



Action Project: Evaluate viability and effectiveness of instructional degrees and certificates (“programs”).

Institution: Glen Oaks Community College

Contact: Lucy Zimmerman – lzimmerman@glenoaks.cc.mi.us – 269-467-9945

Annual Update: 2003-09-16

Form Navigation

<u>Description</u>	<u>Areas Affected</u>	<u>Processes Affected</u>	<u>Process Measures</u>
<u>Outcome Measures</u>	<u>Performance Targets</u>	<u>Keeping Focus</u>	<u>Rationale for Action</u>
<u>Related AQIP Criteria</u>	<u>Related AQIP Principles</u>	<u>Contact Person</u>	<u>Update/Review</u>

Description ↑

Glen Oaks Community College will create systems to ensure the desired results of programs are being met. If met, Glen Oaks will publicize the findings. If not met, Glen Oaks will take measures to address the deficiencies or to eliminate the program. The realization of this goal should: 1. Increase effectiveness of existing programs. 2. Identify viable programs that need more support. 3. Eliminate programs that are not effective. 4. Require all new programs to have measurable goals. 5. Establish a program review schedule. 6. Improve external and internal customer satisfaction.

Related AQIP Criteria ↑

Primary	7-Measuring Effectiveness
Related	1-Helping Students Learn
Related	3-Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs
Related	8-Planning Continuous Improvement
Related	None

Related AQIP Principles ↑

Principle

Principle
Principle
Principle

Rationale for Action ↑

Learning is central to the Mission of Glen Oaks Community College. Therefore, viable and effective academic programs are the focal point for the College. The improvement of viable programs and the elimination of those that are not viable or effective will increase the support for the College from all our stakeholders. The rationale for choosing this criteria (Measuring Effectiveness) is that, by improving academic programs, the College is directly helping students learn, is increasing its understanding of students' and other stakeholders' needs, and is applying the principles of continuous quality improvement to the planning process.

Areas Affected ↑

Student Services; Instruction; Institutional Research

Processes Affected ↑

Program Planning and Budgeting ; Employee Input and Feedback; Curriculum Development ; Professional Development

Process Measures ↑

Financial revenue and cost ; Three-year enrollment trends; Program and course completion rates; Certification results; Job placement rates; Fall-to-fall retention rates; Course and program satisfaction as indicated by employers, former and current students, and faculty Furthermore, the Program Review Committee will develop a program rating system that combines key measures and the results from monitoring stakeholder satisfaction. This committee will review the facts and will use the rating system and narrative to communicate the results of the evaluation. For those programs that are viable but have deficiencies, the Program Review Committee will identify any additional support needed to improve the program and will communicate this to the Dean of the College.

Outcome Measures ↑

Number of programs reviewed each year; Program ratings; Number of programs revised/updated each year; Number of programs eliminated each year; Level of customer satisfaction

Performance Targets ↑

Year	Quantitative and Qualitative Stretch Targets
One	Establish Program Review Committee and the process of evaluation.
Two	Evaluate one (1) vocational and one (1) transfer program. Establish baseline data.
Three	Evaluate three (3) or four(4) additional programs. Monitor customer satisfaction levels for Year Two programs.

Keeping Focus ↑

A. The Dean of the College will establish a Program Review Committee and charge it with the following responsibilities: (1.) Determine a program review schedule, (2.) Create a program rating system, and (3) Evaluate programs and report results. B. The Dean of the College will initiate actions based on the Program Review Committee's recommendations. C. The Dean of the College will publicize the results of each program review. Outstanding reviews will be celebrated.

Contact Person Information: ↑

First Name:	Ron
Middle Initial:	
Last Name:	Pribble
Title:	
Email:	rpribble@glenoaks.cc.mi.u
Phone:	269-467-9945

Annual Update: 2003-09-16 ↑

A. Describe the past year's accomplishments and the current status of this Action Project.

The "Goals Commitment Declaration" for this Action Project (quantitative) indicated that in the 2002 – 2003 academic year two programs would be reviewed. This goal was expanded from two to ten programs in the 2002 Annual Update, but the expansion was overly ambitious. Instead, eight programs were reviewed: Associate of Business, Associate of Applied Science in Business, Accounting Certificate, Computer Information Certificate, Office Administrative Assistant Certificate, Supervision Certificate, Associate of Applied Science in Nursing, and Practical Nursing Certificate. The faculty or area coordinator for the discipline in conjunction with the lead faculty for each program generated the report for each program. A narrative report was prepared using data and research findings. Each report included these major sections: Program Need (viability), Program Cost (efficiency), Program Quality (effectiveness), Conclusions, and Committee Recommendations. Specific data researched for Program Need included fall program enrollment (headcount for previous 4 years), fall course enrollment for specialty courses for the previous 3 years, and labor market information. Cost per contact hour of instruction was determined for Program Cost. Specific data researched for Program Quality included articulation/transfer information, faculty credentials (credits taught during the last 3 years and evidence of professional development), student outcomes data (3-year fall to fall retention, graduates, percentage of withdrawals by course, student assessment results, GPA, job placement rates, wages per hour), facility and equipment inventory, student satisfaction (PROE questionnaire and focus groups), faculty/administration satisfaction (PROE questionnaire and focus groups), and employer satisfaction (focus groups). Each respective review report addressed strengths and weaknesses. The Program Review Committee, formed in 2002 as part of this Action Project, served as a sounding board for the drafts of the review documents and as the body that made a program recommendation. The reports and the recommendations are the foundation for continual review, year-to-year, of each program and its improvements. The current status of the project is to begin the program review process for one associate degree and five certificate programs identified for review in 2003 – 2004. The Program Review Committee will also be monitoring the progress toward improvement of the eight programs reviewed in 2002 – 2003.

Review (11-11-03):

GOCC has adequately described the activities from last year. It looks like they have established a Program Review Process and reviewed eight programs. The reviews were based on a variety of data sources and a written report was required. This report does not indicate whether or not the review process changed the College effectiveness in terms of the desired results of programs.

B. Describe how the institution involved people in work on this Action Project.

The Program Review Committee had as its purpose in year two to implement the review process outlined in the initial year of the Action Project. The committee included members from the following departments of the College: Academic Affairs (dean, two faculty coordinators, three faculty); Student Services (registrar, counselor); Grants and Research; and College Development. The committee met monthly to refine process, collect data, and review information. Several of the committee members were responsible for writing the summative reports for their programs.

Review (11-11-03):

It looks like progress is being made in this area. The description, however, does not detail how many months the program review committee met, the attendance at the meetings, where the summative reports are located, whether or not minutes were kept, and whether or not agendas were followed. In addition, the above report does not detail the reasoning behind the composition of the committee or their the exact activities or outcomes.

C. Describe your planned next steps for this Action Project.

A new Program Review Committee will be formed for the 2003 – 2004 academic year. The committee will include carry-over members to ensure for continuity from the prior year and new members focused on the six programs that are up-coming for review. This committee will work on obtaining reports for those programs. The committee will also assess the value of the measures for which data was gathered in the prior year and identify those data elements that had little value or for which the data was not accurate. Based on the first full year's experience with the program review process, decisions will be made on what to analyze for the up-coming year. The committee will also be requesting a progress update from the eight programs reviewed in 2002 – 2003. The cycling of program reviews has been set up so that a program goes no longer than five years before it is up for a thorough second review.

Review (11-11-03):

Again, it looks like progress is being made; however, because of the lack of information describing how the institution involved people in the action project, there is also a lack of information in describing the planned next steps. Which members will be carried over? Will all of them be carried over? What six programs are going to be reviewed? More detail would be very helpful.

D. Describe any "effective practice(s)" that resulted from your work on this Action Project.

With only the initial review of programs having been completed, the College has no "effective practice" to share with the broader higher education community. However, the College does invite institutions that have not yet established a process for program review to contact Glen Oaks or to review materials, sent at an earlier date to AQIP, that describe the establishing of this process for our institution. Furthermore, for the College, the initial review has yielded effective practices. For example, during data collection, several sources were found to be lacking in the degree of accuracy needed for use reliability. These areas were the identification of student major and the distribution of faculty salaries over several cost centers for faculty teaching in multiple disciplines. These discoveries have triggered corrective measures in student services and in the business office to ensure the integrity of data for future reviews. Moreover, based on problems identified relating to performance of the registered nurse level graduates on the national licensing examinations, the Nursing Department took corrective actions with respect to their nursing policies. Finally, in the summative reviews of the programs, the review committee found the five original options listed in "Committee Recommendations" (highest commendation, continue with minor improvements, modify significantly, discontinue, and schedule for further review in the coming year) to be too delimiting. The committee instead opted for a narrative approach to the "Committee Recommendations" section, noting, for each individual program, strengths and areas for improvement in addition to recommending actions that will result in improvement. This change has provided

more robust and useful information in the realm of continuous quality improvement.

Review (11-11-03):

Though effective practices have yet to be identified, the information provided concerning the internal effective practices shows progress on the Action Project.

E. What challenges, if any, are you still facing in regards to this Action Project?

Accuracy of data has at times posed a challenge. The staffing of the College is a limitation on the degree to which data can be collected, reviewed for accuracy, and corrected when found to be inaccurate. This has been exacerbated during the 2002 – 2003 year by increasing financial constraints caused mainly by state funding issues. Due to the struggling economy of the State of Michigan, the College has had its state funding cut by 10% for the 2004 fiscal year. At this time, the corrections to the data bases used in the program review are being made, but there is a concern for the College's ability to continue this is in the future.

Review (11-11-03):

Though the above information lists challenges, the details have been omitted. What is the staffing of the College that causes a limitation? Are there individuals who are seeking resolution to the challenges? Is the financial constraint caused by the state funding issue going to be a challenge in 2005 fiscal year? More detail is needed.

F. If you would like to discuss the possibility of AQIP providing you help to stimulate progress on this action project, explain your need(s) here and tell us who to contact and when?

Review (11-11-03):