

Outcome-Based Program Review Handbook



**Process and Procedure Guides
For Improvements within Academic Programs
Revised August 2018**

San Joaquin Valley College
Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Table of Contents

SJVC Mission.....3
Our Core Values3
Program Review Overview4
 What is Program Review?..... 4
 Purpose..... 4
 Participants 4
 The Cycle of Review..... 5
 Improvement Overview Chart 6
 Program Review Process 7
 Before the Review7
 During the Review7
 After the Review8
 Follow-up Reviews8
 Impromptu Reviews.....8
 Program Review Report Policy & Procedure..... 9
 Program Review Report Sample.....10
Proposals for Improvement.....12
 Measurement, Evidence and Support Documentation 13
 Textbook Improvement Procedure..... 14
 Textbook Improvement Proposal Sample.....15
 Course Improvement Proposal (CIP) Procedure..... 18
 Course Improvement Proposal (CIP) Sample.....19
 Program Improvement Proposal (PIP) Procedure 21
 Program Improvement Proposal (PIP) Sample22
Curriculum and Instructional Purchasing Overview.....28
 Curriculum Purchase 28
 Instructional Purchase 28
 Repair or Replacement of Supplies/Equipment 28
 Ongoing Replacement of Supplies / Consumables 28
 Capital Budget Request 28
 Purchasing Process 29
 Purchase Proposal Sample: NEW Curriculum and Instruction Purchases.....30
Additional Resources34
 SJVC Program Review Rubric: Rubric for Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Program
 Review Process 34
 WASC Student Learning Assessment in Program Review..... 36
 ACCJC Institutional Effectiveness: Program Review..... 37



SJVC Mission

San Joaquin Valley College prepares graduates for professional success by offering Baccalaureate and Associate of Science Degrees and Certificates of Completion in business, medical, and technical career fields. The College serves a diverse student population with a common interest in professional development through career-focused higher education. The College is committed to student development through the achievement of measurable learning outcomes, emphasizing a balance of hands-on training and academic instruction. The College identifies and responds to the educational and employment needs of the communities it serves. The College is committed to the success of every student.

*Approved by the Board of Governors, July 2008
Revised May 2017*

Our Core Values

Success – The College Community is committed to the personal, academic, and professional success of its students, employees, and graduates by providing high-quality education programs, instruction, professional development opportunities, support services, and guidance.

Integrity – The College Community expects personal and professional integrity in the fulfillment of its mission.

Excellence – The College Community sets excellence as a standard in all areas of operation.

Diversity – The College Community celebrates and embraces diversity; emphasizing inclusion and open dialogue.

Community Involvement – The College Community encourages and supports student and employee involvement in their respective communities to mutually enhance civic, personal, and intellectual development.

Lifelong Learning – The College Community fosters an environment where students and employees actively pursue lifelong learning.



Program Review Overview

What is Program Review?

Program Review is a faculty-driven inquiry process that provides a structure for continuous quality improvement of each academic program. The process brings together key program constituents to evaluate a wide range of data about the program in order to reflect on the health of the program and the level of student learning. As a result of analysis of data portfolio, constituents construct plans for program improvement to be recommended to Senior Management for approval.

Purpose

Instill a culture of evidence-based decision making for the planning and improvement of each academic program through the systematic analysis of student achievement and student learning data.
Initiate dialogue about student learning and achievement among key program constituents.
Impart an alignment among the College mission, core values, curriculum, teaching practices, and a commitment to student learning into the College culture.
Sustain compliance with accrediting body requirements.


Participants

Program Review is open to all key program constituents, including but not limited to, faculty, students, administration, student services, career services, admissions, staff, alumni, employers, Advisory Board members, and community members. Campus and Central Administration Office staff may invite key stakeholders for broad representation. A variety of participants is desired.



The Cycle of Review


**The Cycle of Outcomes and Assessment
Tie Together through Program Review**





Improvement Overview Chart

When do improvements happen?

 <h2 style="margin: 0;">Program Review</h2>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Data Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluation of data portfolio ○ Identification of improvement actions based on data analysis ● Review status and effectiveness of previous Program Review Action Items ● Evaluate and update course and program assessment plans ● Evaluate and update course and program curriculum maps ● Evaluate and update common mastery assessments ● Evaluate resources - library, textbooks, software, equipment ● Identify opportunities for professional development ● Best Practices Sharing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rubrics ○ Classroom curriculum ○ Resources (videos, software, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Student Learning Dialogue form ● Learning Data Analysis Worksheet ● My Instructor Summary Card report ● Course Outcome Results report ● Textbook Improvement Proposals (TIP) ● Purchase Proposals ● Course Improvement Proposals (CIP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CLO modifications ○ Grade components ○ Common assessments ● Program Improvement Proposals (PIP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Significant CLO/PLO modifications ○ New courses ○ Changes in units/hours ○ Matrix changes ○ Programmatic compliance updates

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Program Review Process

Program Review is conducted asynchronously every two years for each program and cross-discipline program (General Education; shared courses) within the learning management system. Program Review is open for participation for a period of 30 days. This format will allow for scheduling flexibility to ensure that all constituents have an opportunity to participate. The electronic format allows for the tracking of decisions made by instructors through discussions, surveys, and voting features. Participants follow an agenda that includes the pre-analysis self-assessment, analysis of program data, Advisory Boards minutes, programmatic information from Career Services/Admissions Departments, student surveys, employer surveys, and accrediting bodies (as applicable).

Before the Review

Campus management staff meet with instructors to prepare for their program specific review. Instructors wishing to submit a proposal or topic to be reviewed during the review must submit the proposal 60-90 days prior to the start of the Program Review to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu.

During the Review

During the meeting time is spent analyzing the data portfolio and additional evidence then identifying course and/or program improvement opportunities based on this analysis.

Improvements may include, but are not limited to (WASC, 2009):

- Refining course level Student Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and/or Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)
- Realignment among curriculum, course level Student Learning Outcomes (CLOs), College mission statement, College core values and Institutional Learning Outcomes
- Refining curriculum maps
- Curriculum changes to improve student learning based on evidence
- Refining, reorganizing or refocusing curriculum to reflect changes in the accrediting agency, discipline or profession
- Professional development opportunities
- Refining course and program assessment processes
- Requests for new equipment or supplies based on evidence

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



- Refining of course grading components
- Evaluating and refining the list of library resources specific to that program

Conclusions of analysis and the corresponding identified improvements are documented in the Program Review Report (see pages 11-16). Identified improvements are documented on the report as Action Items and are tracked through the institution's project tracking, ticket systems.

After the Review

A draft of the Program Review Report is completed by the curriculum department and made available for evaluation. After the evaluation period, all documentation is uploaded to InfoZone where it is permanently housed.

Program Review reports are forwarded to the Senior Management committee headed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and to the Board of Governors Academic Oversight Committee. These committees use the results of the Program Reviews for institutional planning and budgeting along with approving recommendations for program improvement.

Each Program Review is reflected upon and evaluated using the [SJVC Program Review Rubric](#) by all facilitators and co-facilitators of the meeting. Rubric scores are averaged into one score and used as a measurement of institutional objectives associated with Program Review effectiveness.

Follow-up Reviews

Occasionally follow-up reviews are needed to complete or revisit items outlined by the original Program Review. Follow-up reviews are scheduled as needed to complete or "close the loop" on Action Items. Follow-up reviews are not the forum to begin new action on change or purchases.

Impromptu Reviews

Upon occasion, Program Reviews may need to be held to address pressing issues before the scheduled Review date. These Program Reviews can be held if the criteria for impromptu reviews have been successfully met. Impromptu reviews will follow the same culture of evidence processes as a regularly scheduled Program Review.

Criteria for impromptu review include but are not limited to:

- Changes in accrediting body requirements
- Changes in industry standards
- Program related data which indicates a need for attention

San Joaquin Valley College
Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Program Review Report Policy & Procedure

AUTHORITY: Director of Curriculum and Assessment

POLICY: A Program Review Report is to be completed and posted no later than 30 days after the scheduled Program Review.

STANDARDS:

- Program Review Report follows guidelines set by the WASC/ACCJC rubrics for Program Reviews
- Program Review Report follows an assigned template
- Program Review Report is created in collaboration with program constituents
- Program Review Report documents the status of action items and the impact on student achievement
- Program Review Report documents the analysis and findings of course and program student achievement data
- Program Review Report documents an action plan for course and/or program improvement based on the data analysis and findings
- Program Review Report documents all involved constituents and their relationship to the program
- Program Review Reports are stored on InfoZone > Departments > Program Review > Program Specific Documents (left) > choose Program > Program Review Reports and Data Portfolios

PROCEDURE:

- A standard agenda format and participant roster list are required at each Program Review
- Program Review Report is completed no later than 30 days after the scheduled Program Review by the Curriculum Department designee
- Curriculum Department designee uploads completed Program Review Report to the Program Review department of InfoZone
- Constituents have 10 days to review after upload and offer edits on the Report to the Curriculum Department
- The status of Program Review Action Items will be updated at the next Program Review

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Program Review Report Sample

Table of Contents

- Executive Summary
- Mission Statement
- Outcomes
- Timeline
- Highlights by Shared Program Subsection 2014 to 2015
- Qualitative Issues
- Attendance
- Placement
- Retention
- Transferability
- Library and Learning Resources Center Survey
- Shared Course Statistics
- Qualitative Issues
- Outcomes
- Attendance
- Course Completion
- Student Learning Outcomes (Student success only)
- Retention
- Timing the Long
- Program Review Request
- Course Improvement Request
- Footnotes

Executive Summary

Program Overview
The Degree 1 only (D1) program, prepared for professional careers in business, medical, and technical careers. The D1 program is a three-semester, outcome-based program designed to prepare students for employment in a variety of careers. The D1 program is a three-semester, outcome-based program designed to prepare students for employment in a variety of careers. The D1 program is a three-semester, outcome-based program designed to prepare students for employment in a variety of careers.

Certification Exams

Year	Students	Completed Exams	Passed Exams	Completed Exams	Passed Exams	% of Grade
2014	102	87	20	100	20	20%
2015	102	87	20	100	20	20%

Subsection

Subsection	2014	2015	2016
2014	100	100	100
2015	100	100	100

Subsection

Subsection	2014	2015	2016
2014	100	100	100
2015	100	100	100

Subsection

Subsection	2014	2015	2016
2014	100	100	100
2015	100	100	100

Shared Course Statistics

MMA Course Program Data - Shared Courses (Aug 2014 to Aug 2015)

Program Review

Five Year Review Year Median

Subsection

Qualification Paper

Subsection

Attendance

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Green Completion





Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Achievement




Academic Affairs | January 15 - February 15, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | Page 18 of 28

Program Review Experiences



Academic Affairs | January 15 - February 15, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | Page 18 of 28



2016 MONIA Attendance Tracking

Person	Count of Strategic Competencies Discussion	Count of Preparation Self-Reflection	Count of Observation Discussion	Count of Analysis Part 1 Discussion	Count of Analysis Part 2 Discussion	Count of Analysis Part 3 Discussion	Count of Goal-setting Discussion
Person 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Person 30	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Academic Affairs | January 15 - February 15, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | Page 18 of 28

Milestones

2014 Action	Issue	Required Outcome	Progress
Action 1: Review specific CLOs from WCP 100 and add them to WCP 200 for better alignment.	WCP 100 review and add items to WCP 200 for better alignment.	Align the focus area of all programs and ensure alignment between WCP 100 and WCP 200.	Completed
Action 2: Review WCP 100 and WCP 200 for better alignment.	WCP 100 review and add items to WCP 200 for better alignment.	Align the focus area of all programs and ensure alignment between WCP 100 and WCP 200.	Completed

Closing the Loop

2014 Action	Issue	Required Outcome	Progress
Action 1: Fully locate to program goals, objectives for shared success as required in annual program review.	Program review data.	CLO Achievement: 80% to 90%.	Completed
Action 2: Review academic standards, objectives, and outcomes in line of alignment. The program review is an annual program review.	Program review data.	CLO Achievement: 80% to 90%.	Completed

Academic Affairs | January 15 - February 15, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | Page 18 of 28

Green Improvement Report

Question	Yes	No
Review CLOs for alignment with program goals and objectives.	80%	20%
Review WCP 100 and WCP 200 for better alignment.	80%	20%
Review WCP 100 and WCP 200 for better alignment.	80%	20%
Review WCP 100 and WCP 200 for better alignment.	80%	20%

Academic Affairs | January 15 - February 15, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | Page 18 of 28

Action 1	Completed	Progress	Not Started
Review WCP 100 and WCP 200 for better alignment.	80%	20%	0%

2014 program and 2015 CLOs review during the 2016 MONIA Shared Success Program Review.

Participants Roster

1. Alvin Alvarado - Program
2. Alvin Alvarado - Program
3. Alvin Alvarado - Program
4. Alvin Alvarado - Program
5. Alvin Alvarado - Program
6. Alvin Alvarado - Program
7. Alvin Alvarado - Program
8. Alvin Alvarado - Program
9. Alvin Alvarado - Program
10. Alvin Alvarado - Program
11. Alvin Alvarado - Program
12. Alvin Alvarado - Program
13. Alvin Alvarado - Program
14. Alvin Alvarado - Program
15. Alvin Alvarado - Program
16. Alvin Alvarado - Program
17. Alvin Alvarado - Program
18. Alvin Alvarado - Program
19. Alvin Alvarado - Program
20. Alvin Alvarado - Program
21. Alvin Alvarado - Program
22. Alvin Alvarado - Program
23. Alvin Alvarado - Program
24. Alvin Alvarado - Program
25. Alvin Alvarado - Program
26. Alvin Alvarado - Program
27. Alvin Alvarado - Program
28. Alvin Alvarado - Program
29. Alvin Alvarado - Program
30. Alvin Alvarado - Program
31. Alvin Alvarado - Program
32. Alvin Alvarado - Program
33. Alvin Alvarado - Program
34. Alvin Alvarado - Program
35. Alvin Alvarado - Program
36. Alvin Alvarado - Program
37. Alvin Alvarado - Program
38. Alvin Alvarado - Program
39. Alvin Alvarado - Program
40. Alvin Alvarado - Program
41. Alvin Alvarado - Program
42. Alvin Alvarado - Program
43. Alvin Alvarado - Program
44. Alvin Alvarado - Program
45. Alvin Alvarado - Program
46. Alvin Alvarado - Program
47. Alvin Alvarado - Program
48. Alvin Alvarado - Program
49. Alvin Alvarado - Program
50. Alvin Alvarado - Program

Academic Affairs | January 15 - February 15, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | SAC, 1/16/16, 2016 | Page 18 of 28



Proposals for Improvement

Program constituents can propose improvements that are not a direct result of the Program Review process at any time. Do keep in mind that program improvements can involve many departments and require review and processing before implementation is available.

Textbook Improvement Proposal (TIP)

To add, delete, or change a textbook, submit a Textbook Improvement Proposal (TIP) form ([Sample](#)) and additional support data to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu 60- 90 days before the scheduled Program Review.

Course Improvement Proposal (CIP)

To suggest improvements to a course outline, assessment tools, CLOs, grade components, etc. submit the completed Course Improvement Proposal (CIP) form ([Sample](#)) and required support data 60-90 days before the scheduled Program Review to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu.

Program Improvement (PIP)

To recommend more dramatic improvements to a program, such as new courses, unit changes, matrix changes, or accreditation updates impacting several courses you may submit a Program Improvement Proposal (PIP) form ([Sample](#)) and required support data to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu.

Course Improvements	Program Improvements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to common assessment tools (rubrics, skill-offs, questions, projects, dropboxes, grade items, thresholds) • Changes to wording of CLOs that do not impact meaning of CLOs • Changes of less than 50% to Course Student Learning Outcomes (CLOs) in one course • Changes of less than 50% to wording of course descriptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any change needing approval by an external accreditation body • Program name change • Matrix changes • Combining courses • Deleting courses • Adding courses • Course name changes

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes of less than 50% to the Unit Objectives of a course outline • Grade component changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clock hour or unit value changes • Changes to Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) • Changes to performance standards (typing tests etc.)
--	---

Measurement, Evidence and Support Documentation

All proposals require a measurement of improvement and evidence of improvement need as part of the submitted portfolio. Measurement includes at least one metric that will measure the impact of the improvement by meeting a target by a specified date. Evidence can include various support documentation and/or student achievement data.

Measurement. What metrics will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed changes (placement, licensure, certification, CLO/PLO achievement, course completion, etc.)? What is the current status and what is the expected target?			
Metric	Current	Target	By when
<i>Program Placement Rate</i>	<i>69%</i>	<i>75%</i>	<i>14 months after improvements are implemented</i>

Productive Evidence	Unproductive Evidence
<p>Productive Evidence includes but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Documented Advisory Board minutes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statements from Advisory Board members, extern sites, clinical sites, employers, Career Services Managers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detailed recommendations from programmatic accrediting associations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Details on new laws and /or legislation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course comparison with similar institutions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLO data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PLO data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Retention data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Placement data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grades 	<p>Unproductive Evidence includes but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Personal commentary and opinion not supported by productive evidence <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Generalized statements such as “All of our students say...” <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marketing materials from publishers

To access any proposal forms in MS Word format go to:
InfoZone > Departments > Program Review



Textbook Improvement Procedure

1. Completed proposal form is submitted to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu for review **60-90 DAYS** before Program Review.

FORM is located on InfoZone: Departments > Program Review > Document Center

2. Textbook cost increase of 5% or more must be submitted by the curriculum department to the Senior Management Budget Committee for approval.
3. Once approved, the proposal form is uploaded into eCourses for program members to review and discuss for a minimum of **25 DAYS**.
4. Curriculum department:
 - a) orders sample materials for all involved campuses
 - b) informs all appropriate publishers of possible change
 - c) notifies Corporate Director of Purchasing to begin review process
5. After the review period, faculty will be given the opportunity to vote on the text for a minimum of **5 DAYS**.
6. Proposal is approved by a majority of faculty votes. Voting results are posted in forum. Final approval can be dependent upon the level of faculty participation.

Proposal Approved

Corporate Director of Purchasing and Campuses are notified of textbook change. Textbook change is added to the ATL by week 2 day 3 of the next module.

Proposal Not Approved

Proposal is returned to requesting party with feedback from curriculum department.

Discussion on the text may continue.

If a majority of faculty re-evaluate the decision, the proposal may be resubmitted.

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Textbook Improvement Proposal Sample

STANDARD:	Proposed textbook revisions must support the outcomes of the program and be in alignment with SJVC's Mission Statement and Strategic Plan.
POLICY:	Textbook Improvement Proposals are to be completed in full and submitted with support documentation to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu between 60 - 90 days prior to the department's Program Review for peer review and institutional determination. Senior Management approval is required for any text expense greater than 5%.
PROCESS:	Complete and submit the Textbook Improvement Proposal to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu . Attendees at Program Review will vote on adoption of the proposed text/software. A corporate curriculum team member will coordinate implementation of approved proposals.
TIMELINE:	Please allow 90 days for implementation of textbook changes.
Person Requesting:	<i>Erika Hultquist, VT Instructor</i>
Date:	<i>January 6, 2016</i>
Campus:	<i>Fresno</i>
Program:	<i>Veterinary Technology</i>
Course:	<i>VRT 101</i>
Current text(s):	<i>Clinical Anatomy and Physiology for Veterinary Technicians CLASS SET: Mammalian Anatomy, The Cat</i>
ISBN:	<i>9780323046855; 9780895826831</i>
SECTION 1: New Textbook Information	
Title:	<i>Clinical Anatomy and Physiology for Veterinary Technicians Laboratory Manual</i>
Author:	<i>Colville and Bassert</i>
Publisher:	<i>Elsevier</i>
ISBN:	<i>9780323048033</i>
Cost:	<i>Bundle Price \$114.95 – SJVC Cost \$74.71 Textbook and Laboratory Manual</i>
Edition:	<i>2nd edition</i>

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



SECTION 2: Cost Analysis			
Cost increase of 5% or more must be submitted to Senior Management.			
Review Date:	January 15, 2014 / Carole Brown	Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: <i>The approval of this proposal would increase the total cost from \$50.66 / student (+ \$33.56 for a class set of "Mammalian Anatomy: The Cat") to \$74.71 / student.</i> <i>Current program data (01/10/2011 – 01/28/2013) shows VRT101 was taught 11 times with a total of 234 students.</i>			
SECTION 3: Measurement What metrics will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed text? (CLO improvement, licensure, certification, etc.) What is the current status and what is the expected target?			
Metric	Current Status	Target	Date
<i>Completion rate</i>	84%	90%	6/2016
<i>Attendance</i>	82%	90%	
	49% (CLOs 1 & 4)	85%	
	53% (CLO 2)	85%	
	61% (CLO 3)	85%	
<i>CLO achievement is exceptionally low</i>	75% (CLO 5)	85%	
SECTION 4: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes			
1. Provide a general explanation of the benefits of the new textbook.			
<i>This lab manual supplements the information contained in the textbook. There are many learning activities that will supplement the other teaching techniques used in VRT 101. The variety will help meet the varied learning styles of our adult students. Some examples are: Matching questions to terms, labeling anatomy within illustrations and learning games such as crossword puzzles. Implementation will also reduce the need for copies/handouts in VRT 101.</i> <i>PD Comments: This book will replace the Sebastiani text at this time. Currently the Sebastiani text is used as a class set. It is really not very supportive of the main Colville text and has led to a number of confusions between the uses of differing terminology than what is in the main text. Additionally, the lab manual is meant to accompany and reinforce the main text. At this point both Erika and I are making copies out of the</i>			

San Joaquin Valley College
Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



<p><i>lab manual because it has vastly increased the student experience (just going off of commentary from the students themselves) and will greatly assist in cementing their knowledge of Anatomy.</i></p>
<p>2. How does this textbook support the PLOs?</p>
<p><i>Anatomy and physiology are a core foundation of knowledge in the Veterinary health care field. Without a strong basis here, students will struggle throughout their school career and into their professional career until they build a strong foundation.</i></p>
<p>3. How does this textbook better support the CLOs than the current textbook? (Please address specific SLOs in your response)</p>
<p><i>This will supplement the current textbook and provide additional learning resources for the students. This current laboratory manual was made to accompany the current text. It provides not only reinforcement activities like crossword puzzles and word searches, but it also provides the instructor with real world activity ideas to incorporate into the lab to reinforce concepts.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, this workbook uses the same language and terminology as is used in the Colville text. This is greatly reduce student confusion when using it as a dissection guide.</i></p>
<p>4. How does this new textbook support the action items listed on your current Program Review Plan? If it doesn't directly align with action items, provide additional explanation or justification for change.</p>
<p><i>This has not been discussed in Program Review, however AVMA requires us to constantly review textbooks and library holdings for accuracy and applicability to the current curriculum.</i></p>
<p>5. What additional instructor resources are provided with this textbook that are not provided with the current textbook? (PowerPoints, software, etc.)</p>
<p>None</p>
<p>6. Additional Information:</p>
<p><i>All of the additional resources are linked to the textbook (which possess the answer keys to the workbook exercises as well as the image library). This workbook provides better activities to use as reinforcement of material.</i></p>

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Course Improvement Proposal (CIP) Procedure

1. **SUBMIT:** Faculty members from any campus can initiate a proposal. Completed Proposal forms are submitted to the CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu

FORM is located on InfoZone: Department > Program Review > Document Center

Course proposals can be used for a variety of change requests; therefore, the procedure may differ depending on the request. The curriculum department will determine appropriate steps.

2. **VETTING:** at Program Review (30 days)
 - ✓ The proposal is uploaded into the Program Review eCourses for program members to review through the designated discussion forum
 - ✓ The curriculum department will facilitate the forum discussion. All faculty members in the program are encouraged to participate.
 - ✓ After discussion period, the curriculum department will initiate a vote
3. **APPROVALS:**
 - ✓ Depending on the nature of the Proposal, approval by the Senior Management Budget Committee may be required
 - ✓ Proposals may be approved by faculty through majority vote when required
 - ✓ Some proposals can be directly approved by the Curriculum Department
4. **BUILD:** from 2 to 60 days
 - ✓ Changes are communicated to all impacted campuses with an effective date
 - ✓ Curriculum department will coordinate the implementation of the changes

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Course Improvement Proposal (CIP) Sample

STANDARD:	Proposed course improvements must support the outcomes of the program and be in alignment with SJVC's Mission Statement and Strategic Plan.
POLICY:	The Proposal form is to be completed in full and submitted with support documentation to the CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu between 60- 90 days prior to the department's Program Review for peer review and institutional implementation.
PROCESS:	Complete and submit the Course Improvement Proposal to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu . Attendees at Program Review will vote on adoption of the proposal. A corporate curriculum team member will coordinate implementation of approved proposals.
TIMELINE:	Changes may take a minimum of 60 days to implement. Please plan accordingly
Course Improvements include but are not limited to:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording of CLOs • Changes to common assessment and teaching tools (rubrics, skill-offs, exams, projects, grade items, dropboxes, thresholds) • Changes of less than 50% to course outline components (course description, CLOs, UOs) • Grade components 	
Campus:	<i>Visalia, Bakersfield, Fresno, Ontario, Modesto, Hanford, Hesperia, Lancaster</i>
Program:	<i>RT</i>
Course:	<i>RT41</i>
Person Requesting:	<i>Kerry Green</i>
Date:	<i>8/25/14</i>
SECTION 1: Improvement Information- Describe the proposed improvement and how the change will improve the course?	
Change	Justification - Explain how each change will improve the course
<i>Edit the wording to CLO 11 and add a CLO 12. To assess these two outcomes, they proposed updates to the existing rubric. RT41 CLO 11: Pass the Comprehensive Therapist Multiple-Choice secure self-assessment examination</i>	<i>To be in alignment with RRT requirement</i>
<i>(SAE) for advanced level practitioner (RRT) RT 41 CLO 12: Pass the Comprehensive Clinical Simulation self-assessment examination (SAE) for advanced level practitioner (RRT)</i>	

San Joaquin Valley College
Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Section 2: Additional information- Include any additional information that may be helpful with implementing the change

SECTION 3: Academic Leadership Input

A statement from the Academic Dean (Campus Director if submitted by the Academic Dean) documenting their knowledge and support of the proposed improvement is necessary to process the proposal (Separate Attachments or emails to the Curriculum Specialist are acceptable).

All RT Program Directors agree via email by 9/11/14

Ontario supports this change.

Visalia agrees with Jeff.

Temecula is in favor of this change.

I approve of this change.- Jeff Rutherford

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Program Improvement Proposal (PIP) Procedure

1. **SUBMIT:** Faculty members from any campus can initiate a proposal. Completed Proposal forms are submitted to the curriculum department at CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu
FORM is located on InfoZone > Departments > Program Review > Document Center

2. **VETTING:** at Program Review (**30 days**)
 - ✓ Curriculum department gathers input from internal departments such as Academic Affairs, Academic Applications Administrator, Financial Aid, Admissions, Information Systems, Facilities, Associate VP, and any other affected campuses or departments.
 - ✓ External support documentation is gathered by faculty in collaboration with the curriculum department.

3. **APPROVALS:** may require up to **90 days**
 - ✓ Proposal is submitted to the curriculum department for review in no more than 15 DAYS
 - ✓ If the program has an external accreditation body, the proposal will also need approval of the Director of Program Compliance, and will be reviewed in no more than (the same) 15 DAYS
 - ✓ Proposal require submission to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for review and approval
 - ✓ Proposals may also require submission to Senior Management Budget Committee for review and approval

4. **BUILD:** requires a *minimum of 60 days* before implementation:
 - ✓ Approvals and timelines are communicated to all impacted campuses
 - ✓ Faculty and curriculum department or designee build course outlines
 - ✓ Faculty and curriculum department revise/build common mastery assessments
 - ✓ Academic Application Administrator and Registrar(s) build program IDs and schedules
 - ✓ Curriculum department builds Curriculum Repository
 - ✓ Faculty choose ancillaries and textbooks
 - ✓ Curriculum department update all corresponding assessment plans
 - ✓ Curriculum department updates Catalog and marketing materials
 - ✓ Any faculty hiring and/or training will occur as directed by each campus Academic Dean with support from the Director of Instruction

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Program Improvement Proposal (PIP) Sample

STANDARD:	Proposed program improvements must support the outcomes of the program and be in alignment with SJVC's Mission Statement and Strategic Plan.
POLICY:	The Proposal form is to be completed in full and submitted with support documentation to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu between 60- 90 days prior to the department's Program Review for peer review and institutional determination.
PROCESS:	Complete and submit the Program Improvement Proposal to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu . Attendees at the Program Review will vote on adoption of the proposal. If approved, the proposal is forwarded to Senior Management for their review.
TIMELINE:	Program changes take a <i>minimum</i> of 120 days to implement. Please plan accordingly.
Program Improvements include but are not limited to:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any change needing approval by an accreditation body • Program name or course names • Matrix changes • Combining, deleting or adding courses • Clock hour or unit value changes • Changes to Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) • Changes to performance standards (typing tests etc.) 	
Campus:	Fresno
Program:	Veterinary Technology
Contact Person:	Michele Lopez, RVT
Person Requesting:	Michele Lopez, RVT
Date:	April 24, 2014

Improvement Information:	
Describe each proposed change and the reason each will improve the program.	
Change	Justification
VRT206 Companion Animal Nursing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move to Term 1 Mod 1 and pair with VRT101 • Increase from 5 weeks to 10 weeks • Increase the units from 3 units to 5 units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRT206 needs additional time to meet the CLOs • 0 of 5 CLOs achieve target of 80% (CLO1- 48%, CLO2- 60%. CLO3-77%,

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



	CLO4-56%, CLO5-66%)(see CLO data)
<p>VRT101 Anatomy and Physiology of Domestic Animals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change from 5 weeks for 5 hours/day to 10 weeks for 2.5 hours/day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pairing VRT101 (A&P of Domestic Animals) with VRT206 (Companion Animal Nursing) will provide stronger foundational knowledge More time spent on anatomy will increase state board scores in this area <p>Anatomy is one of the areas our recent grads have had trouble with on their state boards</p>
<p>VRT102 Fundamentals of Animal Nursing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce from 10 weeks to 5 weeks <p>Reduce the units from 5 units to 3 units</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This class does not have enough content to support 10 weeks Time is better spent on increasing anatomy and physiology
<p>VRT205 Laboratory Procedures</p> <p>Move to Term 2 Module 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The students need the disease information to be able to meet the CLOs The Lab portion focuses on diagnostics for some diseases. The way the course is set up now, students aren't taught about any of the diseases or symptoms until after the class. Consequently, they are unable to retain the information and differentiate between the various diseases. (For example we teach them how to perform a urinalysis, which can be used to diagnose or monitor kidney functions and kidney disease but currently we don't teach them or introduce them to kidney disease and its symptoms, why it's important, etc. until after this class in companion animal nursing). The new matrix would have them learn the diseases first then learn the diagnostics.
<p>VRT208 Introduction to Pharmacology</p> <p>Move to Mod 2 Term 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VRT208 needs to be offered after both VRT205 Lab Procedures and VRT102 Small Animal Nursing so that the students can apply pharmacology with knowledge from these courses VRT208 needs to be offered closer to the surgery class taught in Term 3 so pharmacological knowledge can be applied to surgery
<p>VRT390 Veterinary Clinical Rotation</p> <p>Extend from 5 weeks to 10 weeks in Term 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will help in relieving the amount of hours for the student in the second 5 week

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



<p>VRT 308 Advanced Pharmacology Move to Term 2 Mod 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is too much content in VRT208 Beginning Pharmacology • There is not enough content in VRT308 Advanced Pharmacology 		
<p>MTH 121 and MTH 122 Move to pair with the Pharmacology classes (VRT208 and VRT308)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The math classes should be given with the pharmacology classes to ensure better understanding of the math required for pharmacology • MTH122 class is currently offered at the end of the program which is too late to assist with pharmacology content 		
<p>VRT 301 Beginning Surgical Assisting A VRT 306 Beginning Surgical Assisting B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine beginning surgery lecture and beginning surgery lab to one class <p>VRT 310 Advanced Surgical Procedures A VRT 320 Advanced Surgical Procedures B</p> <p>Combine the advanced surgery lecture class with the advanced surgery lab class to one class</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently if a student fails the lab but has passed the lecture they only repeat the lab portion. This is a problem because they often have to take a leave for 15 or more weeks before the class is offered again. • The gap between lecture and skills class makes for more student failures upon repeating the class. 		
<p>VRT 490 Externship A VRT 491 Externship B</p> <p>Combine Externships A and B to one 15 week course</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some students complete all extern hours prior to the start of VRT491 adding confusion and unclear attendance postings • Having a single course for all extern hours to be completed would simplify and clarify student records • As expressed in past VT Program Reviews, Career Services personnel support this change in expectancy of higher placement rates 		
<p>ENG 121 and ENG 122</p> <p>Place in the matrix where appropriate to accommodate core course improvements</p>			
<p>SECTION 1: Measurement What metrics will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed changes? (Placement, licensure, certification, CLO/PLO achievement, course completion, etc.) What is the current status and what is the expected target?</p>			
Metric	Current	Target	By When
VTNE (the licensing exam)	25%	90%	18 months after

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



			implementation
State board scores	25%	90%	18 months after implementation
CLO achievement in ten courses	30 of 78 (38%) of VT CLOs were assessed and achieve 80% mastery	All 78 CLOs to achieve 80% mastery	18 months after implementation
Graduation Rate (11/21/11 – 12/17/12)	52%	70%	18 months after implementation
Placement (11/21/11 – 12/17/12)	86% for 2012 per June 2014 Fact Sheet (see below)	Continue exceeding 75% institutional target	18 months after implementation

SECTION 2: SUPPORT DATA (Include as an attachment documentation from outside sources and of student success that support the need for the changes)

2.1 Documentation: Support documentation includes but is not limited to: Advisory Board minutes or statements from members; statements from career service department, extern sites or employers; documentation of programmatic regulations from accreditation associations or new laws and/or legislation; research on current industry trends; course comparison with other institutions

2.2 Student Success Data: Student Success Data includes but is not limited to: CLO data, PLO data, Placement data, Licensure/ Certification data, Retention data, Enrollment data, Attendance data, Course surveys

List of support data:
 Statements from former students
 CLO data (See Appendix 2)

Explain how the data listed above support the proposed changes

Previous student statements illustrate the need for a program improvement such as:

- The classes are taught in such a way that students have trouble retaining knowledge because the class order is not designed to build on previous knowledge
- Information is given after the concepts it explains. (The pharmacology is given before the diseases – they learn the treatment of diseases before they learn about the diseases)
- The anatomy is given 25 weeks before the diseases are introduced
- The diagnostic procedures are outline before the diseases are introduced or explained

CLO Data

- There are 78 total CLOs from all courses. Of the 78, 30 achieved target, 25 were below target and 23 were not assessed (from January 2013 to present)
- 25 of 55 (45%) of common mastery assessment questions assessed did not meet the 80% target

- The data illustrate the lapses in knowledge retention. Common Mastery Assessment questions in later classes require re-teaching of information due time gaps between introductory and advanced classes. Instructors spend several class hours in surgery class reviewing pharmacology and the students still have a difficult time grasping the concepts and remembering the drugs because pharmacology was taught too long ago when students get to the advanced classes.

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



SECTION 3: ALIGNMENT WITH OUTCOMES

Provide a narrative that explains how the proposed changes align with and support the Student Learning Outcomes identified within the program. (Academic Affairs to complete)

New matrix will support achievement of current PLOs and ILOs. CLO and PLOs will not change. Courses will be shuffled and adjusted to the appropriate length for outcomes to be achieved.

SECTION 4: TEACH-OUT

A "teach-out" is when current students will need to finish their original class schedule while new students will be given the changes – this can create the need for additional classrooms, teachers, or changes to student contracts. (Used for assessing the financial impact of the changes)

This proposal will create a "Teach Out" situation: Yes No

Describe the plan for addressing a teach-out situation:

The current program is linear, and each term is a prerequisite to the previous term. The content shift will mean that students returning from an LOA may have to take independent study to catch up.

SECTION 5: IMPACT ON STUDENTS

Provide a detailed narrative that clearly explains how the proposed changes will impact current student schedules and/or campus experience both positively and negatively.

The current students should not be impacted by the change. There is adequate lab and lecture space for the new matrix to begin without any impact on the current students.

The negative impact during the teach-out period would be that any failures of classes or any students on LOA or returning from LOA would need to take independent study courses to complete the program.

SECTION 6: IMPACT ON FACULTY

Provide a detailed narrative that clearly explains how the proposed changes will impact any faculty scheduling or qualifications. Will additional faculty be needed? Will current faculty need additional training? (Used for assessing the financial impact of the changes)

The surgery classes will require a commitment of 10 weeks per class instead of 5 weeks. This should not impact scheduling; the same teacher often teaches the lab and lecture portions of the class.

The faculty members who teach the lecture are fully qualified to teach the lab. Frequently the same teacher teaches the lab and the lecture.

The expectations in the class for the students will be clear and consistent because the same instructor will be teaching both lecture and lab.

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



SECTION 7: IMPACT ON RESOURCES

Provide a detailed narrative that clearly explains how the proposed changes will require modifications to current classroom space/ facility usage or require new/additional equipment. (Used for assessing the financial impact of the changes)

The only resource requested is the textbook Veterinary Dentistry for the Nurse and Technician for ten of the VRT courses (See Appendix 3).

There is adequate lab and classroom space available. There is no additional equipment needed to implement these changes. There is no anticipated impact on other programs or departments.

SECTION 8: IMPACT ON PROGRAMATIC ACCREDITATION

Does your program have an external accrediting body? What are their requirements for this sort of change?

AVMA requires a letter notifying them of the changed matrix. Greg Osborn will assist with this requirement upon PIP approval.

SECTION 9: ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP INPUT

A statement from the Academic Dean (Campus Director if submitted by the Academic Dean) documenting their knowledge and support of the proposed improvement is necessary to process the proposal (Separate Attachments or emails to the Curriculum Specialist are acceptable).

The proposed changes to the VT program will benefit students' academic, clinical, and professional journey. The requested changes reflect a better aligned curriculum ensuring students have necessary prerequisite knowledge and skills throughout the program. Careful consideration was taken after having taught the program to our recent students. Input from all VT faculty and administration has been received and reviewed resulting in a comprehensive program revision. I am confident that these changes will assist our students in achieving our ILOs.

Sumer Avila, CD



Curriculum and Instructional Purchasing Overview

Program constituents can propose new supply and/or equipment purchases for the program or campus that are not a direct result of the Program Review process by submitting the required documentation to the Curriculum department. New purchases fall under two categories: Curriculum Purchase and Instructional Purchase.

Curriculum Purchase

A Curriculum Purchase is defined as NEW (not replacement) items requested by faculty specific to the student achievement of course and program outcomes and job placement. To request NEW items, submit the completed Purchase Proposal form to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu with the required supporting documentation 60-90 days before the scheduled Program Review.

Instructional Purchase

An instructional purchase is defined as NEW (not replacement) items requested by faculty to support classroom instructional techniques. Instructional purchases are not specific to any one program.

Repair or Replacement of Supplies/Equipment

If equipment is in need of repair or replacement, please inform your facilities manager through the Service Desk System and it will be repaired or replaced. These items have already been justified therefore no purchase proposal is necessary.

Ongoing Replacement of Supplies / Consumables

Replacement of ongoing consumable supplies will be processed through the Purchase Request System (PRS) on InfoZone. These items also have already been justified therefore no purchase proposal is necessary.

Capital Budget Request

A purchase costing more than \$1,000 or having an estimated life span of two or more years requires a Capital Budget Request (CBR) and must also follow the purchase request policies. For additional questions about purchasing, please refer to the Purchasing and Facilities Policies and Procedures Booklet found on InfoZone.



Purchasing Process

Purchases

Purchase Proposal and CBR (if required) are submitted to
CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu

Proposal form is uploaded into the Program Review eCourse for program members to review and discuss for **30 DAYS**



Proposal and CBR go to the Senior Management Budget Committee for final approval



Upon approval curriculum department notifies the campuses and forwards approved proposal and CBR to Corporate Director of Purchasing for purchase fulfillment



Selected equipment is then added to the approved program equipment listing

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Purchase Proposal Sample: NEW Curriculum and Instruction Purchases

<p>STANDARD: New supply and/or equipment purchases must be in alignment with SJVC's Mission Statement and Strategic Plan. They must support the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), and show a positive correlation to career placement.</p> <p>POLICY: The Proposal form is to be completed in full and submitted with support documentation to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu between 60- 90 days prior to the department's Program Review for peer review and institutional determination.</p> <p>PROCESS: Complete and submit the Purchase Proposal to CurriculumImprovements@sjvc.edu. Attendees at the Program Review will vote on adoption of the proposal. If approved, the proposal is forwarded to Senior Management for their review.</p> <p>TIMELINE: Program changes take a <i>minimum</i> of 120 days to implement. Please plan accordingly.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Curriculum Purchases</p> <p>Policy: Curriculum purchases are defined as NEW items requested by faculty specific to student achievement of course and program outcomes and job placement.</p> <p>Process: The <i>Purchase Proposal</i> is to be completed in full and submitted with supporting documentation to the Curriculum Technician. If the proposal involves a program on multiple campuses, stakeholders from those campuses will be asked to review the Proposal prior to final approval.</p> <p>Examples: Patient simulators, virtual labs, durable medical equipment, HVAC training equipment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Instructional Purchases</p> <p>Policy: Instructional purchases are defined as NEW items requested by faculty to support classroom instructional techniques. Instructional purchases are not specific to any one program.</p> <p>Process: The <i>Purchase Proposal</i> is to be completed in full and submitted with supporting documentation to the Classroom Technology Specialist.</p> <p>Examples: Laptops and laptop carts, Interactive whiteboards, Clicker response systems</p>
<p>Timeline: Allow at least 90 DAYS for purchase and installation after approval.</p>	
Item	<i>Doppler Blood Pressure Monitor</i>
Total Cost (for all campuses included)	<i>\$1,255 / campus (Bakersfield in 2015)</i>
Is this request from Program Review? If so, please list the PR number	<i>No</i>
Person Requesting	<i>Robyn Nearn, DVM</i>
Supervisor	<i>Lisa Kisla</i>
Campus	<i>Fresno</i>
Date	<i>05/05/14</i>
Software required:	<i>No</i>
IS notified:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Program	<i>Veterinary Technology</i>
Course(s)	<i>VRT206, VRT301, VRT306, VRT310, and VRT320</i>

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



SECTION 1: Measurement What metrics will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed changes? (Placement, licensure, certification, CLO/PLO achievement, course completion, etc.) What is the current status and what is the expected target?			
Metric	Current	Target	By When
<i>VTNE (the licensing exam)</i>	25%	90%	<i>18 months after implementation</i>
<i>State board scores</i>	25%	90%	<i>18 months after implementation</i>
<i>CLO achievement in ten courses</i>	<i>30 of 78 (38%) of VT CLOs were assessed and achieve 80% mastery</i>	<i>All 78 CLOs to achieve 80% mastery</i>	<i>18 months after implementation</i>
<i>Graduation Rate (11/21/11 – 12/17/12)</i>	52%	70%	<i>18 months after implementation</i>
<i>Placement (11/21/11 – 12/17/12)</i>	<i>86% for 2012 per June 2014 Fact Sheet (see below)</i>	<i>Continue exceeding 75% institutional target</i>	<i>18 months after implementation</i>
Section 2: Summary of Benefits <i>Explain the benefits of the proposed supply/equipment to the course and program or instructional techniques.</i>			
<p><i>The Doppler blood pressure monitor is the only blood pressure monitor that meets the standard level of care for measuring blood pressure in the awake patient. Our students must be familiar with the use of this equipment as it will be a common skill for them to perform in the daily practice routine. While both the Cardell and the Doppler are approved and acceptable for monitoring blood pressure in the anesthetized patient, the Cardell (the instrument we use now) is consistently inaccurate in smaller patients.</i></p>			
Section 3: Supporting Documentation <i>Attach at least two forms of documentation from outside sources that support the need for the purchase. Supporting documentation includes but is not limited to: Advisory Board minutes or statements from members, statements from career service department, extern sites or employers, detailed recommendations from</i>			
<p><i>programmatic accreditation associations or new laws and/or legislation, research on current industry trends.</i></p> <p>Supporting items are (attached):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Recommendation for Doppler BP monitor Purchase by AVMA made during accreditation process</i> • <i>Two statements from extern site hospitals and potential employer for Veterinary Technology graduates supporting the use of this equipment in the work place</i> • <i>Statement from CVMA District V governor</i> • <i>Statement from Instructor for VRT, 301, VRT306, VRT310, and VRT320</i> 			
Section 4: Improvement of Student Achievement <i>4a. Explain how the proposed supply/equipment will increase student achievement.</i>			
<p><i>Student achievement will be increased due to the ability to be able to perform and interpret blood pressure measurements in awake patients, as well as anesthetized patients. This has applications in general veterinary practice as well as emergency practices. Blood pressure measurement is an essential part of the anesthetic monitoring process. It is also used in the diagnosis and monitoring of many medical patients. The students will gain an appreciation for the limitations of oscillometric blood pressure monitoring systems, as they would now be able to compare measurements in the anesthetized patient. In addition, the accuracy of student assessment of anesthetic depth will be improved with a more accurate monitoring device.</i></p>			

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



<p><i>4b. Summarize how this purchase will assist student placement. Have any students been denied placement because of the College's lack of this supply/equipment?</i></p>	
<p><i>The familiarity and ability to use the Doppler blood pressure will add to the skill level of the student and increase placement. This skill is used on a routine basis in awake and anesthetized patients. It is a standard of care that we are not meeting at this time. This skill is even more important in the emergency setting and will add to the students' placement at these types of hospitals.</i></p> <p><i>It is unlikely that students will be denied placement because of lack of this one skill. However, the ability to use this equipment enhances the skill set of our SJVC veterinary technology graduates and improves placement.</i></p>	
<p>Section 5: Alignment with Outcomes</p>	
<p>Curriculum Purchase <i>5a. Explain HOW the proposed supply/equipment aligns with and support the CLOs and/or PLOs. Please identify and list the specific SLOs.</i></p>	<p>Instructional Purchase <i>5a. Explain HOW the proposed supply/equipment aligns with and supports the ILOs and/or Instructional Department outcomes for an instructional technique purchase.</i></p>
<p>VRT 206: <i>CLO 2 - Evaluate and verify conditions affecting various organ systems in dogs and cats and conclude the correct methods of treatment and prevention.</i></p> <p>VRT 301:</p>	<p><i>Students will perform blood pressures in the workplace and therefore must practice this skill in the classroom.</i></p>
<p><i>CLO 1 - Identify common surgical instrumentation and methods of sterilization</i></p> <p><i>CLO 2 - Discuss the protocols for surgical patient care from admission to recovery</i></p> <p><i>CLO 4 - Discuss proper technique and procedures of anesthetics in a veterinary setting.</i></p> <p>VRT 306: <i>CLO 3 - Monitor patient during procedure and recovery.</i></p> <p>VRT 310: <i>CLO 1 - Discuss anesthesia and critical care assessment.</i></p> <p>VRT320: <i>CLO 1 - Apply various protocols to induce, monitor, and recover surgical patients with anesthesia.</i></p>	
<p><i>5b. How are the CLOs and/or PLOs being currently taught and assessed without this purchase?</i></p>	<p><i>5b. What instructional techniques are currently being used without this supply/equipment?</i></p>
<p><i>The same CLO's and SLO's are currently being taught with the Cardell monitor</i></p>	<p><i>The Cardell monitor is less inaccurate in small patients and those that are awake. This creates confusion for the student when determining how to treat patients. It is also not the equipment used in routine practice to assess patients that are awake.</i></p>

San Joaquin Valley College

Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Section 6: Implementation	
<i>6a. What maintenance or upkeep is required for this supply/equipment (Batteries, Belts, etc.)?</i>	
Batteries, service; only if trouble shooting is required.	
<i>6b. Will this supply/equipment become outdated and need to be replaced? If so, approximately how long until it is outdated?</i>	
No. It will not become outdated. The only need for replacement would be from damage. With proper care, this instrument can last for many years.	
<i>6c. Will faculty need to be trained on how to use this supply/equipment? If so, describe the training plan and skills assessment plan.</i>	
Faculty will not need to be trained as they are already familiar with the use of this type of equipment.	
Section 7: Ordering Information	
Attach all of the following documentation:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed equipment/supply specifications • List of possible vendors • Additional ordering information 	
Any additional info or comment:	
<p>The complete kit includes the probe, sphygmomanometer, headset, carrying case, 9-volt battery, 2.5 cm cuff and 5.0 cm cuff. The 7.5 cm cuff and the 10 cm cuff will need to be purchased additionally. The carrying case, while costly is vital for the protection of this sensitive equipment during storage.</p> <p>This product is available through Henry Schein Animal Health. It can also be purchased from MWI.</p> <p>The price for the complete set is \$1,105.00.</p> <p>Additional items: 10 cm cuff (\$80.00) and 7.5 cuff (\$70.00)</p>	
Section 8: Academic Leadership Input	
A statement from the Academic Dean (Campus Director if submitted by the Academic Dean) documenting their knowledge and support of the proposed improvement is necessary to process the proposal (Separate Attachments or emails to the Curriculum Specialist are acceptable).	
Section 9: Internal Research (completed by AA staff)	
<i>How many students are enrolled in this program on all campuses?</i>	
<i>Is this item in use on another campus? If so, which campus(s)?</i>	
<i>How will we measure return on investment?</i>	
Section 10: Senior Management Review	
Proposal must be reviewed by Senior Management or authorized representative.	
Review Date:	Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	



Additional Resources

SJVC Program Review Rubric: Rubric for Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Program Review Process

Target = 14 points with no emerging criteria

Criterion	Initial -0	Emerging-1	Developed-2	Highly Developed-3
Participation	Internal participants consist of division managers, program directors and corporate staff.	Internal participants consist of division managers, program directors, instructors and corporate staff.	A variety of internal participants consist of campus management; instructors; members of career services, admissions and corporate staffs; and students.	A variety of internal and external participants consist of campus management; instructors; members of career services, admissions and corporate staffs; students; alumni; employers; advisory board and community members.
Process	Participants evaluate the program's effectiveness on a needs basis.	Program review schedule is established where participants evaluate and modify curriculum resources based on traditional evidence. Minutes are written to capture the process.	Program review schedule is followed where participants evaluate and modify program practices based on direct and indirect evidence. Report is developed to capture the process.	Program review schedule is systematic where participants evaluate program effectiveness; modify program practices based on direct and indirect evidence and close the loop on previous initiatives. A report is developed that include new initiatives to improve student learning and program effectiveness.
Planning and Budgeting	No integration exists between program review and the College planning and budgeting processes.	A plan is developed to integrate retention, completion and placement results with the College planning and budgeting processes.	An informal process integrates student achievement and student learning data with the College planning and budgeting processes.	A systematic, formal process integrates program review results with the College planning and budgeting processes.

San Joaquin Valley College
Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



Types and Use of Evidence	Initiatives to improve program effectiveness are based primarily on grades and anecdotal information.	Initiatives to improve program effectiveness are based primarily on evidence of student achievement and less on evidence of student learning.	Initiatives to improve program effectiveness are based on indirect and some direct, authentic evidence of student learning and student achievement.	Initiatives to improve student learning and program effectiveness are exclusively based on a variety of indirect and direct, authentic evidence of student learning and student achievement.
Assessment of Learning Outcomes (PLO, CLO)	No student learning outcomes are being assessed.	Some student learning outcomes (PLOs, CLOs) are unevenly assessed and form an inconsistent pool of evidence.	Most SLOs, along with some PLOs, are systematically, electronically assessed and form a growing pool of consistent evidence.	All learning outcomes are systematically, electronically assessed and form a substantial pool of consistent evidence.
Analysis of Evidence	No evidence is analyzed through the program review process.	Evidence of student achievement is presented at program review and generally analyzed.	Participants review evidence prior to review. Data outliers are identified through collaborative analysis of evidence.	Participants review evidence prior to review. Dialogue ensues about total program effectiveness including the success rate of Program Learning Outcomes. Trends are identified.
Evaluation of Assessment Tools and Process	No procedure exists to evaluate the quality of a program's assessment process.	Program constituents occasionally provide feedback on the program's assessment process. Feedback is based mostly on anecdotal information.	Program Review Conducted within the past two years.	Program Review Conducted within the past two years.

San Joaquin Valley College
Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



WASC Student Learning Assessment in Program Review

WASC

PROGRAM REVIEW

Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Required Elements of the Self-Study	Program faculty may be required to provide a list of program-level student learning outcomes.	Faculty are required to provide the program's student learning outcomes and summarize annual assessment findings.	Faculty are required to provide the program's student learning outcomes, annual assessment studies, findings, and resulting changes. They may be required to submit a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.	Faculty are required to evaluate the program's student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, bench-marking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. They present a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.
Process of Review	Internal and external reviewers do not address evidence concerning the quality of student learning in the program other than grades.	Internal and external reviewers address indirect and possibly direct evidence of student learning in the program; they do so at the descriptive level, rather than providing an evaluation.	Internal and external reviewers analyze direct and indirect evidence of student learning in the program and offer evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. They have sufficient expertise to evaluate program efforts; departments use the feedback to improve their work.	Well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. They give evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. The department uses the feedback to improve student learning.
Planning and Budgeting	The campus has not integrated program reviews into planning and budgeting processes.	The campus has attempted to integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but with limited success.	The campus generally integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but not through a formal process.	The campus systematically integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, e.g., through negotiating formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.
Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts	No individual or committee on campus provides feedback to departments on the quality of their outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, impact, etc.	An individual or committee occasionally provides feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc.	A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc. Departments use the feedback to improve their work.	A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. Departments effectively use the feedback to improve student learning. Follow-up activities enjoy institutional support
The Student Experience	Students are unaware of and uninvolved in program review.	Program review may include focus groups or conversations with students to follow up on results of surveys	The internal and external reviewers examine samples of student work, e.g., sample papers, portfolios and capstone projects. Students may be invited to discuss what they learned and how they learned it.	Students are respected partners in the program review process. They may offer poster sessions on their work, demonstrate how they apply rubrics to self-assess, and/or provide their own evaluative feedback.

San Joaquin Valley College
Outcome-based Program Review Handbook



ACCJC Institutional Effectiveness: Program Review

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review
(See cover letter for how to use this rubric.)

Levels of Implementation	Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review <i>(Sample institutional behaviors)</i>
Awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review. • There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research. • There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals. • The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.
Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness. • Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness. • Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin. Etc.) • Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality. • Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement. • Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.
Proficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly. • Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making. • The program review framework is established and implemented. • Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness. • Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples. • The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.
Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. • The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness. • The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.