To access the most recent version of the Program Review Manual and review instruments, click [here](#).

**Revisions Completed 12.6.16**

- The Table of Contents was reorganized to appropriately reflect the order of the review instruments.
- 2.2 of the CTE Review Instrument: the ICCB replaced the unit cost question with the following: *How do costs compare to other programs on campus?*
- In all data analysis templates (CTE, Academic Disciplines, and Remedial Math and ELA), the Retention Rate measure was removed.
- In the CTE Program Review Data Analysis section, the Completion Rate measure was changed to “Number of Completers.”

**Frequently Asked Questions Part I (02/02/17)**

1. **What years need to be reviewed for the program reviews that are currently taking place (FY2017) and due September 1, 2017?**

   Within the 5-year Review Schedule (page 36 of the manual), review the column of program areas in the fiscal year listed. For example, “Communications” as part of the Academic Disciplines will be reviewed during fiscal year 2017 and will be submitted to ICCB by September 1, 2017 (following the end of the fiscal year).

2. **For the data analysis sections, what years of data should be reviewed?**

   The most recent 5-year longitudinal data available. For program review submissions due September 1, 2017 that were reviewed during FY2017, colleges should report the most up to date data available (likely fiscal years 2011-2015 or 2012-2016). It is unlikely that FY2017 data would be available prior to review and submission. If a program is new and was not implemented over the last 5 years, please indicate and include the most recent applicable data.

3. **Is an individual CTE Program Review Analysis form to be completed by CIP code or by curriculum code?** For example: in FY17, CIP code 11 Computer and Information Sciences and Support Services is on the schedule. Within that CIP code we have several 6-digit CIP codes and within those 6-digit CIP codes we may have one or many curriculum codes. At what level are colleges to respond to the Program Review Analysis?

   At a minimum, colleges are to review individual programs using the 6-digit CIP code. The 5-Year Review Schedule includes examples of programs with 6-digit CIP codes but is not all-inclusive.
4. When a college has a program that houses a degree and a certificate which are falling into different CIP codes, and as a result different review years, can the college conduct a review of both during the year assigned to the degree CIP code?

Although the manual states that the ICCB will only honor previously approved and documented exceptions to the 5 Year Program Review Schedule, in this instance which may be rare, it is logical for the reviews of both the degree and the certificate in question to be conducted in the same fiscal year. When this occurs the college should make this clear in the review submission.

5. For the CTE review template, does “Number of Students Enrolled” refer to the number of students enrolled in the program (i.e. AAS, Cert, etc.) or the number of students enrolled in the program courses?

Colleges should report on the number of students enrolled in the program as a concentrator to avoid counting students who may be taking various program courses as electives. A program concentrator earns at least 12 credits within one fiscal year in a single program area sequence. The program area sequence should conclude with an award of a community college credential. Students can also be deemed a program concentrator if they complete a short-term (less than 12 hours) credential within a fiscal year.

6. How is completer defined and where is this information located?

Completers are successful student completions of approved programs. More than one completion can be reported for a student in a fiscal year due to stackable credentials within a program of study. Hence, a student could accumulate three (3) completions if the student earned one (1) Certificate of a Year or More and two (2) Certificates of Less than a Year. Information related to completions by community college can found via ICCB’s Data Book. Select the needed year and then Section III. Tables III-7, Table III-8, and Table III-9 provide completions by community college.

7. For the review of Academic Disciplines, the form seems to be a combination of summary and detail data. Does the Review Summary include statements for all subjects within the discipline being reviewed? For example, within FY17 the college will report on Communications - there are several subjects involved (Visual Communications, Art, Multi-Communications Media, Music, Speech) – Is there one Summary for Communications and then an individual review analysis for each of the different subjects?

For the first two sections of the Academic Disciplines review template (Review Summary and Review Analysis), colleges are to complete a high level and comprehensive review of the discipline. For the third section of the review template (Data Analysis), colleges are to review individual courses or clusters of courses, if appropriate, within the discipline.
8. For Student and Academic Support Services, should there be one form submitted for each of the individual programs being reviewed in the particular year? (For example, in FY17 one form will be submitted for Admissions, one for Recruiting and one for Registration and Records for a total of 3 forms.)

Yes, that is the preferred method of submission.

9. For Student and Academic Support Services, are we required to complete and submit the **Self-Assessment Toolkit** forms as provided on the ICCB website, or is this optional?

The Self-Assessment Toolkit is available for colleges to use as they review Student and Academic Support Service programs; however, colleges are not required to complete and submit this for the review.
Frequently Asked Questions – Part II (12/29/17)

10. Given the fast pace of change brought on by advances in technology, are we still holding to a minimum review of every 5 years? Should colleges consider 3 year reviews to allow for changes in industry?

Colleges are statutorily required to review programs following the statewide program review cycle which occurs on a five-year cycle; however, colleges are encouraged to continuously review programs on a shorter basis which may include review and revisions stemming from ongoing program advisory committee convenings. It is important to note that many colleges review programs annually, although the review may be less extensive than the required statewide program review process.

11. Do we need to include a table for all courses within an academic discipline?

Yes. All courses that fall within the academic discipline scheduled for that review year must be included.

12. For the “CTE Completion Rates”, what is the length of time that should elapse for us to measure completion?

The CTE template does not call for “completion rates” but rather number of completers. For academic disciplines, the template does call for “success rate”, but that metric is for the course being reviewed, not the program or discipline. “Success rate” is determined by the percent of students achieving a C grade or better at the end of the course, excluding withdrawals and audit students.

13. Who, at the college, should lead the program review process?

The position and role of the person(s) that lead, facilitate, compile, and submit the statewide program review submissions annually vary between colleges. Typically, the college’s Chief Academic Officer (CAO) or lead institutional research/effectiveness administrator serves as the ICCB point of contact. Although the ICCB requires one point of contact, we encourage that program review is completed as an institution-wide process and is not completed in a silo by any one person or division. All faculty, deans, administrators, and other staff should have an intentional role within the program review process.

14. Will the college remain anonymous in this OCCRL external evaluation and focus group findings report?

Participants in the OCCRL external evaluation will be acknowledged as a group in the final report. Specifically, participants who consent to have their information shared specifically for acknowledgment will have their names, title, and college included in a listing for the acknowledgement section of the OCCRL’s final report. Otherwise, the identification of the college and any participants will not be published by OCCRL in relation to this evaluation and
the data collected for it, unless the participant provides specific permission in writing. For example, if a college has employed an exemplary practice, a representative from the college with first-hand experience with the practice may be invited to share their experiences in a blog, podcast, or brief. Participation in such activities would be voluntary and not affect their participation in other evaluation activities in any fashion.

Data shared at project events and during focus groups cannot be guaranteed to be confidential. OCCRL will not published identifiable information associated with data collected at project events. However, while OCCRL will encourage participants to treat information shared as confidential, OCCRL cannot control the information that may be shared among or by other participants. Also of note, ICCB will co-facilitate project events.

Data collected via interview will be confidential. Potential participants who want to share information confidentially are encouraged to participate in an interview. Anyone who is currently contributing to the program review process at their college or who contributed to the program review cycle ending September 2017 is encouraged to share their experiences with the evaluation team via an interview. Participants do not have to attend the project events to participate in an interview and participating in an interview does not preclude participation in project events. Anyone interested in being interviewed can contact Dr. Heather Fox at hlfox2@illinois.edu for more information. Invitations to participate will be sent in January 2018.