

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS

	# and % of Reports Submitted*
2007-08	7/65 (10%)
2008-09	6/51 (12%)

*Programs without full-time faculty exempt.

PROGRAM REVIEWS

2006-07

7/7 scheduled reviews completed (100%)

Scheduled	Completed
AASACC Business - Accounting	x
AASACT Business - Applied Accounting	x
AASGBU Business -General Business	x
AASMGT Business - Management	x
AAS-RE Business – Real Estate	x
CP-AT Business - Accounting Certificate	x
CP-BUS Business Certificate	x

2007-08

3/6 scheduled reviews completed (50%)

Scheduled	Completed
CP-CIC Cisco Systems	
CP-TCH Microcomputer/Network Technician	
CP-NA Network Administration	
AA-MTH Musical Theatre	x
ASCHEM Chemistry	x
AS-MAT Mathematics	x

2008-09

7/10 scheduled reviews completed (70%)

Scheduled	Completed
CP-ECE, AASECE Early Childhood Education	x
General Education	x
AASCRJ, AASLEA, AA-CRJ, CP-LEA Criminal Justice	x
AASDTA, AASDTC, AASDTM Drafting Technology	

ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAMS

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS

	# of Reports Submitted
2005-06	18
2006-07	12
2007-08	4
2008-09	4

PROGRAM REVIEWS

2005-06

6/7 scheduled reviews completed (86%)

Scheduled	Completed
Facilities	
Library	x
Academic Skills Center	x
Counseling	x
Student Activities	x
Disability Support Services	x
Prison Program	x

2006-07

1/3 scheduled reviews completed (33%)

Scheduled	Completed
ABE/ESL/GED	
Fallon/Rural Corridor	x
Athletics	

2007-08

4/4 scheduled reviews completed (100%)

Scheduled	Completed
Admissions and Records	x
Bookstore	x
Sedway Café	x
Human Resources	x

2010 PARC ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS

2008-09

1/7 scheduled reviews completed (14%)

Scheduled	Completed
Facilities	
Business Office	
Financial Assistance	x
Child Development Center	Accreditation materials submitted
Public Safety	
Institutional Research	
Development and External Affairs	

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK FROM PROGRAM REVIEW TEAMS

FEEDBACK SESSIONS

The feedback session would be more valuable if it occurred directly after completion of the program review. (Admissions and Records, 2008)

There was no feedback from the assessment committee after the 2004 program review, but there was feedback from the President and Vice President. The café advisory committee provides more useful feedback than PARC could. (Sedway Café, 2008)

This was the first program review this department had completed for which it received feedback from the assessment committee. (Human Resources, 2008)

It would have been better to move up the report deadline so that the feedback session could occur before the summer break. (AS Mathematics, 2008)

PROGRAM REVIEW FORMS, GUIDELINES AND PROCESS

The form was designed for academic program reviews and therefore did not make sense for an administrative department's program review. PARC should have different forms for academic and administrative program reviews. (Admissions and Records, 2008; Human Resources, 2008)

Auxiliary operations, such as the Child Development Center, bookstore, vending machines and the café should have a different program review process because their operations are affected by various contracts and agreements. (Sedway Café, 2008)

The program review team was unsure about what was required and should have contacted the members of PARC more often for assistance. (Human Resources, 2008)

The timeline in the program review guidelines helped the team stay on track. The team appreciated the flexibility of not requiring a site visit and exit interview of the external reviewer. It was helpful to be able to look at another department's completed program review, so it's a good idea to publish program reviews on the college website. The guidelines were unclear in terms of whether the Action Plan was due before or after the completed report was submitted. (Financial Assistance, 2009)

The program review process was valuable, and the completion of the Student Learning Outcomes/Course Matrix was especially helpful because doing so made faculty courses in terms of the learning outcomes and whether the courses went far enough toward fulfilling those outcomes. Out of this process, the idea to articulate a theatre appreciation course came about, and faculty were able to borrow ideas/materials from UNR colleague Gary Aldrich. This review was a learning experience, but the last program review was not. So many words that are almost synonymous are used—words such as,

2010 PARC ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS

“goals,” “outcomes,” and “objectives.” Faculty didn’t know how to demonstrate evidence of satisfaction. It would be more valuable to measure employer satisfaction than student satisfaction. (AA Musical Theatre, 2008)

PARC should reduce the amount of paperwork required; post reports on the Web and link to other documents. [*Note: guidelines and report template were in one document at the time of this review.*] The process takes a year and a half, so the timeline should not be shortened. (AS Chemistry, 2008)

The document (guidelines and report form) was overwhelming. Make sure teams have the correct curriculum forms. Various versions of the forms were floating around at the time of the review. (AS Mathematics, 2008)

The site visit was useful. The discussion with the focus group of students provided the most enlightening information of the entire process. (AS Mathematics, 2008)

A program review team member served as an external reviewer for a Great Basin College program review right after she completed her review and found that GBC’s process was not as well developed as WNC’s. GBC faculty used elements of WNC’s program review guidelines in completing their Early Childhood Education program review this year. (Early Childhood Education, AAS and Certificate, 2009)

Include a one-page summary timeline of the program review self-study process in the program review guidelines for clarity. (Early Childhood Education, AAS and Certificate, 2009)

Teams would do well to involve a faculty member from a transfer institution in the program review process as an external reviewer. (Criminal Justice, 2009)

The value in the self-study process is to improve programs, but WNC’s current process is too convoluted, creates too much stress and work, and should be pared down by half. There is not enough time to document assessment formally. Programs need more manpower in order to comply with the assessment mandate. Institutional Research should conduct all program reviews because it’s an administrative task. Those involved in program review and assessment need to send the message to the administration that there is a considerable amount of time and effort required to perform assessment and program review. The mandate to perform program review and assessment is a faculty workload issue that should be reviewed along with other faculty workload issues. (Criminal Justice, 2009)

Academic programs should address the general education component. (General Education, 2009)

All the different program review forms and their purposes were confusing, and the lack of a form designed specifically for general education was frustrating. The process was convoluted. The differences between the five-year assessment plan and the action plan were not clear. (General Education, 2009)

SUPPORT

The process was made more difficult because of the vacant assessment coordinator position. The program review form called for a budget spreadsheet, but the budget officer didn't know what was required. The PARC member assigned to assist the program review team didn't know how to help. The external reviewer was not helpful to the process. (Admissions and Records, 2008)

Different people on PARC gave different answers when help was sought. (AA Musical Theatre, 2008)

It was helpful to meet with assessment coordinator Tracy Viselli. She helped make the process less overwhelming. Institutional Research was supportive in providing information. It would be helpful to appoint a PARC member or small group to work together with the program review team throughout the process. (AS Mathematics, 2008)

Don't let teams panic because program review is doable. (AS Mathematics, 2008)

PARC members supported the self-study process well and should be commended for their work in assessment and program review at the college. (Early Childhood Education, AAS and Certificate, 2009)

Division Chair Robert Morin was supporting of the programs and the self-study process, and his support validated the importance of the programs. (Early Childhood Education, AAS and Certificate, 2009)

Information provided by Institutional Research was valuable. (Early Childhood Education, AAS and Certificate, 2009)

LOGISTICS

It was difficult to complete the review because the vendor changed during the process. (Sedway Café, 2008)