PRC Summary Report for AY19

1. **Program Review Committee (PRC) was reorganized.** New committee members were added to the AY18 team. The committee met eleven times in Fall 2018 (Sep 13, 20, 27; Oct 4, 9, 18, 25; Nov 1, 8, 15, 29) and seven times in Spring 2019 (Jan 31; Feb 14, 28; Mar 22; Apr 4, 23; May 9).

2. **PRC members**. Members were nominated by academic administration from stakeholder groups. Business Office and Chinle Campus reps did not participate. Members included the following:
   a. Agbaraji, Casmir (admin rep)
   b. Arviso, Coleen (PR Coordinator in AY18)
   c. Begay, Sheena (IR rep)
   d. Fowler, Henry (faculty rep and PRC chair)
   e. Henry, Jerlynn (Student Services rep)
   f. Hunter, Kelly (faculty rep)
   g. Loley, Lemanuel (Career Services rep
   h. McLaughlin, Daniel (Assessment rep)
   i. Meles, Abraham (faculty rep)
   j. Tom, Brenda (HR rep)

3. **PRC accomplishments:** *the PRC...*
   a. Simplified Program Review template that was established in AY18. Strived to make it easier for Self-Study team members to complete.
   b. Developed an Evaluation Rubric for quality control and feedback to Self-Study team members.
   c. Sought to prefill administrative data:
      i. Student Data: by Institutional Research
      ii. Job Placement: by Career Services
      iii. Faculty: by Human Resources
      iv. Costs: by Business Office
   d. Posted each template in Google Docs to facilitate authorship by multiple interests.
   e. Set up PRC website.
   f. Organized an Orientation for Self-Study Team Members in Fall 2018 (but not in Spring 2019). Was attended by each instructor and chairperson tasked with a Program Review assignment in Fall 2018. One-on-one orientations took place for Program Reviewers in Spring 2019.

4. **Results**
   a. Six Program Reviews were assigned in Fall 2018, following NTU's Program Review cycle. Four were deemed complete; two were not completed. Eight were assigned in Spring 2019. Seven were deemed complete; one was not completed.
   b. Scorecards were produced for each semester (see Tables 1 and 2 below). Checks (√) represent aspects of the Program Review that were completed.

PROGRAM	Hist	Curr	Stu data	Job plmt	Prog asst	Strn/ chal	Fac	Rec	Cost	Act plan
CARPENTRY AAS Lee/Quashie	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√
CHEM ENG AAS Ehteshami	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√
ADV MANU TECH Vohnout/Ehteshami	√		√			√	√	√		√
CDL CERT Woody/Quashie	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√
CONST TECH AAS Quashie	√	√	√		√	√	√	√		√
BIM (CAD) Charley/Ehteshami	√	√	√				√			

TABLE 1: *Program Review Scorecard for Fall 2018*

PROGRAM	Hist	Curr	Stu data	Job plmt	Prog asst	Strn/ chal	Fac	Rec	Cost	Act plan
DINÉ CULTURE MA Thomas	√		√				√			
DINÉ CULTURE BA Fowler & DS faculty	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√
ENERGY SYST AAS Griego	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√
ENV SCIENCE BS Mader	√	√			√	√		√		√
ENV SCIENCE AAS Chischilly	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		
LAW ADV AAS Hibbard/Yazzie	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√
LEGAL ASST CERT Hibbard//Wood/Yazzie	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√
PRE-NURSING Llanque/	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√

TABLE 2: *Program Review Scorecard for Spring 2019*

5. **Prefilled data provided overall by academic administration**
    a. Institutional Research: 93%
    b. Career Services: 64%
    c. Human Resources: 93%
    d. Business Office: 0%

6. **Program Review narratives and PRC evaluation feedback with scores** (click on each link below for details):

Program Review Narrative	PRC Feedback	PRC Score*
FALL 2018		
Advanced Manufacturing Technology	AMT feedback evaluation	0.22
Carpentry	Carpentry feedback evaluation	0.55
Commercial Driver's License	CDL feedback evaluation	0.78
Chemical Engineering	Chem Eng feedback evaluation	2.44
OVERALL SEMESTER AVERAGE		1.33
SPRING 2019		
Diné Studies BA	Diné Studies feedback eval	2.33
Energy Systems	Energy Sys feedback eval	1.67
Environmental Science AAS	Env Sci AAS feedback eval	1.11
Environmental Science BS	Env Sci BS feedback eval	1.78
Law Advocate	Law Adv feedback eval	1.67
Legal Assistant	Legal Asst feedback eval	1.67
Pre-Nursing	Pre-Nursing feedback eval	1.78
OVERALL SEMESTER AVERAGE		1.72

* Scale: 1=emerging, 2=developing, 3=proficient

TABLE 3: *Program Reviews and PRC feedback*

7. **Program Reviews not completed in AY19**
    a. Computer-aided Drafting (Fall 2019)
    b. Construction Technology (Fall 2019)
    c. Diné Studies MA (Spring 2019)

8. **Discussion**
    a. Participation in Program Review was mixed. Overall, PRC member attendance was 64% (from Sep 2018 to Apr 2019). Program Reviews by assigned faculty members was 79%. Three faculty members did not conduct the Program Review assignments.
    b. Only two of the eleven reviews that were completed approached "proficient" (on evaluation rubric scale): Chemical Engineering, 2.44, by Dr. Gholam Ehteshami in Fall 2019, and Diné Culture BA, 2.33, by Dr. Henry Fowler and Diné Studies faculty in Spring 2019.
    c. Program Reviews were hindered by the complete absence of Costs information from the Business Office despite repeated attempts to work with that department.

9. **Opportunities for Improvement**

    ACTION PLANS
    a. Faculty who completed the Program Reviews each have opportunities to finalize and implement Action Plans for improving their programs. Each could be assigned to report on this work in Fall 2019 semester (see note #d in the following

section about clarifying responsibility for implementing and reviewing such plans).

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS
    a. Revise the Program Review cycle. Extend the time between Program Reviews from once every three years to once every five or six years unless deemed necessary by academic administration. Assign Program Reviews not completed in AY19 for AY20. Include instructors from all university campuses in appropriate committee and Program Review assignments.
    b. Revise the Program Review annual calendar:
        i. Confirmation of assigned programs: by May 1 (in prior academic year)
        ii. Orientation: by Sep 15
        iii. Self-study by assigned Program Reviewer(s): by Dec 15
        iv. Initial review by PRC: by Feb 1
        v. Hearings (organized by the PRC, led by Program Reviewers, and open to the university community): by Mar 15
        vi. Final report to administration and Board of Regents: by May 1.
    c. Clarify with academic administration revised Program Review cycle and calendar within larger context of planning-assessment-evaluation-budgeting cycles.
    d. Clarify with academic administration responsibility for following up with Program Review recommendations including those for specific academic programs and those for the university as a whole.
    e. Review the Program Review evaluation rubric for opportunities to recognize and celebrate success.
    f. Work with Business Office to redo job descriptions and information processes so that program costs data are made available to program reviewers. Establish a program efficacy metric (e.g., total program revenues divided by total program costs). Include in Program Review template grant revenue generated by programs.
    g. Include the improvement of Program Review process as a goal in NTU's new strategic plan.
    h. Require participation in Orientation for Program Reviewers. Include samples of excellent Program Review work.
    i. Produce a comprehensive Program Review Guide that spells out all process requirements and details.

ACADEMIC POLICIES
    a. Revise the annual academic calendar so that it explicitly supports Program Review as well as academic planning, assessment, and continuous improvement. Have time set aside for these activities in convocations prior to fall and spring semesters, assessment days at mid-semester, and in post-commencement period for completing annual assessment reports.
    b. Revise faculty workload policies. Incentivize faculty workload regarding Program Review assignments as well as Program Review Committee membership.
    c. Revise the faculty contract so that it explicitly includes academic assessment and program reviews.

d. Revise faculty and department chair job descriptions and evaluation forms so that it includes academic assessment and Program Reviews. Consider extended contract period for department chairs so they can take responsibility for planning, assessment, and improvement processes.

ACADEMIC SUPPORT PROCESSES
  a. Fix Business Office procurement processes.
  b. Improve program budgeting processes.
  c. Establish plan to promote planning, evaluation, and continuous improvement for academic support units in ways that promote the university's strategic plan.
  d. Establish a university-wide Technology Plan so that all classrooms have a minimum of appropriate instructional technology.
  e. Establish plan to improve Library Services so that all NTU students have access to appropriate academic support.