PHSC

PASCO-HERNANDO STATE COLLEGE

Administrative and Academic/Student Support Units
Program Review Guide

Introduction

The overall purpose of the administrative program review is to comprehensively review information specific to a program's or planning unit's constituent support and viability to inform program planning and improvement.

Each program review will be composed of three parts—a self-assessment conducted by program staff members appointed to the self-assessment task force, a review of the self-assessment task force's report by the program viability task force, and a final leadership review and response conducted by the Division Dean and the Vice President of the unit under review. Reviews will be completed in a five-year cycle.

Planning objectives (action items) that stem from the program review will be indicated as such in the College's planning management system, Strategic Planning Online (SPOL), as part of the planning units annual planning.   Items identified as action, watch, and forward will be communicated to the President's Administrative Council in a synthesized annual report that includes all program review outcomes for the reporting year.

Program Cover Sheet

Academic Year:

Division:

Program(s):

Administrative Program Review Committee:

Self-Assessment Task Force:

> Participants: This should be a group of staff members working in the program and appointed by the division dean or their designee. The size of the group will vary depending on the program, but will likely consist of 3-5 members, including a designated member to chair the self-assessment task force.

> Charge: The self-assessment committee is responsible for providing a 1-2 paragraph response to each of the subcomponents in the 2 program review categories. The response should be provided after committee members analyze the evidence for each subcomponent. The committee is also responsible for generating a response to the outcome prompts (pg. 5) for each category and making any revisions they deem necessary after reviewing feedback provided by the viability task force.

Name, Title

Program Viability Task Force:

> Participants: Faculty, staff or administration from other college planning units. The size of the group will vary depending on the program, but will likely consist of 3-5 members, including a designated member to chair the program viability task force.

> Charge: Respond to the self-assessment task forces summary of findings and associated subcomponents for each category by making recommendations, acknowledging strengths, and asking probing questions.

Leadership Task Force:

Participants: Division Vice President and Dean.

Charge: Respond to the final report produced by the self-assessment task force and make final recommendations for action items.

Let's Begin (Self-Assessment Task Force)

The administrative program review is structured into two main categories: constituent support and program viability. Each category has multiple subcomponents supported by evidence, some of which is ==provided== to the program and some of which is generated by the program. Provided or suggested evidence may not be entirely inclusive of all relevant program data or information and task force members are encouraged to include additional evidence as appropriate. A glossary of subcomponent terms, timeline for completion, and category response templates are provided to committee members as part of the academic program review process.

In addition to providing a 1-2 paragraph response to each of the subcomponents in the 2 program review categories. Please list and provide access to any additional pieces of evidence the program wishes to consider. Program review requires the following outcomes for each primary category:

Strengths (Program Strengths):

Action Items (SPOL planning objectives for the coming year(s); 2-3 across both categories; examples for Category 1 Constituent Support might include: creating assessment maps, developing assessments, responding to auditor suggestions, etc.):

Watch Items (Items that are not immediate planning items, but that the program will watch for potential future action items.):

Forward Items (Items that the self-assessment task force would like to forward to division and institutional leadership for consideration in division or college-wide planning.):

Category 1 Constituent Support: This section focuses on the program's mission, key services, desired outcomes, and program/consitutent achievement.

Category	Subcomponent	Evidence	Guiding Questions
Constituent Support	1.a Program Mission/Purpose	Program Mission Statement	Does the Planning Unit Mission align with industry standards, and/or discipline specific accrediting bodies, and/or oversight agencies. Who are the primary constituent groups for the program? Are there special populations the program is targeting?
Constituent Support	1.b Program Design	Detailed Description of Key Experiences/Services provided by the program or planning unit (i.e. job placement, planning, advising, enrollment, tutoring, budgeting, etc.)	Are there support or training materials associated with the key services/experiences for the program? Are these materials specific to all target populations (i.e. students, staff, faculty, external audiences)? Are those materials accessible in multiple modalities? Does the program need to partner with other internal or external departments/agencies to improve program design? Does the program/service design align with desired outcomes?
Constituent Support	1.c Student Learning Outcomes & Co-curricular experiences/Planning Outcomes	Learning Outcomes Map Learning Outcomes Results Learning Outcomes Action Items Constituent Surveys Planning Outcomes Rubric	Does the program provide services/programs appropriate for specific student learning outcomes? Does the program provide services/programs aligned with PHSC's institutional learning outcomes (ILOs)? Has the program mapped learning outcomes and co-curricular experiences as appropriate? Has outcomes data been used to make changes to the program? Does the program/service design align with identified student outcomes? Have we considered the feedback provided by the office of institutional effectiveness on the planning outcomes rubric?
Constituent Support	1.d Achievement	Retention Data Completion Data Course Success Rates Outside Auditor Reports Recognitions	Are there special populations the program is targeting? If so, how is that population faring? How does the college know the services/programs offered are effective? What are the standards of achievement? Does the program need to partner with other internal or external departments/agencies to improve?

Findings (Category 1): After reviewing the evidence collected for the program analyze your findings for each subcomponent. Responses should reference evidence reviewed during your analysis. Conclude the section with overall statements of strength, action items, watch items, and forward items for the category.

Analysis of Findings for Subcomponents:

1.a Program Mission

1.b Program Design

1.c Student Learning Outcomes & Co-curricular experiences

1.d Achievement

Strengths (Program Strengths):

Action Items (SPOL planning objectives for the coming year(s); 2-3 across both categories; examples for Category 1 Constituent Support might include: creating assessment maps, developing assessments, responding to auditor suggestions, etc.):

Watch Items (Items that are not immediate planning items, but that the program will watch for potential future action items.):

Forward Items (Items that the self-assessment task force would like to forward to division and institutional leadership for consideration in division or college-wide planning.):

Category 2 Program Viability:

Category	Subcomponent	Evidence	Guiding Questions
Program Viability	2.a Staffing	Staff: Constituent Ratios Professional Development	Are staff to constituent ratios sufficient for quality service? Why or why not? Are ratios aligned with accreditation standards or industry norms? Are staff provided with opportunities to develop professionally? Does the program need to partner with other internal or external departments/agencies to improve services?
Program Viability	2.b Program Demand	Usage Statistics from main program support systems (i.e. click rates, wait times, counts of students served by key service provided, etc.)	Are our target constituents accessing our services? Are we underserving/overserving our constituents? How do we know (trend data)? Does the program need to partner with other internal or external departments/agencies to improve? Are there practices that need to be expired or revised?
Program Viability	2.c Policies and Procedures		Are the programs current policies aligned with relevant state statutes and/or board rules?
Program Viability	2.d Facilities	Technology Space Accessibility	Do staff have the technology they need to do their work? Are office space and furniture adequate?

Findings (Category 2): After reviewing the evidence collected for the program analyze your findings for each subcomponent. Responses should reference evidence reviewed during your analysis. Conclude the section with overall statements of strength, action items, watch items, and forward items for the category.

Analysis of Findings for Subcomponents:

2.a Staffing

2.b Program Demand

2.c Policies and Procedures

2.d Facilities

Strengths (Program Strengths):

Action Items (SPOL planning objectives for the coming year(s); 2-3 across both categories; examples for Category 1 Constituent Support might include: creating assessment maps, developing assessments, responding to auditor suggestions, etc.):

Watch Items (Items that are not immediate planning items, but that the program will watch for potential future action items.):

Forward Items (Items that the self-assessment task force would like to forward to division and institutional leadership for consideration in division or college-wide planning.):