

Periodic Program Review Guidelines

Office of Academic Affairs



Community College

2018-2019

Revised December 2018

LaGuardia Community College

Periodic Program Review (PPR) Guidelines

The Purpose of Outcomes Assessment at LaGuardia	2
The Context for Outcomes Assessment	3
Assessment Framework	4
Benefits and Responsibilities	4
Key Priorities of Periodic Program Reviews	6
PPR Timeline	7
PPR Report	9
Section I. Introduction	9
A. Program Overview	
B. Key Questions and Issues	
C. Your Program Learning Outcomes	
D. Inquiry Assessment Project	
E. Closing the Loop	
Section II. Key Data Elements	9
Section III. General Education and Program Learning Outcomes	10
A. Program Learning Outcomes	
B. General Education Core Competencies & Abilities	
Section IV. Curriculum Review	13
A. Individual Course Review	
B. Key Review Questions	
C. Relation to the Field	
Section V. Inquiry Assessment Project	14
Section VI. Student Success	14
A. Transfer and Placement	
B. Advisement	
C. First Year Seminar	
D. Grants and Mini-Grants	
Section VII. External Review	15
Section VIII. Action Plan	15
Appendix A: External Review Site Visit Guidelines	17
Appendix B: Inquiry Assessment Project Primer	18
Appendix C: Sample Budget Request (Active Year)	20
Appendix D: Programmatic Benchmark Reading Norming Sessions	21
Appendix E: Guidelines for Programs with External Accreditation	24
Appendix F: Preparing for the Provost Consult in Prep Year	26

The Purpose of Outcomes Assessment

At LaGuardia Community College, outcomes assessment nourishes learning and teaching. At the core of LaGuardia's Mission Statement "to educate and graduate" one of the world's most diverse student populations is an idea that rests in the heart of the mission of the City University of New York (CUNY): opportunity.

The central mission of both LaGuardia and CUNY aims to provide students with the higher-order abilities or competencies they need to create new opportunities for themselves — and in the process to change their world. At LaGuardia, three Core Values anchor this mission: diversity, responsibility, and learning. Outcomes Assessment is a set of processes that LaGuardia and all accredited institutions of higher education are required to undertake to:

- 1) identify college-wide learning priorities or competencies, for both General Education and disciplinary majors;
- 2) collect data that documents student learning for both General Education and within academic programs, and
- 3) use that data to take meaningful actions to improve student learning, and to then assess whether those improvements were effective.

Assessment of student academic learning at LaGuardia Community College takes place through two key arenas:

- 1) Benchmark Readings. On an annual basis, faculty and staff join together to read and score student work related to the General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities. The College shares this data with faculty and programs, who use this it to strengthen student learning.
- 2) Periodic Program Review. All academic majors and programs (and non-academic programs and units) conduct Periodic Program Reviews (PPR). PPRs are led by program faculty, who use their findings to recommend and implement changes in programmatic learning.

Assessment is a way for the LaGuardia community to better understand the learning process — what students are learning and how their learning develops across semesters and disciplines. It is a way for faculty and staff to work together to support student growth and development to address shared college-wide learning goals and to deepen their practice through a careful examination of the evidence of student learning.

Periodic Program Reviews foster a culture of learning for both students and faculty, wherein faculty use the information from assessments to revise curriculum, pedagogy, and assignments in an effort to create an even stronger learning experience for all students.

The Context for General Education Framework for Outcomes Assessment

LaGuardia's Outcomes Assessment processes have emerged organically from sustained work by faculty and staff over the past two decades. During the 2001-02 academic year, an Outcomes Assessment Plan was approved by the College's governance bodies. Guidelines for the CUNY-mandated Periodic Program Review (PPR) process have been revised to reflect this Outcomes Assessment Plan. In 2013, Provost Paul Arcario charged a task force with rethinking our Core Competencies. The Task Force assembled faculty and academic chairs, Senate members and Student Affairs professionals and gathered college input, reviewed best practices, and designed a plan to address the College mission and prioritize the kinds of learning LaGuardia values most. As a result of the Task Force recommendations, in 2014 the College adopted three Core Competencies: Inquiry and Problem Solving; Global Learning; and Integrative Learning to be demonstrated through three Communication Abilities: Written, Oral, and Digital Communication. This framework, the Learning Matters framework, was passed unanimously by College governance.

- The Core Competencies are Inquiry/Problem Solving; Integrative Learning; and Global Learning;
- The Core Abilities are Written, Oral, and Digital Communication.

These Competencies and Abilities, which apply to all students, are addressed in General Education courses (the Pathways Required Core) and in selected courses in every major at the College.

LaGuardia's Outcomes Assessment plan is designed to assess institutional effectiveness in terms of learning and teaching and use the data to improve our pedagogies and academic programs. In line with our commitment to the academic, career, and personal growth and development of every student, the assessment system will use a variety of assessment tools to evaluate the effectiveness of learning and teaching. A central feature of the assessment plan is an emphasis on interdisciplinary skills development, in that required Core Competencies are to be developed and assessed across all disciplines.

LaGuardia's Outcomes Assessment process places a strong focus on a systematic and longitudinal examination of actual student work as collected on their ePortfolios and/or in the assessment depositing area of the Digication ePortfolio system. LaGuardia focuses its primary assessment on authentic examples of student work, rather than standardized national tests, because we believe that this provides a clearer and more meaningful way to understand student learning, and better supports faculty efforts to make the changes needed to strengthen student progress.

Our Assessment Framework

Our assessment processes are meant to answer questions such as:

- ✓ What do we want our students to learn?
- ✓ What are our common priorities as a College?
- ✓ How do we know we are succeeding in teaching those priorities?
- ✓ How do we know our students are learning?
- ✓ How can we use what we know to improve learning for all students?

These questions have a comprehensive scope. We seek to consider:

- ✓ The *entire* purpose of college education, from first to last semester.
- ✓ The teaching that takes place inside *and* outside the classroom.
- ✓ The learning that happens *within* and *across* programs, majors, or disciplines.

While outcomes assessment is required to maintain accreditation and exist as a college, LaGuardia is committed to a tradition of excellence in teaching and learning that goes beyond the minimum expectations. LaGuardia employs assessment practices in order to be “a learning college” — a college that is continuously examining, learning, and improving how it supports student learning and development.

Periodic Program Reviews reflect LaGuardia’s core value of “learning,” with the understanding that learning is not confined to students, but also describes a disposition of faculty and staff. The Learning College embodies the value of “responsibility” — faculty and staff taking responsibility for collectively strengthening the education that we provide to our students.

Benefits

Periodic Program Reviews are an opportunity for faculty to reflect and study their program learning goals, pedagogy, and curriculum. The PPR process allows faculty to assess strengths and weaknesses, make evidence-based evaluations, and plan for future actions. It’s a time to look at the bigger mission and future of a program, as well as a period to identify new tools for student success. It’s a unique chance to have a dialogue with College leaders, share accomplishments, and articulate needs. It’s also a chance for all faculty in a program to collaborate on the goals, outcomes, politics, and plans for student learning in their program.

Responsibilities

PPRs are mandated by the CUNY Board of Trustees, and each academic program must complete regular PPR cycles. PPR reports are submitted to the Provost and Associate Provost & Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. A site visit by external evaluators to review the Self-Study report is required for programs without an outside accrediting body. PPR reports should be between 20-30 pages and include

relevant appendices.

In order to prepare for the PPR, program directors and program self-study teams attend a seminar (four meetings) over the academic year prior to their active self-study. At these meetings, we review the processes and procedures for PPRs as well as provide contextual, program specific information for how to conduct a robust Inquiry Assessment Project. In the spring semester, meetings will be with individual program teams.

Programs are eligible for up to three hours of released time during the Active Year to support faculty work on the report.

Key Priorities of Periodic Program Reviews: General Education and Program Learning Outcomes

Students' growth and development throughout their academic careers at the College are assessed by evaluating achievement in two broad categories: The General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities, and Program Learning Outcomes.

A fundamental element of your PPR regards your student success in both General Education and Programmatic Learning Outcomes. These elements are guided by the following questions:

1. Where are students learning the General Education Core Competency and Communication Abilities in your program, and where are Programmatic Learning Outcomes introduced, reinforced, and mastered?
2. How do we know students in the program are graduating with competency and proficiency in General Education, and how are you assessing the effectiveness of your Program Learning Outcomes?

PPRs require programs to submit and assess the following:

- A mission statement that speaks to overall program goals (based on a synthesis of the already existing performance objectives for each course in the program).
- Program Learning Outcomes for their degree program or department.
- An Inquiry Assessment Project that assesses student learning between introductory-level courses and capstone courses (post-45 credits) to help assess student achievement of overall programmatic goals. (An ideal way to make these comparisons is to use the ePortfolio as a way for students to demonstrate growth within a program. If the program is interested in student reflection, it may also use the program goal statement as a rubric to reflect upon how and to what extent they have fulfilled the program goals.)
- The effectiveness of student learning of the General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities.

Each program should clearly map both the General Education and Program Learning Outcomes in a curriculum map, which will show where they are being addressed and which courses have been designated as depositing courses. It is the responsibility of faculty teaching these courses to have students deposit work into the appropriate competency in the ePortfolio Assessment area. Program Directors must inform faculty about their responsibilities in depositing.

PPR Timeline

The PPR Process has three stages spread across five years: 1) Prep Year; 2) Active Year; and 3) Implementation Years. Prior to Planning Year, the department chair identifies a program review leader and a review committee to develop the Self-Study.

Planning Year:

- ✓ October Introductory Meeting (Team Meeting 1)
- ✓ November Develop Inquiry Assessment Project and Program Issues (Team Meeting 2)
- ✓ December Deposit student work
- ✓ January Participate in College Benchmark Readings
- ✓ March Submit revised Inquiry Assessment Project & Program Issues
- ✓ March Discuss Revised Documents (Team Meeting 3)
- ✓ April Finalize questions for Institutional Research and Assessment (IR)
- ✓ May Meet with IR (Team Meeting 4)
- ✓ May Depositing student work
- ✓ June 1 Submit polished Inquiry Assessment Project and Program Issues
- ✓ June Meeting with Provost, Department Chair, and IR

Active Review Year:

- ✓ Sept Conduct Programmatic Benchmark Readings
- ✓ Sept Identify External Reviewer
- ✓ Oct-Dec Deposit for Programmatic Benchmark Readings
- ✓ December Submit draft of PPR
- ✓ January Participate in College Benchmark Readings
- ✓ Jan-April External Reviewer site visit
- ✓ April 1 Prepare Semi-final draft of PPR for External Review
- ✓ April 30 Departmental Chairperson signature
- ✓ May Deposit student work
- ✓ May 1 Final PPR Report approved by your Department Chair
- ✓

Implementation Year 1

- ✓ Fall Response to AA with a formal implementation plan
- ✓ Fall Update Academic Affairs with PPR plan
- ✓ Fall II PPR actions inform College Strategic Plan
- ✓ Spring Year-end implementation updates inform College Strategic Plan

Implementation Year 2 and 3

- ✓ Continue implementation
- ✓ Send updates to Academic Affairs regarding your progress and continue to update College Strategic Plan

Requirements for the final two implementation years will be agreed upon in conjunction with Academic Affairs.

PPR Report Outline

Section I. Introduction: Program Overview

In this section of the report, please identify the following:

- A. Program Overview: Please briefly narrate the recent history and status of your program, including details about its size (faculty and students), its age (in years), and its academic department. This section should also state how the program aligns with LaGuardia's Strategic Plan and Mission Statement and the Mission Statement of your department.
- B. Key Questions and Issues: These are special issues raised in the report, which typically have corresponding data points, recommendations, and action plans in Section VI. In the spring prior to review year, the department chairperson, program coordinator, and appropriate faculty meet with representatives of Academic Affairs to identify concerns and issues currently facing the program that will be addressed or investigated as part of the PPR. For example, are there known particular problems, such as low enrollment? Or are there issues with facilities, staffing, etc. Connect back to issues identified in your prior PPR and/or issues identified by outside accreditors where applicable.
- C. Program Learning Outcomes: State your Program Mission Statement and your Program Learning Outcomes.
- D. Inquiry Assessment Project: This is a brief executive summary or preview of what you assessed and why, what the results were, and what actions you plan to take as a result.
- E. Closing the Loop: Relate action plan and recommendations from previous PPR, and address how current PPR addresses those plans and recommendations.

Section II. Key Data Elements

Program data will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment in early fall of your review year, on:

Standard Data Set for Periodic Program Review (PPR)* Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

1. **Enrollment** (per Fall and Spring semester and trends over five-year period).
2. **Demographics** (per Fall semester).

3. **Cohort Analysis** – Retention, Graduation & Transfer (one-semester and one-year rates for each Fall cohort over five-year period).
4. **Degrees** awarded.
5. **Remedial Placement** of Entering Majors.
6. **Grade Distribution and Course Pass/Completion Rates** (completing with a C- or Better (high pass) and D- or better (official pass)).
 - a. For all courses in Department.
 - b. Courses in Department for students in Major.
7. **Course Sections** and Average Course Size by Courses in Department.

*Note: Consultation with Academic Department may determine additional data to be provided.

In collaboration with Academic Affairs each program should outline other data that might be useful in conducting a PPR. These questions will be discussed with at our May meeting with Institutional Research and Assessment (IR) in the planning year. An additional appointment with IR to discuss specific details of the request is highly encouraged.

Section III. General Education and Program Learning Outcomes

In this section you should demonstrate your success as a program through Program Learning Outcomes. Your program is responsible for both creating an Inquiry Assessment Project related to your Program Learning Outcomes, and for participating in the annual Benchmark Reading Program.

You will use outcomes data to support your claims in this section. Outcomes should include an analysis of student performance for Program Learning Outcomes as related to the Core Competencies and Abilities (to determine which areas may need revision and improvement).

Evaluate the overall strengths/weaknesses of your program in terms of appropriateness of the curriculum, currency of the curriculum, and effectiveness in developing overall programmatic competencies as well as the General Education Core Competencies.

Through the combination of these two projects, you will have a robust sense of how students are doing in your program and how your students are doing with the General Education competencies.

A. Program Learning Outcomes

This section of the report should answer the following questions:

- How does your mission statement speak to your overall program goals?
- What are your Program Learning Outcomes, and why are they appropriate?
- Where are students learning Program Learning Outcomes? Where are they introduced, reinforced, and mastered? Please provide a curriculum map where you identify where each of your PLOs is taught and where they're reflected in your curriculum.
- How or in what ways do your Program Learning Outcomes align with the General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities?
- What methods and evidence of direct assessment did you use to assess your Program Learning Outcomes, and what data did you produce to make claims about them? (See Appendix B for methods of direct assessment.)
- What data did you generate to assess your PLOs? Please provide the data in table form if possible.
- How do your Program Learning Outcomes align with the goals of your department?
- How do your Program Learning Outcomes align with the goals of the College?
- What Program Learning Outcomes are relative strengths for the program, and which could be strengthened?
- How do your assignments generate the level of growth you wish for your students, related to your Program Learning Outcomes?
- How will the results of this assessment been used to strengthen the program? (You may refer readers to your Action Plan in Section VII.)

Defining Program Learning Outcomes. A fundamental element of your PPR regards your student success in assessing your Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), which are often based on a synthesis of the already existing performance objectives for key courses and assignments in the program. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are outcome statements that describe “what students should be able to demonstrate, represent, or produce based on their learning histories” throughout the course of their education in your program (Maki 88).¹ They align with General Education and institutional intentions for student learning across the curriculum and co-curriculum (Maki 88). They should flow from and support the mission of the

¹ Peggy L. Maki, *Assessing For Learning*. Virginia: Stylus, 2010.

College and your department. They should be mapped to your curriculum so that you can show where each PLO is introduced, reinforced, and mastered at the level of course and assignment. They should be “collaboratively authored” and reflect the best practices of your discipline, field, professional organization, and articulated institutions. Direct evidence of each PLO should be quantitatively and/or qualitatively assessed on a regular basis. The PPR asks that programs review, justify, and articulate their PLOs and how they continue to be appropriate for the next 5-year PPR cycle.

B. General Education Core Competencies and Communication Abilities

Benchmark Readings: Members of your PPR Team should participate in the College’s annual Benchmark Reading during the PPR process. These readings will contain artifacts deposited by students in your major. The purpose is to collect and score data to make it more effective for programs to evaluate their learning outcomes related to the Core Competencies and Abilities. You will receive a report on student performance for your major. You should include this in your PPR and document how the results will be used to inform program changes and improve student learning as measured by both the Core Competencies and Abilities and Program Learning Outcomes.

This section of the report should answer the following questions:

- What is the data you received for each Core Competency and Communication Ability taught in your program? Please provide the data in table form if possible.
- How does your mission statement speak to the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities?
- Where are students learning the Core Competencies and Abilities? Where are they introduced, reinforced, and mastered? Please provide a deposit map where you identify where each competency and ability is taught and where they’re reflected in your curriculum.
- What Competencies and Abilities are relative strengths for the program, and which could be strengthened?
- How do your assignments generate the level of growth we wish for our students, related to the Core Competencies?
- Does your student work demonstrate progress towards mastery of the programmatic competencies that are supposed to be developed in each course and in the program as a whole?
- How will the results of this assessment been used to strengthen the program? (You may refer readers to your Action Plan in Section VII.)

Defining the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities. At LaGuardia, each program has identified courses along the curriculum pathway that incorporate assignments connected to the College's Core Learning Competencies and Communication Abilities. In these courses — “earmarked for deposit”— students complete high-stakes assignments linked to our Learning Matters rubrics and then deposit them in our ePortfolio system.

By mapping assignments across the curriculum, we are able to capture students' progress on the Competencies and Abilities at various stages of their degree, from the First Year Seminar, through key courses at the early, mid and late stages, culminating in the Capstone course experience. By bringing groups of faculty together to read and score these artifacts of student learning, programs can answer important questions about the impact of the curriculum over time:

All three Core Competencies and three Communication Abilities must be addressed at three places (early, middle and late) in each program. Please provide your deposit map, and use data from the Benchmark Readings or programmatic benchmark readings to identify places to strengthen learning in these areas. Ultimately, the report must answer the question: How do we know students in the program are graduating with competency and proficiency in General Education?

Section IV. Curriculum Review

A. Individual Course Review: Assess the strengths/weaknesses of each course in the program core — success in terms of meeting the instruction and performance objectives for each course. For each course:

1. Review course proposals. Are the course descriptions accurate and relevant? Revise as needed.
2. Collect a random sample of faculty syllabi. Do they match the course proposal? Do they meet both the course and institutional objectives? In key courses marked for General Education and Programmatic learning, are they coherent with your Program Learning Outcomes and the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities? If not, revise the proposals to ensure greater congruence between what is officially to be taught and what is actually being taught.
3. Review the courses in your program core sequence. Is the sequence relevant to student learning outcomes for the program? Revise as

needed.

B. Key Curriculum Review Questions

1. What is your rationale for course sequencing (or non-sequencing)?
2. Can you describe any recent or planned curricular changes?

C. Relation to the Field

Please answer the following questions:

- Does your curriculum show evidence of being responsive to changes in your field? Provide evidence that your curriculum is current with career and industry expectations, and/or national practices in the discipline. Examples of evidence include review by outside experts; review by site visit experts; point-by-point comparison to national and/or industry standards.
- What are your strategies to prepare students for fulfilling careers with family-sustaining wages?

Section V. Inquiry Assessment Project

Please summarize your Inquiry Assessment Project here. It should address some (if not all) of the main questions and issues related to your Program Learning Outcomes, with an emphasis on their relation to any other Program Issues. Identify the methods employed to create meaningful data from your key questions. If you have already addressed the project at length in other sections of the report, refer the reader to those sections. Consider taking an opportunity to reflect on the conclusions and meaning of the project as a precursor to any recommendations and actions described in Section VII. Please see Appendix B for more information.

Section VI. Student Success

A. Transferability and Placement. Evaluate the transferability of your program. How well do the courses in the program transfer? Please include: description of how course design includes consideration of transfer; information on existing agreements, MOUs, or articulations; and data to support the transferability of the program's courses. Please provide data as to the success of the students in the program in transfer as well. At what rates do they: transfer early, transfer after graduation, or complete their degree at the four-year college (CUNY only)? What is the correlation between performance (GPA, graduation) at LaGuardia and performance at the receiving institution? Identify any transfer issues/problems.

B. Advisement. Evaluate the use of the advisement process in your program. How does your program provide advisement to students in your major? How is advisement conducted? What data is available for review — e.g., (a) How many students are advised annually? (b) Are there particular points in your program where advisement is conducted? (c) How does your program

decide what students need what types of advisement (tiers)? (d) How does advisement have an impact on successful progression in your program, timely graduation and transferability? (e) What are the most common topics discussed with students?

C. First Year Seminar. Discuss the First Year Seminar/Experience in your program, and provide an example of a First Year Seminar syllabus from your program. Describe any issues related to the First Year Seminar. Provide and analyze any data related to FYS/E.

D. Grants and Mini-Grants. Relay the goals and actions of any Learning Matters Mini-Grants from your program that occurred since the last PPR.

Section VII. External Review

According to Middle States accreditation guidelines and CUNY, all programs must include an external reader. If your program already reports to an external accrediting body, this is sufficient. If you do not have an external accrediting body, then you must seek an external reader outside of LaGuardia Community College. CUNY mandates that during the program review process each program must receive a site visit resulting in a written report by an external reviewer. This reviewer should preferably *not* be CUNY faculty at another institution. When non-CUNY reviewers are not possible, programs may ask for special permission to retain CUNY faculty. The Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs approves all program reviewers. The reviewer will be responsible for reading your final report and offering feedback and thoughts relating to transfer, employability, and learning competencies. In the fall of your active writing year, please contact a reviewer. Invite them to an on-site visit with your program in the spring semester between January and April and send them a draft of your PPR prior to the visit. Request that they respond to your report and recommendations in writing by May 1. A suggested template is provided for completion by the external reviewer in Appendix A.

Section VII. Action Plan

Based on the analyses in the prior sections – along with feedback from Academic Affairs and the external evaluator – please formulate specific recommendations and actions you will undertake to strengthen the program, particularly in regard to improving student learning outcomes, including the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities. For those programs that are accredited by outside evaluators, please include action steps based on issues identified on annual reports or on your outside accreditation criteria. Include a copy of the criteria in the appendix.

These actions should be incorporated into the Strategic Plan for your department for the years following your PPR. Recommendations for actions should be based on specific data and analysis generated by the PPR. Please work with your Department Chair to incorporate your PPR recommendations into action steps.

It is helpful to break down future actions into short and long-term steps or goals. PPR teams should be prepared to present a data point, a recommendation, and an action step at the spring Instructional Staff meeting.

Programs will report on their action-implementation goals in Years 1, 2, and 3 of the PPR (after the active report year).

EXAMPLES:

Data Point: An assessment of student development in terms of Inquiry and Problem Solving (IPS) consisted of reviewing 80 student-writing projects taken from their ePortfolios, comparing samples of work from intro courses vs. capstone courses. Scoring the work with the IPS rubric revealed that scores improved by 1 point on the rubric (1-4 scale); however, capstone writing scores averaged 2.5 — less than the desired 3.0 score for graduating students. A review of the nature of assignments in the capstone course revealed that the assignments did not require students to draw conclusions based on evidence, meaning that the work would never rise to the desired level.

Recommendation: Review and revise IPS assignments in capstone courses in the major.

Action: A team of faculty will devise model IPS projects for the capstone course (September-December); the projects will be incorporated into courses the following spring semester (March-June) as a pilot. Student work will be deposited in ePortfolios and assessed using the IPS rubric (June); successful assignments will be incorporated into all capstone courses in the subsequent semester.

Data Point: A hypothetical assessment of student work in terms of Digital Communication consisted of reviewing 80 student ePortfolios, comparing them from intro courses, mid-range courses and capstone courses. Scoring the work with the Digital Communication rubric revealed that scores improved by .7 points on the rubric (1-4 scale); however, capstone scores averaged 2.2 — significantly lower than the desired 3.0 score for graduating students. A review of the curriculum revealed that the assignments intended to build Digital Communication did not directly address the dimensions of the Ability as laid out in the rubric.

Recommendation: Review and revise digital communication assignments in designated courses in the major to more effectively build students' multimodal composition skills.

Action: A team of faculty will devise new assignments for each course (September-December); the projects will be incorporated into courses the following spring semester (March-June) as a pilot. Student ePortfolios will be assessed using the Digital Communication rubric (June); successful assignments will be incorporated into all sections of the relevant courses in the subsequent semester.

Appendix A: Preparing for a Periodic Program Review (PPR) External Review Site Visit Guidelines

LaGuardia's Periodic Program Review (PPR) process is one of the College's key processes for inquiry based outcomes assessment as mandated by the CUNY Board of Trustees and our accreditation agency, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The PPR is required of all programs at LaGuardia every five years, and all programs must include an external review.

CUNY mandates that the PPR must include a site visit and report written by an external reviewer. This needs to be someone who is not CUNY faculty or staff. When non-CUNY reviewers are not possible, programs may ask for a waiver. In all cases, selections must be approved by the Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. These guidelines should help you prepare for your external reviewer's site visit, and outline the components of the written report.

The site visit should be scheduled between January and April. The external reviewer should review a draft of the PPR report prior to the site visit, and be prepared to discuss recommendations with the PPR Writing Team.

The site visit should include:

- Classroom visits.
- Meeting with the PPR Writing Team, Department Chair, students, other faculty and staff to offer initial evaluation and comments.

Within 30 days of the site visit, the reviewer should submit to the Program Director a written report that includes the following information:

- Evaluation of the overall quality of the draft document the PPR Writing Team has produced.
- Summary of any meetings held with faculty, students, or staff.
- Successes and best practices of the program, as well as weakness or challenges for the program.
- Evaluation of the program recommendations and action plan.
- Recommendations (4-5) on program areas that need to be addressed and strengthened.

Appendix B: Inquiry Assessment Project Primer

As part of your Periodic Program Review you are asked to complete a Programmatic Assessment Project. This project is in part based on the data collected in Section III. This Project should speak to how you will assess one or more of your Programmatic Competencies, and/or how they relate to key question(s) or issue(s) in your program.

- Look at your list of programmatic competencies and list of critical issues and questions (you may have to design them if you don't currently have them).
- Identify 1-2 Program Learning Outcomes you would like to address (and/or 1-2 key issues and questions) by examining how they are introduced, reinforced, and mastered at different moments of student learning.
- How do your selected Program Learning Outcomes address student success as far as retention, transferability, and/or achievement of learning outcomes?
- Think about using student deposits and artifacts from ePortfolio to answer your questions.
- Examine assignments that your program has created for evidence of learning at the programmatic level. You may need to create your own programmatic rubric.

Your project can start by answering these questions (below). Narrative plans and a drafted project table will be submitted as a revised draft in the spring of your Prep Year. Narrative explanations and a completed project table will be submitted as drafts and as a revised draft in the spring of your Active Year with your PPR report. It may be helpful to review some sample program reviews from your discipline.

1. What are you planning to investigate in your programmatic assessment project and what are you hoping to learn?
2. What is the project design for this? What is the timeline? Where and when will you gather, collect, assess, and analyze results?
3. Feel free to use the table below if it is helpful.
4. Please let us know what resources/support you need as far as Institutional Research and Assessment, Center for Teaching and Learning or Academic Affairs.

Question(s)	Outcome(s) Statement with Threshold	Timeline(s)	Data Collection/ Methods	Results	Plan(s) of Action/Plan to improve outcomes

An ideal assessment for a program. The recent development of students building a "Core ePortfolio" from their First Year Seminar through key courses culminating in a Capstone course provides an opportunity for program faculty to take "snapshots" of student development at various stages in their academic paths. Programs undertaking a PPR might select a random sampling of ePortfolios to undertake a holistic assessment of student learning, and/or examples of how Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are introduced, reinforced, and mastered at different moments of a student's learning. For example:

- 1) Faculty might ask students to deposit their entire ePortfolio into the back-end of the ePortfolio system to be scored as part of the College's Benchmark Reading process for a specific Competency and Ability (often Integrative Learning and Digital Communication), or
- 2) Program faculty might read select ePortfolios from graduates in their programs to identify evidence of one or more Program Learning Outcomes developed over the course of a student's degree.

Teams should keep in mind the ways that ePortfolio is a powerful tool for scaffolding and capturing students' development as 21st century learners over time.

Methods of Direct Assessment

A menu with types of options for PLO assessment could include: core or course ePortfolios, essays, research papers, problem sets, oral examinations, performances, presentations, clinical experiences, (Trudy and Banta 96).² Program could pull from projects specific to the major by "asking students to create and exhibit products or present demonstrations that are representative of work done by professionals in the discipline" (Trudy and Banta 97).

Some Methods of Direct Evidence of Student Learning:

- Ratings of student skills in their field experience by supervisors.
- Scores and pass rates on appropriate licensure or certification exams.
- Capstone experiences such as research projects, theses, dissertations, oral defenses, exhibitions, and performances, scored using a rubric.
- Other written work, performances, and presentations, scored using a rubric.
- Scores on locally designed multiple-choice or essay tests, such as final exams in key courses, qualifying examinations, and comprehensive evaluations.
- Score gains between entry and exit on published or local tests or writing samples.
- Observations of student behavior, undertaken systematically and with notes recorded systematically.
- Summaries and assessments of electronic class discussion threads.
- Think-alouds, which ask students to think aloud as they work on a problem or assignment.
- Student reflections on their values, attitudes, and beliefs (Suskie 21).³

² Trudy W. Banta and Catherine A. Palomba. *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment in Higher Education*. Second Edition. Jossey-Bass, 2015.

³ Linda Suskie. *Assessing Student Learning: a commonsense guide*. Second edition. Jossey-Bass, 2009.

Appendix C: PPR Budget Plan for Active Year

To support the work of the faculty members involved in their Program Review Active Year, three hours of released time per program are available, and a nominal stipend of \$500 for an external reader (non-CUNY only). **Faculty are eligible for release time only.**

Please use the table below to fill in your plan for the use of the released hours.

Name of Faculty Member	Number of Released Time Hours

Appendix D: Programmatic Benchmark Readings: Norming and Process

Norming sessions are an essential step in meaningful Student Learning Outcomes Assessment. They are crucial precursors to the actual measuring of student work when faculty and staff assign scores to student work, and help improve the “reliability” and value of your reading. They are also powerful learning experiences that help faculty and staff readers more deeply understand the competency being discussed. After a norming session, readers should be able to agree (within 1 point) on what constitutes different levels of student work. Once “normed,” readers can then score student work by themselves.

The purposes of norming sessions are:

- To define what constitutes student learning relative to goals and objectives and the dimensions of our Competencies and Abilities.
- To help readers come to agreement about the meaning of rubrics used to measure student work.
- To determine what student work matches the rubric scale.

For an effective norming session, provide readers with folders containing:

- Rubrics: matrixes or grids that define learning outcomes on a 1-4 scale.
- Range-Finders: examples of student work at each level (1-4) so that scorers can have models.
- Norming Samples for faculty to read, score, and discuss.

A sample norming session agenda might look like:

1. Introductions.
2. Leaders introduce relevant rubrics; discuss clarifying questions about them
3. Participants then read annotated student work in the Range Finders.
4. Leaders lead discussion about range-finders (explaining why something is scored a certain way).
5. Everyone then reads norming samples (unscored) and assigns scores (NOTE: Leaders should have selected in advance how norming samples should score.)
6. Leaders ask participants to go around and share their scores, and why they gave that particular score. Leaders can help participants understand why that sample was selected with a particular score in mind. Discussion aims to help everyone come closer to a consensus understanding of the rubric’s dimensions and scaling levels.

NOTES ON RUBRICS & SCORING

LaGuardia’s Core Competency and Communication Ability rubrics use a 1-4 scale, in which 1 is Novice and 4 is Proficient. Nationally, a four-point score is considered statistically and intuitively feasible, reproducible, and scalable. Our goal is for graduating LaGuardia students to reach at least a score of 3, or “Competent.” We do not expect that entering students or baseline artifacts reach this level.

In our readings, we use sympathetic holistic scoring, where a reader comes up with an overall score that takes the dimensions into account, as opposed to a specific numerical score for each dimension.

On a 1-4 scale, it's OK if readers come within *one* point of each other on their overall or holistic score for any given artifact. For example, someone gives the work a 1, the other person a 2. Where you see *more* than one-point difference, such as a 1 and a 3, discussion must be brought to bear on the rubric's relation to the work, and conversation must direct the scores into a one-point difference (someone has to "give" a little). The "norming" process should help readers more effectively align their shared assumptions and understandings of the Competency/Ability as expressed by the rubric.

Guidelines for Interpreting and Presenting Benchmark Data

As programs plan their norming sessions for Learning Matters Mini-Grants, Periodic Program Reviews (PPRs), or other initiatives, they should also strategize about their data compilation, interpretation, and presentation tactics. We ask that Benchmark leaders consider the following guidelines and questions. Overall, remember that the purpose of assessment is to examine growth over time, and to create meaningful data that can inform action steps.

Suggestions for Scoring and Data Compilation

- i. Artifacts receive two scores from different faculty.
- ii. Artifacts with divergent scores (88 and a numbered score; difference of more than 1 point (1 and 3, 2 and 4) receive third score from third reader).

Suggestions for Data Analysis and Dissemination

As you review and analyze your data, we suggest you keep these questions and suggestions in mind:

1. What are your questions? What are you hoping to learn from this process? What issues do you already know about that you're hoping to examine or better understand?
2. Consider your audience. Are you writing to other faculty in the program, or to an audience outside your program? Make adjustments depending on the answer.
3. As you compile and review your scores, ask yourself: what do these data mean? What can you learn from it? Is the data what you expected? Take note of the difference between your expectations and the results.
4. In your data, what was the difference between 88s and 1s? What about 2s and 3s?
5. Consider the role of assignment(s) in building student learning and generating the artifacts you've scored. From what you know, does the assignment address the dimensions of the relevant competency and ability?

6. What data could provide your findings with context and framework? Is there contextual college-wide data you can use? What does a comparison to college-wide look like? What conclusions can you draw about your program data from that comparison?

After your readers have scored, we suggest that you schedule a follow conversation with your readers. (This can happen before or after your larger data analysis process.) In the discussion, you might consider the following clusters of questions, designed to enhance assessment as a learning process.

Student Artifacts. What did you learn from scoring the artifacts? What did you learn about assignments designed to address this Competency/Ability? What factors contributed to higher scores? How could assignments be tweaked to create higher-scoring artifacts?

The Core Competency and Abilities. Has your understanding of this Core Competency/Ability changed? Were some dimensions easier to score than others? What were some of the factors that contributed to 3s and 4s? (Other possible questions specific to each competency and ability could include...IPS: Did you find artifacts that were just Inquiry or just Problem Solving?)

Action Steps. What advice would you give faculty and program directors who are teaching this core competency or ability? How can the College best support faculty in assignment development for Core Competency/Ability learning? How can we use what we've learned to shape teaching and learning at the College?

Faculty Insight. What insights from our discussion would be important for bringing stronger Core Competency and Ability learning back to the classroom? How might this discussion inform your work with the Core Competencies & Abilities? How might these insights inform your program's engagement with the Core Competencies?

Appendix E: Guidelines for Programs with External Accreditation

Program reports for external accreditation count as reports for the Periodic Program Review (PPR). All such programs are still responsible, however, for submitting any information normally expected for College PPR reports, such as evaluation and actions for the Core Competencies and Communication Abilities.

Programs with external accreditation must do the following:

1. Complete the College PPR cycle, including meetings with the College liaisons for Periodic Program Reviews during their the Prep Year and Active Year, and annual Closing the Loop reports for Years 1-3;
2. Meet with the Provost in their Prep Year to discuss their plan and actions;
3. Provide the College with a copy of their external report.

At the end of their Active Year, programs will submit to the College a “Crosswalk Document” that lists to the pages/links where all PPR content can be found in their external report. In this Crosswalk or in an appendix, programs will submit any additional required information not otherwise included in the external report.

The Crosswalk Document

The goal of the crosswalk is to identify the manner in which your program has met the LAGCC PPR guidelines and requirements.

The crosswalk document will provide a table that identifies where the external accreditation report addresses the areas required for College PPRs (see below).

Directions:

1. Identify the name of your program and the accreditation body to which you submitted your report.
2. Provide information that demonstrates the way in which your self-study/accreditation documents address the PPR requirements. You may crosswalk one or more sections of your self-study/accreditation document to each PPR section.
3. Provide comments as you see fit to clarify the cross-walked sections.
4. For sections of the PPR that do not have a counterpart in your self-study/accreditation documents:
 - a. Comment/note that your accrediting body does not require this information
 - b. Provide a narrative response to demonstrate how your program meets the PPR requirement(s)

Self-Study/Outside Accreditation Crosswalk Table

Name of Program:

Name of Accreditation Body:

PPR Section	Guidelines Page	Included in External Report (Yes/No)	Self-Study Outside Accreditation Document*	Comments**
I. Introduction A. Program Overview B. Key Questions and Issues C. Your Program Learning Outcomes D. Inquiry Assessment Project E. Closing the Loop	9			
II. Key Data Elements	9			
III. General Education and Program Learning Outcomes A. Program Learning Outcomes B. General Education Core Competencies & Abilities	10			
IV. Curriculum Review A. Individual Course Review B. Key Review Questions C. Relation to the Field	13			
V. Inquiry Assessment Project	14			
VI. Student Success A. Transfer and Placement B. Advisement C. First Year Seminar D. Grants and Mini-Grants	14			
VII. External Review	15			
VIII. Action Plan	15			

*(Please provide the section of the document – i.e.: name, page, etc. that addresses each PPR section)

**Briefly add context or comment where necessary (for example, if the corresponding page/section of outside report doesn't clearly address PPR Guidelines, please explain or contextualize).

Additional Narrative(s). Please copy below additional narrative information and/or data to supplement the Crosswalk.

Appendix F: Preparing for the Provost Consult in Prep Year

Please send the following items to Provost Arcario on or by June 1st, and copy the PPR leadership team.

1. One-page executive summary containing:

- Program(s) name(s). The name of your program (or total programs under review) and your department.
- Program Description. A brief (1-4 sentences) description of your program's official definition.
- A brief summary of your Inquiry Assessment Project, emphasizing what you plan to study and why, your method of data collection, and a brief timeline of the project's steps (2017-2018, broken down by months and/or semesters).
- A list of 3-5 "key questions" your Inquiry Assessment Project, and your larger PPR, will address.
- A brief list of 3-5 "Program Issues" that your PPR will address.

2. Please also provide:

- A revised copy of your Inquiry Assessment Project.
- A revised copy of your Program Issues (additional details).
- A list of the revised data points requested from InR.
- Any other materials (such as the previous PPR's "Closing the Loop" action items) you feel relevant.