During the past two years, the Instruction Office has been involved in the development of a program evaluation and review model for use within the instructional program. The design finally agreed upon involved the use of both qualitative and quantitative elements of information.

When the model was conceived late in the Fall, 1982, semester, it was presented to the Division Chair Council for review and comment. Suggestions were made which served to strengthen the model, and five or six additional meetings with faculty representatives followed which further strengthened and refined criteria used in the design. During the Spring, 1983, semester, the revised design was again presented to the Division Chair Council for endorsement. At this meeting, it was suggested that a "pilot run" be conducted to further evaluate the procedures prior to implementation college-wide. The Biological Sciences Division agreed to serve as participants for the pilot study.

The original form developed on which to plot the quantitative and qualitative information included three sets of criteria. The first set, GENERAL CRITERIA, included the cost/income ratio (cost to operate the program versus income generated), weekly student contact hours (WSCH) generated by one full-time equivalent faculty (FTE) at the 4th week and at the end of the semester, attrition and the cost per WSCH. This information would be compared to the college average (1.00) on the scale to determine the relative position of the department/program being evaluated. If a department/program statistic was above the college average, costs were excessive; if data appeared below the line, costs were below the college average. (Ideally, costs should be equivalent to the college average or below.)

The second set of criteria, SPECIFIC CRITERIA, was added to provide additional information about the program under evaluation. The category includes questions pertinent to vocational/occupational programs related to job success and placement as well as the success encountered by students who may be taking state or national examinations.

The third set, DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA, was the qualitative information, the most unique feature of the model. These measures were designed to determine the quality inherent in the department/program as perceived by three evaluating sources: the department itself, the Division Chair Council, and the Instruction Office. The rationale for using the three sources of evaluation is that these criteria represent a set of judgments. The thought was that using more than one source of evaluation would provide a better assessment of the department/program under evaluation in addition to providing a more realistic measurement of quality.

continued ...
During the summer of 1983, Dr. MacDougall requested that departments be evaluated against the strategies developed for the college. This information then became CATEGORY FOUR. Data for the Biological Sciences was also prepared simultaneously during summer, 1983, and close coordination between the Instruction Office and the department resulted in further revisions. By the end of the summer it was decided the model could be implemented college-wide.

Beginning in the Fall, 1983, semester, the final model was presented to the Division Chair Council for its endorsement (Attachment 1). Due to the acute fiscal situation faced by the college at the start of the 1983-84 college year, a decision was made to no longer proceed with the pilot study phase and evaluate all departments/programs prior to January 1, 1984. Therefore, a schedule was developed showing a timeline for the process. Each department was requested to complete the self-evaluation (Attachment 2) and return it to the Instruction Office by a specified date. The quantitative, or baseline data, was prepared for every department/program and distributed by mid-October, 1983, to departments for verification and personal use.

The next divisions to follow Sciences were English/Essential Skills/Journalism, Mathematics/Earth Science/Computer Science, and Business. Including the Sciences Division, fourteen departments/programs have now been evaluated.

Toward the end of the Fall, 1983, semester, it became clear the college would not have to engage in contingency planning and it appeared best to slow down the process and incorporate the original thought to evaluate one-third of all departments each year for a three-year period. This meant that departments/programs would be scheduled for review at least once every three years.

A modified approach was recommended and discussed with the Division Chair Council. The suggestion was endorsed and implemented according to a schedule. The new approach was well received by all concerned, and indications are that it was the proper thing to do.

In conclusion, the Instruction Office feels the model developed is a good one. Departments have been supportive and cooperative. This summer, 1984, the Instruction Office will prepare for the evaluation and review of the second one-third group of departments to be evaluated during the 1984-85 college year. Criteria for selecting departments who will participate continue to be areas of high cost, decline in enrollment, evidence of unusual trends, high attrition, low student interest, etc.

The Instruction Office remains open and flexible in approaching the Program Evaluation/Review process, and our goal is to seek ways to make it more effective. Departments have been supportive, and we are confident the process we have implemented is viable and among the first to include qualitative elements as part of the overall evaluation process.
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Attachments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Criteria</th>
<th>Department Criteria</th>
<th>Institutional Criteria</th>
<th>Program Criteria</th>
<th>Specific Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Criteria</td>
<td>Department Criteria</td>
<td>Institutional Criteria</td>
<td>Program Criteria</td>
<td>Specific Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Criteria</td>
<td>Department Criteria</td>
<td>Institutional Criteria</td>
<td>Program Criteria</td>
<td>Specific Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Criteria</td>
<td>Department Criteria</td>
<td>Institutional Criteria</td>
<td>Program Criteria</td>
<td>Specific Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Criteria</td>
<td>Department Criteria</td>
<td>Institutional Criteria</td>
<td>Program Criteria</td>
<td>Specific Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Criteria</td>
<td>Department Criteria</td>
<td>Institutional Criteria</td>
<td>Program Criteria</td>
<td>Specific Criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Criteria**

- Program: Occupational
- Transfer: Yes
- Non-Occupational
- Total FTE: 2
- Attrition: 3
- Part Time
- Cost/Income Ratio: WSP/FTE
- MSA/FTE (Course Completers)
- Expense (Direct)

**Program Specific Criteria**

- Program Specific Criteria

---

**Program General Criteria**

- General Criteria

---

**Program Department Criteria**

- Department Criteria

---

**Program Institutional Criteria**

- Institutional Criteria

---

**Program Transfer Criteria**

- Transfer Criteria

---

**Program Non-Occupational Criteria**

- Non-Occupational Criteria

---

**Program Total FTE**

- Total FTE

---

**Program Attrition**

- Attrition

---

**Program Part Time**

- Part Time

---

**Program Cost/Income Ratio**

- Cost/Income Ratio

---

**Program MSA/FTE (Course Completers)**

- MSA/FTE (Course Completers)

---

**Program Expense (Direct)**

- Expense (Direct)
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DIVISION COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE
Program Evaluation and Review

Form: (Mark One) _____ Individual _____ Summary

Directions: Place a number 1-5 in the blank space provided. The value represents the rating assigned to the criterion being measured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Item III. Program Quality Criteria

   1. To what extent is the department program aligned with the College Mission?
   2. To what extent is the department program keeping pace with "State of the Art"?
   3. Does the department maintain and strive for instructional quality?
   4. To what extent is the department student oriented?
   5. To what extent is the department engaged in curriculum review and evaluation?
   6. To what extent does the department evidence college and community involvement?
   7. Does the department work together as an harmonious team?
   8. To what extent does the department have effective internal communication?
   9. To what extent does the department evidence cooperation with other departments within their division and the college?
   10. To what extent does the department promote access to non-traditional students (i.e. older adults, women, minorities)?
   11. Does the department identify and respond to changing conditions within its field, the college and/or the community?
   12. To what extent is the department responsive to changing enrollment patterns?
   13. Does the department prepare five-year plans in the spirit of cooperation and in a professional manner?
   14. To what extent does the department evaluate its own programs?
   15. To what extent does the department identify its needs and communicate them to the administration?
   16. To what extent is the college meeting departmental needs for equipment supplies, professional growth and the new technological developments?
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2. Item IV. Institutional Direction Criteria

2.1 Trends in District Demography
   
   a. To what extent does the department/program engage in and plan for recruitment programs in the secondary schools aimed at minority students and to what extent does it encourage potential transfer students among them?

   b. To what extent is the department/program aligned with the student college readiness program in terms of assessment, advisement, developmental education and methods of retention?

   c. To what extent does the department/program identify and meet the needs of the non-traditional (especially older) students?

2.2 Trends in Enrollment

   a. To what extent does the department/program identify the needs and develops programs specifically aimed at needs and objectives of older students?

   b. To what extent does the department/program determine the optimum scheduling considerations for a diverse clientele and schedule classes at convenient times and places to more effectively meet the needs of all students?

2.3 Effects of High Technology

   a. To what extent are faculty in the department/program encouraged to keep abreast of new technology?

   b. To what extent does the department/program increase programs or offerings which serve the employment needs of local business (e.g. Computer Science, Electronics)?

   c. Is serious consideration given to the introduction of new programs or expansion of existing programs to train students in new technologies (i.e. automation, holography, solar energy, laser technology, bionics and telecommunications)?

   d. Does the department/program expand the use of data processing technology in instructional programs?

   e. To what extent does the department/program explore agreements with local industry and business to offer worksite training programs related to these technological implications?

   f. To what extent has consideration been given to offering new courses specifically aimed at retraining and upgrading for employees of local firms?
2.4 Educational Deficiencies in Society

_____ a. To what extent does the department/program place emphasis on varied teaching strategies to accommodate a diverse student population?

_____ b. Does the department/program or faculty in the program contact and work with youth-oriented agencies to encourage college enrollment of more young people?

_____ c. To what extent does the department/program involved increasing the awareness among high school students and dropouts of the consequences related to a lack of education in today's society?

2.5 Economic and Legislative Implications

_____ a. To what extent does the department/program exploit methods of increasing productivity including use of CAI and other media, better retention of students, more efficient scheduling?

_____ b. Does the department/program make use of private business as a source by increased cooperation and coordination, contracting for special classes to meet business needs, and taking programs and classes to the worksite?

2.6 Resource Considerations

_____ a. To what extent does the department recognize and understand the very real constraints on resources and the need to resort to reallocation of existing resources in effective planning?

_____ b. Does the department carry on an aggressive program to augment funding sources by outside sources?

_____ c. To what extent does the department make efficient use of staff and facilities by providing productivity aids and by creative scheduling?

_____ d. Are incentives for faculty retraining to fit into a changing curriculum developed within the department?

2.7 Alternative Deliveries of Education

_____ a. Does the department evaluate alternative deliverers of educational services to determine what advantages they offer and determine whether the department can and should attempt to provide comparable services?

_____ b. To what extent does the department negotiate, where appropriate, with other deliverers to provide programs of instruction that meet their needs and offer the advantages sought by their students?

2.8 Trend Toward Inter-dependence of Nations

_____ a. To what extent is the department involved in increasing the numbers and diversity of foreign students by active recruitment?

_____ b. To what extent does the department explore new programs (both academic and support) and courses to heighten student awareness of multi-culturalism, including a possible faculty and/or exchange program?