The following suggested enhancements were received as feedback from the fall 2013 Program Review process. The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, IT Department, and the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC) discussed the broad utility of the suggestions and their feasibility. The following lists were made of the enhancements that are feasible for spring 14 (and thus are planned to be implemented for Program Review in spring 14), that are being considered (depending on feasibility) for implementation in spring 2015, and that are not planned to be implemented due to infeasibility and/or limited utility of the suggestion.

Enhancements feasible for spring 2014 Program Review:

- “It would be helpful to know more information about students’ economic background, ethnicity, and primary language.”
  - These breakdowns will be made available.

- Breakdown data additionally by student age, gender, and educational goals.
  - These breakdowns will also be made available; however, the information in the Student Information System (SIS) for student educational goals is currently not very accurate, so we’re proposing not including that information for now – it may be included in the future with the implementation of the new SIS, in which students’ educational goals will be more accurately recorded/updated.

- “All data screens need to present data in a less aggregated fashion, by course within a department for example.”
  - This information is already included as an interactive report on the College’s website, so a link and directions will be provided in Program Review to this interactive online report.

- Incorporation of Institution-Set Standards (for course success, course retention, degrees, and certificates) into Program Review.
  - The institution-set standards for course success and retention rates will be added into the Program Review system (or a link to them will be provided), and disciplines will be asked to compare themselves to the standards. In terms of incorporation of the institution-set standards for certificate and degree completions in Program Review, the Program Review Oversight Committee has initiated discussion of the application of these standards at the program level, and it will issue a recommendation to EPC by spring 2014 for implementation in spring 2015. In the meantime, for spring 2014 program reviews, disciplines will be provided with data to evaluate the percentage of total college certificates and degrees that are awarded by the discipline each year, in addition to the data they have already been evaluating in their annual program reviews regarding the number of certificates and degrees awarded by the discipline each year. Disciplines will be asked to discuss their performance on these measures (and in relation to the standards for successful course completion rate and course retention rate), and in areas that are identified as needing improvement, they will be asked to develop and implement strategies and/or interventions that will result in improvements in the achievement outcome(s). Then, in the following year’s program review, they will be asked to assess the effectiveness of those strategies and interventions, in part, by analyzing the discipline’s most recent performance on the student achievement outcomes compared to the prior year’s performance and compared to the standard(s).

- “SLO follow-up reports need to be made available.”
  - A link will be provided to the SLO website.
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• “It would be great if the objectives and resources could have headings to show what Program Review period they relate to. Also, in this same area if all ‘term or year’ could be designated as 2012-2013, 2011-2012, 2010-2011, etc.”  
  o This will be done.
• “Advisory page needs updating, dates are old.”  
  o The years will be updated as suggested.
• “Add a dialog box on the curriculum page.”  
  o This will be done.
• “Possibly a ‘read only’ screen while the Program Review process is in progress for faculty/adjunct faculty to view.”  
  o It will not be possible to create a ‘read only’ version while the program review is in progress, but the Program Review system will be configured such that only one person will be allowed to update and save changes on any one screen at a time – thus multiple people can be logged in and working on different screens in the program review at the same time, but they will need to be working on different sections of it.
• “I would recommend that we be able to link over to various docs at lamission.edu like the strategic master plan, and the other master plans, and the gap analysis of Dr. Lee, ACCJC docs posted under accreditation etc. That will help then to provide the link as a reference to what action was taken on it to improve our programs.”  
  o Links will be included in the system where available and appropriate.
• “The inclusion of narrative in any screen should be full screen with spell check, etc.”  
  o The PROC recommended against the “full screen” option (because it is useful to see the other information on the screen when responding), but spell check is automatically available when completing the Program Review using Internet Explorer.
• “When editing an objective then returning to the list of objectives, the one just edited/accessed should be highlighted. Currently upon returning one goes to the top of the list.”  
  o The objective that was just edited will now be indicated in some fashion (e.g., it will be in a different color text) when returning to the list of objectives.
• “Displaying a number for each objective would also help especially when the narrative of one refers to another.”  
  o This will be done.
• Be able to discontinue an objective directly, even if it has a resource request.  
  o This will be done.
• Add rationale for priority ranking given to each objective (when creating/ updating an objective).  
  o This will be done.
• Should we leave the online program review system open year-round for the most part, except for budget requests?  
  o After the Program Review closing date at the end of May, the Program Review system will be available again (after a short period of down time) for the next year for anyone wanting to work on their next year’s review early; however, additional enhancements may be being made to the system before the official opening date of Program Review for the next year.
• “Objective screens should allow for more specific department/program/discipline ‘related goals.’ These could be added by the department and would be more meaningful at the department/program level. These could also then changed or be updated as the need arises.”  
  o An optional screen will be added for spring 2014 Program Reviews called “Dept./Discipline/Unit Goals” that will allow Program Review participants to type in or upload a document with these types of goals for now, which then can be referenced with
narrative when creating objectives in the Program Review system. See also the last bullet point in the “Checking on feasibility…” list below for future planned enhancements to this screen.

Checking on feasibility of enhancements for spring 2015 Program Reviews:

- “On average class size, count combined sections together as one class, so that the data here can count.”
  - The issue of combined classes is a complicated one, and it works differently in different disciplines. We need to look into this further to determine the feasibility/utility of this suggestion.
- “...provide some documentation/tutorials within the program review that you can click on while updating the resources/objectives on how to remove or retire or discontinue objectives and attached resources, as I got confused on how to do it, but later figured it out.”
  - The PROC discussed that the system is pretty user friendly, and we don’t currently have the resources to put together these kinds of tutorials – this can be addressed through training for now. In addition, the enhancement in the list above to be able to discontinue an objective directly, even if it has a resource request, will make this a much more straightforward process.
- Need to incorporate ILOs into instructional Program Review system (“What do your courses do that promote the ILOs?” or some other meaningful incorporation).
  - A system for the assessment of ILOs based on the roll-up of assessments from the course SLOs that map to each ILO is currently being developed. Once this roll-up system is functional, we could do a sum of course SLOs from the discipline to see how the discipline is contributing to each ILO, and the disciplines would then be able to evaluate this in their program reviews.
- Create a screen for the department’s 3-year plan chart (which is now being required by the Educational Planning Committee for 3-year academic comprehensive program reviews) and be able to connect objectives to the goals in the plan (e.g., select the department goal in the objective screen).
  - Incorporation of this type of chart on the “Dept./Discipline/Unit Goals” screen is planned for implementation in spring 2015.

Not planning on implementing:

- “A comparison with ‘College Averages’ is not as useful in many cases as comparisons with larger aggregates of data for the discipline. For example, success and retention for English would be more accurately understood compared with the average for all English departments across the district.”
  - This is not feasible because there is not enough space on the server to pull this amount of data in real time and generate the reports – we will request that the District post this type of report on the District website, which could then be linked to LAMC’s Program Review system.
- Look at when classes fill by section, and by course by time of day.
  - This is not feasible because there is not enough space on the server to pull this amount of data in real time and generate the reports – this is a specialized request that requires a lot of time and resources.
- Incorporate student complaint log into Program Review.
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- The PROC discussed that this is not appropriate or feasible because Program Review is done at the discipline/unit level, whereas the log is by division. Also, other processes are being put in place to address the issues identified in the complaint log.

- “The Objectives and Resources could have any discontinued box go gray, so it is more easily distinguished from the active boxes.”
  - This is not necessary because discontinued objectives/resource requests go onto a separate list and are not included in the active list.

- “It would be nice if we could delete obsolete objectives. I cannot see how to do so.”
  - Objectives that are no longer relevant go onto the lists of discontinued or completed objectives for historical documentation and are not deleted from the system.

- Make updating of all objectives mandatory every year?
  - PROC recommended against making this mandatory because you may want to continue an objective without making any updates to it.