Montgomery College

Program Review Feedback

2015-2016

Clevette Ridguard
8-3-2106

Focus Group for Improving the Academic Program Process: 2015-2016

Throughout the year, we solicited input as to the ideal program review process for the College. Meetings were held with several constituency groups: vice presidents and provost, deans, and chairs. General comments from those meetings are below.

Meeting with VPPs: Ackerman, Stewart, Payne, Latimer, Preston, Jones, and Ridguard (Wed. 7/22/15)

- When addressing discussions and decisions about low producing programs, some questions to consider would be:
  - Review of data regarding completion and transfer
  - Would students be well served by getting a gen studies degree? Could related academic areas be packaged into a more global offering? Example: Dance degree into Performance Art Degree
  - Do students need the degree to succeed? What is the need goal/interest in keeping the degree?
  - What standard criteria/questions can be established to address all low producing programs?
- Student input into the process (Survey current and past students)
  - What is/was your experience in the program?
  - Rate or rank the program in terms of meeting your educational goals.
  - Consider [faculty] giving 5 extra points for students taking "in-class" survey
- Continue to include Career Coach Data in the review
  - Ask more pointed questions related to industry jobs and preparation.
    o Does your program lead to stackable/imbedded credentials?
    o Are we meeting accepted statewide implementation for credentials?
    o Are there any barriers to getting credentials?
- Alignment
  - Better explanation and understanding about the College processes and how they align and are integrated; CAR, OA, MC 2020 Initiatives, 16-20 FYE, 17-20 FYE initiatives, etc.
  - CAR ask about the alignments, but more is needed
- Advising
  - What courses are you doing advising for your majors (degrees and certificates)?
- Teaching Interventions and Methodologies
  - Capture new things faculty are doing to engage students
  - Faculty PD and Credentials
  - Using data from the DFW report, ask questions about instructional strategies, etc. for student improvement
  - Consider questions related to greater examination of demographic and course delivery data (f2f, online, etc.)
- Consider specific questions for our Top Twenty Enrolled Courses, related to:
  - Programs with gateway courses
  - Completion rates, etc.
- Lead Person or Responsible Person

- Identify a name of person (specific) and not just faculty or chair
- Consider Perkins Data for use in the CAR process

Meeting with Chairs: Eric Benjamin, Andrea Foster, Nawal Benmouna, Cassandra Jones, and Clevette Ridguard (Wed, 7/29/15)

- Clarity is needed about the role of program assessment and program review. The chairs would like more information and explanation about the processes and plan to invite us to one of their meetings on each campus.
- Some programs have used program review (CAR) to move the program forward, set the agenda for the program, and accomplish "said" goals and objectives. Example: Engineering
- Concerning data:
    - DFW reports are very helpful to pin point or target students needing additional support.
    - Data regarding those students who have completed developmental courses, MATH, ENG or RD would be useful.
- Additional discussion about specific student learning outcomes questions.

Meeting with the Deans: Darrin Campen, Jim Sniezek, Sharon Fechter, Kathy Michaelian, Cassandra Jones and Clevette Ridguard (Thurs, 8/6/15)

- In favor of more External Peer Reviewers. Helpful
- More details about benchmarking and curriculum. Stronger focus on these items
- Continue status updates annually
- Ensure that deans and faculty are informed about recommendations results earlier in the process and have the opportunity to discuss with senior leadership.
- Look at ways to get student input
- Would be good to know student's intentions at MC to help with advising
- Review data in different ways
    - Look at data in program gateway courses
    - Demographic data
- Review getting input from students and asking question(s) in new Course Evaluation
- Review Academic Advising so students are encouraged to complete program
- Question-At what point is a program terminated?
- Consider starting program review process in May
- Need more career information
- Streamline from Sanjay's requests

Spring Semester 2016: Cassandra and Clevette traveled to Chairs' Meeting on each campus

- Met with Rockville Chairs: 11/19/15 3:00
- Met with TK/SS Chairs: 4/20/16 3:00
- Met with Germantown Chairs: 4/26/16 3:00

Two Questions were asked of the chairs:

1) In creating a review process for a program or disciplines, what questions would you include in the review?
2) What are some specific questions that you have about your students or program/discipline that would help with program/discipline planning?

Replies and Comments:

- Consider asking about indirect assessment measures
- Consider extending time that faculty have to conduct program review
- Comment: Current process (FY16) was very comprehensive
- Consider asking how do the activities in your discipline align with the strategic plan and themes
- Consider defining how resources are aligned with program goals.
- Need to know: Developmental-professional development geared toward improving retention and completion in READ & English core courses
- Data question to consider:
    - What is the combined percentage of graduation and transfer rates in your area?
    - Disaggregate data for A-C+D-W by US born abroad to identify areas of training for faculty-instruction for ESL students or inclusive curriculum

Math Department Spring Discipline Meeting (5/17/16)

Cassandra Jones attended this meeting. Here is a re-cap of their comments.

QUESTION 1: In creating a review process for a program or discipline, what questions would you include in that review?

Data Questions
- Initial enrollment   - Faculty workload (appropriate ESH)   - Development ESH   - How many students   - Success rate of students exit from the classes   - How many students transfer successfully?   - Success rates after transfer   - Matriculation of students (how well did they meet objectives)   % adjunct vs full time faculty (data)

Preparedness/Placement
- Do they know how to be successful?   - How effective is the Math discipline in preparing students for courses in the other disciplines we serve/support?   - How well do our courses prepare students for courses in other fields or on their jobs?   - Do remedial courses prepare students for college level courses?   - Do service courses provide what is needed by other departments?   - How well does the program meet the needs of other majors (educ., engin,…) careers?   - How successful are students at transitioning from developmental to above cohort (career/other major, STEM)   - Is our program adequately preparing students for STEM majors?   - How well students do in successive classes   - How well do courses prepare students for courses in other disciplines   - Is class X actually preparing students for class Y? (where Y>X)   - Proper placement   - Bottleneck courses….   - Faculty Review of course material – meeting objectives for MC/transfer   - Faculty review of student preparedness   - Faculty review of student willingness to accept rigors of the course   - Student review of course material – How helpful/useful   - Student review of preparedness – felt comfortable with material

Prerequisite concerns
- How do prerequisite courses prepare students for the course requiring the prerequisite?   - Appropriate placement of students   - Appropriate prerequisites

Resources/Support
- Access to resources – tutoring, textbook   - Where do they [students] need help?   - Do they[students] know what they are going to take in next class   - What opportunities are there for interested/capable students to draw students in?   - How many opportunities are there for best students?   - Access to additional resources   - How much do students retain from course to course   - Facilities – How well did space/technology support academic goals
Standards
- Does your discipline have a standard (teaching practice assessment) for each course?   - National standards (MAA, ….) what should be measure of success for student? (pass dev? Pass CCM? Higher analytical skills? balance checkbook?) Pedagogy in line with current thoughts?
Developmental Math
- In developmental – are we helping build skills/techniques that will help students succeed in credit courses   - Do the developmental courses (80, 93, 96) affect study habits?
Teaching
- Delivery method for classes   - Are all sections of each course taught with the same rigor and standards?   - Relevance to current trends   - To review the strengths/weaknesses of the incoming MCPS students in Math   - Review of existing techniques (or implement new ones) for effectiveness   - How relevant is the material covered to current trends and research in the field?
Other
- Student Student's perception of mathematics as a subject (do they know what mathematics really is)   - What plans are there to broaden the selection of statistics courses offered   - What disciplines do terminal courses such as 110 and 115 support?   - Will offering new courses in statistics help the discipline?

QUESTION 2: What data or information would help you to evaluate the effectiveness of your discipline or program?

Student Tracking
- Long term tracking of students, into their 4-yr school   - Follow up of how students do in follow up math classes/majors

- Student progress from one math course to another and their success in courses taken in other disciplines (after completing math pre-req)
- How well do students do in sequel courses (e.g. of those students who pass Math 165 how many pass Math 181?
- Success in next class/prepared for next class (student and faculty)
- Success rates after transfer
- Success rates in subsequent courses
- Student successes rate in subsequent courses
- Success in subsequent STEM courses and transfer

- # of math majors
- # of math majors we have
- # of incoming students who graduated through the existing programs
- Enrollment data per course
- Waitlist counts

Grades
- Pass rates/DFW rates
- Final course grades
- Grade in subsequence course
- Pass rates in course
- How students who earned A, B, C in course that is a prerequisite do in the subsequent course
- What are students' grades in higher-level courses at T.I. (Transfer Institutions)?
- What are the grades of other students in the same courses?

Other
- Entrance exam and exit exam (for each course) where are students at beginning
- Do faculty members like program?
- Do students like program?
- What are their[students] plans – teachers, statistics, PhD in math
- A description of the topics/applications the other STEM would like the math departments to do a better job of covering; relevant real-world applications
- Is placement test doing a good job of placing students in the right math course?
- Data about student transferring skills to other disciplines
- Successful transfer (are they prepared when they transfer?)
- Success rates for transfer
- National standards/benchmarks
- Data of graduating students of past several years
- How students do at transfer institutions
- More specific data about continuously evaluating students over multiple semesters
- Comparison across disciplines
- Are a <u>variety</u> of assessment vehicles being used?
- National benchmarks
- Grades through successive classes
- Do grades in prerequisite classes predict grades in current class?
- Success after transfer

OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Any math course or math courses that require repeat registrations by student to be successful?
- Student feedback
- Comparing our school programs with other programs of similar schools
- Students' awareness of additional supporting resources – in person and online
- Students' awareness of policies/subsequent courses
- Interventions for course repeaters

Montgomery College Academic Program Review Faculty Feedback-Spring 2016

This survey was conducted at the end of spring semester 2016. There was a 20% response rate to the survey. Fifty faculty involved in the review process were invited to provide feedback to survey questions. Here is a summary of the responses.

1. <u>The process timelines were sufficient to complete the process?</u>

    The majority of the responses were yes to this question (54%).

2. <u>The data received was presented in an easy to understand format and sufficient to review the program?</u>

    The majority of the responses were no to this question (54%).

3. <u>The orientation was adequate and provided sufficient information to complete process requirements.</u>

    The majority of the responses were yes to this question (54%).

4. <u>What are the top three things that you learned about your program during the academic program review process?</u>

We have poor communication across campuses - few are willing to participate
The program gives students too many choices and not enough guidance.
more consistent messaging about the program needed; students had really created an identity around the program; more support needed for advising
1- The program has grown from a non-credit to a credit program 2 - The intake and retention numbers have seen a tremendous uptick 3 - The program has to reinvent and provide a pathway for further growth in terms of career
How much information that was required and that most of the information required was difficult to obtain. How MC staff don't respond to their email and voice mail.
Need to revise outcomes and course descriptions.
The name of the degree is confusing to outsiders. We need to offer additional business/communication courses to augment the degree. The certificates need more content.
Reinforced knowledge about time to completion. Confirmed student satisfaction with program. Perspective on structure of program leadership
Need to revamp and review our discipline

> **1) The instructions on how to execute the review were not very clear. 2) One must seek clarification even when one is fairly sure that the process makes sense 3) Our program is very complex compared to others, yet it is nicely organized.**

5. <u>This program review assisted you in program planning to help students achieve their educational goals?</u>

63% strongly agreed or agreed with this statement. Four respondents provided comments:
• **We have so few students in our program that this kind of review is difficult to assess.**
• **The process enabled us to see the potential for growth of the program**
• **We have several action steps for advising which we will implement.**
• **I think it was a matter of putting together things we already knew.**

6. <u>What part of the review was the most useful? (8 responses)</u>

Five respondents said the external peer reviewer. Other responses were creating a mission statement, planning for the future and nothing.

7. <u>What part of the review was the least useful? (8 responses)</u>

The part where you say what teaching methods are being used in the courses was not reasonable - there are many, many classes our students can choose from and most have many sections which do different things - how can we know? (And, by the way, I trust those teachers to use the most appropriate methods for their field - I can't tell them that one teaching method is better than others.)
The data we had about the program (such as enrollment trends) was simply insufficient to create any meaningful conclusions, and yet we were pressed to analyze the data. I'd recommend giving workgroups the opportunity to develop a better data plan going forward if they find the data they currently have is insufficient.
All parts were equally useful
comparing to other colleges
Having data provided as PDF - not an easy format to manipulate.
repetitive paperwork
none
I cannot say anything was "least" useful.

8. <u>What changes would you make to the review process? (9 responses)</u>

Perhaps assign an out-of-discipline coordinator (Dean's Administrative Assistant?) to facilitate communication and deadlines.
It took too long, was too much work. We could have learned most of this by sitting down with a few students and the instructors that are most involved in the program.
For small disciplines, a huge amount of work falls on the lap of just a couple people, and the different assessments aren't aligned to support each other. More consolidation and alignment of different assessment processes would help all of those processes receive more attention and be more meaningful.
Making sure that other members of the faculty fully participate in the process
More advance planning, having the reports required sent with the documentation that must be completed. Having a FAQ section to refer to
Provide data in Excel worksheets rather than PDF - easier for us to data-mine without having to re-type large amounts of numbers.
Provide a template for external reviewers to use in submitting their reports.
none
More time, clearer instructions.

9. <u>Provide any additional comments. (3 responses)</u>

Overall, this was my first time participating in the process. I think it was a useful process and overall it was eye opening.
It would be useful to be able to seek other data points during the process but time just is not available. If we could perhaps request this data ahead of the review year maybe that would be
I do not have any further comments

<u>Library Survey Feedback for Administrative Program Review Summer 2016</u>

(Three out of the nine participants responded to the survey. See comments below)

Q1: How useful was the review process for your unit? How did the unit review inform your decision-making or future plans for your unit?

- This process gave us the opportunity to reflect together on our strengths and weaknesses, as well as the opportunities and challenges that impact our work. It was also helpful to benchmark against outside organizations.

- I think it was a useful way to frame some of the more important activities we have planned in a way that was digestible outside of the Libraries. The Libraries has a fairly robust strategic planning process in place, but, the CAR asked us to respond in ways that we don't normally do in our Libraries Master Plan -- especially as regards recommendations and budget.

- Very useful. SWOT analysis, benchmarking and recommendations were incorporated into master planning efforts.

Q2: How did the timelines, process guidelines, and support for completing the process meet with your expectation?

- The timeline felt short, but we were able to complete the process. We received a good level of support, especially with developing an activity to elicit feedback from the entire unit.
- I was relatively new to Montgomery College and so had very few expectations about the process. The support we received from the CAR office was always timely. It seemed as though there weren't hard-and-fast answers to some of our questions, perhaps because the process had so recently been revised, but maybe too because it's designed to be tailored somewhat to the unit performing the review.
- It met expectations

Q3: Were the questions and topics addressed in the review sufficient for a comprehensive self-evaluation of your unit? Please comment on any questions that you would add, delete, or revise.

- N/A

- My tendency would have been to provide more information than we were able to within confines of the CAR document. For a unit as large as the Libraries, focusing on so few areas under Part Two: Effectiveness of Service, probably doesn't give as holistic a view of our work as would be needed in a comprehensive self- evaluation. However, as a distillation of what we find most important to report out, I think it was certainly a good exercise, especially as it required us to prioritize recommendations and hone our message.

- The review was very good for surfacing some key issues and priorities and was very valuable. No recommended changes.

Q4: What suggestions (general or specific) do you have for improving the review process?

- N/A

- Would consider suggesting external peer review of our programs and services for our next review.

Q5: Please provide any additional comments.

- Thank you for doing this. It has been helpful to the organization.

- N/A
- The CAR writing process, at least the way we accomplished it in the Libraries, was a lengthy, deliberative project. I'd be curious to know what sort of time expectations other units have for the staff that are writing the report, if other units have front-line staff do the work or if it's primarily completed by the unit administrator, and to   know more about what expectations are for the periodic (annual?) reviews of progress. It seems like we completed the CAR draft, it was eventually approved, but then I don't know what comes next.