

**Cerro Coso Community College  
Program Review Handbook**



**Academic Year 2023-2024**

Purpose of Program Review .....3

    Faculty Responsibility for Program Review .....3

    Kern Community College District Board Policy .....3

    Education Code Section 78016.....4

Program Review Committee .....4

    The Program Review Charge .....4

    Types .....5

        Instructional Program Review.....5

        Non-Instructional Program Review .....5

Program Review Committee Composition.....5

    Committee Membership .....5

    Program Review Committee Roles and Responsibilities .....5

Program Review Committee .....6

Program Review Process .....6

    Qualifications for Program Review .....6

    Process for Adding New Programs .....6

    Five-Year Program Review Timeline .....7

        Years One-Three .....7

        Year Four for Instructional Programs .....7

        Year Four for Non-Instructional Programs .....8

        Year Five .....8

            September (Instructional) or February (Non-Instructional) .....8

            October (Instructional) or March (Non-Instructional).....8

            Next Few Months Before Submission .....8

    Program Review Submission .....9

Evaluation and Assessment.....9

## Purpose of Program Review

This handbook is intended to outline the five-year program review process, cycle, and requirements including responsibilities, timelines, criteria for program reviews, and the role of various components of the College in the review process. It provides information, guidance, how-to guides, and other tools for faculty and administrators responsible for program review.

## Faculty Responsibility for Program Review

College faculty are responsible for initiating and participating in educational program development and the processes for program review. Title 5 §53200(b) identifies Academic Senate as an organization whose primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters. Section §53200(c) defines academic and professional matters as the 10 +1 requirements including policy development and implementation of the following:

1. Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and planning courses within disciplines
2. Degree and certificate requirements
3. Grading policies
4. Educational program development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
9. Processes for program review
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate

## Kern Community College District Board Policy

According to Board Policy (BP) 4023, the College will rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate for program review. Program review shall be determined through established College procedures and shall meet all statutory and accreditation requirements.

College procedures for program review shall include:

- Appropriate involvement of the faculty and Academic Senate in all processes;
- Academic Senate involvement requires consideration and action taken by the Academic Senate or appropriate Senate committee;
- Regular review and justification of programs and course descriptions; and
- Consideration of job market and other related information for vocational and occupational programs.

References: Education Code Section 78016: Title 5 Sections 51022 and 53200

## Education Code Section 78016

3(e) A written summary of the findings of each review shall be made available to the public.

Title 5 Sections 51022 and 53200

## Program Review Committee

The Program Review Committee (PRC) shall oversee the program review process and work to ensure all necessary program reviews, instructional and non-instructional, are completed as scheduled. The PRC is a sub-committee of the Academic Senate (AS) and an associated committee of College Council, under the Institutional Effective Committee (IEC) (Academic Senate Constitution, Article 7: Section 2).

### The Program Review Charge

The Program Review Committee (PRC) provides oversight for Cerro Coso Community College's (the College) program review process and documents to improve student learning and achievement. More specifically, the purpose of the PRC is to:

- ensure program review processes are ongoing, systematic, and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.
- oversee the review and refinement of the program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.
- ensure the results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.

The College employs Program Review as a major component of college planning to improve student achievement. Program Review is an opportunity for the college to examine the extent to which programs are meeting their mission and contributing to the improvement of student learning. They are used in conjunction with other documents to

inform department decision making about curriculum design and course scheduling. The College uses them as the basis of the integrated planning cycle to guide the allocation of resources, including staffing, facilities, information technology, marketing, and professional development.

## Types of Program Reviews

Program Reviews are conducted once every five years for instructional programs, student services programs, and programs in administrative services. There are two types of program reviews: instructional and non-instructional. Each PR type has its own template and process.

### Instructional Program Review

Instructional PRs are for academic programs identified by the Office of Institutional Research (IR). Instructional PRs include academic degrees and certificates, general education patterns, the Honors program, and learning support units like the library and the Learning Assistance Center (LAC).

### Non-Instructional Program Review

Non-Instructional PRs are for student services and administrative services programs.

## Program Review Committee Composition

The Cerro Coso Community College Program Review Committee is comprised of 9 members. The appropriate constituent leadership appoints members to the committee.

### Committee Membership

- Program Review Coordinator (faculty)
- Administrative Representatives (2)
- Classified Representatives (2)
- Faculty Representatives (4)

### Program Review Committee Roles and Responsibilities

- Program Review Coordinator is a faculty position with 0.3 load, or the equivalent stipend, assigned each semester. The coordinator works individually with proposers to draft the initial Program Review and works with the PR Committee to complete the PR process. Responsibilities include coordinating with the Office of Institutional Research Office (OIR), Academic Senate (AS), the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), and College Council to complete the Program Review process for each identified program.

- Committee Members are responsible for reviewing each Program Review submitted to the committee for accuracy and clarity and participating in the evaluation of and other work for the committee.

## Program Review Committee

The PR Committee works asynchronously to review the PR documents, provide feedback, and support the PR proposer.

## Program Review Process

### Qualifications for Program Review

A program that satisfies all the following is required to complete a program review:

- The program is college-centered, and most processes and procedures are primarily under the control of the program or the college.
- The program can determine their program outcomes (outcomes are not solely prescribed by the district or by an external agency).
- The program's service recipients benefit from program self-reflection and identifying areas of improvement.
- The program has a need to plan and advocate for long-term resource needs from the college.
- The program is addressed in annual unit or section plans.

A program or unit not meeting the criteria above will continue to plan and reflect as part of the annual planning cycle, via either the Annual Unit Plan or Annual Section Plan processes but will not be included in the Program Review Cycle.

### Process for Adding New Programs

New academic programs are submitted via the Curriculum and Instruction Council (CIC). Once the new program has been approved by the Chancellor's Office for addition to the catalog, the new program will be added to the Program Review timeline. The first Instructional Program Review will be scheduled to be completed five (5) years after the first course offering.

As student and administrative service units are reorganized and or developed, they will be added to the Program Review timeline. The first Non-Instructional Program Review will be scheduled to be completed five (5) years after the student or administrative service was first implemented. IEC will identify when new student and administrative service units are implemented.

## Five-Year Program Review Timeline

Instructional programs will follow an Academic Year cycle with program reviews due in the Spring semester of the designated year.

Non-instructional programs will follow a Calendar Year cycle with program reviews due in the fall semester of the designated year.

Reminder: programs should be meeting regularly, at least once a semester, outside of Flex days, to complete the work of the program which includes discussing SLO and PLO assessments. Include minutes in the program canvas so they are easily accessible when developing the Annual Unit Plans (AUPs) and program reviews.

### Years One-Three

1. Follow the SLO Assessment Cycle presented in the program's last Program Review. If a Non-Instructional Program without SLOs, follow the AUO assessment plan developed in the last PR during this 3-year period.
2. Every Student Learning Outcome (SLO) needs to be assessed for every course in the program. It is recommended that the initial SLO assessment happen in the first 2 years of the Program Review Cycle so there is time to reassess, if needed. The SLOs need to be assessed in every section and in each method. If a course is offered online, in ISEP, and onground, for example, all three modalities need to be assessed.
3. The SLO data needs to be inputted into the Curriculum Assessment Management System (CAMS). (include links from Canvas SLO website for this, once completed and ready to use)
4. If an SLO is not met, then it needs to be reassessed the next time the course is offered. Any changes made to course content, or the assessment tool need to be documented in the AUP. The reassessment needs to be recorded in CAMS once completed.
5. Once the SLOs are assessed, any suggested changes or improvements need to be reflected in the Course Outline of Record (COR). Whether there are changes or not, the COR needs to be updated and submitted to the Curriculum Instruction Council (CIC) for an update and to maintain currency. Preferably, this will occur within the first year of the PR cycle, no later than year three of the PR cycle.
6. SLO assessments, updates, and changes are documented in the AUP process in the next fall semester.

### Year Four for Instructional Programs

1. Review the mapping of student learning outcomes (SLOs) to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) for accuracy and currency.
2. Using the SLO assessment data, assess the program's PLOs. The PLO assessment data needs to be inputted into the CAMS system.
3. In September, before the AUPs are due in October, the PR Presenter will pull the PLO Assessment Report from CAMS.

4. Discuss the PLO Assessment Report within the program, evaluate the mapping and the results of the PLO Assessments.
5. The PLO Assessment Report will be recorded in the AUP.
6. Start putting together supporting documentation – Advisory Committee Minutes, Program Meeting Minutes, list of all SLOs for the program being reviewed, etc. Make sure the SLO assessment, PLO assessment, and any other program review information is documented in department meeting minutes.

## Year Four for Non-Instructional Programs

1. Identify data sources for each AUO and consult with the Office of Institutional Research regarding data processes for assessing the AUOs. Consultations can be requested using the [Custom Data Request Form](#)
2. Discuss the AUO assessments within your department, evaluate the mapping and the results of the AUO assessments.
3. Using the identified data, assess the AUOs and input the results into the CAMS system.
4. The AUO assessment will be recorded in the AUP submitted in Fall of Year Five.
5. Start putting together supporting documentation – department meeting minutes, survey or other data used for AUO assessment, and make sure program review information is documented in department meeting minutes.

## Year Five

### September (Instructional) or February (Non-Instructional)

1. The Program Review Coordinator will send all Program Review Presenters completing a program review a working draft of the Program Review template.
2. Instructional Programs
  - Review the data provided by the Office of Institutional Research (IR) for accuracy.
  - Gather data related to SLO and PLO assessments from the first 3 years of the PR cycle.
  - CTE programs need to request labor market data and core indicator reports from the CTE dean.
3. Non-Instructional Programs
  - Consult with Office of Institutional Research to identify any college relevant data for the PR.

### October (Instructional) or March (Non-Instructional)

1. Meet with the Program Review Coordinator to review the PR template and address any questions or concerns related to the PR process and template. This is an individualized process; the PR Coordinator will work with each program to identify what is needed to best review, assess, and advocate for the program.

### Next Few Months Before Submission

1. The PR Presenter writes the Program Review document. The data is the foundation. Build the narrative around the story that the data tells and use the data to advocate for what the program needs to continue to be successful.



2. The PR Presenter should consult with the overseeing administrator early in the process for input about the Program Review.
3. CTE Program Reviews should be presented to their advisory committees for input and feedback.
4. Input from any other important stakeholders, including department members, is recommended during this process.

## Program Review Submission

Program Reviews are evaluated and confirmed as completed through the following process:

1. **Submission.** The Program Review is submitted to the Program Review Coordinator via email ([programreview@cerrocoso.edu](mailto:programreview@cerrocoso.edu)). The Program Review Coordinator evaluates the completeness and appropriateness of the document, providing feedback, if necessary. If substantial corrections need to be made, the PR will be sent back to the PR Presenter. This initial review will include spelling and grammar as well as an overall look at the thoroughness of each component of the PR. The PR Presenter and PR Coordinator will work together to edit the draft before sending it to the PR Committee for a first read.
2. **First Read of the PR Committee.** After the PR Presenter and PR Coordinator have edited the document, the PR Coordinator will send the PR to the PR Committee and the Outcomes Assessment Committee (OAC) for a first read. The PR Committee will review the PR and provide feedback on the PR, which will be summarized and sent to the PR Presenter for incorporation into the PR document.
3. **Revision.** The PR Coordinator will work with the PR Presenter to address the recommended changes.
4. **Resubmission.** The PR Presenter submits the revised PR to the PR Coordinator.
5. **Second Program Review Committee Meeting.** The PR Committee will verify the changes were made. If so, the Program Review is confirmed as completing the Program Review Process. If not, further recommendations are made, and Steps 3-5 are repeated. At least two committee reviews are needed for a Program Review to be confirmed as completed.
6. **Academic Senate.** If the Program Review directly influences students, the PR Coordinator will submit the PR to the Academic Senate Executive Council for approval for the PR to be presented at the next available Academic Senate meeting. The PR Presenter can present a summary of key findings from the PR to the Academic Senate, which votes to affirm that the PR process was followed and completed.
7. **College Council.** Once affirmed by Academic Senate, the AS President will forward the PR to College Council to be placed on the next available agenda. If a Non-Instructional PR, then the PR Coordinator will submit the PR to College Council to be placed on the next available agenda. College Council votes to approve or not approve the program review.
8. **Publishing.** After approval from College Council, the Administrative Assistant to the President submits the document to the Web Content Editor for publishing to the college web site.

## Evaluation and Assessment

The PR Committee participates in yearly reflection and assessment regarding current procedures and the updating of the instructional and non-instructional templates.