

Periodic Program Review



Community College

Guidelines

2015-16

LaGuardia Community College

Periodic Program Review Guidelines

Fall 2015

Background	p.3
Elements of the Plan: Programmatic and Core Competencies	p.3
The Periodic Program Review Process	p.4
The Report	p.6
Section I. Issues	p.6
Section II. Key Data Elements	p.6
Section III. Educational Goals of the Program	p.6
A. Programmatic Competencies	
B. General Education Core Competencies.	
C. Transferability, Placement, and Advisement.	
Section IV. Student Learning Outcomes	p.7
A. Overall student learning and development.	
B. Individual Course Review	
C. Benchmark Readings.	
Section V. External Review	p.8
Section VI. Action Plan	p.9

Support: We understand that this seems daunting right now! Please be assured that representatives from Academic Affairs (Currently Niesha Ziehmke, Regina Lehman, and Justin Rogers-Cooper) are available to assist you in your PPR process and look forward to working with you. Your Departmental representatives on the Assessment Leadership team are also available to support you in the process.

Please be in touch whenever you need assistance.

Niesha Ziehmke: nziehmke@lagcc.cuny.edu

Regina Lehman: rlehman@lagcc.cuny.edu

Justin Rogers-Cooper: jrogers@lagcc.cuny.edu

BACKGROUND

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.

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.

The plan is designed to assess overall student achievement of the College's general education core competencies as well as each major's programmatic competencies. 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 inter-disciplinary skills development, in that required core competencies are to be developed and assessed across all disciplines.

ELEMENTS OF THE PLAN: PROGRAMMATIC AND CORE COMPETENCIES.

Students' growth and development throughout their academic careers at the College are assessed by evaluating achievement in two broad categories: Programmatic Competencies and General Education Core Competencies.

Programmatic Competencies. A statement of overall program goals (based on a synthesis of the already existing performance objectives for each course in the program) has been developed by each program. Programs should devise an inquiry assessment project that allows it to make comparisons between student assignments from 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.

General Education Core Competencies. In 2013, responding to Middle States and other events, Provost 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 LaGuardians value most. As a result of the Task Force recommendations, the College adopted three core competencies: Inquiry and Problem Solving; Global Learning; and Integrative Learning to be demonstrated through three communication abilities: Written, Oral, or Digital Communication in 2013-14.

Each program has identified, through a grid, where in its curriculum these Competencies and Abilities are being addressed and have designated these courses as depositing courses. It is the responsibility of faculty teaching these courses to have students deposit work in to the appropriate competency in the ePortfolio Assessment area. Program Directors must inform faculty about their responsibilities in depositing.

THE PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

How to Conduct Your PPR Self-Study:

- Outcomes assessment process outlined above is part of a program's PPR.
- PPRs are mandated by CUNY to be conducted on a regular basis.
- PPR process involves a program self-study, with student learning outcomes as a primary focus – along with a review of major issues and concerns (e.g., enrollment, retention, facilities).
- PPR report is submitted to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- A site visit by external evaluators to review the Self- Study report is required
- PPR involves a 5-year time period which incorporates a planning year, an active review year, and three years of implementation.
- PPR report should be no more than 20 pages and may include relevant appendices.
- Programs are eligible for up to \$5000.00 during the review year to support PPR projects, pending budget approval. This includes a \$500.00 stipend payable to an external reviewer.

In regard to student learning outcomes, the following two key questions should guide your self-study:

1. What competencies/knowledge do we want students in the program to graduate with (includes core and programmatic competencies)?
2. How do we know students in the program are graduating with those competencies and knowledge sets?

In order to prepare for the PPR, we request that 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 will review the processes and procedures for PPR's as well as provide contextual, program specific information for how to conduct a robust inquiry assessment project. In the fall semester, meetings will be held that combine all PPR teams in an effort to foster community among faculty participating in PPR. In the spring semester, meetings will be with individual program teams

In general, the timeline is as follows (with exact dates to be worked out, particularly if coordinating the PPR with mandated, external accreditations):

1. Planning Year:

- ✓ October: Introductory Meeting (Team Meetings 1)
- ✓ November: Inquiry Assessment Project (Team Meeting 2)
- ✓ March, May (Team Meetings 3 and 4) Tentative meeting with IR in May
- ✓ March 30th Written identification of Program Issues
- ✓ April 27th Final questions for Institutional Research
- ✓ May 30th Identify the external reviewer
- ✓ June 1st Written plan for an inquiry assessment project.

2. Active Review Year:

- ✓ October: Benchmark readings
- ✓ Dec. 1st: First Draft of PPR
- ✓ January-April External reviewer
- ✓ April 1 Semi-Final Draft of PPR, draft report to external reviewer
- ✓ April 25th Departmental chairperson signature
- ✓ May 1st Final PPR approved by your dept chairperson with signature due in AA

3. Implementation Year A

- ✓ November 1st Response to AA with a formal implementation plan
- ✓ November 15th Update Strategic Plan website with PPR implementation steps
<https://wp.laguardia.edu/StrategicPlan> (Site coordinator, Niesha Ziehmke
nziehmke@lagcc.cuny.edu)
- ✓ February 1st Post mid-year updates and final PPR implementation updates to Strategic Plan
- ✓ May 23rd Post end of year updates and implementation updates to Strategic Plan

4. Implementation Year B and C

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

Requirements for the final two implantation years will be agreed upon in conjunction with Academic Affairs. For more specific information please see the Periodic Program Review Timeline and Policies documents.

THE REPORT

The report should include the following sections:

Section I. Issues

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.

Section II. Key Data Elements

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

- Enrollment trends
- Retention
- Graduation
- Transfer
- Placement
- Pass rates in gateway/key courses
- Full-time/part-time faculty ratio

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 IR in the planning year. An additional appointment with IR to discuss specific details of the request is highly encouraged

Section III. Educational Goals of the Program (i.e. What competencies/knowledge do we want students in the program to graduate with?)

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:

- A. Programmatic Competencies.** A statement of overall programmatic competencies_ (based on a synthesis of the already existing performance objectives for each course in the major-area requirements of the program) should be clearly stated in the form of a mission statement. What are the expected outcomes for student learning, that is, competencies and knowledge sets, in the program?
1. Map the general statement of expected competencies onto the curriculum. In other words, are the overall goals of your program reflected in the curriculum? Any lack of congruency should result in either a revision of the overall goal statement and/or the curriculum itself.

2. 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.
- B. General Education Core Competencies.** All three core competencies and three communication abilities are goals for student learning in each program. If you have not done so already, specify where and how each core competency and ability is being reinforced across the curriculum in your program.
- C. Transferability, Placement, and Advisement.** Evaluate the transferability of your program. How well do the courses in the program transfer? Identify any transfer issues/problems. Conduct an environmental scan and evaluate job placement for students in your program. Describe and evaluate how transfer and career development are promoted within the program, as well as how advisement is conducted.

Section IV. Student Learning Outcomes (i.e., How do we know students in the program are graduating with the expected competency and knowledge sets?)

This is the key section in your Periodic Program Review. Here is where you can demonstrate your success as a program through student learning outcomes. Your program is responsible for both creating an inquiry assessment project related to your programmatic competencies and for participating in the annual Benchmark Reading Program. Through the combination of these two projects, you will have a robust sense of how students are doing in your program on your program competencies and how your students are doing in General Education competencies.

- A. Overall student learning and development.** Develop an **inquiry assessment project** that makes sense for your program and conduct this assessment. This will be discussed in the preparatory year. This project is how you investigate the information you provide in Section III item 1. One thing that programs do is examine a sampling of student ePortfolios. A faculty team consisting of faculty from your program, along with faculty from the Assessment Committee, should compare portfolio assignments in the intro-level course with those in the capstone course (as well as any other courses deemed appropriate) to assess growth in programmatic as well as the core competencies across a student's entire college career. Also consider when reviewing student work: Do the assignments yield the level of work you wish students to achieve? Does the student work demonstrate mastery of the programmatic competencies that are supposed to be developed in each course and in the program as a whole? Are all the core competencies being covered in your program?

An ideal assessment for a program might use ePortfolios: At LaGuardia each program has identified a minimum of three *portfolio courses*: an introductory or 100-level course; a required urban studies course, and a senior-level (capstone) course. Required ePortfolio assignments in these courses enable the college to take "snapshots" of student development at various points in their academic careers. Student development of

ePortfolios within their program allow for a holistic assessment of student learning from their first year to their capstone seminar by looking at the integrative elements of the ePortfolio. However, in programs where it is not possible to include three ePortfolio courses please continue to collect work at identified points in the ePortfolio assessment area.

Benchmark Readings: Members of your PPR Team will participate in Benchmark Readings in the fall during your active review year. These readings will contain artifacts deposited by students in your major from 2014-present. You will receive a report on performance within your major in November of your active review year. You should include this in your PPR.

B. Individual Course Review: Assess the strengths/weaknesses of each course in the program area: success in terms of producing the desired learning outcomes, currency of teaching methods, and congruence with national practices in the discipline. For each course:

1. Review the course proposal. Are the objectives still appropriate? Revise as needed.
2. Collect a random sample of faculty syllabi. Do they match the course proposal? If not, devise a plan to ensure greater congruence between what is officially to be taught and what is actually being taught.
3. Collect outcomes data for each course (e.g., pass rates; grade distribution). Outcomes should also include an analysis of student performance on individual course objectives (to determine which areas may need improvement).

Section V. 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- someone outside of LaGuardia Community College. It is recommended that this reader be an existing CUNY faculty(not on ECD- executive compensation plan) The reader 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. Many programs have used reviewers from senior colleges where our students most frequently transfer and where our programs articulate. Invite them to an on-site visit with your program in the Spring semester between Jan-April and send them a draft of your PPR report by April 1. Request that they respond to your report and recommendations in writing by May 1, 2016. A suggested template is provided for completion by the external reviewer on the following page.

Section VI. Action Plan

Based on the analyses in the prior sections – along with feedback from Academic Affairs and the external evaluator - formulate specific recommendations and actions you will undertake to strengthen the program, particularly in regard to improving student learning outcomes. For those programs that are accredited, 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 work plan for your department for the year 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.

All PPR teams will be asked to present a data point, a recommendation and an action step at the Spring 2016 Instructional Staff meeting.

EXAMPLE:

Data Point: An assessment of student development in terms of critical literacy 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 critical literacy rubric revealed that scores improved by 1.7 points on the rubric (1-6 scale); however, capstone writing scores averaged 3.2 – less than the desired 4.0 score for graduating students. A review of the nature of writing assignments in the capstone course revealed that the assignments did not require writing of a sufficiently analytical level, meaning that the writing demanded was never at a level that could potentially result in a score of 4 on the rubric.

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

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