



Program Review Manual 2009-2010

<http://www.oakton.edu/resource/oir/progreview.pdf>

Office of Research

Phone: (847) 635-1894

Fax: (847) 635-1997

Home page: <http://www.oakton.edu/resource/oir>

E-mail: Trudy Bers tbers@oakton.edu

Maya Evans mevans@oakton.edu

Jim Holderfield jholderf@oakton.edu

Contents

Introduction and Overview	1
Principles of Program Review at Oakton	2
Programs/Units Scheduled for Review —2009-10	4
Program Review Process and Timetable	5
The Program Review Document ⇄	8
Note: this is the key section for those writing reviews	
Technical and Stylistic Issues	13
Dos and Don'ts of New Approach	14
Institutional Program Review Committee	16
Appendix A - Development of Program Review at Oakton	18
Appendix B - Institutional Program Review Committee: History and Past Members	22
Appendix C - General Education Objectives	24
Appendix D – Higher Learning Commission Criteria for Accreditation	25
Appendix E - Program Review Schedule – 2009-10 through 2014-15	26
Appendix F – Oakton Strategic Goals and Objectives – 2008-2012	28
Appendix G – Sample Feedback Memos	30

Introduction and Overview

For more than 15 years the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) has required each public community college and university in the state to conduct, on a five-year cycle, a review of every instructional, academic support and student services program at the institution. While the IBHE stipulates that we consider the need, cost and quality of programs, each institution can define a “program” and process for conducting the review. In 2006, the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) revised its program review process, permitting institutions more latitude in how to conduct reviews. These changes affect state reporting, but do not impact the way in which program reviews are conducted at Oakton.

Since 1993-94, the program¹- review process was extended to all segments of Oakton, instructional and non-instructional alike. The rationale for extending program review, as well as other principles and rationales that are the basis for Oakton’s program reviews, are presented in the section of this document entitled Principles of Program Review at Oakton. Over time, and particularly since 2007, the Institutional Program Review Committee has sought a more intentional look at the future of a program than had been the case in the past. As often happens in a process such as this one, each year the Committee identifies new topics it would like programs to consider as they write their report.

Though not intentional, we have come to a point where the figurative and literal weight of program reviews have exceeded their value. They take a disproportionate amount of time to prepare, and a disproportionate amount of time for the Institutional Program Review Committee to read and respond to them. Program review remains important, both as a prompt for all departments to take a reflective look at themselves and to think carefully about their futures, and to meet state program review requirements.

Beginning in 2009-2010, Oakton is dramatically redesigning the program review reports, putting emphasis on brief analyses of programs and thoughtful plans for the future. Long narratives describing the program, numerous exhibits, and presentation of materials readily available elsewhere (e.g., course descriptions and screen images of websites) will be memories of the past. **Instead, program reviews will focus on the core work of a department with an emphasis on evidence demonstrating quality and the identification of 3-4 activities, projects or strategies the department itself will undertake to address identified challenges and to sustain and improve quality into the future. We expect that reports will be a maximum of 10 pages. This page limitation will require departments to condense their comments and focus on key data and information.**

Oakton’s program reviews are prepared according to this Program Review Manual, which has been significantly revised to reflect the new program review expectations. As in the past, full program review reports prepared by each department must remain on file at the College; summaries are prepared for submission to the Illinois Community College Board and Illinois Board of Higher Education in accordance with the ICCB Accountability/Program Review Report, which is due to ICCB on August 1 of each year.

All program reviews must include these five parts. There is more information in pp. 8-12, The Program Review Document.

- Part I: Introduction
- Part II: Need
- Part III: Finances (cost/revenue)
- Part IV: Quality
- Part V: Learning, Recommendations and a Guide for the Future

¹ The term “program” is used in the Manual as a general term that includes program, department, service or administrative unit.

Principles of Program Review at Oakton

*These principles were formulated in 1993-94. They continue to serve as important guidelines for program review at Oakton. Over time, and particularly in the few years, the Institutional Program Review Committee has sought a more intentional look at the future of a program than had been the case in the past. In 2009-10 a new statement was added to principle two to note the role of the Program Review Committee in identifying programs that may potentially be at risk, and a new principle was added, directing attention to a program review focus on core elements of a program and its work. **Program reviews are best viewed brief checks on the current state of a program and, more important, as guides for the future.***

1. **The primary reason for conducting program reviews is to ensure the continuation of high quality in all Oakton programs and services and to provide a range of offerings that is appropriate to the College's mission and the community we serve.**

Rationale: we are proud of the high quality of programs and services at Oakton, and wish to maintain that high quality. We want to be sure to continue what works, to refine programs and services as appropriate, and to discontinue programs and services that are no longer needed or supportable.

2. **It is important to establish a safe climate for inquiry as we do program reviews.**

Rationale: to examine the quality of programs and services, participants need to experience a sense of safety and confidentiality. Among the elements of a safe climate are a) closed meetings to allow for full and candid discussions; b) recognition that some issues discussed in these sessions may not need to be included in written reports; c) knowledge that information derived from questions on the Current Student Survey or Alumni Survey that pertain to a particular area do not have to be included in the summary CSS or Alumni Survey Reports. It is important to note, however, that should the Institutional Program Review Committee identify significant concerns about the program, the Committee will carry these forward with the program's knowledge.

3. **The process of reviewing programs and services is as important for the continuation of quality as any report or "product" resulting from program reviews.**

Rationale: what we can learn about ourselves and incorporate into our programs and services may be inappropriate or unnecessary to include in a report designed for a variety of constituencies unfamiliar with the details of our operations.

4. **All segments (instructional and non-instructional) at the College will be part of the program review process.**

Rationale: all departments and units in the College contribute to the teaching and learning environment. Their effectiveness is based both on functioning internal to the department/unit and advancing the central educational purposes of the institution.

5. **There needs to be broad involvement of faculty and staff in program reviews at the departmental or unit level of each program being reviewed.**

Rationale: for program reviews to provide useful information and to increase the value of the process itself, all people at the department or unit level should be invited to participate.

6. **Effective program reviews need to incorporate feedback to participants and the opportunity for them to respond.**

Rationale: feedback and response opportunities provide affirmation of the contribution of program review participants and foster further discussions about program/service improvement.

7. **The program review process and reports should complement and support other self-studies and reports required by external agencies, including the North Central Association, specialized accrediting agencies, the Illinois Community College Board, and the Illinois Board of Higher Education.**

Rationale: numerous independent, state and federal agencies require self-studies and reports of various types. Having a program review process and reports that complement and support these will reduce unnecessary duplication of effort and ease the overall burden of complying with reporting requirements.

8. **An Institutional Program Review Committee will strive to bring institution-level perspective to assessing programs and services.**

Rationale: for administrators, faculty and staff to hear observations and concerns about their programs from others within the College can provide important insights and ideas for improvement as well as recognition of strengths. An institution-level perspective in making recommendations about programs and services brings the review process back full circle to realizing the first principle noted above: the primary reason for conducting program reviews is to ensure we continue to provide high quality in all Oakton programs and services and to provide a range of offerings that is appropriate to the College's mission and the community we serve.

Committee members are a primary audience to whom reviews should be directed. They represent a "lay" audience who may not be familiar with the specifics of a program and who wish to learn about the program. Committee members meet with individuals responsible for program reviews to provide feedback from the committee. This feedback is intended to improve the quality of the reviews.

9. **Program reviews focus on the core elements of a program, its current state and recommendations for the future [principle added in 2009-10].**

Rationale: Over the years program review reports have become longer, until a tipping point was reached where there was widespread recognition that the burden and weight of preparing them outweighed their value. Program reviews remain important, primarily as a prompt for programs to take a reflective look at themselves and to think carefully about their futures. Consequently the report expectations have been revised to permit reducing narratives to a maximum of 10 pages, to focus on evidence demonstrating quality, and to identify 3-4 activities, projects or strategies the department itself will undertake to address identified challenges and to sustain and improve quality into the future.

Programs/Units Scheduled for Review – 2009-10

Instructional Programs

Art
Basic Nurse Assistant
Engineering
Global Business
Humanities / Philosophy
Marketing
Men's Program
Modern Languages
Music
Nursing
Performing Arts Center
Theater
Women's and Gender Studies

Academic Support Services

Koehline Museum

Student Services

Student Financial Assistance (brief report to align with new state calendar)

Other

Accounting Services
Budget and Finance
Human Resources

Program Review Process and Timetable

- Indicates signature of dean or immediate administrative supervisor is required; signature denotes individual has read the outline or report.

Date	Step in Process	Explanation
Spring term prior to program review year	Career program alumni surveys	Office of Research conducts alumni follow-up studies for career programs to be reviewed in the subsequent year in collaboration with each program.
September 9, 2009	Informational meeting	Group meeting with members of IPR Committee; chairpersons, administrators or staff whose programs will be doing reviews; and immediate supervisors of chairpersons, administrators or staff to go over the Program Review Manual (orange book) and respond to general questions. <u>Meeting will be September 9, 2009, 3:00 p.m.; Board Room</u>
	Optional meetings with individual programs	Director of Research, member of IPR Committee, chair/administrator meet with faculty or other staff members in program to have a conversation about the program review process and the key questions that need to be addressed, and to identify other pertinent questions that relate specifically to the given program. Sample topics to explore: why is information important? What uses will information have? The program may wish to invite outside experts to assist in their program reviews.
September-October	Process begins at program level – outline prepared	Chair/administrator and others in department/unit identify questions and data to be examined in program review, in addition to criteria required by the state (need for the program, finances (cost/revenue), quality, and future plans). Process for doing program review also to be determined.
October 15 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Outline due – electronic copy required	An annotated outline of subjects, questions and data the department/unit will examine in its program review, as well as a description of the process to be used, is submitted to the IPR Committee. The outline, which constitutes a "plan" for the program review, should include a brief description of what the program intends to address / include in each part of the review and the data the program expects to use. The outline must follow the program review document parts outlined in the Manual.

Date	Step in Process	Explanation
October 15 – October 30	IPRC reads/comments on outlines	IPR Committee reads outlines for clarity, logic and completeness, and suggests from the institutional perspective other areas a given department/unit may wish to or should consider in its program review. IPRC sends written feedback on outline to program. Also, member of IPRC meets with chair/administrator and supervisor to elaborate on feedback. <u>Committee meets Friday, October 30, 2009; 12:30-4:00; Board Room</u>
October, 2009 – March, 2010	Program conducts visits to peer institutions.	
November, 2009 – February 14, 2010	Program implements review and prepares draft report	Participants in the program review at the program level discuss and prepare draft report. Chair requests supplementary data and research from Office of Research if desired. Visits to peer institutions take place.
February 15 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Draft report due – electronic copy required	Program Review draft reports are submitted to Institutional Program Review Committee. A cover memo drawing attention to revisions or specific responses to IPRC comments about the outline should accompany the draft report. It is strongly suggested the draft be submitted to the supervising administrator by January 31 for his/her comments.
February 15– March 4	IPRC reads/comments on draft reports	IPR Committee reads and offers comments and suggestions on draft. IPRC sends written feedback on draft report to program. Also, member of IPRC meets with chair/administrator and supervisor to elaborate on feedback. <u>Committee meets Friday, March 5, 2010; 12:30-4:00; Board Room.</u>
March 8 – April 14	Revise draft report	Program review participants at the program level revise report, taking into consideration feedback from IPR Committee.
April 15 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Final report due- electronic copy required	Program Review final reports are submitted to IPR Committee. A cover memo drawing attention to revisions or specific responses to IPRC comments about the draft report should accompany the final report. It is strongly suggested the final report be submitted to the supervising administrator by April 1 for his/her comments.

Date	Step in Process	Explanation
April 15 – April 24	IPRC reads, comments on final reports	IPR Committee reads final program review, determines whether to accept or seek further revisions of report, discusses process and recommends changes for next year. <u>Committee meets April 30, 2010; 12:30-4:00; Board Room</u>
May 5		Office of Research, on behalf of IPRC, sends summary of final program review process to President's Council, Faculty Senate, and Classified Staff Association. Council also receives Part V: Learning and Recommendations, from each report. R & D Committee will also receive relevant information Complete reports are available to President's Council and others, upon request.
May - June	Vice President, Administrator, Chair/Manager meetings	Vice President meets with appropriate deans, chairs and managers to discuss learning and recommendations of program review.
July	Summary reports submitted to Illinois Community College Board	Reports required by ICCB are sent to that agency.

The Program Review Document

Note: Revised for 2009-2010

Contents and Sections of the Report

The program review document should contain a cover and the five parts described below. The report, not counting the cover, should be a maximum of pages.

Cover: Name of Program
 Chairperson or administrator/manager
 Names of those participating in the program review process

Part I: Introduction

The purpose of the introduction is to describe the program to individuals, such as members of the Institutional Program Review Committee, who are unfamiliar with the program. The introduction also serves to describe the process used to conduct the review and the internal and external context within which the program operates.

- What does the program do? Use just a sentence or two.
- What process was used in doing the program review? Use just a sentence or two. Oakton encourages broad-based participation in the program review process, including involvement of full-time and part-time faculty, staff, administrators, advisory committees, professional organization representatives, and others. Clearly each program will have its own set of individuals who might participate in the program review process.
- What did the Learning and Recommendations section in the department's last program review contain, and to what extent have the recommendations been implemented? Be brief, and focus only on significant recommendations.
- What major changes over the past several years, both external and internal to the College, have affected the program? Include only if there have been significant changes that have substantially affected the program.

Examples of external changes include:

Changes in the labor market
Changes in or new licensure or accreditation requirements
Receptivity of transfer institutions
Pool of students and potential students

Illinois Articulation Initiative impact on department

Examples of internal changes include:

- Enrollment changes
- Changes, additions and deletions of curricula and courses
- Technology as it impacts teaching and learning, and course delivery
- Changes in faculty/staff
- Facilities

If the department has a web site, be sure to provide the URL address. Please do not duplicate in the report materials that are available on the web site—just let us know they are on the site. The department's web site is a source for Program Review committee members to obtain information about the department.

Part II: Need

Why is this program needed at Oakton? In most cases the need for the program will be self-evident: we must have a variety of support offices to take care of College business and support students, and many of our instructional programs, especially general education, are core to a college. Instructional programs often use evidence such as enrollments and labor market need. Service programs often use evidence such as number of participants, users, clients, customers.

Part III: Finance (Cost/Revenue)

What are the costs of the program and, if available, what are the revenues? Do costs seem appropriate given the program size and in comparison with other similar Oakton programs (if comparative data are available)? The Office of Research will provide revenue/cost data for instructional programs. Other programs should use their budgets. This section may also include comments related to technology innovations or other actions that improve efficiency or economy, as well as information about cost containment efforts. Revenues from external grants or donations may also be discussed in this section or in Part III: Quality, whichever seems most appropriate for the program. The Cost section should not take more than a single page, and perhaps less.

Part IV: Quality

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief narrative and indicators of quality for the program. The program should present a "pattern of evidence" regarding quality. Reviews should address any of the following items that provide a picture of the program's quality or have had a significant impact on quality over the review period:

- Degrees / certificates awarded (instructional programs)

- Satisfaction of students, participants, users, clients, customers
- Number and credentials of full and part-time faculty/staff and their achievements
- Quality of equipment and facilities
- Support from external agencies such as accrediting bodies or advisory committees
- Innovative activities or services
- Course and curriculum development
- Student academic and other student outcomes (assessment)
- Linkages with external organizations
- External grants or other awards
- Results of generic course syllabi review conducted by department to ensure syllabi are current and include learning objectives

Instructional programs offering online courses should be sure to provide information about them, including evidence of student learning and success.

Multiple measures of quality should be used. These may be quantitative, qualitative, and/or a combination. There are no uniform criteria or formulas or indicators of quality that are applicable to all programs. Assertions of quality need to be supported with documented evidence such as survey results, lists of faculty presentations/publications, etc., but these should not be included in the program review report.

Here are some examples of how, and how not to, write statements.

Example 1: Internship program

Bad Example: Students are doing well in the internship program.

Bad Example: See Exhibit 1 for a list of all internships held by students along with detailed results and analysis of the survey administered to the internship coordinators at the local sites.

Good Example:

The department conducted a survey of site coordinators in collaboration with Oakton's internship specialist. Survey results showed that the site coordinators were very pleased with the quality Oakton's students. The average ranking was 4.6 out of 5, and the comments were very positive. One item of constructive feedback was that students could have learned more about writing memos in their coursework at the college. This was good input and our introductory course will be modified accordingly.

Example 2: Enrollment

Bad Example: Enrollment is strong.

Bad Example: Enrollment is high in introductory courses and falls off a bit in subsequent courses.

Good Example: Course enrollments have increased from 579 enrollments in 2004-05 to 701 enrollments in 2008-09, a 21% increase. An analysis of the percentage of seats occupied in each section revealed that, on average, 34% of seats in the introductory course were used. The department will reduce the number of introductory sections scheduled by two per semester; capacity in remaining sections and the online class should provide adequate enrollment opportunities for students. In advanced classes, an average of 42% of seats were occupied. Ordinarily only one section of each advanced course is scheduled per semester; we will look at the schedule to determine whether we might schedule some advanced courses once per year rather than once per semester.

Example 3: Student use of a service

Bad Example: Too few students in developmental courses use the Learning Center.

Bad Example: Several initiatives with developmental courses led to increased student participation

Good Example: While approximately one-third of Oakton's students use the Learning Center, fewer than 10% of students in developmental courses seek academic assistance. To encourage participation of these students in tutoring, tutors were assigned to specific sections of a developmental course in which they offered mini-lessons and urged students to see them in the Learning Center. Nearly 50% of students in these developmental math sections and 34% of students in developmental English sections worked at least once with the tutor assigned to their course.

The quality section should also contain brief observations and ideas gained from required visits with two peer institutions in 2009-10. Ordinarily visits will take place at two of the following institutions, with the selection made by the department and administrative supervisor. If an institution not on this list has a particularly well regarded program in the area being reviewed, a visit to this institution may be done with approval of the administrative supervisor.

Peer institutions ordinarily include: College of DuPage, College of Lake County, Elgin Community College, Moraine Valley Community College, Parkland College, William Rainey Harper College

Finally, the quality section should include a brief discussion of how the department is supporting *Change Matters*, Oakton's strategic plan for 2008-2012, especially as department initiatives relate directly to a specific strategic goal or objective. Departments may not have specific activities tied to an identified goal or objective; if this is the case, the department should note this.

In a program review of this nature, discussions of program weaknesses and challenges are also appropriate. Recognizing areas for improvement is as much a part of the program review process as identifying areas of strength.

Part V: Learning, Recommendations and a Guide for the Future

The purpose of this section is to describe what is planned as a result of what was learned during program review. Recommendations for specific actions to improve or sustain quality and to address weaknesses should be clearly stated and focus on what the program itself can do, not on what other departments at Oakton might do for the program. Below we present an example.

Example: Working with other departments

Bad Example: We believe this program has growth potential if it only had better cooperation with departments such as College Advancement and the Advising and Counseling Center.

Good Example: The department plans on working with College Advancement in mapping out some new marketing approaches for the program, and to provide the Advising and Counseling Center with a one-page summary of the department's curricula and opportunities for students in order to keep ACC staff apprised of program changes and strengths.

This is a crucial section of the program review, which provides a guide for the future. It will be a key part of the discussions that take place among chairs/coordinators, managers, deans and supervising administrators during the meetings that take place in May-June following the completion of the program review cycle.

Exhibits

Beginning in 2009-10 program review reports should not include exhibits. All relevant information must be contained within the body of the report.

Technical and Stylistic Issues

The following technical and stylistic issues should be addressed in the draft and final reports. While these may seem picayune, they can make a substantial difference in the clarity, readability and professionalism of the program review documents.

- Page numbers - Please number pages in your program review report.
- Please be sure to check spelling, update dates, review grammar, and proofread. Provide ample white space on pages. The Program Review Reports are distributed to a number of readers outside the Institutional Program Review Committee; they reflect on the department or unit and on the College itself.
- Please do not use acronyms without defining them first.
- When statistical or descriptive data about the College or the environment is used (e.g., labor market demand for certain jobs) please use current information. The Oakton library contains a great deal of information, and is an excellent starting place for an information or resource search.
- When using graphs, be sure they are readable, and that the graphs accurately portray data. For example, using 3-dimensional columns when there are only two dimensions of data often distorts the data and interferes with clarity.

Dos and Don'ts for New Approach 2009-10

Do

- Concentrate on core purpose of program
- Be brief; summarize key quantitative data demonstrating quality and what the findings indicate about program quality
- Include only the most critical information to the program. For example, in aligning to the strategic plan, the department should only list the most critical initiatives that relate to this plan rather than taking a whole page or two to go through each category of *Change Matters*.
- Use multiple measures, quantitative and qualitative
- Brief discussion, if germane to the department, of
 - Quality of equipment and facilities
 - Support from external agencies such as accrediting bodies or advisory committees
 - Innovative activities or services
 - Linkages with external organizations
 - External grants or other awards
- Cost/revenue (data for instructional programs provided by Office of Research; other programs use budget information)
- Briefly summarize what was learned from visits to peer institutions
- Briefly note how program supports specific Oakton strategic goals / objectives (if no specific ones are germane, state this)
- Briefly note what previous review's Learning and Recommendation section contained and the extent to which recommendations have been implemented; focus only on significant recommendations

- Instructional programs must include data about
 - Enrollments
 - Degrees / certificates awarded (if program awards them)
 - Results of alumni and/or current student surveys (note significant findings—do not include all results)
 - Number and credentials of full and part-time faculty/staff and their achievements (note significant findings-do not include detailed information)
 - Results of generic course syllabi review conducted by department to ensure syllabi are current and include learning objectives
 - Student learning outcomes assessment results and use of results (summary—do not include details)
 - Note on forthcoming faculty retirements and likely affect on program, if germane

Don't

- Include exhibits or appendices
- Include full reports on alumni surveys
- Include course/curriculum descriptions
- Provide more than a sentence or two description of the core purpose of the program
- Include job descriptions
- Include screen shots of web sites
- Include labor market information and data, except if a sentence or two summary is particularly significant for the program
- Include details on degrees/certificates awarded; just summarize what data suggests with respect to demand and utility of awards in the program
- Provide faculty / staff biographies or vitas

Institutional Program Review Committee

Role

The Institutional Program Review Committee brings an *institution-level* perspective to the program review process. The Committee provides to each department/unit observations and suggestions relating to such topics as questions and data that can or should be examined in the program review for that department/unit; questions and data that might be examined at the institutional level; and the logic, clarity and completeness of program reviews. In addition, the Institutional Program Review Committee may make recommendations and/or observations regarding a program or service to the department/unit; supervisor, or first-level administrator if the supervisor is not an administrator; or another administrator as appropriate. The Committee operates with candor, confidentiality and discretion, acting as a “constructive colleague” for those doing reviews and for the President’s Council.

The Committee may provide suggestions to the department, dean and or President’s Council should data and information in the report indicate the program may be at-risk. The Program Review Committee does not recommend actions regarding at-risk programs. This is the role of the vice president and President’s Council, as described in the Research and Development Committee report Approach to Identify and Address At-Risk Programs.

Membership

See Appendix B for more information on the Program Review Committee and past members.

Members of the
2009-10 Institutional Program Review Committee are:

Senate representative	Margaret Gas
Library	Rose Novil
Science & Health Careers	Laura Thelen
Mathematics & Technology	Paul Boisvert
Languages, Humanities & the Arts	Joo Lee
Social Science & Business	George Lungu
Academic Affairs	Nancy Prendergast
Student Affairs	Michele Brown
Continuing Education, Training, and Workforce Development	Donna Keene
Business & Finance/IT	Renee Kozimor
Classified Staff	Danielle Cargo, Admission & Enrollment Mgt; Maria Haske, Division III; Kathi Kuhlman, Business Services
President’s Office	[Trudy Bers]
Office of Research (ex officio)	Trudy Bers, Maya Evans, Jim Holderfield

Programs	Team
Art, Koehnline Museum, Engineering, Human Resources	Team 1 - Cargo, Evans, Novil, Thelen
BNA, Nursing, Budget & Finance, Accounting Services	Team 2 - Bers, Haske, Keene, Lungu
Global Business, Marketing, Men's Program, Women's & Gender Studies, Financial Assistance	Team 3 - Brown, Gas, Kuhlman, Lee
Humanities & Philosophy, Performing Arts, Music, Modern Languages, Theater	Team 4 - Boisvert, Holderfield, Kozimor, Prendergast

Appendix A

Development of Program Reviews at Oakton

This section describes the evolution of program reviews at Oakton with respect to both the process and expected contents of reports. Linkages between program reviews and the assessment of student learning outcomes and/or strategic objectives are described.

The format and process for department/program reviews was developed during the academic year 1987-88 by a faculty committee, and reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Members of the committee were Eugene Lockwood (Chair of committee and Chair of Department of Humanities/Philosophy), Cindy DeBerg (Chair of Medical Record Technology), Linda Korbel (Chair of Department of Foreign Languages), Spencer Bowers (Chair of Science Department), and Michael Matkovich (Co-chair of Department of Mathematics, Computer Science and Physics). Kerry Smith, Coordinator of Research and Planning, served as a special consultant to the committee.

In 1991-92 refinements in the format and process were made, based on recommendations of chairs who had completed program reviews, deans, and Kathy Thoma, Coordinator of Research and Planning, who compiled data for the reviews over the past two years. Suggested refinements were circulated among chairs and deans for comment and approval, and are incorporated in this document.

In 1992-93 Productivity was added as an element to be addressed in program reviews, the timetable was adjusted to permit adequate time for revision of documents prior to submission to ICCB, and data for each A.A.S. or certificate were added to comply with new ICCB Program Review Guidelines.

In 1993-94 the Program Review process and manual were refined yet again. Major changes include the formation of an institution-level program review committee to provide feedback to individual departments and to take a more global approach to program reviews; providing for wider participation in the process; and allowing for greater flexibility in selecting data and information to be used. The program review calendar was adjusted to accommodate each of these refinements. Members of the committee that proposed this refined process were Gene Atkin, Trudy Bers, Juele Blankenburg, Marilyn Clay, Diane Davis, Barbara Keeley, Jill Mawhinney, John Michaels, Barbara Rizzo and Jane Wilson. Cost Summary Keys to identify components of cost/revenue variables were developed in 1994-95 by a subcommittee comprising Gene Atkin, Mary DeNotto, Bill Rothwell, Cliff Stock and Urban Thobe.

Beginning with the 1996-97 program review cycle, all final program review reports have been sent to the vice president to whom an area reports or to the president, if the reporting

line is directly to her. In the past members of the President's Council were able to read reports if they wished, but did not actually receive them. The new approach was intended to give greater prominence to program reviews and to strengthen the extent to which they are used by top leadership in budgeting and decision-making.

In 2001-02 the President's Council asked that each program review include a paragraph describing what was learned through the program review process and reporting, and what the department plans to do as a result. Also, the configuration of the Institutional Program Review Committee was changed to reflect the creation of two new vice presidencies. Continuing Education, Training and Workforce Development has one administrator on the IPRC, and Business and Finance and Information Technology have one administrator from either area on the IPRC. The vice president for Continuing Education, Training and Workforce Development appoints the administrator from that area. The vice presidents for Business and Finance and for Information Technology decide jointly which area will have representation and appoint the committee member. The Academic Affairs area has one administrator, appointed by the vice president for Academic Affairs.

In summer 2002 a subcommittee of the IPRC revised the program review manual to simplify and clarify instructions. The basic components, expectations and process for program reviews are unchanged. Subcommittee members included Trudy Bers, Sandy Costanza, James Kostecki, Susan Maltese and Doreen Schwartz. The 2002-03 IPRC suggested small refinements in the process for 2003-04.

Program Review and the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

In 2008, Oakton joined the Higher Learning Commission's Assessment Academy and created a new position, Associate Dean for Student Learning, to provide leadership and support for assessing learning outcomes. An Oakton Program for the Assessment of Learning (OPAL) Steering Committee, composed of faculty and administrators, provides overall leadership and guidance for assessment. Two other groups, one focusing on general education and the other on career and technical education (CTE) programs, concentrate on assessing general education and CTE program learning outcomes respectively. Each group, known as OPAL-GE and OPAL-CTE, includes several members of the steering committee and additional faculty.

Beginning in 2008-09 Oakton launched a more intentional and vigorous initiative to ensure assessments of student learning take place in general education, at the program level in CTE curricula, and in high-enrollment, key courses in all disciplines.

Results of assessments are expected to be reported annually. Assessment results should be briefly summarized in Program Reviews as well.

Program Review and Strategic Planning

In March 2007, Oakton's Board of Trustees adopted strategic goals and objectives for the College for the period 2008-12. Program reviews are expected to include references to how

a department is addressing these goals and objectives, including results/outcomes that move the College toward achievement of the goals and objectives.

Program Review and Visits to Peer Institutions

Visits to peer institutions were incorporated in the program review process by the President's Council, beginning in 2005-06.

To foster a richer understanding of Oakton's programs and departments, and to obtain ideas from similar programs and departments, units doing program reviews are expected to visit similar departments/programs at two peer institutions and to include in program review reports a description of what was learned on these visits and ideas that might be useful for the department to consider. Beginning in 2006-07, these visits are a required part of the program review process.

Ordinarily visits will take place at two of the following institutions, with the selection made by the department and administrative supervisor. If an institution not on this list has a particularly well regarded program in the area being reviewed, a visit to this institution may be done with approval of the administrative supervisor.

Peer institutions ordinarily include:

- College of DuPage
- College of Lake County
- Elgin Community College
- Moraine Valley Community College
- Parkland College
- William Rainey Harper College

Shift in Focus to the Future

Over time, and particularly since 2004, the Institutional Program Review Committee has sought a more intentional look at the future of a program than had been the case in the past. **Program reviews are best viewed as both reflections on the past and guides to the future.** This approach is both in keeping with the Higher Learning Commission's orientation to emphasize a forward-looking approach to accreditation, and with Oakton's desire to strengthen the value of program review by having reports serve as guides for planning, budgeting, staffing and facilities.

Closing the Loop – Meetings with Chairs/Coordinators, Managers, Deans, Other Administrators and Administrative Supervisors

Beginning in 2006, the appropriate vice president meets with deans, chairs/coordinators, other administrators and managers to discuss the learning and recommendations of program review. This new process is intended to close the loop and ensure the administration has

ample opportunity to discuss the findings and implications of program reviews with the departments doing them. Meetings should occur in May-June following the completion of the year's program review cycle.

Refocusing Program Review – 2009-10

By 2009-10 it had become apparent that program reviews was imposing a substantial work burden on both departments doing the reviews and the Institutional Program Review Committee (IPRC). Each year more was expected in Reviews, and nothing was eliminated. Reports grew to 50 or more pages and it was frequently challenging to sift through pages of descriptive material to find data, information and analyses that honed in on the core work of a department. Consequently, the President asked the Executive Director of Research, Curriculum and Planning to work with a small group of individuals who had served on the IPRC and done reviews to revise the program review report outline and expectations. Their recommendations were subsequently reviewed by the Council of Chairs and Coordinators and administrators.

The 2009-10 Program Review Manual reflects changes made. In brief, program reviews will now

- Be limited to a maximum of 10 pages plus a cover page;
- Focus on the core work of the department;
- Provide evidence demonstrating strengths and challenges;
- Identify 3-4 activities, projects or strategies the department recommends it undertake to address identified challenges and to sustain and improve quality in the future.

Program review remains important; it commends departments to think reflectively about their work and how they can improve their programs and services. It asks participants to step back from day-to-day tasks and consider the program from a broader perspective, understanding how it fits within the overall mission and organization of the College. It demands that assertions of quality must be supported with evidence. It requires programs to think about what is really important in the work of the department.

Appendix B

Institutional Program Review Committee – History and Past Members

The Program Review Committee is constructed in compliance with a membership schematic and rotation system that ensures representation across divisions and units of the College. The total membership = 15-16, including ex officio members.

Category	Appointed by	Number
Faculty	Divisions, counselor/library, Faculty Senate	1-2 career program 2-3 transfer program 1 counselor or library faculty 1 Faculty Senate
Classified staff	Classified Staff Organization	3 (no more than 2 from Academic Affairs)
Student Affairs	Vice President for Student Affairs	1 administrator
Academic Affairs	Vice President for Academic Affairs	1 AA administrator
Continuing Education, Training and Workforce Development	Vice President for CE, T & WD	1 administrator
Business & Finance/Information Technology	Vice Presidents for Business & Finance and for Information Technology	1 administrator from either area
Presidents' Office	President	1 administrator (optional – decision of president)
Office of Research	Ex officio	Trudy Bers / Maya Evans/ Jim Holderfield

Faculty Rotation and Past Members

Year	Senate	Library or Counselor	Division 1 Science & Health Careers	Division 2 Mathematics, Physics & Technology	Division 3 Languages, Humanities and the Arts	Division 4 Social Science and Business
2000-01	Mike Milstein	Library (Susan Maltese)	Tom Brehman	Elaine MacAlister	Patti Interrante	Carl Bauer
2001-02	Jill Dybus	Susan Maltese	Sandra Kubala	Paul Boisvert	Patti Interrante	Carl Bauer
2002-03	Lynn Woodbury	Michelle James	Sandra Kubala	Paul Boisvert	Katherine Howard-Rogers	Jay Cohen
2003-04	Lynn Woodbury	Michelle James	Dave Rodgers	Hassan Sayeed	Tom Bowen	Jay Cohen
2004-05	Joan Warmbold	Sherrill Weaver	Dave Rodgers	Hassan Sayeed	Dan Detloff	Katherine Schuster
2005-06	Katherine Schuster	Sherrill Weaver	Carla Ferguson	Carole Shapero	Dan Detloff	Joan Warmbold
2006-07	Betsy Elsaesser	Jan Thompson-Wilda	Michael Carr	Pam Schmidt Hegg	Mike Maloney	George Heyman
2007-08*	Same senator	Jan Thompson-Wilda	Same transfer program faculty	Same career	Same faculty	Mary-Pat Martin
2008-09	Margaret Gas	Jan Thompson-Wilda	Laura Thelen	Pam Schmidt Hegg	Jelena Bankovic	Mary-Pat Martin
2009-10	Margaret Gas	Rose Novil	Laura Thelen	Paul Boisvert	Joo Lee *	George Lungu
2010-11	New senator	Same library	New transfer	Same transfer	New career if possible	Same transfer

* Rotation not followed due to resignations from committee or sabbatical

Appendix C

General Education Objectives Approved April 2009

Critical Thinking

Identify, define, analyze, interpret, and evaluate: ideas, concepts, information, problems, solutions, and consequences. This includes the ability to compute and comprehend quantitative information and to engage in the scientific process.

Communication

Communicate ideas, concepts, and information through written, oral, and non-verbal means. Collaborate with people of diverse backgrounds and abilities.

Literacy

Demonstrate the ability to read critically within content areas. Use technology to locate, to evaluate, and to communicate: data, information, ideas, and concepts. Access, critique, and select from a variety of information resources.

Responsibility

Demonstrate an understanding of responsibility in one's academic, professional, and civic life. Demonstrate an understanding of cultural and aesthetic diversity as they relate to the individual, the community, and the global society.

Appendix D

Higher Learning Commission (North Central Association) Criteria for Accreditation

Note: Oakton's Self Study Report was completed in Summer 2007 and the accreditation visit took place in October 2007. The College received a 10-year accreditation. The next visit is scheduled for Fall, 2017. Since 2007 the Higher Learning Commission has begun revising accreditation processes and reports; consequently it is highly unlikely the next accreditation process will resemble the 2007 one.

Criterion One: Mission and Integrity

The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future

The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching

The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge

The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

Criterion Five: Engagement and Service

As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

Appendix E - Program Review Schedule 2009-10 through 2014-15

Year	Instructional Programs	Academic Support Services	Student Services	Other	ICCB Cross-Disc
2009-2010	Art Basic Nurse Assistant Engineering Global Business Humanities / Philosophy Marketing Modern Languages Music Nursing Theater Women's and Gender Studies	Koehnline Art Gallery Men's Program Performing Arts Center	Financial Assistance (brief report --to move to statewide calendar)	Human Resources Accounting Services Budget and Finance	Vocational Skills
2010-2011	Automotive Programs Early Childhood Education Global Studies Human Services (includes Substance Abuse) Pharmacy Technician Physical Education Physical Therapist Assistant & Massage Therapy Real Estate Social & Behavioral Sciences (Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology, Social Science) Historical & Policy Studies (Economics, Geography, History, Political Science) Teacher Education Programs Women and Gender Studies concentration	Alternative & Distance Education Library TV Production Instructional Media Services (IMS)	Career Services	Facilities	Transfer functions & programs (AA, AS, AAT, AFA, ASE)

Year	Instructional Programs	Academic Support Services	Student Services	Other	ICCB Cross-Disc
2011-12	Computer Information Systems Electronics English, Journalism & Communications (developmental and college-level) Business Health Information Technology Law Enforcement Computer Applications for Business Computer Network Systems programs (include Cisco) Manufacturing Technology/Machine Technology Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) Speech World Wide Web Alliance for Lifelong Learning	Business Institute	Athletics (Intercollegiate & Intramural) Enrollment Management Financial Aid Registration & Records Student Activities		General Education
2012-2013	Architectural Technology / Construction Mgt Computer Science Facilities Management & Engineering / Air Condition, Heating & Refrigeration Fire Science Management & Supervision Mathematics		Enrollment Management Registration & Records	Grants & Alternative Funding College Advancement Research, Curriculum & Planning Information Technology Business Services (Administration, Bookstore, Copy Center)	Adult Ed & ESL
2013-2014	Accounting Financial Services Graphic Design/Animation & Multimedia Great Books Program Honors Program Mechanical Design Medical Laboratory Technology/Phlebotomy/Aseptic Pharmaceutical Preparation Science	ASSIST The Learning Center		Business Services (Purchasing and Food Service) Public Safety	Remedial / Dev

Appendix F

Change Matters **Oakton Strategic Goals and Objectives** **2008-2012**

*We are an institution of academic excellence that acts boldly,
with courage, creativity, and agility, to shape our future in a changing global society.*

Academic excellence. We will uphold the preeminence of academic excellence as the engine that drives College decision-making.

- Advance the culture of assessment as integral to improving teaching, learning and student success.
- Increase student engagement and connections with faculty, particularly as measured by the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE).
- Improve the success and persistence of all students, especially underprepared students.

Innovative learning for local and global citizenship. We will evaluate and change our academic programs and learning opportunities to foster local and global citizenship and to meet clearly identified student and community needs.

- Create innovative interdisciplinary concentrations, especially within the baccalaureate areas, and create new career programs through collaborating with outside partners and employers.
- Increase opportunities to earn Oakton credit by invigorating credit for prior learning and service learning opportunities and expanding enrollments in dual credit courses by 25 percent by 2009-2010.
- Reinvent our use of time and space by revamping our class schedules and course offerings to be responsive to student needs and interests, optimize use of community resources, and foster high quality learning.
- Broaden connections with our external constituencies to ensure our programs and services are responsive to community needs.

WISE student services. We will involve all employee groups in developing, enhancing and delivering services that Welcome, Inform, Support, and Engage our students.

- Plan and construct one-stop student services centers at the Des Plaines and Skokie campuses by fall 2010.
- Implement required orientation for new students, including an online option, by fall 2009.
- Redesign student advising to improve effectiveness and student satisfaction by fall 2009.

Anti-bias college. We will continue to transform our College's practices, curricula and ways of engaging with one another in order to overcome racism and other forms of bias.

- Review and revise curricula to address issues of bias and cultural competence.
- Involve at least 80 percent of full and part-time faculty, staff, administrators and student leaders in anti-bias training by 2012.
- Expand outreach to underserved populations, and strengthen networking and support systems for Oakton students and employees.

Green college. We will respect, conserve, and improve the environment through our academic offerings, learning opportunities and ecologically sound practices.

- Develop baccalaureate concentrations, career programs, courses and community activities related to environmental issues.
- Demonstrate stewardship of the environment by reducing energy consumption, increasing recycling efforts, and adopting environmentally sound practices in infrastructure improvements and purchasing decisions.
- Continue to transform and restore our grounds and natural habitat so they are a model for environmental responsibility and an educational resource for students and the community.

One college: Four campuses (Des Plaines, Skokie, electronic, neighborhood). We will provide a consistently high quality learning experience at multiple locations and via multiple delivery systems.

- Increase course enrollments by 20 percent at the Skokie campus by 2010-2011.
- Update and enhance our plan for distance education and hybrid classes, ensuring that student success is comparable to students in classroom-based courses.
- Reassign curricula to best location(s) to optimize use of space, enrollments and high quality learning opportunities.
- Improve Oakton's website and other forms of technology for student, employee and community use.

Model work environment. We will develop a model work environment to attract and retain a diverse work force that is best able to serve students and the community.

- Initiate practices to increase collaborative decision making, improve communication, better engage part-time faculty, and encourage respect among employees.
- Institute programs to improve employee health and welfare, and facilitate work/life balance.
- Require and support professional development for all employees.

Reinvented physical space and infrastructure. We will reinvent and maintain the College's physical space and infrastructure in ways that build an environment conducive to learning and creating community.

- Reconfigure our classroom environments to better support teaching and learning and to improve comfort.
- Enhance study, meeting and lounge space to foster community and meet the needs of our students.
- Invest in infrastructure maintenance and improvements.

Financial stewardship. We will use our resources to advance our mission and goals while maintaining adequate reserves for the future.

- Implement innovations, practices and procedures to contain costs of tuition, textbooks and instructional materials.
- Explore new external funding sources to supplement existing revenue.
- Commit funds each year to support strategic goals and objectives.

Appendix G

Sample Feedback Memo on Final Report from IPRC to Program
Note: 2008-09 Reviews followed previous Manual; they were expected to be more comprehensive and longer than reviews beginning 2009-10

Office of Research, Curriculum, and Planning

Date: May 5, 2009 **cc:** relevant Dean/Admin; IPRC
To: Specific Program Chair/Director
From: Institutional Program Review Committee*
Subject: Program Review 2008-09 Final Report

The Institutional Program Review Committee held its final 2008-09 meeting on Friday, April 24. We discussed the final program review reports and are pleased to tell you we have accepted your report.

We appreciate especially the work of all those departments that submitted reports on time, and your willingness to address the IPRC recommendations and observations to draft reports in your final reports. The cover memos detailing changes from draft to final reports, which most of you provided, were especially helpful and appreciated. We also found that many reports were excellent: they included concrete data and information to support assertions of quality, provided informative descriptions of the program/department, and included reflections about how the program can improve. We identified these model reports: Accounting, the Learning Center, and Business Services/Purchasing. Model reports will be added to the new myOakton group to be established for those doing reviews next year (see below).

Please note that the next step of the program review process is for a meeting to take place with the appropriate vice president, dean and chair/coordinator or other administrators / managers doing reviews. The purpose of this meeting, which should take place in May-June, is to close the loop and permit the vice president to talk with key administrators and faculty to discuss program review findings and what they suggest for future activities and emphases for the program. This is an important step, and one the committee is confident will strengthen the value of program reviews.

We want to express our gratitude to you for all of the time and hard work you put into these program reviews. We know what it takes to critically evaluate your department in a comprehensive manner, and most of this year's reports were well done. It is obvious that a great deal of discussion and reflection went into each report. We are hopeful that you are able you use your learning and recommendation in a substantive way over the next few years.

* Institutional Program Review Committee (IPRC) 2008-09

Jelena Bankovic, Trudy Bers, Danielle Cargo, Maya Evans, Margaret Gas, Maria Haske, Pam Hegg, Jim Holderfield, Donna Keene, Mary-Pat Martin, Nancy Prendergast, Doreen Schwartz, Linda Sutherland, Laura Thelen, Jan Thompson-Wilda, Cheryl Warmann

As we did last year, we will be sending to the President's Council the Learning and Recommendations sections of your reports. President Lee and the vice presidents have full access to complete reports as well. Information in your review will be synthesized by Office of Research staff and submitted to the Illinois Community College Board as part of our annual Accountability/Program Review Report.

Based on this year's process, the IPRC has several suggestions for improving the program review process and reports next year. We are most interested in your perceptions about these ideas, as well as other ideas you have about how the program review reports and process can be improved:

Last year the IPRC revised the timeline for submitting draft and final reports in order to give the IPRC adequate time to review them. The new timetable presented difficulties for those doing reviews. Therefore, we recommend going back to the original timetable, as follows:

- October 15 – outline due (same as in the past)
 - February 15 – draft report due (as in the past—this year the date was moved to February 1)
 - Last week in February or early March – IPRC meet and provides feedback to drafts (this year met mid-February)
 - April 15 – final report due (as in the past—this year the date was moved to April 1)
 - Last week in April – IPRC meet and to discuss and make recommendations on final reports.
- Establishing a myOakton group for those doing program review so they can access information, model reports, the Program Review Manual and other materials relevant to program reviews. We said we would do this last year, but did not.
 - Asking departments to look at their last Program Review and comment on what occurred as a result of the Learning and Recommendations included in it.
 - Asking departments to discuss their web sites, online courses, and department actions or activities to address the College's anti-bias / diversity goal. We've asked for these before but will be more emphatic in the 2009-2010 Program Review Manual.
 - Attempting again to deemphasize the preparation of long Appendices and emphasize the importance of including relevant data and information in the body of the report.
 - Attempting to help departments prepare shorter reports that focus on key information and not on long histories or descriptions.

Please share your ideas with us, by June 7th if possible. You can email them to tbers@oakton.edu or talk with any member of the Committee. If you would prefer to send us your thoughts anonymously, please feel free to send a hard copy of your suggestions to Trudy Bers through interoffice mail.

Thank you for your excellent work.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM NOTES (part of 2008-09 feedback to each department)

Accounting (instructional program)

This is a model review. Thank you for doing excellent work. We note in particular the efforts to ensure consistency across sections of the same course and the use of technology. The program is proactive and revitalized. In your report you addressed the feedback memo to your draft report and made all requested changes; in the future please be sure to provide a memo directing us to the revisions in the final report. Again, thank you.

Business Services—Purchasing

This is a model review. Thank you for doing excellent work. You addressed the feedback memo and made all requested changes. The report has an excellent format and style. We commend you on having plans to address challenges of new staff and better implementation of purchasing processes. Perhaps set a timeframe for training new employees and for completing work associated with BANNER implementation.