Report/Recommendations.

## **Phase 3: Action Plan and Implementation**

---

### **Overview**

Submission of the Complete Program Review Document (CPRD) (which includes an amended PRC Report, the External Peer Reviewer's Report with Recommendations, and any factual corrections made by APROC, AMT or the PRC) to APROC triggers the convening of the Implementation Steering Team (IST).

The Implementation Steering Team (IST) is convened by the VP designee and PRC chair. The IST prepares to implement plans from the Complete Program Review Document by generating an initial implementation report which summarizes initial viable financial options and potentially removable barriers. The IST facilitates and coordinates discussions with respective stakeholders (local and global) when resources limit implementation of Program Review plans. To make implementation concrete, the IST may draw up an action plan for implementing recommendations that lists both resource-dependent and resource-independent plans that can be checked throughout the 5-year cycle. The IST then periodically meets to facilitate implementation and progress monitoring and reports progress to IR and APROC. [Department Plans](#) provide an annual mechanism for updating progress on action planning. The IST adapts plan implementation in response to institutional changes in strategic priorities, goals, approaches or funding that impact feasibility

### **Action Plans: Implementing Recommendations**

See [Guiding Principles document](#) for detailed overview of the Implementation Phase of APR.

Given the stakes involved in writing up an implementation plan that will guide your program's work for 4-8 years, APROC recommends that PRC leads engage as many program faculty, including lead faculty and their deans, early in the process of moving from recommendations to action planning. It's optimal

to complete your Implementation Plan in early Fall term. In 2018, the deadline for resource allocation requests is November 30<sup>th</sup>, and so plan accordingly.

### **Corrections to Your Report**

If the PRC or the AMT has any errors of fact or additions to make to the Program's self-study, please send them to APROC Chair as soon as possible so that APROC can update the report and share it with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) as critical feedback on the program's role in mission fulfillment.

### **Scheduling for Your Implementation to Meet Budget Cycles**

APROC strongly encourages development of initial implementation plans as early as possible so that financial options can be considered within the annual budget cycle. This IST meeting is where you can work on finalizing a plan for this year and into the future based on your program's recommendations.

### **What does the Implementation Steering Team Do?**

The team prepares a joint report with consensus recommendations from the report and a plan that includes financial options and/or timelines for recommendations requiring college resources (e.g., human resources, technology or other material resources). There may be local resource issues within your program. In such cases, the IST should use the Program Review recommendations to set priorities and draw up a plan for implementation. Where there are no resource issues, the consensus recommendations are implemented. [See Guiding Principles Language below.]

The Implementation Planning template guides development of your report/action plan; use or adopt it to outline concrete actions needed to implement your program recommendations. Such a plan can be useful in tracking and reporting on progress toward improvement in coming months and years.

### **Institutional Effectiveness and Core Themes:**

By the time you have completed your self study you should be aware of the college's Core Themes. To learn more about Lane's Core Themes, Objectives and Indicators visit Lane's website <https://www.lanec.edu/planning/core-themes> . APROC is collecting data for the college about the program reviews that respond to external peer evaluators' feedback, so we ask that you make note of any initiatives or responses to the external peer evaluators' responses in your Implementation Plan.

The program and division maintain a copy of the complete report, as does APROC and the AMT. For your information, the complete report with external reviewers' report will also be sent to the [IEC](#) to be used as critical feedback for its work in college-wide planning and improvement. APROC is charged with archiving this complete document and tracking progress during the improvement/implementation cycle.

The IST should meet regularly to promote implementation. Department or division meetings may be a good mechanism for regular check-ins. APROC is planning a workshop this fall for IST work and we'll let you know when that is scheduled. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any questions.

**"APR Guiding Principles" referencing Implementation Steering Team's role: (April 2015)**

*Following the completion of this report, the VP-designee and PRC chair will convene an **Implementation Steering Team** for preparing implementation plans. The PRC will take primary responsibility for summarizing strategic options for moving the program forward that represented a **consensus** of the Self-Study and the External Peer Review; and the VP-designated members and the PRC-designated members will jointly summarize **initial viable financial options and potentially removable barriers** based on the initial data provided for the Program Review and the consensus program review recommendations. This will form the **initial report** of the Implementation Steering Team. Following this, the team will periodically meet to facilitate implementation of the recommendations coming from the Program Review. The meetings and progress in implementation will be regularly reported by the Steering Team to IR and the APROC.*

*The joint expectation shall be that lack of resources, barring major changes in demand for the program, is the main challenge the IST will need to deal with and that questions of recommendation merit have been adequately settled through the earlier program review progress. To the extent that resource issues are not an issue, implementation is expected to proceed quickly as is feasible. To the extent that resource issues exist, but are local in nature, the team is expected to raise the issues locally among stakeholders, including any relevant Steering Teams, to set priorities for distributing resources and make plans for removing resource barriers.*

*To the extent that resource challenges are global, the team will raise these issues to the IEC as concrete matters for which there needs to be strategic college priorities set and college financial plans created, which are adequate to deal with these areas of program implementation. Creating such viable strategic priorities and financial plans for implementing the results of Program Review will be the **responsibility** of the IEC and/or other appropriate bodies. With the clarification or modification of strategic priorities, goals, approach or funding, the feasibility of implementing recommendations may change. In such cases, the IST will have responsibility to consider implementation progress under these new conditions.*

## **How to Develop Your Action Plan: Work with Your Program Culture**

Each department culture has developed its own ways of working, and programs should work within their local systems to track implementation of improvements.

**“SMART” Goals:** One approach to operationalizing recommendations for improvement is to develop so-called “SMART” goals. Although this is just one system of framing your program’s work, the acronym provides useful prompts that can spur discussion and create concrete and manageable tasks that can be distributed among faculty and over time:

- **Specific** (Other relevant terms: simple, sensible, significant).
- **Measurable** (Other relevant terms: meaningful, motivating).
- **Achievable** (Other relevant terms: agreed-upon, attainable).
- **Relevant** (Other relevant terms: reasonable, realistic and resourced, results-based).
- **Time bound** (Other relevant terms: time-based, time limited, time/cost limited, timely, time-sensitive).

## **Annual Planning: Using Your Implementation Plan to Guide Annual Plans**

While your self-study will be complete after the first year, the results of your work will continue to guide your planning for 5-8 years. Each year in the fall, use the implementation plan to guide the year's work. As APR becomes more integrated into the college's planning and resource allocation processes, this will become a familiar and regular feature of program work. Look for more information in the coming year.

### **Academic Program Review Implementation Plan**

Program:

#### **Implementation Steering Team (IST)**

Program Review Committee lead:

Faculty designees:

VP Designee:

Dean:

Submitted (date):

Approvals

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Program Review Committee Lead

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Dean

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## Implementation Planning

Your implementation plan will summarize recommendations that emerged out of your self-study process and identify requisite actions in support of these recommendations. You should review your plan annually (in the spring, in conjunction with annual department planning) and make updates, adjustments, and revisions as needed and appropriate. It should be considered an active, working document.

After completion of your Year 1 self-study, you will develop an implementation plan that is discussed and reviewed with the Implementation Steering Team (IST), comprised of the PRC lead plus any additional faculty designees, the department dean, the Vice President of ASA or designee, and the Director of Planning who serves in an ex-officio role.

As possible, it is recommended that you have conversations with your Dean both during your self-study process to keep them apprised of the work and the recommendations that are emerging, and also as you are developing your implementation plan.

During IST meeting(s) you will discuss and review your recommendations, action plans, time lines, and resource implications. Where new resources are needed, the Dean and VP designee will allocate dedicated funds as possible as part of the initial approval. If there are funding constraints or limitations, these will be noted and the resource request will be funneled into a secondary process (for example, contracted faculty requests.)

Your initial implementation plan should be completed and signed by IST members on or before November 30 of the year following completion of your review so you can maintain momentum in moving your plan forward and resource needs can be considered and processed. As mentioned above, you do not need to map out all four years of implementation in your initial plan. Focus on the first phase(s) of work needed to support recommendations. Through the annual review and update process, you will have the opportunity to make adjustments and connect into resource considerations.

### Essential Elements of Implementation Plans

- 1) Summary of Recommendations
- 2) Measurable Outcomes (as possible)  
*These can be connected to specific recommendations and/or part of the overall improvement plan*
- 3) For Each Recommendation
  - a. Initial action plan (major steps)
    - These can include additional study or research
    - You can identify an initial action in support of the recommendation with the understanding in the coming year(s), you will have the opportunity to add additional actions.

b. Initial timeline

*When do you expect to complete or check in on the initial action steps?*

c. Resources needed

*Include existing college resources (e.g. assessment team, marketing department), plus anticipated new or additional resources (e.g. curriculum development, equipment, staffing)*

4) Signatures of the PRC lead, Dean, and Vice President designee.

Questions?

Anne McGrail, APROC Chair

Jen Steele, Director of Planning & Strategy

### **Phase 4: Mid-Cycle Progress Check-In**

Each year, your program's Department Plans provide the occasion to update your Implementation Plan progress and initiate the next stage in your plan. Year 3 of your program review cycle (with the Self-Study Year as Year 1) provides the occasion for feedback to APROC on your work and from APROC on college progress in supporting your program's goals. The APROC chair will contact your program late in Year 2 of your APR cycle to set up a meeting for this feedback conversation. You can report on your progress in achieving goals and implementing recommendations for improvements and APROC will act as a support and liaison to remove obstacles to implementation. The plan for Check-in is being refined by APROC and ASA.

### **Phase 5: Implementation Continued Year 5 with Beginning Plan for Self-Study Year 6**

Year 5 of your program review cycle (beginning with Self-Study Year as Year 1) will ideally be a time of reflection and preparation for the new Self-Study Year. By Spring of Year 5, your program should select a PRC lead and communicate with APROC about plans for beginning your Self-Study.