CSM Program Review Process
Presented by CSM Academic Senate President to ASGC on April 11, 2013

The revision process began in Spring, 2012 as an effort to better integrate program SLO and student learning data assessment into the Institutional Planning Committee's (IPC) overall planning and self-assessment cycle.

The Program Review Revision Group, an ad hoc Academic Senate committee charged with reviewing and revising program review, is made up of the Academic Senate President, Academic Senate committee chairs, appointees, and the Dean of the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE).

The members are James Carranza (Academic Senate President), Laura Demsetz (Faculty Co-Chair, Accreditation), Cheryl Gregory (appointee, Learning Support Centers), Teeka James (appointee, AFT President), David Locke (Chair, College Assessment Committee), Teresa Morris (Chair, Committee on Instruction), Eileen O'Brien (appointee, Student Services), and John Sewart (Dean, PRIE).

Summary of major changes:

The revised program review forms and processes (for how they will be used to inform institutional planning) address all relevant accreditation standards in an efficient, logical manner.

All programs submit an annual program review, emphasizing ongoing reflection, assessment, planning, and action—the focus of which is to sustain and improve student learning on a continuous basis. The revised forms strive to avoid duplication of data entry and analysis.

The revised forms provide links to essential planning documents and data resources. Ideally, we will move to an electronic, database format for the 2014 cycle to simplify input and retrieval and, more importantly, to facilitate the use of program reviews in institutional planning.

The program review template begins with, generally, program reflection, followed by SLO and student learning data assessment, long-range planning, short-term action planning, and budgeting. Instruction, Learning Support Centers, and Student Services use the common template though sections and sub-sections may vary.

Program review is essential to program and institutional self-assessment and planning. It is the most important contribution to the institutional planning process that programs make in support of student learning and success.

Full-Time Faculty Requests are made using criteria agreed to by both the Academic Senate and Instructional Administrators Council, so faculty and deans do not duplicate efforts in making requests. The Full-Time Faculty Request Form is no longer in the program review form but is instead linked or "attached."

Program Vision informs IPC's long-range institutional planning and decision-making. The short-term action planning aids programs in prioritizing, documenting, and tracking

plans to sustain and improve student learning and success. These plans will be used to further inform and guide IPC in matters directly related to student learning.

PRIE revised the "Student Success and Core Program Indicators" data sheet, replacing linear projections with student success indicators tracked over three years. The demographic variables section now captures data over three years rather than one, making it possible for programs to note trends in success.

The Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) and Academic Senate are actively engaged in revising the process for how program review is used to inform college planning.

The revised form for Instruction addresses Title 5 requirements for CTE programs.

The revised forms encourage all programs to document and share "professional enrichment" needs, consider possible connections to other programs across the institution in support of student learning and success, and anticipate long-term resource needs.

(For additional context, refer to "ACCJC Accreditation Standards: Annotated for Continuous Quality Improvement" and Program Review: Setting a Standard, adopted 2009, ASCCC.)

Overview of Integrated Planning for Continuous Improvement of Student Success

Integrated Planning Hierarchy
CSM's planning process begins with the mission statement that drives the planning at both the institutional and program level and clearly puts student success at the center of the college's planning.

Institutional Planning Cycle
The institutional planning cycle is designed to result in continuous improvement that starts and ends with assessment. Institutional planning draws heavily on SLO assessment through the identification of themes and trends emerging from the program reviews. Initially discussed and prioritized at the division or unit level, these trends and themes are then forwarded to IPC, where they are prioritized at the college level based on the Institutional Priorities and then used to update institutional plans and develop initiatives, which, in turn, inform budgeting and resource allocation. The impact on student success is measured and assessed and the cycle begins again.

Program Planning Cycle
Program review draws heavily on results from SLO assessment at the course and program levels and thus is centered on student success. Also informing program review is institutional research that includes data and information about student demographics, program efficiency, mode of course delivery, and CTE gainful employment; updates on course outline revisions and curriculum development; and recommendations from CTE advisory committees.

Integrated Planning Cycle
The integration of the institutional planning cycle and the program planning cycle is informed by evidence from institutional data and information, much of which is

captured in the EMP. Student success is at the center of both planning cycles and is the criterion against which continuous improvement is measured and assessed.