



Program Review Manual 2008-2009

<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 Bersbers@oakton.edu](mailto:Trudy.Bers@oakton.edu)

[Jim Holderfieldjholderf@oakton.edu](mailto:Jim.Holderfield@oakton.edu)

Contents

Introduction and Overview	1
Principles of Program Review at Oakton	2
Programs/Units Scheduled for Review —2007-08	4
Program Review Process and Timetable	5
The Program Review Document	8
Technical and Stylistic Issues	12
Institutional Program Review Committee	13
Appendix A - Development of Program Review at Oakton	14
Appendix B - Institutional Program Review Committee: History and Past Members	17
Appendix C - General Education Objectives	19
Appendix D - North Central Association Criteria for Accreditation	20
Appendix E - Program Review Schedule – 2007-08 through 2012-13	21
Appendix F – Oakton Strategic Goals and Objectives – 2008-2012	23

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 program review process was extended to all segments of Oakton, instructional and non-instructional alike. The rationale for extending program review and other principles/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 in the last year or two (since about 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.**

Oakton's program reviews are prepared according to this Program Review Manual, which is revised each year to reflect experiences of the previous cycle and to conform to any new state guidelines or requirements. 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 parts (see the section The Program Review Document for more information):

Part I: Introduction

- What does the program¹ do (description)?
- What process was used in doing the program review?
- What major changes over the past several years, both external and internal to the College, have affected the program?

Part II: Need

Why is this program needed at Oakton? How does it support Oakton's mission?

Part III: Cost

What are the costs of the program and, if available, what are the revenues? What efforts to contain costs have been made?

Part IV: Quality

What is the quality of the program? Consider quality in areas such as student academic and other outcomes, personnel qualifications and achievements, program practices, facilities, equipment, etc. 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. The review should include information about the program's student learning outcomes assessment activities, findings and use of findings. The review should also include information about how the program's purpose and activities address Oakton's strategic goals and objectives. The review should also include observations and ideas obtained from visits to peer institutions.

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

- What have faculty and staff of the program learned through the program review process?
- What is planned as a result of what was learned (include recommendations for specific actions to improve or sustain quality)?

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 (since about 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 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.

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.

Programs/Units Scheduled for Review – 2008-09

Instructional Programs

Accounting
Financial Services
Graphic Design, Animation & Multimedia
Great Books
Honors
Mechanical Design
Medical Laboratory Technology
 Phlebotomy
 Aseptic Pharmaceutical Preparation
Science

Academic Support Services

Learning Center

Student Services

Other

Business Services (Purchasing & Food Service)
Public Safety
Facilities Utilization

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 11, 2008	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 11, 2008, 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, cost, quality, and future plans). Process for doing program review also to be determined.

Date	Step in Process	Explanation
October 15 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Outline due – electronic copy required	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
October 15 – October 30	IPRC reads/comments on outlines	<p>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 October 31, 2008; 12:30-4:00; Board Room</u></p>
October, 2008 – March, 2009	Program conducts visits to peer institutions.	
November, 2008 – January 31, 2009	Program implements review and prepares draft report	<p>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.</p>
February 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Draft report due – electronic copy required; appendices can be hard copy but must be electronic list of them	<p>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 26 for his/her comments.</p>

Date	Step in Process	Explanation
February 1– February 20	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 February 20, 2009; 12:30-4:00; Board Room.</u>
February 27 –March 31	Revise draft report	Program review participants at the program level revise report, taking into consideration feedback from IPR Committee.
April 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Final report due- electronic copy required; appendices can be hard copy but must be electronic list of them	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 March 26 for his/her comments.
April 1 – 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 24, 2009 ; 12:30-4:00; Board Room</u>
June 1		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

Contents and Sections of the Report

The program review document should contain a cover, the five parts described below, and exhibits as appropriate.

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 (description)? This may include a history of the program, program objectives, characteristics of individuals served, and other information that will help a person unfamiliar with the program learn about it. Programs are encouraged to keep the historical information relatively brief and focused on the past five years unless information from earlier years are particularly useful or important.
- What process was used in doing the program review? 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 major changes over the past several years, both external and internal to the College, have 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
- Retention of students in program
- Changes, additions and deletions of curricula and courses
- Technology as it impacts teaching and learning, and course delivery
- Changes in faculty/staff
- Facilities

Part II: Need

The purpose of this section is to explain why the program is needed at Oakton and how it supports Oakton's mission and strategic goals. Instructional programs often use evidence such as enrollments; offer of curricula or courses fundamental to Oakton's mission of providing transfer, career and remedial education; and labor market need. Service programs often use evidence such as student use or delivery of services essential for operating the college.

Part III: Cost

The purpose of this section is to examine and analyze costs of the program and, if available, revenues to offset costs. Unit cost data (provided by the Oakton Budget Office) is generally used for instructional programs. Non-instructional and auxiliary service programs generally derive cost/revenue data from their annual 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.

Part IV: Quality

The purpose of this section is to provide a narrative and indicators of quality for the program. The program should present a "pattern of evidence" regarding quality. Reviews should include the following data, if relevant, as well as additional data and information germane to the specific program:

- Student enrollment data (instructional programs)
 - Number of participants, users, clients, customers (support services and other units)
 - Degrees / certificates awarded (instructional programs)
 - Satisfaction of students, participants, users, clients, customers
 - Advisory committee members and activities
 - Number and credentials of full and part-time faculty/staff credentials 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

Assertions of quality need to be supported with documented evidence such as survey results, lists of faculty presentations/publications, etc. Sources of data should be noted as well. 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.

Instructional programs should be sure to look at the number of degrees/certificates awarded, and to discuss whether, if there are many certificates, it makes sense to retain so many or whether students and the College would be better served by having fewer, but more general, certificates.

The quality section should also contain observations and ideas gained from required visits with two peer institutions in 2008-09. 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 discussion of how the department is supporting *Change Matters*, Oakton's strategic plan for 2008-2012. In particular, department initiatives that relate directly to a strategic goal or initiative should be described and data depicting progress in meeting the objective/goal should be presented, if available.

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 twofold: a) to describe what faculty and staff of the program have learned through the program review process, and b) to describe what is planned as a result of what was learned. Recommendations for specific actions to improve or sustain quality and to

address weaknesses should be clearly stated. The recommendations must be linked back to information or observations made in previous sections of the report.

A useful approach to this section might be to include these sub-parts:

- Lessons learned
- Areas of identified strengths
- Areas of identified need
- Areas of potential growth and development
- Recommended actions

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

Programs may add exhibits to amplify and enhance the report. Please note that each item presented in an exhibit should be referenced in a discussion within the body of the report itself; the reader should know why the exhibit is important and what it adds to understanding. Do not put crucial data or information in an exhibit only. The reader should be able to understand the program review without referring to exhibits.

Beginning in 2008-09 the Institutional Program Review Committee requests that exhibits be kept at a minimum. Please try to limit both the number and length of exhibits.

Examples of exhibits are:

- Enrollment or usage data details (summary information should be in the report itself)
- Degrees and certificates awarded details (summary information should be in the report itself)
- Cost / revenue data details (summary information should be in the report itself)
- Results from student surveys details (summary information should be in the report itself)
- Results from assessments of student learning outcomes details (summary information should be in the report itself)
- Illinois Occupational Information Coordinating Committee labor market data (career programs) —data supplied by Office of Research upon request
- Other relevant materials

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.
- Consider adding a glossary of terms if the report uses a number of acronyms.
- 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.

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.

Membership

See Appendix B for more information on the Program Review Committee and past members. Members of the 2008-09 Institutional Program Review Committee are:

Senate representative	Margaret Gas
Counselor	Jan Thompson-Wilda
Science & Health Careers	Laura Thelen
Mathematics & Technology	Pam (Schmidt) Hegg
Languages, Humanities & the Arts	Jelena Bankovic
Social Science & Business	Mary-Pat Martin
Academic Affairs	Nancy Prendergast
Student Affairs	Cheryl Warmann
Continuing Education, Training, and Workforce Development	Donna Keene
Business & Finance/IT	Doreen Schwartz
Classified Staff	Danielle Cargo, Admission & Enrollment Mgt; Maria Haske, Division III; Linda Sutherland, Library & Media Services
President’s Office	[Trudy Bers]
Office of Research (ex officio)	Trudy Bers, Jim Holderfield

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 May 1999 the College submitted an Assessment Plan to the North Central Association. The Plan includes projects to assess student learning outcomes at the classroom, course, departmental, general education and institutional levels. Every department with responsibilities for student learning contributed to the Plan and is expected to implement projects and studies to assess student learning outcomes. Assessment of student learning outcomes is fostered and guided under the broad direction and leadership of the Student Academic Assessment Team (SAAT), convened in the fall of 1998. Results of assessments are expected to be reported annually. Assessment results should be 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 about 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 new 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.

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 / James Kostecki/David Rudden

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	Mike Maloney	George Heyman
2007-08*	Same senator	Same counselor	Same transfer program faculty	Same career faculty	Same faculty	Mary-Pat Martin
2008-09	Margaret Gas	Library	Laura Thelen	New transfer	Jelena Bankovic	Same career
2008-10	Same senator	Same library	Same career	Same transfer	Same faculty	New transfer
2010-11	New senator	Counselor	New transfer	New career	New faculty	Same transfer

* Rotation not followed due to resignations from committee

Appendix C

General Education Objectives

The purpose of the General Education courses at Oakton Community College is to develop the student as an educated person who can and will:

- Engage in the process of inquiry and problem solving through the following:
 - Define problems
 - Construct hypotheses
 - Gather, analyze, and interpret data/information using a variety of resources and methods, including technology
 - Explain how information fits within an historical context
 - Differentiate between fact and opinion
 - Compare and evaluate alternative solutions
 - Communicate findings effectively in writing and in speech
- Work and communicate effectively with people from a variety of backgrounds, individually and in teams
- Apply ethical principles to local, national, and global issues
- Recognize skills necessary to build and maintain effective human relationships

Appendix D

Higher Learning Commission (North Central Association) Criteria for Accreditation

Note: Oakton's next Self Study Report, part of the process for seeking continuing Accreditation by the HLC was completed in Summer 2007. The accreditation visit will occur in October 2007. Kathleen Carot and Tom Bowen are co-chairs for the Self Study. Accreditation criteria are:

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 2008-09 through 2013-14

Year	Instructional Programs	Academic Support Services	Student Services	Other	ICCB Cross-Disc
2008-2009	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 Facilities Utilization	Remedial / Dev
2009-2010	Art Basic Nurse Assistant Engineering Humanities / Philosophy International Trade Marketing Modern Languages Music Nursing Theater	Koehnline Art Gallery Men's Program Performing Arts Center Women & Gender Studies	Financial Assistance	Human Resources Accounting Services Budget and Finance	Vocational Skills
2010-2011	Automotive Programs Early Childhood Education Global Studies concentration 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's Studies concentration	Alternative & Distance Education Instructional Media Services Library TV Production	Career Placement Counseling & Advising Health 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) World Wide Web Alliance	Business Institute	Athletics (Intercollegiate and 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 **W**elcome, **I**nform, **S**upport, and **E**ngage 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.