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Focus Statement

Explore the development of a single process for curriculum review with a focus on continuous improvement.
Current Process – C & I

The Five Year Review Process

Courses reviewed:
   All permanent (Class Two) transfer level courses.

For each course reviewed:
   • Provide updated generic course syllabus
   • Confirm/update articulation agreements
   • Identify two learning objectives or outcomes from the course syllabus and provide:
     o An explanation of the process instructors used to assess the objective
     o Evidence of including sections and instructors at all locations teaching in all formats
     o A copy of the assessment instrument(s) used is included
     o An analysis of the results of the assessments is provided
     o An explanation of the utility of the results reflecting instructional changes that have or will be made

The emphases of the Five-year review process:
   • Ensure up-to-date curriculum
   • Provide faculty influence for curriculum development and maintenance
   • Improve communication among instructors regardless of location or format
   • Encourage analysis of results and creative action based on findings
   • Satisfy accreditation requirement
Current Process – Program Review

Career Program Assessment Committee Procedures

START

Every Five Years

Annually

Inform deans of programs up for review and ask for any changes

Program Coordinator writes and submits Program Assessment Report to dean

Dean approves?

YES

Dean signs and forwards to Career Program Assessment Committee

Report is distributed to Reading Teams within the Career Program Assessment Committee

Reading Team approves?

YES

Program Coordinators completes Feedback Form and submits to Dean

Dean approves?

YES

Program Coordinator makes improvements/changes and resubmits to Dean

NO

NO

Annual Program Improvement Plan Updates submitted by Program Coordinators

Annual Program Improvement Plans sent to Vice President of Instruction’s Office

Vice President of Instruction reviews report and meets with Program Coordinator

Program Assessment Report is sent to Vice President of Instruction’s Office
CAR generated by department/faculty with documented faculty input and discussion, as appropriate, of:
  i. Need for CAR
  ii. Core class?
  iii. Diversity class?

Master syllabus developed by “content expert” (qualified faculty – FT/PT) and must conform course description and syllabus to college model

Department faculty (area faculty, where appropriate) approve CAR

Course checked against CCN matrix...course # generated
  i. Submit to Diversity Committee as needed

CAR (and AS28, as necessary) submitted to:
  i. (A & S) C & I Committee and then forwarded to VP of Instruction Office, or
  ii. (Applied) VP of Instruction Office

Entered into system by Enrollment Services. Copies sent to:
  i. Advising Center
  ii. Department
  iii. Enrollment Services
# COURSE ACTION REQUEST FORM

(Refer to instructions on reverse side.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog information</th>
<th>Effective date</th>
<th>Approval date</th>
<th>C&amp;I signature</th>
<th>AS28/AS28A required: *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. ____ Class I (new course/temporary status)________________________  ___________________________  <strong>Yes</strong> <strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ____ Move to Class II (permanent status)__________________________  ___________________________  (Must attach checklist)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ____ Class III (undergoing revision)_______________________________  ___________________________  (Must attach checklist)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. ____ Class IV (course deletion)______________________________  ___________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. ____ Change information______________________________  ___________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Reason for initiating course or proposing change (must be completed)__________________________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Catalog number ____________________________

2. Current course title ____________________________
   (If change, new course title) ____________________________

3. Credit hours: _____ Contact hours/week: Lecture _____ Lab _____ Clinic _____ Co-op _____

4. Revised course description (attach copy of current course description from the catalog if CAR involves descriptions change):
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

5. Prerequisite(s)

   Catalog number(s) ____________________________

6. Title abbreviation (30 characters maximum) ____________________________

7. Course type: ____ T ____ U ____ D  Suggested discipline ____________________________

8. For T courses, check all that apply below:
   ____ Communication core: Writing  ____ Humanities core: Literature  ____ Math Core
   ____ Communication core: Speech  ____ Humanities core: Arts & Ideas  ____ Diversity
   ____ Historical/Cultural core  ____ Humanities core: Interdisciplinary  ____ Interdisciplinary
   ____ Social Science core  ____ Science core  ____ Elective

9. Cost implications: ____ No change  ____ Change in staffing, facilities, training, equipment (attach explanation) ____________________________

10. Reviewed by Advisory Committee: ____ Yes  ____ No  Date reviewed: ____________________________

11. Will submit for approval as diversity course? ____ Yes  ____ No  Date approved: ____________________________
    Will submit for approval as core course? ____ Yes  ____ No  Date approved: ____________________________

12. Faculty member ___________________________________________ Date ____________________________

13. Dean (gold copy) ___________________________________________ Date ____________________________

14. Vice President Instruction____________________________________ Date ____________________________


(submit to Office of Vice-President of Instruction, 211 Linn Hall)

COURSE ACTION REQUEST FORM INSTRUCTIONS

Please type all information.

A. Check if a new or reactivated course is being added. (It will be listed in the college catalog and, when appropriate, submitted to D.O.E. on the AS28A.) Complete items E, 1 through 13.

B. Check if the course is being reviewed for approval by C&I committee to move to Class II.

C. Check if significantly revised course is being reviewed for approval by C&I committee to move to Class II. Complete items E, 1 through 13.

D. Check to delete courses from the printed catalog. The information will remain in the computer. Complete items E, 1, 2, and 9, 10, 12, 13.

E. Check to change information on the course. Complete items 1, only those items to be changed, and 12 and 13. Attach a copy of the catalog course information as it exists prior to this change.

F. This statement should provide a clear explanation for the proposed new course or change being requested.

APPROVALS: AS28’s and AS28A’s are required for Applied Science and Technology and Career Option programs.

1. To be completed when A, B, C, D, or E is checked.

2, 3, 4, 5 This information should be provided exactly as it will appear in the catalog. Item 3 reflects the total number of credit and contact hours. Note Item 4: Begin description with verb and write complete sentences. Do not type using all caps.

6. Abbreviate the course title if it exceeds 30 characters.

7. Check to indicate the type of credit: T-transfer; U-Associate of Applied Science Degree; D-Developmental. Include suggested discipline.

8. For T courses if applicable – check all appropriate categories

9. If this request will have cost implications, attach a separate sheet outlining these implications (staffing, facilities, training, equipment, other) and how the department will address them.

10. Review by Advisory Committee for Applied Science and Technology and Career Option programs only.

11. Check Yes or No.

12, 13, 14 Signatures and dates should be obtained in the same sequence as listed. The Dean will keep one copy after signing and dating and forward the request to the Vice President’s office. Once the Vice President has approved the Course Action Request, a copy will be forwarded to Enrollment Services for entry into the SRS and catalog files. A copy will be sent back to the originating department and Advising Center. The Arts & Sciences Curriculum and Instruction Committee Chair will sign those Arts & Sciences requests when appropriate. Those requests not approved will be returned to the originating department with an explanation for not being approved.
Recommendations

Completed by Departments:
- Curriculum review should be done in academic clusters regardless of delivery mode or location.
- Departments should adopt a visioning and strategic goal process.

Completed by KQIP team:
- Create a framework document for faculty/departments to use for review process.
- This KQIP team should continue to meet next fall and include Al Rowe, Iowa City representation, and deans.
- Create ongoing assessment plan. This plan would require that AQIP questions identified are answered the first time through the process and then yearly progress reports (including Gantt charts) thereafter.

Research and dissemination:
- Look for other community colleges doing a single curriculum review process.
- A resource person for curriculum review and assessment training to be part of KCELT.
- This committee should attend a deans’ retreat to facilitate studying the AQIP document.
- Celebrations twice each year to share curriculum review successes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>COMMITTEE APPROVAL</th>
<th>COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum review should be done in academic clusters regardless of delivery mode or location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments should adopt a visioning and strategic goal process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a framework document for faculty/departments to use for review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This KQIP team should continue to meet next fall and include Al Rowe, Iowa City representation, and deans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create ongoing assessment plan. This plan would require that AQIP questions identified are answered the first time through the process and then yearly progress reports (including Gantt charts) thereafter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look for other community colleges doing a single curriculum review process</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A resource person for curriculum review and assessment training to be part of KCET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This committee should attend a deans’ retreat to facilitate studying the AQIP document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrations twice each year to share curriculum review successes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## One Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow this team to continue next year - adding AI Rowe and an Iowa City rep to the team</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleconference or visit other community colleges doing a single curriculum review process</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a framework document for faculty/departments to use for review process</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a dean’s retreat to facilitate studying the AQIP document.</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an ongoing assessment plan.</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch best practices</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report out to the KQIP Steering Committee</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Success Indicators

- Meeting minutes
- Summaries of research
- Creation of a framework document
**AQIP Criteria**

**How this Project Meets the Nine AQIP Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>How Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Helping students learn</td>
<td>Focusing on continuous improvement in the curriculum review process will more quickly improve curriculum areas by pulling in best practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Accomplishing other distinct objectives</td>
<td>Shifting focus from past practice to goal achievement will facilitate purposeful department conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Understanding students’ and other stakeholders’ needs</td>
<td>Discovering students’ barriers to learning, and crafting curricular changes to help them overcome them, is an element of continuous improvement promoted by curriculum review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Valuing people</td>
<td>Valuing individual and individual learning styles, understanding learning styles and designing courses curriculum to take into account learning styles, we are valuing the students as individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Leading and communicating</td>
<td>Providing a single processes for curriculum review on both the Applied and the Arts and Sciences sides of the college will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supporting institutional operations</td>
<td>Committing institution resources and support through KCELT will communicate to all faculty that excellence in learning and teaching is a major priority of Kirkwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Measuring effectiveness</td>
<td>Collecting data to measure effectiveness and develop continual improvement plans is part of the curriculum review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Planning continuous improvements</td>
<td>Incorporating continuous improvement into this curriculum review process improves effectiveness because it looks forward rather than merely documenting what has happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Building collaborative relationships</td>
<td>Crafting parallel processes for curriculum review on both the Applied and the Arts and Sciences sides of the college will facilitate faculty and department collaboration along the curriculum review timeline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes, 1/16/06
KQIP Curriculum Review

Present:
JL McClure
Pam Hansen
Heidi Hansel
Mary Lou Lauer
John Henik
Mike McLaughlin
Allison York
David Keller

There needs to be a better way to maintain accountability standards with our curriculum. We have two completely distinct way of working with our courses and curriculum. C&I’s strength is in their review of individual courses. With Applied Science, Program Review looks at the program and overall competencies and less on the individual courses. We need to look at a ways to improve this process. Possibly look at one process at the college. We need to continue to focus on student learning and what it takes for our courses and programs to improve student learning.

What are the processes we are looking at for this committee? Mary Lou wants to look at how we keep curriculum fresh and how we keep things updated. It does not matter the discipline or program.

JL recommended that we may consider changing the name of our committee. It was agreed to call the committee, KQIP Curriculum review Committee. It was decided that the committee is not to focus on assessment but rather look at the overall process of curriculum oversight and accountability. Allison recommended that before the next meeting that the processes be mapped out by a couple people and presented at the next meeting. Heidi Hansel, Chair of Program assessment and David Keller, Chair of C&I agreed to map this out. John Henik agreed to map out the CAR approval process.

Mary Lou also commented that we may want to talk about ways to address curriculum creep.

Next meeting will be February 3rd, 1-3, 207 NH.
February 8, 2006

TO: KQIP Assessment Team members

RE: Team meeting minutes
    February 3, 2006
    1:00 – 3:00 P.M.
    Room 207, Nielsen Hall

PRESENT: Allison York, John Henik, Mary Lou Lauer, Heidi Hansel, Pam Hanson, David Keller, J.L. McClure, Susan Simon, Lauri Hughes

Select a Recorder
The committee agreed to rotate the duties of recorder. John Henik was the recorder last week. Mary Lou Lauer volunteered this week.

Set Meeting Dates
The committee will meet from 1:00 – 3:00 P.M. in room 207, Nielsen Hall on the following dates:
Feb. 10
Feb. 17
Feb. 24
Mar. 3
Mar. 10
Mar. 24
Mar. 31 (wrap-up date)

Review Materials
Heidi provided everyone with a color copy of the current process for program assessment. The committee had a lengthy discussion about the current program assessment process, the current curriculum and instruction process, and teaching and learning outcomes (see page 2). Heidi shared the assessment process from Ohio. John asked for clarification regarding the current CAR’s process. John also provided handouts from the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) web site. Everyone was encouraged to review the material and highlight things that apply to this committee for the next meeting.

The committee discussed ideas regarding how the assessment process/model may look in the future: process may be a set of questions, to be meaningful, something that has flexibility for implementation, due to current departments working on their processes – may not be implemented until 2008.

Without further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by Lauri Hughes
Learning Assessment
Ex. 1 Students aren’t effective resources.
Next semester – was there a change?
Ex. 2 Students aren’t good logical thinkers. (must be longitudinal)
Are students better logical thinkers?

Learning Outcomes
2 – 3 are manageable
Assess Outcomes
Reassess
Make Changes

Teaching Practices
Make a teaching change
Here’s an interesting question.

CAT’s
Assessment
longitudinal
Make a teaching change
reflection
documentation - ?

Curriculum Improvement
Data to support changes made

[Curriculum became logic based]
[application focus, hands on practices]
Teach & Learn separate

[Lecture, problem-solving, Socratic]
delivery

[Lecture –
modeler
facilitator]
February 14, 2006

TO: KQIP Assessment Team members

RE: Team meeting minutes
   February 10, 2006
   1:00 – 3:00 P.M.
   Room 207, Nielsen Hall

PRESENT: Heidi Hansel, Pam Hanson, David Keller, Susan Simon, Mike McLaughlin, Lauri Hughes

Review Materials
The committee reviewed the AQIP criteria in relationship to the current program assessment and C & I process. The following things were discussed:
⇒ The committee members agreed that a review process is better at the department level
⇒ There are currently no written expectations of the C & I chair
⇒ The C & I chair could potentially be the only person who sees the big picture of the department being reviewed.
⇒ Currently there is no feedback loop for all the time invested by faculty
⇒ Consider having an outside source review programs: advisory committees or colleagues at other colleges
⇒ The committee liked the idea of requesting improvements. C & I currently has no way to request improvements
⇒ The committee liked the idea of focusing on “Reflection & Improvements” when making recommendations.
⇒ The committee wondered what happened with the C & I departments reports. Does the VP of Instruction receive them in a 3-ring binder?
⇒ Each department has recently been asked to establish a vision for 5 years. The idea of visioning one-year and five-years was discussed.
⇒ The committee discussed the idea of including a visioning component in each department’s report. Include best practices when developing a vision for the department
⇒ For programs that are accredited – would they need to complete the process in the same manner?
⇒ The committee discussed the possibility of having each department be divided by courses/discipline. Each small group would review two different courses/disciplines. Remember – faculty can not evaluate other faculty.

Recommendation
The committee discussed the idea of giving the following recommendation to the KQIP Steering Committee:
This KQIP team recommends a single unified process for all academic areas which incorporates the following AQIP categories: ____________.
The committee liked the following criteria’s: # 1, 3, 7, and 9.

**Homework Assignment**  
Everyone should review the 9 general AQIP categories in the packet that was handed out at the last meeting. Highlight the things listed in each category that capture the things applicable to assessment.

Without further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:20 P.M. The next meeting will be Friday, February 17, 2006 from 1:00 – 3:00 P.M. in room 207, Nielsen Hall.

*Respectfully submitted by Lauri Hughes*
Members Present: Mary Lou Lauer, Allison York, JL McClure, Heidi Hansel, David Keller

2. Mary Lou reported the Kirkwood AQIP application has been approved. AQIP accreditation timeline is unknown at this time.

3. Mary Lou distributed AQIP – Baldrige crosswalk. An “X” indicates the areas where one should find similar information.

4. The committee discussed the AQIP Category One (Helping Students Learn). The key questions for curriculum review are identified as:

1C1
1C2
1P1
1P2 (see notes below)
1P6
1P8
1P11
1P12
1P13
1R2
1I1
1I2
5. A significant discussion ensued from question 1P2. The highlights included a report from Instruction Branch that faculty should determine core (as is currently the procedure). It was determined that C&I or some identified group should delineate the process of creating a new course. A standardization of new course development is sought to ensure quality. The English department model will be submitted as a best practice.

A proposal for the process is below:

- Individual or small group of faculty determine need for a new course.
- A generic syllabus is created for the proposed course.
- New course is presented to department faculty and core determination is made.
- Approval of dean is secured.
- New course is presented to diversity committee and diversity determination is made.
- Course is presented to C&I and gains Class I status.
- Course is approved by Vice President, Instruction.
- Course is officially created in Colleague.

The process should include “funnel dates” or deadlines for submission to be included in course catalog for Spring and Fall.

6. Recommendations to the CAR form were made.

Delete item 11 on the CAR.
Insert the following between items 8 and 9.
   If any category in #8 is checked,
   Date approved by department as core ________________.
   Date approved by diversity committee ________________.

7. How will Common Course Numbering (CCN) affect the process of creating a new course? When will faculty check the CCN matrix to see if a course similar to their proposal exists? These questions are similar on multiple campuses, but as of yet no state-wide decisions have been made.

8. We recommend a future KQIP team consider the broader umbrella of department review. In addition to curriculum review, continuous improvement at the department level must include (1P4) communicating expectations to students and (1P5) advising.

9. A significant change in the process of curriculum review to focus on continuous improvement will require defining the reporting procedure for both faculty and administrators. Training administrators and faculty on the
reporting process will require considerable funding, and should occur through the KCETL center.

**Our next meeting is Friday, March 3 from 1 – 3pm in NH207.**
We will start with AQIP category 3.

Respectfully submitted by David Keller
KQIP Curriculum Review Team Minutes
March 3, 2006

Members present: Mary Lou Lauer, Allison York, John Henik, David Keller, Heidi Hansel, Susan Simon, Pam Hanson, Lauri Hughes

1. Mary Lou reported that the KQIP Steering Committee would be meeting April 12 to consider this team’s report. She also said that she sees this team not necessarily as one charged with initiating action but rather more of a “think tank” or “discussion group” that may continue on through next year.

2. John discussed item 5 from the 2/24 minutes (changes in CAR), noting that there is in process an online version in the works and that we shouldn’t go too fast with changes; the team could make this part of our recommendations.

3. The team continued the review of the AQIP categories, with the following decisions:

Include:

3C1
3P1 | 3P2 | These four items can be combined into two:
3P3 | 3P1 + 3P3 and 3P2 + 3P4
3P4 | (3P5 is subsumed within 1P2)
3I1
3I2

There is nothing relevant to this team’s objectives in categories 7, 8, or 9, which concern departmental or institutional review, not curriculum.

After a discussion of category 2, it was decided that while the category is concerned with “distinctive objectives” that are extra-curricular, we should add another item to category 1:

1C6: What student learning objectives do you have that are distinct to your courses or programs (objectives that distinguish a course’s or program’s unique identity)?

4. There was a discussion of what would be done with the yearly reports of continuous improvement the team has been moving to proposing – who would read them, review them, evaluate them? The consensus was that the reports should be for the benefit of the department or program, and that there wasn’t curricular knowledge outside the departments or programs to review or evaluate
the continuous improvement processes and assessments. One possibility would be periodical outside review by content or professional organizations.

There was general consensus that we recommend a yearly (or perhaps twice-yearly) “celebration” of continuous improvement efforts at a division- or college-wide level, in order to communicate and share with others what was happening across the college.

5. Heidi said that the AQIP items the team had identified covered all of the nine items in the current career program review except #2 (“capable of responding to technological change and innovation”). It was decided that we should try to write a new “process” in category 1 to cover this item.

The next team meeting is Friday, March 10, 1-3 pm in NH207. The tentative agenda is:

- develop an affinity diagram for barriers
- develop a process diagram for process
- decide where and how to place the “technology” concern (#5 above)

Submitted by J.L. McClure
Members Present: Allison York, JL McClure, Heidi Hansel, Lauri Hughes, David Keller, Susan Simon

1. The committee discussed the movement of the CAR through the system or the “CAR Trip” and came up with the following:

   - CAR generated by department/faculty with documented faculty input and discussion, as appropriate, of:
     i. Need for CAR
     ii. Core class?
     iii. Diversity class?

   - Master syllabus developed by “content expert” (qualified faculty – FT/PT) and must conform course description and syllabus to college model

   - Department faculty (area faculty, where appropriate) approve CAR

   - Course checked against CCN matrix…course # generated
     i. Submit to Diversity Committee as needed

   - CAR (and AS28, as necessary) submitted to:
     i. (A & S) C & I Committee and then forwarded to VP of Instruction Office, or
     ii. (Applied) VP of Instruction Office

   - Entered into system by Enrollment Services. Copies sent to:
     i. Advising Center
     ii. Department
     iii. Enrollment Services

2. The committee also discussed the need for an ongoing assessment plan. This plan would require that the AQIP questions already identified are answered the first time through the process and that there are progress reports (including GANTT charts) annually thereafter.

   a. **Assess** (identified by “chunks” – i.e., programs, sequences, courses…)

      Internally
      (NOTE: The “how” and “how often” assessed questions would need to be determined internally)
      Department
      Faculty
      Committees (i.e., Diversity, Faculty…)
Externally
Transfer Documents
Advisory Committee/Industry (if applicable)
External Reviews
Accreditation/Certification

b. **Review** Assessment Data (with an eye for improvement) and report on data analysis as an introduction to the **Strategic Plan**

c. **Improve**

i. Faculty develop a **Strategic Plan** (as approved by appropriate Dean) including:
   1. Resource requests
   2. Changes in teaching/learning
   3. Timeline for review

ii. Faculty put plan into action

d. Note that this process would be a continual loop and would start over again with the need to **Assess** the improvement, etc.

3. The committee discussed possible barriers to this plan and came up with the following list:
   a. Having more work for faculty
   b. Faculty aversion to having to do assessment, in general
   c. Faculty needing time and training
   d. Money (for time, external reviews, external testing/assessment)
   e. The possible need for more adjunct faculty (if release time is granted)

4. Additional suggesting made by the committee were:
   a. There is a need for a statewide system to be in place for checking courses to the CCN database and assigning course numbers
   b. The CAR form needs to be updated, as suggested in a previous meeting.

**Our next meeting is Friday, March 24 from 1 – 3pm in NH207.**

Respectfully submitted by Heidi Hansel
KQIP Curriculum Review meeting minutes
March 24, 2006

Members Present: Allison York, JL McClure, Heidi Hansel, Susan Simon, David Keller

Allison created a folder to maintain documentation of our committee work. The folder is located at J:\Shared\2006 KQIP Curriculum Review. Please store any minutes and other documents we have used this semester in the appropriate folder.

Refer to the ongoing assessment plan developed at the March 10 meeting (Item 2 in the minutes). Under Improve, Susan and Heidi will ensure the resource requests section is expanded to include a technology request component.

Audiences for curriculum review:
- Board
- Faculty
- Dean/Administration
- NCA and Higher Learning Commission

Questions:
- Does AQIP have a list of expectations including guidance through the process and methods to use that would fulfill curriculum review?
- How do we include adjunct faculty?

Recommendations:
- Create ongoing assessment plan. This plan would require that AQIP questions identified are answered the first time through the process and then yearly progress reports (including Gantt charts) thereafter.
- Create a framework document for faculty/departments to use for review process.
- This KQIP team should continue to meet next semester and include Al Rowe, Iowa City representation, and deans.
- Talk to schools further ahead in AQIP process to seek guidance.
- Departments should adopt a visioning and strategic goal process.
- Celebrations twice a semester to share curriculum review successes.
- This committee should attend a dean’s retreat to facilitate studying the AQIP document. This would be done to help recreate the process we went through this semester.
- Curriculum review should be done in academic clusters regardless of delivery mode or location.
- A resource person for curriculum review and assessment training be part of KCELT.
- A future KQIP team should consider the broader umbrella of department review.
Funding necessary for:

- Consultants
- External review (bring other community college faculty in to review our curriculum)
- Administer proprietary tests

Respectfully submitted by David Keller
KQIP Curriculum Review meeting minutes
March 31, 2006

Members Present: Allison York, J.L. McClure, Susan Simon, Pam Hanson, Mary Lou Lauer, Mike McLaughlin, David Keller

Organization of committee recommendations

- Completed by Departments:
  - Curriculum review should be done in academic clusters regardless of delivery mode or location.
  - Departments should adopt a visioning and strategic goal process.
  - Celebrations twice a semester to share curriculum review successes.

- Completed by KQIP team:
  - Create a framework document for faculty/departments to use for review process.
  - This KQIP team should continue to meet next semester and include Al Rowe, Iowa City representation, and deans.
  - Create ongoing assessment plan. This plan would require that AQIP questions identified are answered the first time through the process and then yearly progress reports (including Gantt charts) thereafter.
  - Celebrations twice a semester to share curriculum review successes.

- Research and dissemination:
  - Look for other community colleges doing combined curriculum review.
  - A resource person for curriculum review and assessment training be part of KCELT.
  - This committee should attend a dean’s retreat to facilitate studying the AQIP document. This would be done to help recreate the process we went through this semester.
  - Celebrations twice a semester to share curriculum review successes.

- Other recommendations:
  - A future KQIP team should consider the broader umbrella of department review.

Budget for proposal:
Visit other colleges $4000.
Discussion of budget line for training and use of proprietary tests. Mary Lou said currently testing dollars would come from department budget, and any funds for training faculty should come from KCELT budget.
Some department budget dollars should be earmarked for assessment projects.
Institutional research position could act as resource person for curriculum review. Would like to have something like a help desk or office hours for faculty to receive assistance with assessment projects.

Pam Hanson and Susan Simon will search for a conference during fall, 2006 regarding curriculum and/or assessment. We would like to propose round table at a conference to discuss how other colleges do curriculum review. We could host a conference for this purpose in the future. **Presentation on Wednesday, April 12 at 3:30pm in the Board Room.**

PowerPoint Slides:
- Introduction (Allison)
- Think-tank approach (Mary Lou)
- Team Members (Allison)
- Focus Statement (Allison)
- Current Process C&I (David)
- Current Process Program Review (Mike)
- AQIP (Allison)
- Recommendations (J.L.)

Appendices to report:
- C&I documents
- Program Review documents
- AQIP document
- Columbus State Community College Academic Assessment Plan
- Course Action Request form

Lauri will create needed Gantt charts and will develop PowerPoint slides.

Next meeting: Friday, April 7 from 1:00 – 3:00. We will finalize our presentation and assign speakers for various parts.

Respectfully submitted by David Keller
Curriculum Program Assessment Handbook
INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE FOR THIS HANDBOOK
Since some faculty are always new to the process, the Assessment Team feels that this information guide may help in successfully reviewing your program. The guide is designed to provide the information and guidelines you need to complete your program assessment.

PURPOSE FOR ASSESSEMENT
Program assessment at Kirkwood Community College is founded on the principle that committed, professional educators constantly strive to improve their methods and the outcomes for their students. Assessment of career programs at Kirkwood Community College is conducted for two reasons:

1. It creates mechanisms for improvement and internal accountability.
   - identifies areas needing change
   - plans for future improvements
   - strengthens those areas which are working well
   - provides documentation for supporting/funding change
2. It supports external accountability.
   - satisfies state accreditation requirements
   - satisfies North Central accreditation requirements
   - meets requirements of agencies which accredit special programs
   - addresses changing business and industry needs

After your initial assessment is complete, assessment will be an ongoing process with a report completed every five years.

SOURCES OF HELP
In addition to this handbook, other sources of help are available to you during the assessment process. These include:

1. Information sessions scheduled to provide individuals involved with the assessment process and access to program specific information from various college sources.
2. Questions regarding some standard Kirkwood program data collection and processing may be directed to: Institutional Research (Ext. 4905 or e-mail)

ROLE OF THE CAREER PROGRAM ASSESSMENT TEAM
The Career Program Assessment Committee is a team of faculty and staff representing the Applied Science and Career Option programs, that supports the process. The goal of the team is not to evaluate the programs, but rather to make sure the process is completed in an acceptable manner and that the process continues. Team members are available for support and guidance throughout the process.
ASSESS PHASE
GATHERING ASSESSMENT DATA

ASSESSMENT CYCLE
Each program will be on a five-year evaluation cycle. This means that every fifth year the faculty will do a formal data driven evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the program including the completion of an improvement plan. An improvement plan update form will be completed annually until the next reporting cycle. Data should be collected continuously over the five-year period.

REQUIRED DATA COLLECTION ELEMENTS AND METHODS
Certain data are required for your program assessment. This requirement is to satisfy school, state, NCA and federal educational goals. The required elements and methods are described below.

Surveys
Four surveys are required to be administered annually. Over a five-year cycle, patterns may reflect areas that are in need of attention. Departments have the responsibility for administering these surveys. Survey forms are available from Institutional Research (Ext. 4905).
- Current Student survey
- Advisory Committee survey
- Graduate Satisfaction survey
- Employer Satisfaction

Persistence Data
Enrollment data by years and term and graduation rates by year are required and provide persistence information. This information is found on a "standard" report (#2206) from the Kirkwood Student Record System and available from Institutional Research (Ext. 4905) or on the faculty network. This report establishes entering cohorts of first-time students and tracks these students semester to semester and year to year. It documents how many (and which) students do each of the following:
1) graduate
2) graduate and transfer (confirmed transfer only)
3) transfer (confirmed transfer only)
4) withdraw (formal process involving Student Development)
5) continuing
6) discontinue.

OPTIONAL DATA COLLECTION METHODS/ADDITIONAL DATA
Additional data which could be beneficial in determining program strengths/limitations and useful in completing the narrative sections of the Program Summative Report are listed below. Responsibility for collecting additional data belongs to the program. You may contact the Program Assessment Team members or Institutional Research (Ext. 4905) for any
available assistance. Many forms of data are readily available and do not require extensive work to gather.

Optional data:

- Fall-to-fall persistence (Institutional Research)
- Course retention
- Graduation rates (Institutional Research or your own departmental records)
- Completion/student success in articulated programs (Dave Bunting)
- Course loading (Deans)
- Faculty development requests/completions (Human Resources)
- Facility improvements (Department)
- Technology (equipment) improvements (Department)
- Instructional technology improvements (Department)
- Equipment requests tendered/completed (Department)
- Content of course/curriculum revisions (Department)
- Student portfolio reviews
- Internship student evaluations
- Performance tests
ANALYSIS PHASE
ANALYZING THE DATA

GOALS OF DATA ANALYSIS
The purpose of analysis is to identify strengths and weaknesses within the
program. When the evidence presented is analyzed, judgments should be made
about the program strengths and weaknesses in the areas being studied. Ask
yourself, "What are the data saying about the effectiveness of this aspect of the
program?" (For example, you might report, "95% of the graduating students
gave the highest rating on the equipment and facilities. This indicates that we
are providing an excellent physical learning environment.")

PREPARING THE PROGRAM SUMMATIVE REPORT
Sections below provide the instructions necessary to complete the Summative
Report for your program. The Program Summative Report is the document you
will use to summarize the data you have collected, analyze the data and identify
program strengths and improvement areas. This is the report you will submit for
review. Each program may add narrative or sections to the report that they feel
enhance their assessment. Sections of the report format that are not appropriate
to your program, such as accreditation, may be identified as not applicable to
your program. If so, please identify this in your report.

COMPLETING THE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT GENERAL INFORMATION
Complete each line with the general information requested. Program perspective
may be used to describe any unique conditions or characteristics about your
program.
HOW TO COMPLETE A SUMMATIVE REPORT 
AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Instructions:

1. The Career Program Assessment Team requires that all programs performing 
a program assessment use the Summative Report form to review your 
program. A copy of this is available on the J:/Shared drive in the 
PROGREPO file. You may also obtain a hard copy from the CPAC 
Chairman.

2. Attach to your report, supporting exhibits which are critical to the reading and 
interpreting of the report, including survey results, recommendations sheets 
from the advisory committees (not meeting minutes), accreditation exam data 
in summary form, and data which relates directly to the improvement plan. 
You may also have program-specific surveys that should be included in the 
assessment.

3. The Dean for your department should review the report to verify the 
information before it is submitted to the chair of the Career Program 
Assessment Team. A signature line for the Dean appears on the General 
Program Information page of the report form.

4. Submit a copy of your report to your Dean by December 16, 2005. After the 
Dean's approval, send four copies to the CPAC chair (Heidi Hansel, 129 
Nielsen Hall). Always keep a copy of your report in your personal files for 
your reference.

5. Career Program Assessment Team members will review your report and 
discuss the process you used to complete your report.

6. The reading team will respond to you in writing and through verbal contact 
with any questions, concerns or requests for clarifications regarding your 
report. (See attached Career Program Assessment Summative Report 
Review form that team members will use to provide feedback to you)

7. You will have the opportunity to answer any of these questions by completing the 
appropriate form to revise your report after the first reading. (See Feedback 
Form) This must be completed if you have an unacceptable report.

8. If deemed necessary, a supplemental reading may be performed by the 
reading team, 
after any corrections or clarifications have been completed.

9. After the final review of your report, it will be sent to the Vice President, 
Instruction. The completed version of the summative report will be kept on
file in the Vice President, Instruction office. You should also keep a copy of your report in your department office. These reports are not sent to the Iowa Department of Education unless specifically requested by that agency.

10. The Vice President, Instruction, will schedule a meeting with the program coordinator and respective Dean to discuss the process, program strengths, results of student learning and improvement plans that have been developed.

11. Implementation of the improvement plan will be the responsibility of the program and department. (See information following on how to develop an improvement plan.)

12. Monitoring of progress on the improvement plan will be conducted by the Career Program Assessment Team. This improvement plan update will be completed by program coordinator's annually after the report has been submitted and will be due in March. Progress will be identified using the form used for the initial improvement plan. (See Improvement Plan Update form)

13. Questions may be addressed to the chair of the Career Program Assessment Team. Heidi Hansel (Ext. 4919), or to a team representative from your department. The representative for 2005-2006 are:

Agricultural Sciences—Linette Geissler and Trish Ringgold
Business and Information Technology—Bill Beaty and Heidi Hansel
Health Sciences—Dawn Eitel and Sandra Kotowske
Industrial Tech—Andy Livin and Bob Jones
Career Option—Susan Simon
Administration—John Henik, Mary Lou Lauer, and Dale Simon
Discretionary Member—Morris Pounds
Institutional Research—To be announced