



# Instructional Program Review Handbook

This handbook serves to define and communicate the process for reviewing all instructional programs at Cerritos College.

## Mission Statement

Instructional Program Review (IPR) is a faculty-driven, shared-governance selfevaluation process for the facilitation of improvement of all instructional programs at Cerritos College. In conjunction with the Unit Planning process, the program review process solicits evidence-based documentation from instructional programs to assess effectiveness and identify areas of institutional and instructional improvement through the development of strategic goals.

## Structure of the Instructional Program Review Committee

The instructional program review process is mandated by the accreditation standards of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), the State of California Department of Education (Title 5), and the Cerritos College Board of Trustees (Board Policy). The standards require that the institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures and analyzes how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institutional program review process is the primary means for demonstrating individual program effectiveness by providing evidence of program performance.

The committee shall consist of the following members:

One faculty member from each instructional division

Business

Liberal Arts

Humanities and Social Sciences

Health, Physical Education, Athletics, Dance

Health Occupations

Technology

Fine Arts/Communications

Counseling/Career Services

Library  
Science, Engineering and Math  
Four members from management appointed by ACCME

One member from classified staff appointed by CSEA

One member from the student body appointed by ASCC

One member ex-officio immediate past Chairperson

The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning shall serve as a non-voting advisor to the committee

## **Program Review Process**

The Program Review process includes a six-year cycle for all programs to be reviewed. The review year is defined as the year in which the self-study report is prepared and accepted by the IPR Committee.

Following is a description of the requirements and general timing of each phase of the process. (See Appendix H for an activity schedule.)

### **Phase 1 – Planning, Training and Design**

(December – May in the school year prior to review year)

All departments/programs under review are identified and contacted. Orientation sessions are held to familiarize participants of the nature, timing and extent of each phase of the process. Individuals assigned to coordinate the process (department chairs) should consider work allocation issues in order to gather the necessary information for the self-study report.

A member of the instructional program review committee will be assigned to each program under review. The assigned committee member will act as a liaison between the committee and the program evaluation team to assist in any way necessary to facilitate the process.

Programs should contact the Division of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning (IERP) during this phase if they would like assistance constructing surveys or similar instruments. IERP is available January – April to help programs with these requests.

Programs should also contact the Cerritos College Librarian Representative, Stephanie Rosenblatt, so a librarian can be assigned to conduct a comprehensive review of relevant library collections and have the necessary time to allocate funds and augment the current collections if necessary.

By March 31<sup>st</sup>, each program under review will submit the “Instructional Program Review Planning Form” (Appendix A) to document the plan for the review process. Each program will be randomly assigned a presentation date with the committee, thereby establishing the deadlines for the draft and final submission of the self-study report prepared in Phase 4.

### **Phase 2 – Self-Study Design, Methods, and Data Collection**

(March – August in the school year *prior* to review year)

The self-study design, methods, and data collection phase represents the most significant time and resource commitment by the program participants. This phase has two purposes: (1) to further develop the design and methods to collect data and evidence for the self-study’s analysis and conclusions (Phase 3) and (2) to collect the data. During this phase, each department develops an overall plan to collect program, institutional, and primary data.

For primary data, the program identifies, develops, and creates its own data collection instruments (e.g. questionnaires, surveys, focus groups, personal interviews, and document data).

For program data, the evaluation team identifies and collects available data relevant to the operation of the program which is collected at the program level (e.g., program faculty, resources, SLO assessment and analysis, etc.). Program data also includes each department defining its courses, certificates, and degrees and identifying the resources and methods used to deliver the program to students. External parties who have influence on the program are also identified (e.g. advisory committees, licensing agencies, etc.).

For institutional data, programs are required to access a standard set of instructional data produced by the college’s IERP. This data will be provided to the program by IERP. The result of the self-study design, methods, and data collection phase is to have a set of data to use to evaluate the program. The information gathered from the analysis of this data will be used to support claims made in the self-study report. These results will be used to identify strengths and weaknesses in the program in order to provide a basis for planning (completed in Phase 3).

To complete this phase with the technical and material support of the IERP, evaluation teams are required to meet with the dean of that office. IERP can assist in the design, implementation, and analysis of data collected through instruments like questionnaires, surveys, focus groups, and personal interviews.

Due to the nature of this requirement, it is important that early planning be established to allow adequate time for completing the data collection process.

### **Phase 3 – Self-Study Analysis and Report Preparation**

(August - October)

At the onset of the academic year, programs undergoing the peer review process will be required to schedule a data consultation with IERP. The program will be provided with their data/summary electronically. A description of this data can be found in Appendix B.

The program’s evaluation team prepares a report that documents the analysis and findings of the self-evaluation phase (Phase 2). Using the evidence and data collected in Phase 2, the report describes any potential changes in curriculum, teaching methodology, instructional interventions, facilities, faculty and staff to take advantage of strengths and opportunities and improve upon weaknesses and/or mitigate threats. The report should include a brief description of the program and should focus on Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT). The primary focus of effort in writing the self-study report should be on the SWOT analysis and goal setting process. The final step is to develop meaningful mid-range and long-term goals established by the program’s self-evaluation team. For more information on the content and format of this report, see the section in this handbook titled “Writing the Self-Study Report.”

The program’s evaluation team will be assigned a visitation date by the IPR committee. This date establishes the deadline for the self-study report. The visitation date will be assigned no later than March 31 prior to the review year. A draft of the report is due to the IPR liaison six weeks prior to the visitation date. The self-study draft report must be submitted electronically either in a Microsoft Word or Adobe pdf format. Comments from the IPR committee will be provided to the evaluation team within two weeks after submission of the draft report. A summary of the report timing follows:

<b>Visitation Date</b>	<b>Assigned by IPR Committee</b>
<b>Due date for planning form</b>	<b>March 31 in year prior to review year</b>
<b>Due date for report draft</b>	<b>Six weeks prior to visitation date</b>
<b>Due date for final report</b>	<b>Two weeks prior to visitation date</b>

The final report is due to the committee two weeks before the visitation date along with the ‘Instructional Program Review Submittal Form’ which is signed by the members of the evaluation team and the division dean. (See Appendix B).

#### **Phase 4 – Program Review Visitation**

(November – April)

A representative from each program will attend a Program Review meeting and review its S.W.O.T. analysis as well as go through the program’s mid-range and longterm goals with the committee. At the meeting, department faculty and division management are welcome to attend and have the opportunity to provide additional comments.

The IPR committee will provide comments and feedback, ask questions and review any evidence supporting assertions in the report. The program review committee

approves reports and prepares the 'Instructional Program Review Approval Form.' (See Appendix H.)

### **Phase 5 – Report to Faculty Senate, Coordinating Committee, and Budget and Planning Committee**

(April - May)

At the end of the school year, a report is prepared by the IPR committee and presented to the Faculty Senate, Coordinating Committee, and Planning and Budget Committee. The report is intended to discuss overall trends rather than specific issues. Frequently, issues identified by multiple departments indicate an institutional concern. The information in this report can be used by the institution to prioritize the allocation of resources. All documentation generated by the process is archived for review by interested members of the instructional community.

## **Writing the Self-Study Report**

**The primary outcome of the Instruction Program Review (IPR) process is the preparation of a self-study report. The primary purpose of the self-study report is to gather and analyze data related to your program and perform a S.W.O.T. (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis. Based on your S.W.O.T. analysis, you develop meaningful and measurable goals for accomplishment over the next six years.**

**Following are the steps to take in order to write your self-study report:**

1. **REVIEW THE DATA** – All data related to your program should be gathered and organized. Include any data available for the past three years. Below is a check list of data to consider including in your review:
  - a. Institutional Data (See Appendix B)
    - i. WSCH
    - ii. FTES
    - iii. FTEF
    - iv. Course Completion Rate
    - v. Enrollment
    - vi. Retention Rate
    - vii. Degrees Awarded
    - viii. Certificates Awarded
    - ix. Demographics of students in program (ethnicity, gender, age, etc.)
    - x. Perkins Core Indicators (CTE courses)
  - b. Program Data
    - i. Curriculum and course outlines (See Appendix D)
  - b. SLO Data (See Appendix E)
    - a. Course, Program and Institutional SLO Assessments
    - b. Course, Program and Institutional SLO Improvement / Action Plans

- c. Changes resulting from the Course, Program and Institutional SLO process iii. Demographics (Ethnicity, Gender, Age, etc.)
    - c. Additional Data
      - i. Student Surveys
      - ii. Club/Focus group minutes
- 2. **EVALUATE THE DATA** – Department faculty should review and analyze all data in a collaborative manner in order to identify areas of success or concern as indicated by positive and/or negative trends.
- 3. **WRITE THE SELF-STUDY REPORT** – Prepare your self-study report by including the following sections. ***Your report should not exceed 15 pages.***
  - a. **Section 1 – Brief Description of the Program (4 to 5 pages)** – Include a brief narrative of the process for gathering and evaluating the data. Include your conclusions regarding areas of success and concern to facilitate instructional improvement and increase student success. Provide specific data that supports any conclusions drawn and/or indicates change. This section should focus on the data which you found the most significant in determining your concerns or conclusions.
  - b. **Section 2 – SWOT Analysis (3 to 4 pages)** – Prepare a list of bullet points which describes each of the following:
    - i. **Strengths** - Positive trends which are under the direct control of the department faculty.
    - ii. **Weaknesses** – Negative trends or concerns which are under the direct control of the department faculty.
    - iii. **Opportunities** – Positive trends which are outside the direct control of the faculty, but affect (or potentially affect) the department in a positive way.
    - iv. **Threats** – Negative trends which are outside the direct control of the faculty but affect (or potentially affect) the department in a negative way.

All items listed in the SWOT analysis should be numbered to facilitate mapping to the goals established in Section 3.

- c. **Section 3 – Goals of the Program** – For each item listed in Section 2, prepare a list of department goals. All listed goals should be mapped back to the S.W.O.T. analysis by labeling each goal with a letter (S, W, O, T) and a number (1,2,3 etc.).

Each developed goal should follow the “SMART” acronym:

- i. **Specific** – The goal should be well defined and include specific action items necessary for accomplishment
- ii. **Measurable** – The goal should include measurable parameters which provide a benchmark for completion.

- iii. **Achievable** – The goal should not include tasks which are dependent upon the approval or accomplishment by outside parties. (Example: Hiring a Full-Time Faculty Member. Only the Board of Trustees can hire faculty based on recommendations of the administration and faculty)
- iv. **Realistic** – The goal should be accomplishable.
- v. **Time Based** – The goal should include a completion date.

**Use the following format in preparing your goal section. (See Appendix C.) Use the Ref column to indicate the specific SWOT item being addressed.**

**One goal could address multiple SWOT items and multiple goals could address one SWOT item. (Information has been included as an example.)**

Ref	Goal	Action to be taken	Completion Date	Person Assigned
S1	Promote our program to four year institutions in order to provide out students with a pathway to a bachelor's degree	Compile a list of four year schools which offer bachelor's degrees	May 2014	Tiger Woods
		Prepare a list of department chairs at each four year school for contact	August 2014	Peyton Manning
		Contact each identified department chair, schedule a meeting and present information about the department. Find out about scholarships or work/study programs available.	June 2015	Peyton Manning and Tiger Woods
W1	Prepare and present a justification to hire a full time faculty member to the administration	Gather information regarding the need for a full time faculty member	August 2014	Mary Lou Retton
		Write a justification on the benefits to the college community from hiring a full time faculty member	October 2014	Mary Lou Retton and Dorothy Hamill
		Present the justification to the Planning and Budget Committee	November 2014	Mary Lou Retton

## **Consequences for Non-Compliance**

The Instructional Program Review process is an integral part of the overall planning and budgeting processes at Cerritos College. As such, all programs must participate fully in the process in order to establish their mid-range and long-term goals and provide a basis for annual unit plans.

As a sub-committee of the faculty senate, the IPR committee has determined that it is the professional responsibility of all faculty to participate fully in the program review process. It is assumed that all participants in the program review process will perform in a professional and ethical manner.

The following recommendations may apply for any program which is not in compliance with the Instructional Program Review approval process:

1. Department requests for additional human resources be denied.
2. Department requests for equipment or other physical resources be denied.
3. Department requests for Perkins funds be denied.



**Cerritos College**  
**Instructional Program Review Instructional Program Review**  
**Planning Form (Appendix A)**

This form is to be prepared by each program under review and submitted by January 31 in the year prior to the review year.

Program Name \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Team: Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

Members: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date Submitted \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Visitation \_\_\_\_\_

(The visitation date will be assigned by the IPR committee)

Due date for Final Self Study Report \_\_\_\_\_

(Two weeks prior to the visitation date)

Due date for Draft of Self Study Report \_\_\_\_\_

(Six weeks prior to the visitation date)

I have contacted Kristi Blackburn, IPR representative from Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning.

I have contacted Stephanie Rosenblatt, IPR representative from the Cerritos College Library.

Submitted By \_\_\_\_\_

Program Department Chair

Reviewed by \_\_\_\_\_

Division Dean

Reviewed by \_\_\_\_\_

IPR Committee Chair

**Cerritos College**  
**Instructional Program Review**  
**List of Institutional Data, Definitions, & Resources (Appendix B) WSCH**  
**(DSCH & Positive Attendance, whenever available)** State target for  
WSCH generation is 525 per course

- Some courses due to state regulations on size (ie. Nursing clinicals 10-1) will not be able to achieve this target
- If you are not mandated by state regulations, and your WSCH is under 525, what goal can/should be set?
- If your courses are above 525, is there a steady trend line (6 years)? Is this an indicator that your courses/program could/should grow? Is this a resource allocation request?

**FTES (Full-Time Equivalent Students)**

Equivalent to FT: one student taking five courses which are three units each. The college's FTES target is 18,000 (2015-2016).

- Based on your six-year trend line data, is your program/course going to help the college meet the goal?
- Is your program trending upward? Is this indicating growth? Is there a downward/declined? Is there a goal to be set on this particular data point?
- Is there a research allocation request be made regarding this data point?

**FTEF (Full-Time Equivalent Faculty, has been called FTIE)**

Equivalent to FT: one faculty member teaching five courses which are three units each.

This data for this measure is currently unavailable (fall 2015).

- Based on the ratio data, as well as a number of part-time sections available to be taught (whereby if a FT faculty member were hired it would be a zero-sum game), is there resource allocation request to be made? Is there a goal to be set?
- What does this ratio, in conjunction with completion/retention, and successful course completion, tell you about your courses/program?
- Are there additional required mandates for which your program is responsible which may need dedicated faculty to perform? Is this related to a goal or resource allocation request?

## **Degrees and Certificates Awarded**

- Is your program trending upward? Is this indicating growth?  
Downward/decline? Is there a goal to be set or research allocation request to be made regarding this particular data point?

## **Majors**

- Is your program trending upward? Is this indicating growth?  
Downward/decline? Is there a goal to be set or research allocation request to be made regarding this particular data point?

## **Enrollment/Fill Rate**

- Is your program trending upward? Is this indicating growth?  
Downward/decline? Is there a goal to be set or research allocation request to be made regarding this particular data point?

## **Course Completion/Retention Rate**

- Is your program trending upward? Is this indicating growth?  
Downward/decline? Is there a goal to be set or research allocation request to be made regarding this particular data point?

## **Successful Completion/Success Rate**

- Is your program trending upward? Is this indicating growth?  
Downward/decline? Is there a goal to be set or research allocation request to be made regarding this particular data point?

## **Grade Distribution Data (Disaggregated)**

- 6 year trend line: What do you notice regarding courses overall?
- What do you notice in looking at the trend line when it is disaggregated by: age, gender, ethnicity? When two or more student factors are combined? Is there course or courses you want to examine further for disproportional impact/equity? Is there a student factor which would indicate that it may benefit students if an academic or support intervention were created to increase success?
- Is there a goal or resource allocation request which should be created based on the grade distribution and a course?

**Measuring in accordance with ACCJC Annual Report Institutional Set Stands  
(Use IERP data set.)**

**Course Completion/Retention Rate (Percentage)**

- Based on your six-year trend line data, is your program/course going to help the college meet the goal?
- Is there a goal to be set? Resource allocation request to be made?

**Course Success Rate (Percentage)**

- Based on your six-year trend line data, is your program/course going to help the college meet the goal?
- Is there a goal to be set? Resource allocation request to be made?

**Standard for Certificate Completion (Number)**

- Based on your six-year trend line data, is your program/course going to help the college meet the goal?
- Is there a goal to be set? Resource allocation request to be made?

**Standard for Degree Completion (Number)**

- Based on your six-year trend line data, is your program/course going to help the college meet the goal?
- Is there a goal to be set? Resource allocation request to be made?

**Definitions**

Data Element	Description
WSCH	<u>Weekly Student Contact Hours</u> . Calculation: (term contact hours * enrollment / 17.5. It is the number of hours generated per week by each class. For example, a three-hour class with 35 students provides 105 WSCH. An instructor teaching five three-hour classes, or 15 equivalent hours, generates 525 WSCH (5 classes multiplied by 105 = 525). WSCH for concurrent sections is included in WSCH figures
DSCH	<u>Daily Student Contact Hours</u> . Calculation: Courses that meet on a regular basis for at least 5 days, but not for a full term. Examples include short term or summer, inter session courses. To convert DSCH to FTES: (Census day enrollment times number of days) divided by 525 = FTES

Data Element	Description
--------------	-------------

Positive Attendance	<u>Positive Attendance</u> (aka Open Ended courses). Calculation: Classes are open entry/open exit; and do not meet on a regular basis. Also includes non-credit courses. Actual attendance by each student is counted. To convert PA to FTES: count the total hours of attendance for all students and divide by 525= FTES. *note there is a per student cap on hours that can be claimed.
FTES	Full-time Equivalent Student. One FTES is equivalent to a student taking five three-unit classes per semester for a full year. It is calculated by multiplying the number of students in a course by the number of course hours per week times the number of weeks, 17.5 in a semester, then dividing by 525. FTES for concurrent sections included in FTES figures.
Average Class Size	The average class size for each course in the discipline will be provided.
FTEF  FT/PT faculty ratios	Full-time Equivalent Faculty. One FTEF is equivalent to an instructor teaching five three-unit classes per semester for a full year.  Additionally, the ratio of full-time and part-time faculty in the discipline will be provided.
Course Completion Rate	The course completion rate is the sum of course enrollments receiving an official end-of-term letter grade of A,B,C, or CR divided by grade enrollment. May also be called successful course completion rate.
Enrollment	Census date enrollment except for positive attendance classes. Any enrollment for positive attendance classes is counted. Enrollment for concurrent sections is included in enrollment figures.
Retention Rate	The retention rate is the sum of course enrollments receiving any official end-of-term letter grade, excluding W, divided by census enrollment. This is a course retention rate.
Degrees Awarded	The total number of degrees awarded to students in the program.
Certificates Awarded	The total number of certificates awarded to students in the program.
Withdrawal Rates	The number of W grades divided by the grade enrollment.
Number of Majors	The number of students with majors declared in the program
Grade Distribution in courses	The grade distribution in courses within the program will be provided for 6 years (Fall/Spring).

ACCJC Institution Set Standards	<p>The program and its progress/achievement in reaching the ACCJC Institution Set Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard for [successful] course completion = 69.6%</li> <li>• Standard for retention= target in progress</li> <li>• Standard for certificate completion= 549 students per year</li> <li>• Standard for earning a degree= 1,235 students per year</li> </ul>
Data Element	Description

The above data sets include 6 years of data, and will be disaggregated wherever possible by student demographic as well as by modality, such as classroom vs. distance ed.

**Useful links for gathering data:**

Cerritos College Program Review website: <http://cms.cerritos.edu/program-review>  
 Cerritos College Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning:  
<http://cms.cerritos.edu/research-and-planning/>

California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Website: <http://www.cccco.edu/>

**Cerritos College**  
**Instructional Program Review Instructional Program Review**  
**Goal Establishment Form (Appendix C)**

GOALS	ACTION TO BE TAKEN	COMPLETION DATE	PERSON ASSIGNED
<b>Mid-range goals (next 3 years)</b>			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
<b>Long Term Goals</b>			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

**Cerritos College**  
**Instructional Program Review**  
**Curriculum Committee Program Review Checklist (Appendix D)**

It is expected that programs undergoing review are up-to-date with all requirements related to curriculum. Please complete this self-checklist and list any discrepancies in your report as part of your SWOT analysis and goals.

Check	List
	Course outlines have been reviewed within the last 3 years.
	Courses that have not been offered over the last three years have been reviewed and are scheduled for inactivation.
	Prerequisites/co-requisites have been reviewed to assure they are still necessary. Content review and/or statistical validation has been completed within the last 3 years. CTE course prerequisites need to be reviewed every 2 years.
	Course outlines list current texts and Electronic Information Technology to comply with Board Policies and the law: Cerritos College BP & AP 3720,3411 and Section 508 standards (law).
	Course outlines list current SLOs.
	Current course outlines have been submitted to the curriculum specialist in the Academic Affairs office.
	Courses offered as distance education have been approved by the Curriculum Committee to be offered as DE and match the delivery methods outlined in the original proposals.
	(If applicable) text outlines are available for faculty teaching a course for the first time.
	Required courses for the degrees and certificates have been offered within the last 2 years.
	Enough elective courses for the degrees and certificates have been offered within the last 2 years.
	Degrees/certificates have been reviewed to identify any inactivated, deleted, or changed courses. If applicable, the program has been updated to reflect these changes.
	All department courses are part of an approved degree or certificate.
	Current degrees and certificates have been updated.
	Students are completing the degrees and/or certificates. If not, the degree/certificate has been reviewed for change or inactivated.





## **Annual Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Assessment Goals (Appendix E)**

As part of the ongoing process of self-evaluation and improvement, Cerritos College has developed a process for defining, assessing and evaluating SLOs at the Course, Program and Institutional levels. The SLO process is coordinated through a Faculty Senate Committee which encourages all faculty to engage in the process and develop meaningful plans for improvement. The resulting improvement plans provide a link from instructional programs to the College planning and resource allocation process through the Program Review Plus system. Below are guidelines which Department Faculty should use in preparing their self-study report section related to SLOs:

1. Post the assessment results for the 3 most current academic years available for Course Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs), Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) and Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) to the Program Review Plus system in the data section. This information is available either from the SLO Committee website or from preparing "Performance Reports" in the eLumen software.
2. Post all of your Department's "Action/Improvement Plans" to the Program Review Plus system for any plans developed and consider including any of the information in your SWOT analysis, Goals, Activities and Resource requests.
3. In your self-study report, prepare a brief narrative summarizing the data and plans described in 1 and 2 above and insert it in section 1b.

**Note: When the quantity and quality of the SLO assessments are determined to be lacking or inadequate, Department Faculty should develop a goal to address these concerns for future reporting periods.**

(This document was approved by the SLO Committee on October 22, 2018)

Please complete the tables below to demonstrate that your department is completing the assessment goals. You will find the data you need to complete these tables by printing two reports in eLumen:

- For degrees and certificates: Print the “SLO Performance - ISLO/PSLO Overall” report
- For courses: Print the “SLO Performance - By Dept, Course, CSLO” report

For instructions on how to print these reports, click here

<http://cms.cerritos.edu/slo/course-degree-and-certificate-slos/elumen.htm> To complete the table, answer the questions for each academic year since your last six-year Program Review.

<b>Degree and/or Certificate SLO(s)</b>				
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Number of Degrees and/or Certificates Offered by the Department</b>	<b>Number of Degrees and/or Certificates Assessed by the Department</b>	<b>Number of Degree and/or Certificate SLOs identified by the Department</b>	<b>Total Number of Degree and/or Certificate SLOs Assessed by the Department</b>

<b>Course SLO(s)</b>				
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Total Number of Courses Offered by the Department</b>	<b>Total Number of Courses Assessed by the Department</b>	<b>Total Number of Course SLOs offered by the Department</b>	<b>Total Number of Course SLOs Assessed by the Department</b>

**Cerritos College**  
**Instructional Program Review Instructional Program Review**  
**Submittal Form (Appendix F)**

This form is completed and submitted as a cover sheet for the self-study report

Name of the Program \_\_\_\_\_

Date Submitted \_\_\_\_\_

Scheduled Presentation Date \_\_\_\_\_

All courses in the program have been reviewed by the Curriculum Committee within the last six year cycle (*circle one*)      Yes                      No

Explain any exceptions for non-compliance with curriculum requirements:

---

The self-study report adequately addresses the following components:

Description of the Program	Yes		No
Course and program content			
Student demographics			
Human resources			
Instructional Improvement	Yes		No
Teaching effectiveness			
Activities to improve student learning			
Course grading			
Course and program completion			
Program outcomes			
Core indicators (if vocational)			
Student feedback			
Institutional data			
Other	Yes		No
Strengths and weaknesses of the program			
Opportunities and threats of the program			
Goals of the program			

Self-Study prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Reviewed by (Division Dean): \_\_\_\_\_

**Cerritos College**  
**Instructional Program Review Instructional Program Review**  
**Checklist (Appendix G)**

This form is completed by the IPR committee during the review of each program's self-study report presentation (Phase 4)

Name of the Program \_\_\_\_\_

Visitation Date \_\_\_\_\_

IPR Committee Liaison \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Evaluation of Compliance with Institutional Requirements</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
All courses in the program have been reviewed by the Curriculum Committee within the last six year cycle?		
Program is in compliance with guidelines established by the Student Learning Outcomes task force?		
Institutional Data used is current as of the draft due date?		
Program and Primary Data included information which is less than 2 years old?		

The self-study report adequately addresses the following components:

**Description of Component**

Description of the Program	Yes	No
Course and program content		
Student demographics		
Human resources		
Instructional Improvement	Yes	No
Teaching effectiveness		
Activities to improve student learning		
Course grading		
Course and program completion		
Program outcomes		
Core indicators (if vocational)		
Student feedback		
Institutional data		
Other	Yes	No
Strengths and weaknesses of the program		
Opportunities and threats of the program		
Goals of the program		

**Cerritos College**  
**Instructional Program Review Instructional Program Review**  
**Approval Form (Appendix H)**

Committee Action taken:

Approved

Not Approved

Recommendations:

---

Program Review Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Explanation for non-approval:

---