

Program Review Program Assessment Report

**2022-2023 Review
April 12, 2023**

**Prepared for the Instructional Affairs Council
By Dr. Carolyn W. Wiley**

Table of Contents

Overview	3
Purpose and Goals	3
Program Review Cycle.....	3
Criteria for Evaluation.....	3
Organization for Program Evaluation	4
2022-23 Instructional Program Review	4
Committee Members	4
Program Review Findings.....	5

Overview

Instructional program review is an integral part of Northwest's overall institutional effectiveness initiative required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) accreditation criteria. A self-study team made up of administrators, faculty, students, and a member of the Northwest Community Board of Trustees, conducts a program review using established criteria. The Program Assessment Report is the final product of the Instructional Program Review process. The Program Assessment Report documents the team's evaluation of the effectiveness of each program in order to answer the question, "Does the instructional quality of the program meet institutional standards?"

An instructional program is defined as a certificate or degree program approved by the faculty and the administration for which academic credit is given in accordance with the SACS-COC Core Requirement 9.1 description of a program. Programs are SYSTEM-WIDE and are not divided by campus.

Purpose and Goals

The purpose of the instructional program review and assessment is to provide a system for continuous improvement in instructional programs. Review and assessment procedures provide recognition of the accomplishments of an instructional program as well as identify interventions needed for the improvement of the program. The goals for this process are as follows:

1. To ensure the effectiveness of the College's instructional programs
2. To improve the quality of instructional programs
3. To provide data for such intervention decisions as those regarding staff needs, admissions requirements, and curricular additions or deletions
4. To provide a system of regular data collection and analysis
5. To determine how specific instructional programs serve the mission of the College and respond to student and community needs

Program Review Cycle

Each instructional program will be evaluated once in each five-year period. Programs are reviewed by major functional areas and/or locations whenever possible. Instructional programs that are offered on multiple campuses or through distance learning will be assessed as a single unit.

Criteria for Evaluation

The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness will provide the instructional program coordinator for all instructional programs being reviewed during the current academic year with the following self-study materials:

1. *Program Strategic Plan Outcomes* – The instructional program's strategic planning outcomes as listed in the NWCC Strategic Plan, along with the data and analysis from the last five years' annual reviews.
2. *Program Learning Outcomes* – The instructional program's learning outcomes along with the data and analysis from the last five years' annual reviews.
3. *Enrollment* – Longitudinal enrollment information for the prior five (5) years.
4. *Student Success Rates* – Student success is determined by assessing:
 - a. *For AA degree programs*: Retention, graduation and transfer of students to four-year institutions over the prior five (5) years.
 - b. *For AAS degree and Certificate programs*: The state mandated follow-ups with program graduates and (if required) passage rates on state board exams, as reported on the annual Perkins Report, for the prior five (5) years.

5. *Instructor Qualifications* – Information on degrees and credentials of each instructor currently teaching a class in that instructional program, including full-time and adjunct faculty.

The instructional program coordinator should work with faculty members of program(s) under review to use the provided information to complete an analysis of their program. This analysis must include:

1. *SACS-COC Principles of Compliance Survey* – This survey guides the instructional programs through carefully reviewing the requirements as described in the Principles of Accreditation.
2. *SWOT Analysis* – Each program should identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats related to the program.
3. *Overall Assessment and Recommendations* – This section provides a summation of the current status of the program based on the above analysis. The final assessment should include past progress, current status, and future plans for the department. Recommendations from the faculty on ways to improve the instructional program should be included as well.

Both hard copies and electronic copies of all the supporting documents listed above are maintained by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.

Organization for Program Evaluation

An annual Instructional Program Review meeting will be held each academic year to provide the review committee an opportunity to discuss the documents, ask questions of the appropriate instructional program coordinators, and make any recommendations for the Instructional Affairs Council for the improvement of the instructional programs.

The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness will produce a Program Assessment Report which includes committee recommendations for program improvement. The Program Assessment Report will be presented to the Instructional Affairs Council.

2022-23 Instructional Program Review

Committee Members

Dr. Matthew Domas, Vice President of Instruction

Dr. Don Jones, Dean of Lafayette Yalobusha Technical Center

Dr. Carolyn Wiley, Associate Vice President of Academic Instruction & Institutional Effectiveness

Dr. Stephanie Mullins, Dean of Health Sciences

Dr. Keith Reed, Dean of DeSoto Center

Alee Dixon, Board of Trustees Member

Rachel McGonagill, Welding Instructor

Robert Johnston, Automotive Technology Instructor

Mary Helen Wilkerson, Student

Britt Heron, Executive Director of the Tate County Economic Development Foundation

Other Attendees

Dr. Michael Heindl, President

Dr. Tonyalle Rush, Associate Vice President of Student Services & Enrollment Management

Dr. Andrew Dale, Associate Vice President of Community Relations

Dwayne Casey, Associate Vice President of Workforce Solutions and Career Technical Education

Katie Broadway, Director of Career-Technical Education & Program Advancement

Program Review Findings

The following table summarizes the Program Review Committee's results for each program reviewed in terms of the Overall Program Assessment on the Program Review rubric.

Table 1 - Summary of Findings

<i>Program Name</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
Computer Networking Technology	12	0
Graphic Design Technology	12	0
Business & Office Technology	12	0
Paralegal Technology	11	1
Business & Marketing Technology	12	0

Program Review Rubric summaries for each program have been attached, along with committee comments and recommendations. The detailed supporting documents containing specific information for each evaluation criterion are available in the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Several themes emerged from the review process, highlighting areas of improvement and success within our programs.

Overall, the committee was highly impressed with all of the programs reviewed and acknowledged the exceptional work of several instructors, namely Audrie McCann and Lori Philley. Their dedication and effectiveness in delivering instruction were commendable.

During the review process, it was evident that programs adopting a "relational instruction" approach, where instructors cater to each student's individual needs and challenges, witnessed improved retention and student success.

Another key area identified is the need for training in regular and substantive interaction (RSI) for instructors who teach online or have online components in their programs. This training will help enhance the quality of online instruction and ensure effective engagement with students. Note that this supports the findings that relational instruction provides improved student outcomes. Retention issues were identified in some programs, particularly those with online components. This once again emphasizes the need for enhanced RSI in these courses and training for our instructors on implementation of these practices.

Several programs indicated the need for improved marketing strategies. One effective strategy that emerged for program recruitment was engaging with high school students and providing them with insights into their potential program of interest. This approach proved successful in generating interest and attracting prospective students. Additionally, as these are Career Technical programs, they are not often viewed as being transferable to a university. Thus, there is a need to promote the transferability of credits earned to four-year colleges. Marketing this aspect will help attract more students to these programs.

Many programs mentioned the need for updated technology, particularly in computer labs, to support the evolving needs of our programs. Additionally, there is a demand for increased support from the IT department to address technological challenges and provide timely assistance to faculty and students.

It is important to note that there were instances where the data originally provided by the Office of Institutional Research to the programs for this review did not align with the internal numbers the program had kept. Collaborative investigations conducted by the instructors and the Office of Institutional Research

revealed inaccuracies in CampusKey data. This was primarily due to transient students from Ole Miss, who were mistakenly placed in programs such as MMT without being officially accepted into it. To prevent such inaccuracies in the future, it is essential to develop procedures that ensure the accuracy of information in CampusKey.

In conclusion, the instructional program review has shed light on areas of improvement, success stories, and strategies for enhancement. By addressing the identified needs, implementing effective training, updating technology, improving data accuracy, and employing successful recruitment approaches, we can further enhance our programs and promote student success.