



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

12345 El Monte Rd, Los Altos Hills, CA 94022

Program Review

Advisory Council

Program Review Visual Timeline and Due Dates

Month	Due Date	Action	Who is Responsible
September	9-30-19	Notification to Deans, Academic Senate, and Classified Senate Requesting Writers and Readers	Office of Instruction
October	10-25-19	Deans send confirmation of the Writers to the Office of Instruction	Deans & AVPs
	10-30-19	Orientation and Training of the Writers	Office of Instruction
November	11-1-19	Writer(s) Draft the Self-Study Report - Start 11-1-19 to 2-28-20	Writers
	11-8-19	Confirmation of the Readers from Academic and Classified Senates	Academic Senate Classified Senate
	11-22-19	Orientation and Training of the Readers	Office of Instruction Readers
January	1-17-20	Section A-D in the Self-Study Template is due to the Dean for review and feedback	Writer
	2-7-20	Deans provide feedback to the Writer(s) on Section A-D of the Self-Study Template	Deans & AVPs
February	2-29-20	Final Draft (All Sections) of the Program Review Template is Due	Writer
March	3-2-20	Readers are provided the Program Review Template and the PR Evaluation Rubric to begin the evaluation	Office of Instruction
	3-2-20	Readers begin the evaluation of the Program Review Template	Readers
April	4-3-20	Readers Complete the Evaluation and Submit their Final Rubric	Readers
	4-15-20	PowerPoint Presentation Due to the Office of Instruction	Writers
April/May	TBD	College Council Reviews Programs' Self-Study Reports and Presentations	The College Council

Program Review 2019-2020 Appointment of Roles Form

Program Name	Faculty Reader from Division	Faculty Reader at- Large	Classified Staff at- Large	Dean or AVP	IR Coach
Chemistry	Shaelyn St Onge-Cole	David McCormick	Josh Pelletier	Ram Subramaniam	Doreen F
Dental Assisting	Anand Venkataraman	Jay Patyk	Manuel Diaz-Alvares	Ram Subramaniam	Lisa L
Engineering	Ronald Painter	Voltaire Villanueva	Alfred Guzman	Ram Subramaniam	Doreen F
Geography	Kerri Ryer	Geoff Mathews	Eric Hoppe	Kurt Hueg	Lara T
Humanities	Joe Woolcock		Julie Ceballos	Kurt Hueg	Lara T
Music Tech	Carolyn Brown	Brian Evans	Christine Mangiameli	Debbie Lee	Doreen F
Theater Arts & Theater Tech	Elizabeth Barkley	Karen Erickson	Jerry Robredo	Debbie Lee	Lisa L
Pharmacy Tech	Lisa Schulthaeis	Hilary Gomes	Alfred Guzman	Ram Subramaniam	Lisa L
Respiratory Therapy	Kathy Armstrong	Hilda Fernandez	Hayley Davidson	Ram Subramaniam	Lisa L
Spanish		Mary Thomas	Alejandro Favela	Valerie Fong	Doreen F

Preparing and Presenting the Template PowerPoint to The Advisory Council

Programs under review presenting to the Advisory Council is part of the shared governance process and is a part of ensuring compliance with the accreditation process. The Advisory Council's role is to hold programs' accountable to critical engagement as they participate in the program review process. The presentation should provide The Advisory Council with

- an ability to understand the emergent themes, issues, and or needs being experienced by programs under review
- an overview about how the program contributes to the College mission and makes a difference for the students' it serves
- an understanding of the individual program's areas of improvement as well as the overall weaknesses across all programs under review

Presenting also provides the program the opportunity to

- Tell the story of the programs' strengths and ask for the resources/help needed to continue great work, fix areas of weakness, and/or to scale

Presentation to Council

- The Advisory Council presentations will be conducted in 20 minute intervals during two meeting sessions.
- **Writer presentation will be no longer than 10 minutes with an additional 10 minutes for Questions and Answers**
- The Advisory Council requests program presenters use the template provided, with no additional or deleted slides, which will be strictly followed due to the number of presentations and to allow for questions during the time allotted.

Advisory Council PowerPoint Template



Programs Strengths

- Directions for the Slide - From the Self-Study Report, please identify all program strengths/outcomes as outlined in the document.

3



Programs' Actions for Improvement Identified

- Directions for the Slide - From the Self-Study Report, please identify all actions for improvement outlined in the document.

3



Program Data

- Slide Direction – please add any data table you would you like to share

5



Resources Needed

- Directions for this slide - What do you need to make the improvements and or take actions

6

Condensed Outcome Rubric Summary

	Faculty in Division	Faculty At-Large	Division Dean	Classified Staff
Rubric Evaluation				
A. Program Information				
How many criteria are met for the Program Mission statement?	Addresses all 8 criteria - Meets the Standard	Exceeds expectations for all 8 criteria - Excellent	Addresses 4 to 7 of the criteria - Needs Some Improvement to Meet the Standard	Addresses all 8 criteria - Meets the Standard
Reader Feedback	Add a statement about how this is aligned with the college mission.	Nice -- clear and concise. Easy for the reader to understand. All 8 criteria are reflected in the statement.	Responses do not address 1) reflects the program's priorities and values 2) is aligned to the college mission statement	N/A
How many criteria are met for the Program Learning Outcomes?	Addresses 3 to 4 of the criteria - Needs Some Improvement to Meet the Standard	Addresses all 5 criteria - Meets the Standard	Addresses 3 to 4 of the criteria - Needs Some Improvement to Meet the Standard	Addresses 3 to 4 of the criteria - Needs Some Improvement to Meet the Standard
Reader Feedback	The PLO's written are clear, student-centered, measurable and actionable, except the last one. I am unclear on how students are to "distinguish all related career paths associated with the discipline." How will this PLO be measured?	Responses addressed all 5 criteria	The PLO's are measurable in terms of number of degrees and certificates awarded. The outcomes are focused on students. The first PLO statement is easily understood, however, the second PLO is a bit confusing and needs clarification. Also, it does not reflect the levels of learning that build toward higher order thinking skills. Since the second PLO is a bit confusing, I can't tell if it is actionable.	Consider revising PLO # 2. It is not clear how this can be measured. Also, in PLO #3: how is the enhancement being measured? Could it just say- "communicate" instead of "enhanced ability to communicate"?
B. FTES - Enrollment Trends				
1. What does the FTES data trend indicate?	FTES has decreased over the time span no more than 10% - Meets the Standard	FTES has decreased over the time span by 10% to 30% - Needs Some Improvement to Meet the Standard	FTES has decreased over the time span no more than 10% - Meets the Standard	FTES has decreased over the time span no more than 10% - Meets the Standard
How many criteria are met in the data trend narrative explanation for FTES?	The narrative includes all 4 of the criteria - Meets the Standard	The narrative includes 3 of the criteria - Needs Some Improvement to Meet the Standard	The narrative includes all 4 of the criteria - Meets the Standard	The narrative exceeds expectations - the narrative could be used as an exemplar - Excellent
How many criteria are met in the proposed action narrative for FTES?	The narrative includes 4 of the criteria - Needs Some Improvement to Meet the Standard	The narrative includes 4 of the criteria - Needs Some Improvement to Meet the Standard	The narrative includes 4 of the criteria - Needs Some Improvement to Meet the Standard	The narrative includes all 5 of the criteria - Meets the Standard