

**Crafton Hills College
 Planning and Program Review 2009-2010
 Committee Feedback and Recommendations**

Program Evaluated: Chemistry

Purpose of Planning and Program Review

The Planning and Program Review process at CHC is a systematic process for evaluating programs and services annually. The major goal of the Committee is to evaluate the effectiveness of programs, and to make informed recommendations to the President about programs and resources.

The purpose of Program Review is to:

- Provide a full examination of program effectiveness and health
- Identify program areas needing improvement
- Assist in short-range planning and decision-making
- Contribute to long-range planning
- Contribute information and recommendations to other college processes, as appropriate
- Serve as a decision-making conduit by forwarding recommendations to the President

How to Use Feedback

The feedback provided below is intended to be constructive. The section titled “Committee Feedback to the Unit” is a summary of the committee’s observations. This section may include feedback to bolster strengths or to address weaknesses identified in the document. The committee’s final recommendations will be forwarded to the President once all documents have been evaluated. The section titled “Document Quality” is focused on both the overall and the item-by-item quality of the document submitted by the unit for evaluation. The percentage of committee votes in each of the two categories: “Meets Expectations” and “Does Not Meet Expectations” is provided. The Document Quality feedback is designed to help units write documents that clearly and accurately reveal their health and effectiveness. Last, the section titled “Program Effectiveness/Program Health” contains an average rating on the 3-point rubric for each item, as well as relevant comments from committee members. This section is intended to highlight program strengths and to identify weaknesses.

Committee Feedback to the Unit

The document was organized and well-written, revealing a high level of reflection and analysis. The Chemistry department exceeds institutional expectations on nearly all indicators of program health. The unit has measured SLO’s for all classes, and is using the resultant information for

program improvement. Faculty members in the department engage in ongoing dialogue about student learning. Retention and pass rate are especially good, an indicator that excellent teaching is taking place in this difficult course sequence. It might be helpful for the program to re-examine the three-year action plan to ensure that resources correspond to the stated goals.

Document Quality

It is an institutional expectation that units will participate fully in the Program Review process by submitting well-constructed documents that accurately reveal the quality of the program. The ratings below indicate the committee’s item-by-item assessment of the quality of the Program Review document. Individual committee members’ comments are provided as written, followed by a summative comment.

Program Review Question	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	Comments
1.	100%		
2.	100%		
3.	100%		
4.	100%		
5.	100%		
6.	100%		
7.	100%		
8.	100%		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to work on goals – some objectives/goals are resources • Goal 3 is a resource request <p>The document provides a thoughtful reply to this question, however, some committee members felt that there was some confusion regarding resources/ goals/</p>
9.	100%		

General Individual Comment:

- Very well done and a pleasure to read. Very thorough and reflective.
- Great job! Very nicely done.

Program Effectiveness/Program Health

It is an institutional expectation that units will identify student and program outcome measures, gather and analyze appropriate data, and use the resultant information for program improvement. Long-and short-range planning should be based on program strengths and challenges identified as well as the results of evaluation. In addition, the mission of each unit should align with that of the college. The average rating on the 3-point rubric is provided for each item, as well as individual committee members' comments.

Curriculum/Instructional Improvement	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unit clearly describes how the curriculum is needs-based and how they have been innovative. They have completed the SLO cycle numerous times, using the results to improve their teaching. It is refreshing to see faculty who value and SLO results. • SLOs have been assessed as a systematic and ongoing basis for several years. • Great job!
Scheduling	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The matrix is included and explained along with future scheduling needs. The unit has considered student needs and responded accordingly.
Persistence	*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No data • Data not reported. In the process of looking at persistence number between Chem150→Chem151 & Chem151→Chem212 • Not sure how Persistence data is considered in this department – most students complete one course.
Retention	3	
Pass Rate	3	

Enrollment	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was this included? • Unclear from document, trend not provided • Courses continue to be in demand
Faculty Ratio	2.8	
Marketing/Outreach	2.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unit participates in outreach and has valuable partnerships both internally and externally UCR.
WSCH/FTEF	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent chart and interpretation
Faculty Load	3	