Montgomery College

College Area Review
Academic Program Review
Program Report 2017-2018

> **Instructions:** *The program should address each section and provide recommendations using the CAR/Academic Program Review Recommendations Report. This narrative format is intended to capture the comprehensive scope of the program. For each degree program in your academic areas, complete a separate report. The report should be limited to 10 pages. Any appendices should not exceed 5 pages. Findings from this report should inform your recommendations.*

NAME of the Program _____

Section One: Program Overview:

1. **Program History/Purpose/Vision**
   a. Provide a brief overview of the program and how this program serves students.

   b. In the last five years, has this program focused on a particular MC 2020 initiative(s) or Academic Master Plan initiative(s), if yes, describe what actions taken to address these initiatives.

2. **Program Curriculum**
   a. **Curriculum Mapping –** Map the program learning outcomes to the required program courses.
      1. List all required courses for the program in column on the left.
      2. List **all** student learning outcomes (SL0) in the learning outcomes columns.
      3. For each course indicate which program outcomes are addressed in this given course using the following key.
         o *Level of instruction*: I – Introduced, R-Reinforced and opportunity to practice, M-Mastery at the graduation or exit level
         o *Assessment Method:* P-Paper, E-Exam, PO – Portfolio, O-Oral presentation, OT-Other (explain briefly)

List Course Name and Number (BIOL 110)	Program Learning Outcomes									
	Learning Outcome 1:		Learning Outcome 2:		Learning Outcome 3:		Learning Outcome 4:		Learning Outcome 5:	
	Level	Assessment	Level	Assessment	Level	Assessment	Level	Assessment	Level	Assessment

b. **After mapping the curriculum, address the following questions:**
   1. Are all the intended program learning outcomes covered in courses?
   2. Review your course outcomes. Do they sufficiently address the program outcome?
   3. Does the sequencing of courses support and build upon concepts as needed for student learning?
   4. Do the outcomes reflect what students should be learning to prepare them for future professional and educational opportunities?
   5. Do the outcomes need to be modified? Discuss any findings, especially inconsistencies. If there are inconsistencies, please provide solutions.
   6. Are there any curriculum actions that may impact how courses are currently mapped and will be mapped in the future?
   7. How do any of the program courses support the General Studies Program?

   Note: If you have not submitted your Program Assessment Plan, use the information above to craft possible recommendations. Also, if your assessment plan is due, use the information above to craft and submit your Program Assessment Plan (see the Program Assessment Plan form) by 10/1 to outcomes@montgomerycollege.edu. Any changes to the intended or proposed curriculum or student learning outcomes must go through the established College curriculum process.

3. Program Delivery Strategies and Cost

Discuss any teaching methodologies, alternative delivery methods, and any teaching innovations used in program courses that are cost saving measures to students? (Examples: OERs, Z courses, reduction in DWF rates)

4. **Program Models and Best Practices** Conduct a benchmarking analysis to compare program practices. Using the MC Peer Institutions List provided, identify three institutions to answer the questions within the table below. *(Note: An external program accreditors report may be substituted for this information. Use the findings gathered from this information to craft possible recommendations.* OR you may select some four-year transfer institutions to gather information about program models or a combination of the two.

College Name or Accrediting Body: List names of people and position interviewed, institution's website, and phone number and any other pertinent contact information.	1:	2:	3:
Briefly explain why the program at this institution was chosen.			
What similarities exist between Montgomery College's program and this institution?			

What differences exist between Montgomery College's program and this institution?			

Summary Questions: *Based on information from the three institutions above, please answer the following questions below:*

How does MC's program requirements, course offerings, and content compare to the other institutions' program in quantity (# of course offerings), scope (range of program subjects addressed), and depth (100 vs 200 level courses)?

Is MC's program aligned with current trends and best practices in the field, if not, provide an explanation?

Based on the findings, what changes (additions or modifications) should this program consider?

5. **Program Advisory Committee and Articulation Agreements**
   a. **Advisory Committee:** What is the current status of your program advisory board? Does the board meet regularly, how often, and include representation from appropriate industry and academia? Provide a listing of all board members including their affiliation with industry and or academia. How has the advisory committee helped inform and shape program development, modification, and evaluation?

   b. **Articulation Agreements:** Examine the current formal articulation agreements and cooperative agreements that this program has with four year institutions, other community colleges, and high schools. How current are they? What additional agreements are planned, in process, or should be pursued? To address this question, use the information from the College's Articulation website: http://cms.montgomerycollege.edu/edu/department.aspx?id=22488 or contact the College's Transfer and Articulation Manager.

6. **Program and Student Perspective** *(See Student Survey Guide for additional information)*
   a. Using a method identified by the program (e.g. focus group, survey or questionnaire in a required class), collect information from students in this program to better understand their educational experience. Potential topics to include are:
      - Special or unique features of the program
      - Extent to which the program outcomes were emphasized throughout the student's educational experience
      - Any questions that would inform the program's impact on student success and meeting the student's educational goals (e.g. student advising).

Section Two: Program Data: *(See Data Guidelines: Program Enrollments and Awards)*

1. Have program data benchmarks been met? Address the College's benchmarks based on the institutional data provided. If all the benchmarks are not met, provide an explanation indicating action steps to meet data benchmarks in the future. Each degree track should be identified and addressed separately. *(Use the information to craft possible recommendations to address any unmet benchmarks).*

2. Using the data provided from EMSI: Industry Data, are there specific actions this program could take to improve career opportunities for their students, e.g., updating the curriculum, changes to the advisory board, changes in advising, etc.? *(If yes, consider crafting a recommendation related to this information.)*

Section Three: Future Directions: Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats
(See SWOT Helpful Guidelines for completion of this section)

Based on the information collected in the previous sections, conduct a SWOT analysis. Provide your answers in bullet format. From this SWOT analysis, use this information to craft possible recommendations.

- **Strengths:** What areas does the program excel? What are the advantages of the program? What do others see as the program's strengths?
- **Weakness:** What areas does the program not perform as desired? What is not functioning as well as it could? List any risks, needs, and demands for services that the program cannot currently meet.
- **Opportunities:** What factors are present that enable the program's future success?
- **Threats:** What external factors, to the College, if any, impact the program's future success?

	Strengths:	Weakness:
Internal		
External	Opportunities:	Threats:

Section Four: External Peer Reviewer (To be completed as part of the program review)

1. All programs that do not have an external accreditor should include an external peer reviewer report. The reviewer will be responsible for reading your report, data, and related materials and offer feedback and a written response relating to transferability/employability/and learning outcomes. It is suggested that the reviewer come from one of the schools in which our students most frequently transfer or our programs articulate.
2. See additional handout explaining guidelines to conduct the external peer review visit.

Section Five: Complete the CAR/Academic Program Review Recommendations Report (separate form)

After completing this report, the program should synthesize the findings and identify recommendations for the future development of this program. These are high level action items that the program wishes to accomplish in the next five years. Your narrative report should justify these recommendations. Recommendations should reflect analyses and comments from sections one through four. Use the CAR/Academic Program Review Recommendations Report for your recommendations.

- General Guidelines when writing recommendations:
  - use action words.
  - indicate any known associated cost or cost estimates for recommendation implementation.
  - identify responsible person, by name, accountable for recommendation implementation.
- Recommendations should be:
  - implementable in the five-year time period.
  - reasonable and thoughtful based on program review reports, institutional data and faculty, staff, chairs, dean, and vice president and provost discussion.
  - measurable and outcomes oriented.
  - limited to ten or fewer.
  - aligned with MC 2020 Strategic Themes and Initiatives, where applicable.