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PROJECT STATEMENT

To improve the program review process as measured by 1) providing programs that meet external standards as defined by accreditation/approval agencies; 2) successful job and transfer placements for our graduates; and, 3) program adaptability to changing economic, vocational, educational, and social realities.
# PROJECT CHARTER

## Project: Program Review

|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------|

### Problem / Opportunity Statement:
The Academic Affairs Committee reviews all curricula, either in the proposal stage or when substantial revisions are being considered. The College does not have an active Program Review Process.

The NECC FY2004-2006 Strategic Plan provides the impetus for critically evaluating the curriculum development process, evaluating the Program Review process that was developed in 2000 and piloted in 2001, and formulating a revised process that will allow a nimble response to the findings of an effective program review process. This project will integrate institutional and programmatic outcome development and measurement.

### Strategic Alignment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2004-2006 Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Accountable College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.c We will assess quality with systems such as Institutional Effectiveness and Academic Program Review.</td>
<td>Leader(s): Jackie L. Long-Goding, Dean, Health Professions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sponsor:
Paul Bevilacqua, Vice President of Academic Affairs

### Scribe:
Responsibilities shared among team members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members:</th>
<th>Area of Expertise:</th>
<th>Division/Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. George Bailey</td>
<td>English and Foreign Languages</td>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Charles Diggs</td>
<td>Student Advising</td>
<td>Academic Advising Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ellen Grondine</td>
<td>Teacher Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Judith Pollcok-Ciampi</td>
<td>Paralegal</td>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Steve Sullivan (Resource)</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Eugene Wintner (9/03 – 5/04)</td>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
<td>Instructional and Student Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anne Zabriskie</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Health Professions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communities of interest: (primary and other):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students (Currently enrolled and potential)</th>
<th>What Needs Will Be Addressed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ensure that all NECC programs reflect contemporary practice/thinking in the content domain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensure that transfer programs continue to meet all requirements of the receiving institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External constituency (e.g., employers, community)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ensure that NECC graduates are competent, entry-level employees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensure society that public funds are used wisely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide faculty tools and professional development activities required to maintain high quality program offerings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transfer and articulation agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accrediting/approval agencies (e.g., NEASC, the Board of Higher Education, programmatic accreditors)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Document that program outcomes are being achieved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensure that mandated elements in Standards are being met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative and Professional Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proactive response to areas of identified need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**Objectives:**
- Review the existing process for Program Review.
- Design a system that creates the framework for incorporating the Program Review process during the development of new programs.
- Examine the Program Review processes used successfully in at least five other community college environments.
- Develop a system that is synergistic with programmatic accreditation.
- Develop a system that is meaningful to the program and the institution.
- Develop a process that allows anticipatory planning and provides the structure for revising programs to meet projected industry demand.

**Success Metrics (Measures):**
1. The program review process will facilitate the development and revision of programs for which there is student demand, employment and transfer opportunities for graduates, and which include institutional and program outcome measures.
2. The Program Review process will permit an objective review of all academic programs at NECC.

**Considerations (Assumptions / Constraints / Obstacles / Risks):**
1. Final process must be applicable across all programs and curricula.
2. Impact on the culture of NECC: opportunity or obstacle?
3. Time requirements: initial and on-going.
4. Who will have responsibility for managing the final product?
5. How will on-line courses be impacted?
6. What financial resources will be required?
7. What will be the responsibility/role of the directors/assistant deans/deans in the Academic Affairs component?
8. Pilot the process: when, how?

**Available Resources:**
1. Clerical support provided through Division of Health Professions.
2. Faculty participation under College Service.
3. Administrative support: President, Vice President of Academic Affairs, deans/assistant deans.
4. Process Management activities and support provided by Stan Jensen, consultant to NECC.

**Key Milestones:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Program Review process completed</td>
<td>December 15, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify 2 programs to pilot revised process</td>
<td>December 15, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present revised Program Review process to NECC faculty and staff</td>
<td>January 30, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete pilot Program Review process</td>
<td>May 15, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch 2005 edition of Program Review</td>
<td>September 1, 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication Plan (Who, How, and When):**
1. **Team Members:** Present revised Program Review process to Process Management Steering Committee on December 17, 2004.
2. **Team Members:** Present revised Program Review process to general faculty at spring 2005 convocation Program.
3. **Team Members:** Each team member to present draft revisions at department and division meetings in February and March; bring feedback to team by May 1.
4. **Jackie Long-Goding** to present revised Program Review process to dean’s staff at January 2005 Academic Affairs Retreat, and dean’s staff meetings in February and March; bring feedback to team following each presentation.

**Key Stakeholders:**
- Students: Current, former and potential
- Public constituencies: employers, tax payers
- Faculty and administration at NECC

*This form was adapted from the Team Charter template developed at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center (Boston) by Nancy L. Wilkinson, R.N., B.S.N. and John W, Moran, Ph.D.*
Project Background

Northern Essex Community College developed a formal Program Review process in the spring of 2000. Two programs, Dental Assisting and Criminal Justice, piloted the Program Review process in spring and fall of 2001. Upon completion of these projects and a review of the results, the College decided that the process was cumbersome and lacked consistency with programmatic accreditation requirements.

Consequently, plans were made to review the process and make the necessary changes. The 2002 Early Retirement Incentive Program and significant budget reductions impacted this plan as the College experienced a significant loss of personnel in 2002, many of whom could not be replaced, and including many of those involved in developing and implementing the Program Review process. Consequently, revision of the Program Review process was deferred for one year and the existing process placed on-hold.

In the fall of 2003, a committee of faculty and administrators was created to review the existing process with the goal of improving it. The committee reviewed the previous process and compared it to Program Review processes used by several other colleges and universities, both within New England and in other areas of the country. Common elements were identified, and the commonalities were then viewed through the lens of “best practices”. These commonalities were incorporated into a draft revision of the Program Review process for NECC.

In February 2004, the College’s Strategic Leadership Forum (SLF) team learned about Illinois Central College (ICC) and the way in which the institution successfully implemented the concept of process management as a change element. The SLF team investigated further, and subsequently discovered a significant degree of similarity between ICC and NECC. As a result, the SLF team recommended to President David Hartleb that NECC further investigate the possibility of learning more about process management and how it could be used at NECC.

In August 2004, approximately 50 members of the NECC community participated in a three-day workshop to learn both the theory of process management and the tools used during process management activities. Following this training, a Steering Committee was identified and projects for the fall 2004 semester were selected.

Although the Program Review Committee was an active entity, the Process Management Steering Committee believed that application of the theory and tools used in process management would ultimately result in a more powerful and effective Program Review Process. Consequently, the Program Review Committee mapped the elements of process management into their work-in-progress.
Current Process

The Program Review Process at NECC is currently limited to those programs that hold specialized accreditation or approval from an outside agency. During FY04, the following programs participated in program review activities.

Medical Assistant: Self Study Report and On-Site Visit
Agency: Commission on Accreditation in Allied Health Education (CAAHEP) through the Curriculum Review Board, American Association of Medical Assistants Endowment, Chicago, IL
Result: Recommendation for Continued Accreditation

Radiologic Technology: Interim Accreditation Report
Agency: Joint Review Committee on Accreditation for Education in Radiologic Technology, Chicago, IL
Result: Continued Accreditation, with Self Study Report and on-site visit to be scheduled in 2005.

Respiratory Care: Annual Report of Programmatic Outcomes
Agency: Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs, through the Committee on Accreditation for Respiratory Care, Bedford, TX
Result: Accreditation continued.

Nursing: Annual Report
Agency: Board of Registration in Nursing, Boston, MA
Result: Board approval continued.

Criminal Justice: Certification Process for Police Career Incentive Pay Program
Agency: Massachusetts Board of Higher Education
Result: Approved for Police Career Incentive Pay Program

Paralegal: Self Study Report for Continuation of Program Approval
Agency: American Bar Association, Chicago, IL
Result: Self Study Report written and submitted

The current system of programmatic review is limited to the program faculty and any external specialized accrediting agency, and lacks consistency across programs. The outcomes of a programmatic review may not result in a timely submission of requests for budgetary resources. In addition, the current system does not allow the specific program outcomes and resultant requests for resources to be considered within the context of institutional planning.

Figure 1 illustrates the process for program review using specialized accreditation or approval by an outside agency. Figure 2 illustrates the NECC Program Review Process (2000) as experienced by the Dental Assisting and Criminal Justice programs.
Figure 1

Example of Program Review Using Specialized Program Accreditation/Approval Process

Program responds to notice from external agency, using format defined by that agency

Annual Report or Self Study Report

Annual Report of Program Status

Self Study Report

On-Site Visit

Progress Report

Continue Routine Monitoring of Program Outcomes

Yes

Accepted by Agency

No

Yes

Accredit or Approve without further activity

No
Program Review Using

Program Faculty completed Program Review Process

Department Chair submits completed Report to Division Dean

??
Operational Definitions

Accreditation: A status conferred upon an institution or program that measures the institution or program against a set of agreed upon standards and insuring that the institution or program meets those standards. Accreditation is a tool that helps to assure the public that graduates of the institution or program will be well prepared and qualified to enter the workforce. These same characteristics apply to a program that holds programmatic approval or certification from an outside, peer-review agency.

Action Plan: Identifying the steps the department/program will take to make improvements in its program(s), consistent with the College and department/program goals.

Core Values: The NECC Core Values can be accessed through the following link: http://www.necc.mass.edu/about/about_values.shtml

Full-time Faculty: A faculty member who holds a full time position as defined by the collective bargaining agreement. This is one who typically teaches the equivalent of 15 credit hours per semester, or 30 credit hours annually, and completes the requisite number of college service hours.

Institutional Learning Outcomes: The overarching competencies demonstrated by any student who completes an associate degree at NECC.

Institutional Strategic Plan: The Institutional Strategic Plan can be accessed through the following link: http://www.necc.mass.edu/new/stratplan.shtml

Mission Statement: The NECC Mission Statement can be accessed through the following link: http://www.necc.mass.edu/about/about_mission.shtml

Part-time Faculty: A faculty member who holds other than a full time position, as defined by the collective bargaining agreement. These faculty may be part-time and funded by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or be paid through the use of either institutional or grand funds (e.g., DCE, part-time 01).

Program: An organized curriculum that culminates in either a degree or certificate.

Program Outcomes: The skills or abilities a student demonstrates upon completion of a program of study at NECC.

Successful job placement: A student who has either entered the military, or is employed (either full or part-time) in a position related to his/her education.

Successful transfer placement: A student who meets his/her educational goals and is accepted for transfer into a post-associate degree granting institution.
Improvement Theory

“Why do we need this process for Program Review?”

“What’s the ‘real’ reason we are doing this? Isn’t it really just a way for administration to close down programs?”

These three questions have been raised more than once to members of the Program Review Team. Therefore, we believe it is necessary to include some background and respond to these questions before we state the improvement theory.

The program review process exists to provide a framework within which areas of strength and areas in need of improvement may be identified. The sole purpose of Institutional Program Review is to strengthen the academic programs offered at Northern Essex Community College. Therefore, the conceptual framework guiding Institutional Program Review will embed elements of continuous improvement as described by Dr. Stan Jensen in his book Continuous Process Improvement/AQIP Team Development for Colleges and Universities (2003; McMillen Publishing, Ames, Iowa).

Colleges are increasingly called upon to be accountable to the various institutional constituencies. These constituencies include, but are not limited to, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education, programmatic accrediting agencies, students, employers of graduates, and third-party funding sources such as grant agencies.

NECC holds institutional accreditation through NEASC. This accreditation is vital to the survival of the college because it is the vehicle through which students access federal and state financial aid programs; it allows students and the institution to participate in various grant and scholarship programs; and, institutional accreditation is a required element in programmatic accreditation. Graduation from an accredited program is a prerequisite to sitting for licensure and other certification examinations for those graduates who will enter professions that require state licensing or specialty certification as a condition of employment.

With this background in mind, the Improvement Theory for Program Review is:

All programs of instruction offered at NECC will benefit by participating in a structured process of self-study by using a common data set and timeline that allows the findings to be incorporated into program, division, and institutional strategic planning and the college’s budget cycle.

Changes in the System

The Program Review process developed in 2000 is not currently active. As a result, implementation of any system for Program Review constitutes a significant change for the college.

A review of the 2000 version of Program Review reveals that most of the activity focused on written description. Further, although the process did require the reporting of data required in programmatic accreditation documents, the reporting format was significantly different. According to the two program directors who agreed to pilot the 2000 version, this created a burdensome and ineffective system for conducting a program review that enhanced or built upon the elements of their specialized program accreditation.
The 2004 version of Program Review incorporates both description and tabular display of data. Various reporting tables and grids used in several specialized program accreditation documents (e.g., Respiratory Care, Medical Assisting, Nursing, and Paralegal programs) were modified to meet the needs of the Program Review process. Program coordinators/faculty in programs with specialized accreditation will be able to report data that has already been gathered, in a format that does not require significant manipulation. Academic programs that do not currently participate in specialized program accreditation will likely find the data required in Program Review to be easily obtained from a variety of institutional resources (e.g., Institutional Research, Human Resources). The Program Review team believes that the use of tabular data will allow easy transformation into visual charts and diagrams to illustrate significant findings, should the program coordinator/faculty choose to use these methods.

Recognizing that Program Outcomes Assessment is a critical feature of any program review process, the Program Review team elected to require programs to insert their on-going outcome assessment and action plans in “Section Five: Program Outcomes.” The Program Review team believes this reduces the amount of duplicative work for program faculty, while reinforcing the inherent relationship between effective program review and program outcome assessment.

Costs of Improvement in the System

The costs associated with implementing the institutional Program Review process relate to personnel, physical space, and equipment/supplies. The Program Review team projects the cost of personnel and associated office furnishings to be approximately $155,000 - $160,000 annually. In the months immediately preceding accreditation activities, programs typically seek additional funds for improving laboratory and office space, for purchasing new equipment that is reflective of contemporary work environments, and for enhancing the purchase of supplies that are required to support the curriculum plan. The costs of improving the system by implementing a well-planned, systematic calendar for program review activities will likely not exceed the current costs associated with addressing critical needs identified in conjunction with specialized accreditation activities. For programs that do not participate in specialized accreditation activities, the costs of improvement will occur in a planned environment rather than addressing an issue of broken or out-dated equipment and supplies in an emergent nature. Each general category of cost is further described in the following sections.

Personnel

It is apparent that the college needs to identify an individual who “owns” the responsibility for overseeing the Program Review process. Activities associated with program review will compete for the attention of both academic administrators and faculty. In the absence of an individual who has program review at the top of his/her priority list, it is likely that these activities will continue to occur in a haphazard, episodic nature instead of being incorporated into the culture of the college’s academic community. When one considers the complementary nature of Program Outcome Assessment and Program Review, it is reasonable to believe that a full-time position should be created to allow these activities to occur on a day-to-day basis. The cost of salary and benefits for this position are anticipated to be in the neighborhood of $100,000 annually.

In addition, appropriate clerical support will be required, both to support the new position and also to provide support to program coordinators/faculty as they develop, distribute, collect, and prepare data for analysis. This is anticipated to be not less than a 20-hour per/week position. The salary and benefits associated with this position are anticipated to be in the neighborhood of $25,000-$30,000 annually.
Finally, the new positions will require computers, telephones, and office space and furnishings. The anticipated costs associated with identifying and equipping office space are approximately $30,000.

The Program Review process, once fully implemented, may result in identifying critical faculty needs for specific programs. It is not possible at this time to project either the number of these critical faculty needs, or the salary requirements to fund them.

Physical Space

Programs are required to evaluate whether the existing space allocated to support the curriculum plan (classrooms, specialized laboratories) provide an environment that is conducive to effective teaching and learning. It is likely that programs that participate in an effective review process will identify the need either for additional physical space, or the need to enhance existing physical space. It is not possible at this time to project the costs associated with the need to improve or expand the physical plant to support the academic programs.

Equipment/Supplies

The episodic nature of specialized program accreditation activity resulted in programs participating in a cycle of urgency followed by a cycle of inactivity and, sometimes, benign neglect. Over the past decade, outcome assessment has deeply penetrated specialized program accreditation processes, however, the primary outcomes have focused on graduate performance on credentialing and licensure examinations, and graduate employment. It has been too easy for programs to fall into a sense of false security regarding accreditation status when these two outcomes meet the reporting thresholds. As a result, significant costs related to program improvements tend to remain correlated with producing self-study reports and on-site visits as part of the cycle of re-accreditation. These costs do not always occur in concert with the college’s budget cycle, therefore, seeking funds to address the immediate programmatic needs often occurs in the absence of budgetary planning and requires the shifting of funds from one source to another.

Cost and Time Savings

Cost and time savings will result from a systematic planned activity resulting in proactive budgeting and the ability to seek outside funding in a timely manner. It is not possible to quantify the cost and time savings at this time. At a minimum, implementation of the Program Review process will decrease the stress and tension associated with the constant need to “fix” the programs as a result of an outside agency visit.

Anticipated Positive Results and Impact on Program Constituencies

The public views the college community through the lens of the quality of our academic programs, and through student satisfaction with their educational experience at NECC. An effective system for Program Review will enhance the quality of the academic programs offered at NECC by stimulating an environment that is responsive to economic, vocational, educational, and social realities. Faculty will be empowered to make effective, data-driven decisions about academic curricula based on the results of reviews of their programs. Administrators will have access to quality data to use when making decisions about budgetary allocations and planned growth activities for the College. Students and graduates will participate in their education experiences in a dynamic, energetic environment that routinely collects data and responds appropriately.
Institutional Support

The following statement that appears in the Northern Essex Community College Strategic Plan, FY2004-2006, illustrates institutional support:

Accountable College
2.c We will assess quality with systems such as Institutional Effectiveness and Academic Program Review.

http://www.necc.mass.edu/about/stratplan.shtml accessed December 10, 2004

Implementation

The Program Review process will be implemented as a pilot process in the spring 2005 semester. Two programs will participate in the pilot, thus allowing the Program Review Team to evaluate the clarity and effectiveness of the procedure. Based on the outcome of the pilot, members of the Program Review Team will make procedural revisions so that the process can be fully implemented in the fall 2005 semester.

The draft Institutional Program Review Handbook is appended to this report as Appendix A.

Pilot program selection

The Program Review Team believes programs that have “cohort” classes and are accredited by an outside agency will find the Program Review process easy to implement. We are, however, concerned about the implementation for those programs that typically enroll students who progress through the curriculum in a non-traditional manner, and that rely to a larger extent on part-time faculty. During the pilot phase we will select one program that is a quasi-cohort (the students are more like cohort in that there is a defined, systematic progression through the curriculum, although not to the extent of, for example, the health programs) and one program that is not considered to have a cohort format. At the time of this writing, two programs have been identified as potential pilot phase participants.

Resources required to implement the pilot phase

Each program coordinator will be given at least one course reduction during the spring 2005 semester. Assuming that the individual will be replaced with a DCE faculty member earning a Step 4 salary, the direct cost of implementation will be approximately $3,000 per course, or $6,000.

Each program should have access to an outside consultant if requested. Consultant fees in the amount of $3,000 should be allocated to cover these requests, should there be sufficient justification.

Indirectly there are opportunity costs for the program faculty piloting the Program Review process. Indirect costs also include the time the Program Review Team will spend reviewing and revising the procedure and associated documents in response to feedback from the pilot phase program faculty.

Figure 3 illustrates the flowchart for the pilot phase procedure.
Figure 3

Activity Flow During A One-Semester Pilot Phase – Spring 2005

Program selected to participate in pilot phase.

Program faculty review procedures for clarity.

Yes

Program faculty engage in Program Review process.

Yes

Steps clear?

No

Program Review Team revises procedure in response to feedback from program faculty.

No

Program Review Team returns revised process to program faculty.

Program faculty revises report and resubmits it to Division Dean.

Division Dean returns to program faculty with report and rationale for decision.

No

Division Dean Submits to VPDAA and Dean’s Staff

VP accepts recommendations

Yes

Recommendations implemented by program faculty and Division Dean

Yes

No
**Studying the Results**

Results of the pilot phase will be studied using direct feedback from the participants.

The pilot phase will be considered successful if each of the two programs is able to implement the Program Review process and bring the activity to closure. Minor adjustments to the procedure as a result of the pilot phase will not be considered an unsuccessful outcome of implementation.

**Engrafting Improvements**

During the spring 2005 semester, the Program Review Team will consult with the division deans and establish a five-year calendar for program review activities. The Institutional Program Review process will be fully institutionalized with each program having participated in Program Review not later than the spring 2008 semester.

Program faculty will incorporate the Program Review process into daily operation of the program.

The Vice President and Dean of Academic Affairs, in concert with his Dean’s Staff, will recommend quality improvements based upon the results of the institution-wide review of programs.

The Program Review calendar will coincide with the institutional planning and budget cycle.

Documentation for budget requests will include program review evaluations and recommendations.

**Future Improvements**

The initial implementation of the Program Review process will include all associate degree granting programs. The second phase of implementation will include certificate programs.

Developing and implementing a web-based system for completing the Program Review would be a logical future improvement. Technical considerations should include automatic population of specific data fields from the Office of Institutional Research. This will require the development of a comprehensive database, with links to the Program Review charts. Enhancing the use of technology during the Program Review process will reduce manual data collection and entry, and therefore reduce staff time associated with the procedure.
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Purpose

The program review process exists to provide a framework within which areas of strength and areas in need of improvement may be identified. The sole purpose of Institutional Program Review is to strengthen the academic programs offered at Northern Essex Community College. Therefore, the conceptual framework guiding Institutional Program Review will embed elements of continuous improvement as described by Dr. Stan Jensen in his book Continuous Process Improvement/AQIP Team Development for Colleges and Universities (2003; McMillen Publishing, Ames, Iowa).

Colleges are increasingly called upon to be accountable to the various institutional constituencies. These constituencies include, but are not limited to, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education, programmatic accrediting agencies, students, employers of graduates, and third-party funding sources such as grant agencies.

NECC holds institutional accreditation through NEASC. This accreditation is vital to the survival of the college because it is the vehicle through which students access federal and state financial aid programs; it allows students and the institution to participate in various grant and scholarship programs; and, institutional accreditation is a required element in programmatic accreditation. Graduation from an accredited program is a prerequisite to sitting for licensure and other certification examinations for those graduates who will enter professions that require state licensing or specialty certification as a condition of employment.

Standard Four in the 2001 NEASC Standards for Accreditation, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, delineates the standards for programs and instruction against which the College is assessed during accreditation reviews. (See Appendix A-1 for relevant sections of Standard Four).

Program Assessment Cycle

[Diagram of the Program Assessment Cycle: Plan, Implement, Determine Outcomes]
Resources (Key areas that can provide help; contact person(s) with phone number and e-mail)

**Director of Institutional Research**
Thomas Fallon 978-556-3866 tfallon@necc.mass.edu

**Division Administrators**
- **Business, Math, Science, Engineering and Technology**
  - Susan Grolnic, Dean 978-556-3893 sgrolnic@necc.mass.edu
  - Kathleen Proietti 978-556-3874 kproietti@necc.mass.edu
- **Assistant Dean, Business, Math, Science, and Technology**
  - Catherine Sanderson 978-556-3968 csanderson@necc.mass.edu
- **Humanities and Social Sciences (Acting)**
  - Elizabeth Wilcoxson 978-556-3967 ewilcoxson@necc.mass.edu
- **Assistant Dean, Humanities**
  - Jackie Long-Goding, Dean 978-738-7481 jlonggoding@necc.mass.edu
  - Anne Zabriskie 978-738-7446 azabriskie@necc.mass.edu
- **Assistant Dean, Social Sciences**
  - Julie Ward 978-738-7447 jward@necc.mass.edu
- **Health Professions**
  - Ellen Grondine, Director 978-738-7453 egrondine@necc.mass.edu
- **Director of Medical Support Specialty Programs**
  - David Kelley, Dean 978-556-3401 dkelly@necc.mass.edu
  - Patricia McDermott 978-556-3839 pmcdermott@necc.mass.edu
- **Instructional and Student Support**
  - Grace Dimmick, Assistant Dean 978-556-3449 gdimmick@necc.mass.edu
- **Assistant Dean, Developmental Education**
  - Stephen Fabbucci, Dean 978-556-3923 sfabbucci@necc.mass.edu
  - Mary Chatigny 978-556-3925 mchatigny@necc.mass.edu

**Academic Advising Center**
- **Director of Academic Advising Center**
  - Grace Dimmick, Assistant Dean 978-556-3449 gdimmick@necc.mass.edu

**Human Resources**
- **Director of Human Resources**
  - Stephen Fabbucci, Dean 978-556-3923 sfabbucci@necc.mass.edu
  - Mary Chatigny 978-556-3925 mchatigny@necc.mass.edu
Operational Definitions

**Accreditation:** A status conferred upon an institution or program that measures the institution or program against a set of agreed upon standards and ensuring that the institution or program meets those standards. Accreditation is a tool that helps to assure the public that graduates of the institution or program will be well prepared and qualified to enter the workforce. These same characteristics apply to a program that holds programmatic approval or certification from an outside, peer-review agency.

**Action Plan:** Identifying the steps the department/program will take to make improvements in its program(s), consistent with the College and department/program goals.

**Core Values:** The NECC Core Values can be accessed through the following link: [http://www.necc.mass.edu/about/about_values.shtml](http://www.necc.mass.edu/about/about_values.shtml)

**Full-time Faculty:** A faculty member who holds a full time position as defined by the collective bargaining agreement. This is one who typically teaches the equivalent of 15 credit hours per semester, or 30 credit hours annually, and completes the requisite number of college service hours.

**Institutional Learning Outcomes:** The overarching competencies demonstrated by any student who completes an associate degree at NECC.

**Institutional Strategic Plan:** The Institutional Strategic Plan can be accessed through the following link: [http://www.necc.mass.edu/new/stratplan.shtml](http://www.necc.mass.edu/new/stratplan.shtml)

**Mission Statement:** The NECC Mission Statement can be accessed through the following link: [http://www.necc.mass.edu/about/about_mission.shtml](http://www.necc.mass.edu/about/about_mission.shtml)

**Part-time Faculty:** A faculty member who holds other than a full time position, as defined by the collective bargaining agreement. These faculty may be part-time and funded by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or be paid through the use of either institutional or grand funds (e.g., DCE, part-time 01).

**Program:** An organized curriculum that culminates in either a degree or certificate.

**Program Outcomes:** The skills or abilities a student demonstrates upon completion of a program of study at NECC.

**Successful job placement:** A student who has either entered the military, or is employed (either full or part-time) in a position related to his/her education.

**Successful transfer placement:** A student who meets his/her educational goals and is accepted for transfer into a post-associate degree granting institution.
Program Review Team Members and Responsibilities:

Program Review Facilitator (Proposed New Position)
1. Maintains master calendar used to schedule program review activity.
2. Mentors and provides consultation related to the overarching process of program review.
3. Informs Assistant Dean/Dean/Department Chairs/Program Coordinators each spring of programs that have been identified for Program Review.
4. Schedules initial meeting to inform and discuss evaluation materials and process.
5. Reviews drafts of Program Review reports.
6. Assists with identification and development of surveys.
7. Provides administrative support during distribution of surveys.
8. Provides administrative support during collection and analysis of completed surveys.

Assistant Dean/Dean of area
1. Serves as Sponsor of the team
2. Reviews drafts of Program Review reports.
3. Assists with follow-up on implementation of Action Plan.
4. Receives and presents the final report at the VP/DAA meeting

Department Chair (or designee)
1. Meets with Program Review Facilitator and Program Coordinator to review the evaluation process.
2. May either chair the Program Review team, or participate as a member of the team.
3. Identifies faculty members to serve on the Program Review team.
   3.a At least one faculty member shall be from outside the department/program.
   3.b At least one faculty member shall be from outside the division.
   3c At least one faculty member other than Department Chair/designee shall be a member of the program faculty.
4. Identifies at least one Advisory Committee member to serve on the Program Review team. This individual must come from outside the institution.
5. Identifies and develops appropriate survey instruments.
6. Coordinates distribution of student, graduate, and faculty surveys.

Director of Institutional Research (ad hoc)
1. Provides demographic data on population(s) being reviewed.
2. Provides and distributes to the department chair information about program graduates, employment, and transfer rates as appropriate.
3. Assists with identification, development and analysis of appropriate surveys.

Vice President and Dean of Academic Affairs (ad hoc)
1. Schedules Program Review on at least one VP/DAA meeting each fall and spring to receive reports from Assistant Dean/Dean(s) and program coordinator, as appropriate.
2. Reviews findings and recommendations from Program Review team.
3. Meets with area Dean and Program Review Facilitator to participate in development of institutional role in the Action Plan.
Timeline:

Calendar for Completing and Submitting Academic Program Review

The Program Review Facilitator shall maintain a copy of the current Program Review Process, including the five –year schedule for programs to be reviewed. This shall be posted on the College’s intranet.

April 1  The Program Review Facilitator sends those deans, directors, department chairs, and program coordinators with programs scheduled for program review during the next academic year copies of blank forms. Programs are notified whether the Program Review process will be conducted in either the fall semester or the spring semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester Review</th>
<th>Spring Semester Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1 – May 1</td>
<td>October 1 – November 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Program Review Facilitator schedules meetings with each area dean and program coordinator/department chair to review the evaluation process.

| April 1 – May 15 | October 1 – November 15 |

Program faculty identify at least two members of the Advisory Committee who are willing to serve on the Program Review Team. At least one of these must be from outside the institution.

Name and credentials of at least two candidates for outside consultant, should the program faculty request to use this resource, are submitted to the division dean. The individual’s willingness to serve, should s/he be asked to do so by the dean, should be determined prior to submitting the recommendation.

Program faculty submit roster of recommendations for Program Review Team members to division dean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 1</th>
<th>December 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The division dean notifies the program faculty of his/her selection of members of the Program Review Team. The Program Review Team shall consist of at least five (5) members, as defined in the Program Review Team Members and Responsibilities section.
### Calendar for Completing and Submitting Academic Program Review (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 1 – December 15</th>
<th>December 1 – April 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Review Team obtains and analyzes information required to complete the program review process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1 – 15 and April 1 – April 15: Outside consultant, if used, should receive final draft and submit written summary report describing the program’s areas of strength and suggestions for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division dean receives final copy of Program Review document not later than December 20 for fall semester reviews and April 20 for spring semester reviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### January

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Vice President and Dean of Academic Affairs schedules a one-day retreat during which the Dean’s Staff will receive Program Review reports. Scheduling of the retreat shall be such that recommendations can be considered during the college’s budgeting process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations set forth in the program review’s action plans shall be acted upon in the following manner:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accepted:</strong> Recommendations included in the budget proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Accepted:</strong> Recommendation(s) returned to program faculty by division dean with report and rationale for the decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### July 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding for approved recommendations available in college budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During this fiscal year, the division dean shall receive and present to the Dean’s Staff reports describing the status of each of the recommendations in the program review’s action plan, using the following descriptions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implemented:</strong> The recommendation has been fully implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In progress:</strong> The recommendation process is being implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation not yet begun:</strong> Implementation of the recommendation has not yet begun. Briefly explain why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Removed from consideration:</strong> It was determined that the recommendation is no longer appropriate for the program. Briefly explain why.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Organization**

**PROGRAM:**

Submits this Program Review document in fulfillment of the NECC requirements for a comprehensive and systemic review of each academic program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Responsible for Completing the Program Review</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Coordinator</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Chair (if appropriate)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Dean/Director</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean of Division</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section One: Program

1. Does the program have external (specialized) programmatic accreditation?

Yes [ ]    No [ ]

If Yes, please complete the following:

1.a What is the name of the programmatic accreditation agency?

1.b What is the current accreditation status of the program?

What date was the last accreditation status awarded? What is the anticipated date of the next accreditation action?

1.c How often does the program file an official report with the accrediting agency?

1.d Where is the program currently in the review schedule (e.g., year 3 of a 7 year cycle)?

1.e What were the strengths and weaknesses of the program, as identified by the accreditation agency during the last accreditation activity?

Base your response in this area to the citation of Standards.

1.f How has the program been revised to address the citations or recommendations?

2. The program’s mission statement and philosophy are consistent with the mission and philosophy of the College.

Insert the program’s mission statement and philosophy.

Describe the process through which faculty developed the program mission and philosophy.

How does this program facilitate the accomplishment of the College’s mission and core values?
3. The program satisfies one or more of the College’s institutional goals as defined in the Institutional Strategic Plan.

Describe how this program is consistent with one or more goals defined in the Institutional Strategic Plan.

How would significant modification of this program impact other programs at NECC?

4. Program policies and procedures are consistent with those of the institution.

Programs may need to develop specific policies and procedures related to the day-to-day operation of the specific program (e.g., to meet accreditation standards, to establish the parameters for clinical education experiences). When there are specific program policies and procedures, these policies and procedures should be consistent with those of the institution.

Differences between program-specific policies and institutional policies should be described within the context of the program. List any specific program and policies and procedures, and comment on the rationale for any differences from institutional policy and procedure.

5. Students are provided with the current policies, procedures, and relevant information about the program.

Describe the mechanism used to assure that all students enrolled in the specific program receive copies of program specific policies and procedures. Describe the mechanism used to assure that all students in the program receive information about the institutional policies and procedures.

6. The program has in place policies, procedures, or practices related to student success.

State the mechanism used by the program to define student success. For example, if the program facilitates student transfer, and students do indeed transfer, does this meet the program’s definition of success?

How does the program implement its policies, procedures, or practices to enhance student retention?
Section Two: Students

1. The program systematically determines student demand for the program through a process of competitive analysis.

   Complete Chart 1.

2. The program policies, procedures, and practices related to student retention are effective.

   Complete Chart 2.

   Comment on the effectiveness of program policies, procedures, and practices related to student retention.

   If there are two or more consecutive years in which there are five (5) or fewer graduates from the program, describe the analysis conducted by faculty to determine the reason for this number of graduates. Include the action plan the faculty developed and implemented. Comment on the effectiveness of the action plan.

   Complete Chart 3.

   Is there evidence that any segment of the student population has a higher attrition rate from this program? If so, what action has the program taken to address this phenomenon?
Section Three: Curriculum

1. The curriculum is an organized, sequential series of courses that progress from simple to complex learning.

   Insert a copy of the curriculum.

2. The program recognizes the dynamic nature of curriculum development, review and revision.

   State the process used by the program to assure the curriculum meets the needs of students and graduates.

   Describe the mechanisms that allow the employers of program graduates to have input into the curriculum review process.

   How does the curriculum contribute to the student accomplishing the institutional outcomes?

   How does the curriculum contribute to the student accomplishing the program specific outcomes?
Section Four: Program Resources

The program has appropriate resources to accomplish its mission and outcomes.

1. The number of faculty assigned to the program is adequate to complete all activities associated with maintaining a high-quality educational program.

   If the program holds specialized accreditation or approval, state the number of full time faculty (or full time equivalent faculty) required by the outside agency.

   Complete Chart 4.

   What is the ratio of full to part-time faculty in the program? Illustrate the ratio of full time faculty to part time faculty by completing Chart 5. Provide the information for the current and preceding two semesters (e.g., fall/spring/fall or spring/fall/spring).

   How does the ratio of full to part time faculty impact the program?

   Illustrate the credentials of faculty teaching in the program by completing Chart 6. This chart can also be used to document the manner by which faculty maintain their status as content experts and remain current in their field of expertise.

   Complete Chart 6 for each member faculty (full, part time or DCE).

2. The program has classrooms and laboratories of sufficient quality and quantity to provide an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning.

   Does the program have classrooms and laboratories that are adequate to provide an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning? How did the program coordinator/faculty make this decision?

3. The program has access to instructional technology of sufficient quality and quantity to provide an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning.

   Describe the instructional technology required to support the program’s curriculum plan. Is the current instructional technology adequate to provide an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning? How did the program coordinator/faculty make this decision?
4. The program has access to adequate library and related learning resources to provide an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning.

How does the program use the library and related learning resources in the implementation of the curriculum plan?

Are the current library and related learning resources adequate to support the curriculum plan? Describe the process used by the program to determine that the library and related learning resources are adequate to provide an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning.

5. The program has adequate financial resources to achieve its stated mission.

How does the program coordinator/faculty participate in developing the program/department budget?

Are the financial resources allocated to the program adequate to support the program's mission? How does the program coordinator/faculty participate in evaluating the adequacy of the budget to support effective teaching and learning?

Complete Chart 7.

6. The program uses appropriate content experts as a resource.

Does the program have an advisory committee?

If not, what is the program's rationale for this decision?

If yes, insert the following:

4.6.1 Roster of Advisory Committee Members
4.6.2 Schedule of meetings for the past three years.
4.6.3 Insert a copy of the Advisory Committee meeting minutes for the past three years.
4.6.4 Describe the input of the Advisory Committee experts on program outcomes.
4.6.5 Describe the usefulness of the Advisory Committee relative to anticipating changes and challenges that need to be met by the program.
Section Five: Program Outcomes

1. The program participates in Program Outcome Assessment.

   Insert the Program Outcome Assessment plan for the previous three years. If the program has participated in Program Outcome Assessment for less than three years, please comment on the reason and insert the number of Program Outcome Assessment plans the program has completed.

   How has the Program Review confirmed the findings of the program outcome assessment activities?

Section Six: Summary
(Includes Conclusion, Action Plan(s), Request(s) for Resources)

Conclusion
Having complete the Program Review process, the program coordinator/faculty have determined:

1. the program’s major strengths (list and describe, citing evidence for each identified strength.)

2. the program’s weaknesses or areas in which improvement is desirable (list and describe, citing evidence for each identified weakness or area of improvement).

Action Plan
An Action Plan must be submitted for each identified weakness or area in which improvement is desirable. When designing the Action Plan, a suggested plan would include the elements of Process Management using a Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle.

Complete Chart 8.

Resources Requested

Complete Chart 9

Include quotes from vendors, diagrams for requested space, and draft postings as appropriate.
Appendix A-1

New England Association for Schools and Colleges
Standards for Accreditation (2001)

Standard Four
PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION

4.1 The institution’s primary focus is the education of its students. The institution offers collegiate-level programs that lead to degrees in recognized fields of study and require at least one academic year to complete. The institution for which the associate’s degree is the highest awarded offers at least one program in liberal studies or general studies. A program is defined as a curriculum of studies, however formulated, that leads to a degree or other form of academic recognition.

4.2 The institution’s programs are consistent with and serve to fulfill its mission and purposes. Each educational program demonstrates consistency through its goals, structure, and content; policies and procedures for admission and retention; instructional methods and procedures; and the nature, quality, and extent of student learning and achievement. The institution provides sufficient resources to sustain and improve programs and instruction.

4.3 The institution clearly specifies and publishes degree objectives and requirements for each program. Such objectives include the knowledge, intellectual skills, and methods of inquiry to be acquired. In addition, if relevant to the program, objectives include creative abilities and value to be developed and specific career-preparation practices to be mastered. Programs have a coherent design and are characterized by appropriate breadth, depth, continuity, sequential progression, and synthesis of learning.

4.4 The institution undertakes academic planning and evaluation to achieve and, where possible, to enhance the achievement of program objectives. These activities are realistic and take into account stated goals and available resources. The institution allocates human, technological, financial, and physical resources on the basis of its academic plans, needs, and objectives. It recognizes and takes account of the increased demands on resources made by programs offered at a higher degree level.

4.5 As part of its overall planning and evaluation, the institution develops, approves, administers, and periodically reviews its degree programs under established, clearly defined, and effective institutional policies which are demonstrably implemented by designated bodies with clearly established channels of communication and control. Faculty have a substantive voice in the design and execution of the curriculum. The evaluation of existing programs includes an assessment of their effectiveness and continued need. Additions and deletions of programs or courses are consistent with available resources, faculty expertise, student needs, and academic planning.
Curricular planning and evaluation take into account the role of the multiple resources required for the development and improvement of academic programs.

4.6 When programs are eliminated or program requirements are changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements for enrolled students so that they may complete their education with a minimum of disruption.

4.7 Programs and courses are designed to ensure an opportunity for reflection and for analysis of the subject matter. The institution offering programs and courses for abbreviated or concentrated time periods or via different delivery modalities demonstrates that students completing these programs or courses acquire levels of knowledge, understanding, and competencies comparable to those expected in similar programs offered in more traditional time periods and modalities.

4.8 Courses and programs offered for credit off campus, through technologically mediated instruction, or through continuing education, evening or week-end divisions are consistent with the educational objectives of the institution. Such activities are integral parts of the institution and maintain the same academic standards as courses and programs offered on campus. They receive sufficient support for instructional and other needs. Students have ready access to appropriate learning resources. The institution maintains direct and sole responsibility for the academic quality of all aspects of all programs and assures adequate resources to maintain quality. On-campus faculty have a substantive role in the design and implementation of off-campus programs. In programs and/or courses that use special delivery systems (such as computers, newspapers, television, video or audiotape) appropriate opportunities are provided for students to question and discuss course content with faculty.

4.9 If the institution depends on resources outside its direct control (for example, classrooms, library resources, testing sites), provision is made for a clear, fixed understanding of that relationship which ensures the reasonable continued availability of those resources. Clear descriptions of the circumstances and procedures for the use of such resources are readily available to students who require them.

4.10 Conferences, institutes, workshops, or other instructional or enrichment activities that are sponsored by the institution or carry its name are compatible with its purposes and are administered within its organizational structure. The institution assumes responsibility for the appropriateness and integrity of such activities.

4.11 The institution has the responsibility for the academic elements of all instructional programs and course for which it awards institutional credit. These responsibilities include course content and the delivery of the instructional program; selection and approval of faculty; admission, registration, and retention of students; evaluation of prior learning; and evaluation of student progress, including the awarding and recording of credit.
**Undergraduate Degree Programs**

4.12 Undergraduate degree programs are designed to give students a substantial and coherent introduction to the broad areas of human knowledge, their theories and methods of inquiry, plus in-depth study in at least one disciplinary or interdisciplinary area. Programs have an appropriate rationale; their clarity and order are visible in stated requirements in official publications and in student records. Curricula are appropriate, within the context of collegiate education, to the abilities and scholastic preparation of the students admitted to the programs.

4.13 While these criteria apply to all undergraduate programs, specific expectations for associate’s and bachelor’s degree programs, as expressed through the Commission’s accreditation processes, will reflect program degree level. Distinctions made in such expectations may concern such matter as the level, scope, and dimension of degree requirements, and expected outcomes.

4.14 Each undergraduate program includes a general education requirement and a major or concentration requirement. Curricula include requirements above the introductory level with appropriate prerequisites. Wherever possible, the institution also affords undergraduate students the opportunity to pursue knowledge and understanding through unrestricted electives. All undergraduate programs require the use of information resources in addition to course texts and formal instruction.

4.15 The general education requirement is coherent and substantive, and it embodies the institution’s definition of an educated person. The requirement informs the design of all general education courses, and provides criteria for its evaluation.

4.16 The general education requirement in each undergraduate program – general, specialized, or professional – ensures adequate breadth for all degree-seeking students by showing a balanced regard for what are traditionally referred to as the arts and humanities; the sciences including mathematics; and the social sciences. General education requirements include offerings that focus on the subject matter and methodologies of these three primary domains of knowledge as well as on their relationships to one another.

4.17 The institution ensures that all undergraduate students complete one-third of their studies (or the equivalent of forty semester hours in a bachelor’s degree program, or the equivalent of twenty semester hours in an associates degree program) in general education. If the institution offers any program which does not include at least one-third of its requirements in general education, it is able to demonstrate that the program meets the goals expressed in Paragraph 4.19 of this Standard. In no case, however, does the general education component of an undergraduate program constitute less than one-quarter of its degree requirements (or the equivalent of thirty semester hours in a bachelor’s degree program, or the equivalent of fifteen semester hours in an associate’s degree program).
4.18 The major or area of concentration affords the student the opportunity to develop knowledge and skills in a specific disciplinary or interdisciplinary area above the introductory level, through properly sequenced course work. Requirements for the major or area of concentration are based upon clearly defined and articulated learning objectives, including a mastery of the knowledge, methods, and theories pertinent to a particular area of inquiry. Through the major or area of concentration, the student develops an understanding of the complex structure of knowledge germane to an area of inquiry and its interrelatedness to other areas of inquiry. For programs designed to provide professional training, an effective relationship exists between curricular content and current practice in the field of specialization. General studies associate’s degree programs designed to provide the foundation for later specialization through transfer into baccalaureate programs are exempted from the requirements of this paragraph.

4.19 Graduates successfully completing an undergraduate program demonstrate competence in written and oral communication in English; the ability for scientific and quantitative reasoning, for critical analysis and logical thinking; and the capability for continued learning. They also demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific, historical, and social phenomena, and a knowledge and appreciation of the aesthetic and ethical dimensions of humankind. In addition, graduates demonstrate an in-depth understanding of an area of knowledge or practice and of its interrelatedness with other areas.
Chart 1: Competitive Analysis/Student Demand for Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Year:</th>
<th>Year:</th>
<th>Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Applications to Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Transfers to Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment in Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions:

Year: The cohort of students who enroll in a program (identified as declaring the program major) September 1 → August 31. (E.g., for 2004, this would include all students who enroll (declare the major) in Fall 2004, Spring 2005, and Summer 2005.)

Chart 2: Student Retention/Program Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Year:</th>
<th>Year:</th>
<th>Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who transfer prior to graduation from program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions:

Year: The cohort of students who complete the program between September 1 → August 31. (E.g., for 2005, this would be those students who complete graduation requirements at the end of the fall 2004 semester, the end of the spring 2005 semester, and the end of the summer 2005 semester.)
Chart 3: Composition of Program Student Body by Gender and Racial-Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR¹</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>BLACK or AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
<th>AMERICAN INDIAN or ALASKAN NATIVE</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>NATIVE HAWAIIAN or OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>HISPANIC or LATINO</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL²</th>
<th>% MINORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions

¹ Year: The sum of students who enrolled in a program (identified as declaring the program major) September 1 → August 31. (E.g., for 2004, this would include all students who enroll (declare the major) in Fall 2004, Spring 2005, and Summer 2005.)

² Total: The total column must match the annual enrollment identified as “Total Enrollment in Program” from line 3 of Chart 1.
**Chart 4: Faculty Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th># credits taught annually $^1$</th>
<th>FTE $^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions:** Complete this chart for the current and preceding two semesters.

**Definitions**

$^1$ *Annually* refers to the fall and spring semester ONLY.

$^2$ *FTE* = # credits taught annually divided by 30.

**Chart 5: Ratio of Full Time to Part Time Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th># Full Time Faculty</th>
<th># Part Time Faculty</th>
<th>Ratio FT:PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME:</td>
<td>Current Academic Rank:</td>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td>Tenured [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Degrees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>BA [ ]</td>
<td>BS [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Granting Degree:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>MA [ ]</td>
<td>MS [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Granting Degree:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate:</td>
<td>PhD [ ]</td>
<td>EdD [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Granting Degree:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certifications</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Issuing Agency</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications (relevant to teaching responsibilities)</td>
<td>Presentations (relevant to teaching responsibilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education Activities/Professional Development (For past 3 years, or of major significance prior to this time and related to area of teaching responsibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sponsoring Agency</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other information which you believe demonstrates your academic and experiential qualifications, and maintenance of expertise in your area of educational responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHART 7 Financial Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Full time faculty salaries</th>
<th>Part Time and DCE faculty salaries</th>
<th>Professional Development¹</th>
<th>Instructional Supplies</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Assessment²</th>
<th>Other³</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Include all available resources (e.g., Office of Faculty and Staff Development, Perkins, other grants)
² Include any assessment activities, e.g., programmatic accreditation, POAG
³Include other programmatic expenditures, using the following table to identify the type of expenditure and amount.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for Fiscal Year (   )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for Fiscal Year (   )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for Fiscal Year (   )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total for Fiscal Year (   )
## CHART 8: Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Improvement Activity</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Date of Activity</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Improvement Activity</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Date of Activity</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Improvement Activity</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Date of Activity</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Improvement Activity</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Date of Activity</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHART 9: Resource Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIPMENT</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Vendor (include contact information)</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Date Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>Position (identify as faculty, staff, etc.)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Credentials/area of content expertise related to curriculum</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Date Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>Type of space requested</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Description (include square feet, construction requirements, e.g., plumbing, electricity, data ports)</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Date Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>