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I. Purpose

For the purpose of strengthening and improving programs, Aiken Technical College (ATC) regularly reviews and assesses academic programs on an established schedule every three years. Program faculty and educational administrators are actively involved in the assessment process and identify areas of program strengths, challenges, opportunities, threats, needs (personnel, equipment, facilities, and technology), and recommendations for program improvement. Improvement plans will be incorporated into the College’s annual planning and budgeting process for implementation.

II. Procedures and Responsibility

1. The Program Review schedule is developed by the academic deans and approved by the Chief Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Officer.
2. The Director of Teaching and Technology coordinates the Program Review process.
3. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research populates data in the Program Review template and sends it to each division dean for distribution.
4. The department chair is provided a timeline for all the stages of the Program Review submission to the Dean, Peer Review Committee, Chief Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Officer, and the Executive Staff. The department chair (or designee) completes the Program Review. The department chair and program faculty gather and analyze other pertinent data required for a thorough analysis.

5. The Program Review Template, Timeline, Writing Guidelines, and Peer Assessment Rubric are available on ATC's Program Review Share-drive to assist in completing the Program Review.

6. The department chair submits the Program Review to the division Dean. The Dean reviews the report for accuracy and content, and provides feedback and recommendations for improvements/revisions to the department chair. When the Program Review is approved by the Division Dean, the Dean forwards the Program Review to the Directors of Institutional Effectiveness and Research, and Teaching and Technology, who distribute these documents to the peer Review Committee.

7. Program Review Peer Review Committee procedures and responsibilities are outlined in section III.

III. Program Review Peer Review Committee Procedures and Responsibilities

1. All Program Reviews are submitted to the Program Review Peer Review Committee which consists of one department chair representing each of the academic divisions, one at-large faculty member appointed by the Chief Academic Officer, as well as one representative from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research and the Director of Teaching and Technology. Each faculty representative is appointed to serve a two-year term and half of the members rotate off the committee each year and are replaced by new appointees. A Program Review Peer Review Committee Chair will be nominated by the committee and approved by the Chief Academic Officer. The Committee Chair schedules each of the Program Review Peer Review Committee meetings.

2. The Committee members utilize an assessment rubric to independently assess each Program Review for evidence that: the review addresses the previous Program Review recommendations for improvement; student learning outcomes are identified; the extent to which student learning outcomes assessment is used to improve learning; extent to which the program is meeting its mission; level at which quantitative standards are met; evidence that students are successful after graduation; degree to which decision-making is influenced by qualitative and quantitative data; level at which strengths, challenges, opportunities, and threats are identified, addressed, and written into an action plan; and evidence of effective strategic and annual planning. Upon completion of the individual assessment, the Committee members meet to determine consensus comments regarding Program Review strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for program improvement.
3. The Program Review Peer Review Committee meets with the review developer and their supervisor to discuss their assessment of each Program Review and recommendations for program improvement.

4. To assess the program review process, the Program Review Peer Review Committee Chair prepares a Program Review synopsis for each division summarizing the Program Review general strengths, overall trends and issues, repeated themes, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement, and submits the report to the Chief Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Officer.

IV. Presentation to Executive Staff and the Commission

Based on the Program Reviews and Program Review synopses, the Chief Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Officer prepares and submits an Academic Program Review Report to the appropriate committees for annual planning consideration.

V. Program Review Elements for Assessment

The program review process includes, at a minimum, the examination, analysis, and reporting of the following elements:

1. Executive Summary including
   a. Findings
   b. Strengths
   c. Challenges
   d. Opportunities
   e. Threats
   f. Plans, strategies, and timeline
   g. Positions responsible for the plan

2. Qualitative data
   a. Program Mission
   b. Program- Student Learning Outcomes
   c. Summary of past three years of program assessment
   d. Past Program Review Plans/Recommendations/Strategies — Evidence that the program addresses the previous Program Review recommendations for improvement
   e. Develop-a-curriculum (DACUM), focus group, or survey results
   f. Extent to which the advisory committee works to improve the quality of the program
   g. Regional need and demand for the program
   h. Articulation agreements (if applicable), last date of agreement renewal and links
3. Quantitative data and standards for program viability and quality
   a. Class fill rate
   b. Enrollment trends
   c. Percent growth in jobs
   d. Prevailing salaries
   e. Graduate numbers and placement rates
   f. Program retention and persistence rates

4. College Core Indicators

5. Program Needs
   a. Personnel
   b. Equipment of furniture
   c. Facilities
   d. Technology

VI. Program Review Final Report

The final Program Review documents for the Executive staff will be forwarded to the Chief Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Officer, the Director of Teaching and Technology, and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research will archive all Program Review documents. All Program Reviews will be completed in their entirety by February 1 of the academic year so that recommendations can be brought forward for planning and budgeting action through the College's annual planning process.

The Dean of Teaching and Learning submits a qualitative summary of all Program Review findings and recommendations and presents these to the Academic Affairs Division Deans and Directors. Results of actions taken will be reported through the program, division, and College's annual planning process. A follow-up report concerning Program Review Peer Review recommendation status, detailing actions underway to address Peer concerns, is required one year after the Program Review. Additional actions, if needed, will be addressed in subsequent annual plans. In this manner, all planning and budgeting issues for the academic programs are considered in a predictable process tying planning, program review, and budgeting into a continuous cycle of improvement in concert with the College's planning, program review, and budgeting cycle.