



Curriculum and Program Review Evaluation Activity for Accreditation

Administered to LCC Faculty September 2016

The following prompts will be used to help develop our report re: accreditation standards 4A and 4B. In terms of the **Curriculum and Program Review process**, please answer the following questions for each accreditation standard:

1. What aspects of the process are working well?

- Having a living document easily accessed for editing.
- As a member of a large department, collaboration works well. Assessment forces us to collaborate and discuss outcomes and our process of evaluation.
- Swapping ideas from others' review.
- Organized by topic, each quarter has an emphasis. Time to work on assessment during in-service days.
- The process is clear and systematic. The document is easily accessible.
- We have a consistent plan and work through over time. Documents are stored in a central repository. We can compile objects from different sources.
- It is organized into "bite sized" pieces, which makes it much more doable and the schedule keeps us on course for systematic progression through the review. Provided time for work during assessment days. This is a faculty driven process coordinated through an assessment committee composed of interdisciplinary faculty.
- Form is organized and prompts are generally clear.
- Good leading questions that provide an environment for department discussion. Assessment days on calendar to work on the review. Quarter organization on what tasks to complete.
- Assessment days. Communication among discipline faculty. Collaboration of shared responsibility.
- Systematic review of test grades for each quarter reflect student knowledge and teaching effectiveness. NCLEX results indicate effectiveness of the total program indicating any holes in content that requires review.
- Dedicated time to work as a department. Sharing across departments. Breaking into small, manageable chunks instead of the whole document.
- Work is spread out. Clearly defined cycle. Use of Google docs for sharing/ collecting data with department.
- Template is helpful tool!
- This seems to be working well.
- The ease of taking course/curriculum changes to the Curriculum Committee to meet Global Outcomes requirements.

- I like the breakdown of the C&P, little chunks at a time. By working through this process, Lang and Lit has made significant changes to how its outcomes are expressed, which has in turn allowed us to clarify consistent expectations that are assessable. It's a slow process, but it has allowed us to build consistency within our department. The process is also authentic – this is real work and reflection that our department is doing, real impact on curriculum improvement.
- I think the Instructional Assessment Committee communicates effectively with faculty. In particular, stressing the importance of Curriculum Review in the conflict of accreditation.
- Most of the process works well.
- As a relatively new faculty member, it is difficult to address this question. It seems, depending on department and other factors, the process may be working well in terms of progress, while others are not.
- Working with faculty from other departments to review each other's C&P Review documents helped me understand my department's C&P Review much better. The quarterly process of drafting/revision of a subject of the Review (specific sections) made it much more manageable – as well as more valuable, supporting more in-depth and meaningful conversations about student learning. The form of C&P Review enabled more useful, focused assessment of our programs, providing a helpful framework to guide our thinking on how to assess our efforts.
- The contents of each curriculum and program are available to everyone, and feedback is always possible thru departmental committee member.
- Doing this process together is great, and blocking out time is critical.
- I like that we look at one section each quarter so it is not too much at once. The activity today – trading and sharing with other departments was a great idea.
- The running doc works well. The collaborations and peer review is helpful. The input from the deans works well.
- Explanations during assessment days provide clarity for successful completion. Committee represents assessment well.
- Having a living/improving document to work on. Having guidance and small questions to address instead of a big huge thing. Sharing/reviewing documents between departments.
- Great job of parsing this out.
- Working on one standard at a time, however we review our entire process annually anyway.
- Nursing has no choice. It's a required expectation as accreditation for our program is almost identical to accreditation piece for college.
- I think that the group meetings to get things started are helpful.
- Having a specific document to follow and revise is helpful.
- Broken into chunks, continually working on pieces of the whole.
- Allowing for cross-discipline discussion. There is a structured yet flexible process. Information is in one place.
- Having a set time to get the work done. I like that it allows us to look at our programs and evaluate them.
- It keeps information up to date. Tells a lot about our program.
- Leadership!
- When students leave our program for employment.
- Working with others/ working with my team.
- Meet quarterly. Input from all faculty. Keeps us current. Keeps us organized.

- Quarterly meetings reflect on the curriculum and the overall program.
- Our process works well – we have a schedule and work together well. We discuss it quarterly.
- Meeting quarterly good.
- Meeting quarterly working well.
- Very systematic and organized. It's helpful to break it into manageable sections. (It's less daunting)
- I'm pretty new to the college, so this afternoon will be my first time doing this.
- Faculty members play key roles in the assessment efforts.
- The accessibility of the program review document. The quarterly meetings (for accountability). The data that has been provided. The instruction/coaching provided. Because our program accreditation process drives our outcomes and assessment and our documentation and data collection, the LCC faculty activities/requirements are X. I hesitate to say X = redundant, because I do value what we're doing for the institution, as well as for the review, affirmation, and insight that the faculty exercises provide in my program direction. I don't know what I would change or suggest.

2. What aspects of the process are working less well?

- Constant cycling through the same materials leads to a bit of a stagnation.
- Collecting data, recording data, crunching data, is very time-consuming.
- There is little room for qualitative assessment. Much of the learning in Liberal Arts courses is not necessarily "quantifiable," so the process can feel artificial and onerous.
- Some questions/topics do not fit some programs. Moving target, which may be needed, but makes the process harder.
- Some programs/departments are still struggling with formulating outcomes and gathering supporting data. New faculty may inherit incomplete reviews and struggle with working through the process (particularly in small programs).
- Some prompts are unclear as to which information is needed, but there are resources to clear up this confusion.
- Department members not showing up and participating. Maintaining continuous data collection and reporting. (work in progress)
- Maintaining data in a timely fashion. Need to revise surveys to collect program level data.
- In large departments, sometimes one individual can make this process more difficult than necessary.
- Not enough focus time for data compilation. Employee and Alumni surveys are ineffective at capturing program-level data.
- I find that I must do this process by myself, for the most part, due to the nature of my program.
- Because Lit is not taught by all instructors, we don't focus as much on it. Literature is an important component of a well-rounded liberal arts education, and we need to not lose focus on it. We have data and language captured in several places. Ones such being the Academic Master Plan. Some of these efforts are either redundant or key pieces are lost because we are focusing on one without immediate access to the other (meeting in HSB without our computers). We lack confidence that administration reads and considers these documents when conducting their own strategic planning. Are resources we need and document considered in, say, Cabinet discussions?

- I think the assessment of course outcomes has been an obstacle for some faculty, through no fault of our Curriculum and Program Review process.
- The point of some activities were not clear.
- For newer faculty, or those in programs where he/she may be the sole member, it may be unclear what the process is, why it is in place, etc.
- We need specific reflection and follow-through more often.
- Some of the specified objectives don't fit that well. Those specified outcomes may be from the outside.
- When I leave the meeting to work on this – there is constant interruptions and distraction. I would like these days to be working meetings where we are able to bring a device and go through a work, review, reflect, work... Tentative process.
- It's good. Just a learning process.
- Question wording (use of word criteria). More clarity and help with use of Canvas outcomes to streamline data collection and understanding.
- Overuse of the word "criteria"/Global Skills outcomes, Program outcomes, course outcomes, indicators, our personal rubrics??? This can make it difficult to answer some questions.
- Getting from everyday work I do in Canvas to this document.
- Not enough sharing with other departments/divisions. Today was great!
- During the group meetings it is difficult to see what is projected.
- In a department of 99% adjunct it is hard to meet to work on the document. Often this Review falls on the shoulders of the one full time employee. Plus Transitional Studies does not often "fit" with all the sections in this document.
- Numbers-only data collection, which disadvantages non-numerical disciplines and those skills which are assessed subjectively.
- It may be just me but every assessment day, I struggle to find electronic copies of Review so I can update/complete.
- Not sure.
- Working on my own.
- Getting responses to surveys but we are working on that.
- Our team.
- I'm pretty new to the college, so this afternoon will be my first time doing this.
- Most discipline on the academic side do not in themselves comprise a program. Instead, we are parts of the DTA "program," which needs to identify outcomes/ objectives that are not identical to the institution-wide ones.

3. What recommendations do you have for improvement?

- Streamlined, standardized data collection (not "re-invent the wheel" for each dep).
- Provide opportunities for qualitative assessment. Recreate some sort of culminating assignment/experience for DTA students. Create clear outcomes for the DTA program.
- Stick to the plan try to continue to develop consistency.
- More interdepartmental collaboration/sharing like today's (9/15) activity. Outreach to department/faculty that are struggling from programs/departments that have a good "handle" on the process. Orientation to the process for new faculty.
- Utilize Canvas for assessment. Collect data directly from outcome data in courses.

- Develop a more systematic approach to gathering and maintaining data. Revise surveys.
- Help or “coaches” for new faculty, specifically those in very small departments that need to do this without prior knowledge.
- Free up more time during Prep weeks for actual assessment work (fewer meetings). Improve Employee/Alumni survey process to capture more, and more relevant, outcome info.
- Is once a year enough to do this? Short second meeting for spring?
- A periodic review from the department in which my program is located as to my program progress to meet student outcomes.
- Perhaps if possible, provide individual help for faculty. Maybe encouraging faculty to seek help from Brad or Wendy, or someone. Someone who could sit down and tutor faculty.
- The “why” needs to be addressed.
- A more detailed explanation of where the college and one’s specific program is in the process – mostly for new(er) faculty.
- Close the loop!
- Have more freedom for interpretation of outcomes.
- Perhaps more direction and clarification for new people. Many disciplines have few, one, or even no full time people available to work on it.
- None.
- More peer evaluations/understanding how other more-developed departments are doing things.
- Make the questions more clear.
- This is a mature system and I don’t see a major need for change.
- More sharing across departments/divisions.
- Half day assessment or less.
- Specialize the document for specific programs like Transitional Studies.
- Keep up the good work! Good leadership and guidance. Innovations, like this year’s idea exchange between disparate programs, are welcome. Perhaps we could look over another program’s review with a critical eye – what might an assessor think?
- Directed help for struggling departments.
- None.
- Keep Brad involved.
- None.
- Brad does great.
- None.
- I’m pretty new to the college, so this afternoon will be my first time doing this.
- Clear DTA outcomes. Create a culminating DTA experience that can be used to evaluate it.

4. [What evidence exists that shows that we are meeting this standard?](#)

- The curriculum review document that each department maintains and updates.
- Vast majority of employer satisfaction and student readiness.
- Documented revisions are dated. Various data is collected by programs, departments.
- Curriculum and Program Review forms.
- The documents we are compiling in the electronic repository.
- Faculty participation in the process. Completed, working programs and curriculum reviews.

- Completed up-to-date review forms.
- The Review document that is continually revised by each program. Data is organized on a Google spreadsheet and link is documented in Curriculum Review document.
- Gathered data. Curriculum and program review document.
- I assume all programs have this completed and they are reviewed by someone familiar with evaluation/ accred?
- Collected data. Improved pathways.
- Program/curriculum Review.
- Yearly meetings, chance to revise/reflect.
- As to my program, any holistic assessment within my department does not occur. Otherwise I am still in the process of developing effective, efficient assessment models.
- Faculty are required to update Curriculum and Program Review document continually. The evidence is the document.
- The work during assessment day is evidence of the process, but where is the documented evidence that necessary changes are being made/implemented.
- The C&P Review reports; Assessment Day agendas; specific program and curriculum revisions that happened as a result of doing the C&P Reviews.
- Documented list of outcomes for each course.
- This process and the CPR documents are evidence.
- Curriculum and program review is evidence.
- Documentation, data collected.
- Using meaningful data to make program changes and regular review of program processes.
- Regular meetings, good top-down communication.
- More faculty participation.
- Not sure.
- Not sure.
- We're accredited!
- Meeting with my Dean to go over results. Need peer experts available.
- ACEN – Self-study and SEP.
- Data collection and identification of each standard to data.
- ACEN accreditation or SEP systematic eval plan
- ACEN for nursing.
- ACEN/ nursing.
- The quarterly work we generate – plus, our fabulous curricula and programs.
- I'm pretty new to the college, so this afternoon will be my first time doing this.
- I can't respond for the institution, but the program has plenty of evidence and methods of collection.