Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

1. Why do we do program reviews?

Program Review is an integral part of institutional effectiveness and the strategic and budget planning process. Program Review offers an opportunity to gauge successes and design improvement actions to ensure the quality of academic, student success programs, and administrative services. The process improves the quality of the instructional disciplines, administrative services, student success programs offered at Evergreen Valley College. The Program Review process is not an exercise of compliance; although it is required for institutional accreditation, it is meant to bring value and meaning to the everyday operations of a program.

2. What is the purpose of Comprehensive Program Review?

Comprehensive Program Review encourages faculty to take a "big picture" look at their programs. It offers a chance to reflect on their program's achievements, challenges, and ongoing resource needs. Comprehensive Program Reviews also provide essential information for college long-range planning processes, such as revisions to the Institutional Master Plan and long-term budgeting, as well as accreditation.

3. What happens to Program Review drafts after I am done?

The drafts are reviewed and approved by IEC and then forwarded to the College Council for final approval. The resource requests made in the program reviews are forwarded to the Budget Committee. The drafts reside in CurriQunet where they can be reviewed in the future. The recommendations and needs espoused in the program review form the basis for new positions and instructional equipment that are decided upon by the Budget Committee and Faculty and Staff Prioritization Committee.

4. Who can help me with Program Review?

IEC chair, your mentor, your dean, and other faculty in your program.

5. What are my responsibilities in the program review process?

The writer(s) is responsible for documenting the review. The writing of the report and associated processes are an important opportunity for the program faculty and staff to come together to evaluate their own performance with respect to the ability to achieve the program mission and student learning outcomes. This is an introspective review of the program's strengths and weakness. Program faculty should make a candid evaluation of the current situation and future while engaging in collegial constructive dialogue to discuss and design actions to improve on weaknesses, while also taking advantage of future opportunities and innovation. The report should be evaluative rather than merely descriptive. It is not enough for the report to simply describe the operation of the program. The template requires the writer to review and appraise the operations and performance with due recognition of both problems and achievements. Being critical and courageous in recognizing and writing from the lens of self-judgment is the single most significant activity of this process. In general, the mentor and second reader's role should provide an evaluation of the overall quality of the program based on the report and the aligned rubric. The mentor and second readers will rate and provide written responses in the program review feedback about the program's strengths, weaknesses, and actions for improvement identified in the program review draft narrative. The other important aspect of the mentor and second reader's role is to outline unidentified strengths and areas needing improvement. Feedback can be a very powerful tool for program improvement, and when viewed from this perspective the mentor and second reader should approach the evaluation work as helping the program and college to improve rather than to equate it as being a harsh judge.

6. How are my written responses evaluated?

Each program will be provided with a feedback rubric. The mentor and second readers will provide an evaluation of the overall quality of the program based on the submitted draft and the aligned rubric. Each mentor and second readers will complete an individual review and rate the program review based on the feedback Rubric, including providing a score for each item in the rubric. The mentor and second reader will rate and provide written responses in the Feedback Rubric about the program's strengths, weaknesses, and actions for improvement identified in the program review draft narrative. Based on each mentor and second reader's area of expertise, he/she can also provide narrative reflections related to the strengths and challenges facing the program, including:

• The need for resources to assist with program challenges and improvements

• Trends in the discipline that could affect future planning for the program

• Strengths and weaknesses in the program's plan to improve teaching and learning with an emphasis on the disproportionate impact of students of color.

7. Where can I find my template?

The IEC chair provides the template with the prepopulated data. You can also download the blank template from IEC web page.

8. Where can I find the data for my program?

The Office of Institutional Research will prepopulate your program data into the program review template which will be emailed to you along with the excel file of your data. A page link will also be provided for accessing the excel spreadsheet of your data.

9. How many co-contributors can I choose?

You can choose as many co-contributors as you need.

10. Can I add co-contributors after I launch my PR proposal?

No, co-contributor must be chosen before proposal is launched.

11. Can I copy and paste information from word document to the PR module?

Yes, you can, or you can type your answer directly in the rich text editor in CurriQunet.

12. What should I choose for the question- **'Is this a review for a degree/certificate or all the courses in the subject'** on the cover page of the PR proposal? Can I choose both options?

You should choose the option 'all courses'. Currently, you cannot choose both options.

13. Do I need to check boxes next to the questions to add my answers?

Yes, you need to check the boxes next to each question so that the rich text editor box opens up for you where you can add your answers.

14. Is there any word limit for the answers in the rich text editor in PR module?

No there is no word limits for the answers in the rich text editor.

15. Do I need to complete the 'Budget Planning' and 'Technology and Equipment' sections of the PR Module?

Yes. You can ask your dean to provide this information to you.

16. What information should I include in the 'Additional Information' tab?

If there is any information that you would like to share that was not asked in the PR template, you can add it here.

17. Who is responsible for submitting the PR on CurriQunet once changes are made from feedback, the originator or co-contributor (if any)?

The originator is responsible, and he/she **can** only submit the updated draft.

18. Once the PR changes are completed based on the feedback from the mentor and second reader, what are the next steps?

You need to submit the updated draft in the CurriQunet.

19. How can I submit the updated draft in the CurriQunet?

Please follow the following steps to submit the updated draft in CurriQunet:

- Click **on the orange circle** with the number that appears on the Approvals button (do not click on the Approvals button)
- Click on the course being modified
- a new screen will appear with the option to comment and commit.