



Marva Johnson, *Chair*
Andy Tuck, *Vice Chair*
Members
Gary Chartrand
Ben Gibson
Tom Grady
Michael Olenick
Joe York

MEMORANDUM 30-2019-05

TO: Florida College System Reports Coordinators
FROM: Juan Mestre
DATE: September 10, 2018
SUBJECT: Reporting Year 2017-2018 Associate in Arts (AA) and Associate in Science (AS) Level II Program Reviews
DUE DATE: **October 12, 2018**

The web application will be available to submit the 2017-2018 AA and AS Level II Program Reviews on Friday, September 21, 2018. You may print a report of all the program reviews being submitted to verify that they were entered correctly. The Associate/Vocational Review Login is at <http://data.fldoe.org/aavoc/AAVocLogin.cfm>.

Instructions for using the application and associated report are attached. Please forward the necessary information to the appropriate office at your institution that is responsible for entering and verifying these program reviews.

Once you have completed entering these reviews and verified the data using the report, please email [Linda Wheatcraft-Smith](mailto:Linda.Wheatcraft-Smith@fldoe.org) and copy [Kimberly Pippin](mailto:Kimberly.Pippin@fldoe.org).

Program reviews must be submitted no later than Friday, October 12, 2018.

If you have any questions, please contact Linda Wheatcraft-Smith.

JM/lS

Attachments

cc: Executive Assistants to the President

ASSOCIATE IN ARTS PROGRAM REVIEW MODEL

AREA TWO: INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Expanded Guidance

This document is intended to supplement and support the Associate in Arts (A.A.) Program Review Model adopted by the Florida College System (FCS) and is provided for further guidance as each institution delineates its in-depth local program review. Consequently, the four components of the A.A. Program Review Model are reiterated and explanatory comment is provided.

1. The academic leadership at each college is expected to develop a comprehensive five-year design for reviewing the components of the Associate in Arts programs that is consistent with the developed standards for re-accreditation adopted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); in particular, the design should support the specific criteria of Comprehensive Standard 3.3 Institutional Effectiveness.

The new SACS Comprehensive Standard 3.3 Institutional Effectiveness is specifically referenced because it requires institutions to:

- a. Identify the results it expects to achieve through its programs; and
- b. Ascertain whether or not the results are being achieved.

For the A.A. degree program, this program represents a complex and challenging undertaking because, by its very nature, the program provides a general foundation applicable to further academic study in a wide range of program majors or to prepare for life after formalized education. It is, nonetheless, a worthy and important task which should and must be undertaken at each institution.

The five-year design language is intended to communicate the reality that an in-depth review of a complex program like the A.A. degree will most likely involve activity over several years of the cycle, culminating in a report of findings to the local District Board of Trustees (DBT) and the FCS. It is envisioned that each college will develop a plan at the beginning of the cycle which will be adopted by its DBT and shared with the FCS as evidence to demonstrate fulfillment of its program review commitment. This plan is expected to consider all aspects of the A.A. degree program including the following criteria:

- a. Relationship of the program to state needs and priorities as established jointly by the State Board of Education, the Legislature, and the postsecondary education community.
- b. Manpower needs.
- c. Student demand.
- d. Quality and characteristics of students.
- e. Student outcomes, including graduate follow-up results.

- f. Productivity of program in terms of students enrolled, graduates, or service to other programs in the institution.
- g. Faculty and professional staff quality and productivity.
- h. Instructional quality, including average class size and student-faculty ratio.
- i. Quality and accessibility of library resources.
- j. Adequacy of other resources, including equipment, space and non-academic services.
- k. Cost of the program, both instructional and full costs.
- l. Overall quality of program.
- m. Resource needs to accomplish specific improvements.
- n. Possible unnecessary duplication of programs.

The FCS will request brief progress reports each year during the cycle to assure that progress is being made to implement the self-study plans.

2. Each institution is expected to develop a local process that encourages annual planned meetings between college program faculty and colleagues from each university program with significant student enrollment from that college.

It is assumed that a program review process that accomplishes the essence of the SACS mandate will have an in-depth analysis of what happens to A.A. degree completers in the State University System. While students from Florida's colleges transfer to all of the eleven state universities, the pattern typically is that the preponderance of students from any given college will transfer to three to five of the universities. Therefore, it is assumed that particular attention needs to be given in the A.A. degree program review to the universities to which the largest number of students typically transfer. Consideration should be given to at least two levels of analysis:

- a. Institutional Level Articulation Reviews. These reviews might be conducted on an annual or periodic basis involving the academic officers responsible for program review from the college and the universities to which its students transfer in significant numbers. Annual data from the component one process detailed above could be discussed in terms of student tracking patterns, and program review plans and needs could be addressed.
- b. Programmatic Articulation Reviews. With the ability to track individual students through the supplemental data displays provided by the A.A. Level I printouts, a plethora of possibilities for focused, program specific articulation reviews are created. It is assumed that from the Level One data analysis, questions will be raised or areas of concern identified. The comprehensive program review design should provide for focusing on what is happening to students transferring from specific patterns of pre-professional preparation within the A.A. degree to particular university upper division programs. It is expected that faculty members from the respective program areas of both the college and university are actively involved in the dialogue and analysis so that qualitative assessments of preparation levels can be directly communicated, as well as the

quantitative data. It may well be that this programmatic level of articulation review holds the single, most promising feature of the A.A. Program Review process in terms of leading to constructive change at the instructional and curricular levels in the colleges.

3. Each college is expected to develop a process for the internal dissemination of the data on student performance that is assembled as a part of the annual reporting process.

It is assumed that to serve as a basis for program improvement and enhancement, evaluative data needs to be shared with faculty and staff. It is expected that the comprehensive A.A. Program Review design at the individual colleges provide for consistent, systematic dissemination of student performance information to faculty and staff which can serve as continuing motivation for program enhancement.

4. The activities of each college in support of local program review activities will be communicated to the staff of the FCS in order to facilitate the compilation of a comprehensive report on such activities.

Because of the high visibility of program review activity, it is expected that the design of the institutional level of the A.A. Program Review Process will include the systematic reporting of results to the local DBT and the FCS.

In summary, the A.A. Program Review process holds significant potential for helping colleges continually improve their offerings. However, this potential can only be realized with effective planning and implementation at each institution.

Revised 6/28/13

Basic Instructions for AA/Articulated AS Level II Reporting

- a. Everything needed to complete the reports is in the web application.
- b. When you get to the website you will then choose your college and enter the appropriate password.
- c. You then need to select the AA review, this step will bring up the reporting screen for you to start entering your reports.
- d. Be sure to select the **ADD a record** button each time to return and continue entering additional records.
- e. All required fields on the reporting screen must be entered before the record will be accepted.
- f. Once you have completed entering all the reports please e-mail linda.wheatcraft-smith@fldoe.org that you have completed your reports.
- g. A report feature is available so you can print what has been stored for your report.
- h. When reviewing the report if you find an error you will need to delete the entire record and re-enter the information.