



PRC Summary Report for AY20

1. **Program Review Committee (PRC) remained mainly the same.** Two new committee members were added to the AY20 team – Anita Roastingear and Andrea Wilson; otherwise, the same members served in AY20 as served in AY19. The committee met eight times in Fall 2019 (Sep 5, Sep 9, Sep 19, Oct 3, Oct 24, Nov 7, Nov 21, and Dec 5) and five times in Spring 2020 (Jan 16, Feb 26, Feb 27, Mar 5, and Apr 30). Work was largely completed prior to the disruption of spring semester from Covid-19 except for one Program Review presentation and self-evaluation (by the Veterinary Technology team, as explained below).
2. **PRC members.** Members were nominated by academic administration from stakeholder groups. A Business Office rep (although requested) did not participate. Members included the following:
 - a. Agbaraji, Casmir (admin rep)
 - b. Begay, Sheena (IR rep)
 - c. Fowler, Henry (faculty rep and PRC chair)
 - d. Henry, Jerlynn (Student Services rep)
 - e. Hunter, Kelly (faculty rep)
 - f. Llanque, Sarah (faculty rep)
 - g. McLaughlin, Daniel (Student Learning rep)
 - h. Meles, Abraham (faculty rep)
 - i. Roastingear, Anita (faculty rep)
 - j. Tom, Brenda (HR rep)
 - k. Wilson, Andrea (Career Services rep)
3. **PRC accomplishments: *the PRC...***
 - a. Implemented recommendation from AY19 to extend the Program Review process from one-semester in length to one academic year. This provided more depth to the Program Review process.
 - b. Updated the Program Review Guide so that it supports and explains the revised one-year process. Established new guidelines, deadlines, roles and responsibilities, and five-year cycle of Program Reviews. An updated Program Review Cycle is spelled out in Appendix 2 of the Guide.
 - c. Utilized the same Program Review template that was established in AY18 and revised in AY19.
 - d. Developed a Self-Evaluation Rubric for quality control and reflection by Self-Study Teams.
 - e. Sought to prefill administrative data as happened in AY19:
 - i. Student Data: by Institutional Research
 - ii. Job Placement: by Career Services
 - iii. Faculty: by Human Resources
 - iv. Costs: by Business Office
 - f. Posted each template in Google Docs to facilitate authorship by multiple interests.
 - g. Maintained a PRC [website](#).

- h. Organized an Orientation for Self-Study Team Members in Sep 2019. Was attended by each instructor and chairperson tasked with a Program Review assignment. One-on-one assistance took place for Program Reviewers who requested it in Spring 2020.

4. Results

- Eight Program Reviews were assigned in Fall 2019, following NTU's Program Review Cycle as spelled out in Appendix 2 of the Program Review Guide for 2019-20. All eight were completed.
- All of the administrative data were completed except for Cost data from the Business Office. This was the third year in a row that these data were lacking.
- Seven of eight Program Review teams that had authored the reviews participated in Presentations with follow-up Q&A sessions, in February 2020. (The missing team was for the Veterinary Technology AAS program. This presentation was rescheduled, but the event was preempted by Covid-19 disruptions.)
- A scorecard was produced for the reviews (see Table 1 below). Checks (√) represent aspects of the Program Review that were completed; (--) means not submitted.

PROGRAM	His	Cur	Stu dat	Job plt	Prg asm	Str/ chl	Fac	Rec	Cst	Act pln	Self asm	Prs
Admin Office Assistant: April Chischilly & Phillip Quink	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	--	√	√	√
Auto Tech: Steve Kollas & Shanidiin Piechowski	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	--	√	√	√
Computer Science: Frank Stomp	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	--	√	√	√
Diné Culture, Language, & Leadership: Henry Fowler, Sharon Nelson, Dana Desidero, & Paul Platero	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	--	√	√	√
Early Childhood & Multi-Cult Educ: Della Begay & Kelly Dinéyazhe-Hunter	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	--	√	√	√
General Studies: Julie Bales	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	--	√	√	√
Prof Baking: Walter Cloud & Melvina Jones	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	--	√	√	√
Veterinary Tech: Germaine Daye	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	--	√	--	--

TABLE 1: Aspects of Program Reviews Completed

5. Prefilled data provided overall by academic administration

- a. Institutional Research: 100%
- b. Career Services: 100%
- c. Human Resources: 100%
- d. Business Office: 0%

6. Program Review narratives and Self-Study Team self-assessments with scores (click on each link below for details):

Program Review Narrative	Self-Assessment*
Administrative Office Assistant : April Chischilly & Phillip Quink	Not completed
Automotive Technology : Steve Kollas & Shanidiin Piechowski	2.33
Computer Science : Frank Stomp	2.33
Diné Culture, Language, & Leadership : Henry Fowler, Sharon Nelson, Dana Desidero, and Paul Platero	2.33
Early Childhood & Multicultural Education : Della Begay & Kelly Dinéyazhe-Hunter	1.78
General Studies : Julie Bales	2.00
Professional Baking : Walter Cloud & Melvina Jones	2.56
Veterinary Technology : Germaine Daye	Not completed
SELF-ASSESSMENT AVERAGE (including those who completed it)	2.22

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

TABLE 2: Program Review Narratives and Self-Assessments

7. Self-Study Team presentations and program-specific feedback. The following notes are copied from PRC meeting minutes of Mar 5 2020:

Admin Office Assistant: Phil Quink

Quink has been at NTU 26 years
 Program has experienced 20% drop in enrollment, retention, and graduation rates
 How will program assessment be implemented? Not clear.
 Has opportunity to develop clearer dual-credit pathways
 What about the currency of curriculum?
 Think about class scheduling. Weekends, evenings.

Computer Science: Frank Stomp

Stomp has been at NTU 7 years
 AS degree just approved by HLC; will phase out certificate
 Enrollments are very low; declared majors? 6? 15? Not sure
 Not clear difference between CS and IT
 Focus has been on programming; that's where the jobs are
 Plans to include labs in 101 and 150
 Is asking for a second FT instructor
 What about a summer program for HS students, for recruitment?

Diné Language and Culture: Henry Fowler

BA was launched in 2012; MA in 2013; PhD in progress

Mission statements and outcomes have been aligned

Main goal is to perpetuate Navajo language; now aligned to ACTFL standards and assessments

Enrollments: 6-5-18; graduates: 1-2-0

Has opportunities to develop assessment

Opportunities to develop dual-credit pathways

Auto Tech: Shawn Piechowski & Steve Kollas

Been in existence since 2015

Enrollments OK; retention tanking; graduation rates: 18-12-14

Striving for NATEF accreditation by 2021

Big opportunity to get assessment rolling

Internships being set up with police fleet management

Opportunities to include practicum in curriculum

ECME: Della Begay & Kelly Hunter

Enrollments are strong

Must fill vacant faculty position(s)

Are striving to complete course planning

Must develop policy handbooks for faculty and students

Must implement assessment

Must build capacity for state approval

Has opportunity to partner with appropriate lab organizations

General Studies: Julie Bales

Enrollments are OK

Graduation rates very low; we don't know why

Couple of courses are assessed only

No action plan

OFI's to coordinate across sites

Dual-credit

Baking: Melvina Jones & Walter Cloud

Certificate program started under Joe Chapa

Enrollments are OK, not great

OFI to expand dual credit and online

There's an OFI to align ACF assessment w/NTU's

8. Discussion

- e. Participation in Program Review improved in AY20. All eight Self-Study Teams produced Program Reviews. Seven of eight teams completed presentations to the PRC and University community. Six of eight teams completed self-assessments.
- f. Program Reviews were hindered in AY20, as they were in AY18 and AY19, by the complete absence of Costs information from the Business Office despite repeated attempts to work with that department and University administrative to obtain the data. This must be addressed moving forward.
- g. While the Program Review process was largely completed prior to University-wide disruptions from Covid-19 (not to mention disruptions worldwide), the process was interrupted and cut short. For instance, the PRC decided not to pursue the lack of Cost

data with the new CFO, hired in March, 2020, given many other pressing demands on the Business Office and the University as a whole.

9. Opportunities for process improvement

It will be important for the Program Review Committee to begin AY21 by reviewing all elements of this report, especially recommendations both old and new, as spelled out below. Many of the recommendations are repeats from earlier reports. Every opportunity must be taken to report out the recommendations to deliberative groups and committees in position to implement them.

ACTION PLANS

- a. Self-Study Teams that completed the Program Reviews have opportunities to finalize and implement Action Plans for improving their programs. Each team could be assigned to report on this work to the PRC and University as a whole in late Fall 2020 semester.
- b. The responsibility for overseeing Action Plan implementation ought to be clarified, assigned, and evaluated by academic administration.

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

- h. The Program Review cycle was revised in AY20 according to recommendations made the previous academic year. The same timeframe should be implemented in AY21:
 - i. Confirmation of assigned programs: by May 15 (in the 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 15.
- b. Recommendations made in AY19, not considered, still relevant:
 - i. Clarify with academic administration the Program Review cycle and calendar within larger context of planning-assessment-evaluation-budgeting cycles.
 - ii. 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.
 - iii. Review the Program Review evaluation rubric for opportunities to recognize and celebrate success.
 - iv. 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.
 - v. Include the improvement of Program Review process as a goal in NTU's new strategic plan. Establish viable metrics for identifying benchmarks and measuring success.
- c. New recommendations based on AY20 Program Reviews:
 - i. Redo PRC membership. Work with the Faculty Congress to ensure that reps participate from each NTU instructional site.

ACADEMIC POLICIES

- a. Recommendations made in AY19, not considered, still relevant:
 - i. Revise faculty workload policies. Incentivize faculty workload regarding Program Review assignments as well as Program Review Committee membership.
 - ii. Revise the faculty contract so that it explicitly includes academic assessment and program reviews.
 - iii. 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.
- b. New recommendations based on AY20 Program Reviews:
 - i. Improve academic advising. Utilize Jenzabar to support academic advising. Coordinate advisement across Student Services Advisors and Faculty Advisors.
 - ii. Establish career pathways/wheels for each academic program offering. Publish that information online.
 - iii. Support the development of Advisory Groups for all academic programs, especially vocational programs.
 - iv. Clarify graduation requirements (do not allow students to "walk" until they have met all graduation requirements)

ACADEMIC SUPPORT PROCESSES

- a. Recommendations made in AY19, not considered, still relevant:
 - i. Improve Business Office procurement processes.
 - ii. Improve program budgeting processes.
 - iii. Establish plan to promote planning, evaluation, and continuous improvement for academic support units in ways that promote the University's strategic plan.
 - iv. Establish a University-wide Technology Plan so that all classrooms have a minimum of appropriate instructional technology.
 - v. Establish plan to improve Library Services so that all NTU students have access to appropriate academic support.

10. Priority recommendations

Members of the Program Review Committee reviewed draft versions of this report and elected to send to Academic Administration a short list of Most Important Priority Recommendations from all of the observations and recommendations spelled out above. Members ranked twelve statements on a scale of "1=important to 5=critically significant." Here are the four most significant recommendations:

- a. *Implement comprehensive professional development for helping faculty teach online. Ensure that University is optimally prepared to provide quality teaching and learning experiences in face of Covid-19 disruption. (4.89 on scale of 1-5)*
- b. *Revise faculty and department chair job descriptions and evaluation processes so that they include academic assessment and Program Reviews. Revise faculty workload policies. Incentivize faculty workload regarding Program Review assignments as well as committee membership in general. (4.89 on scale of 1-5)*

- c. Improve Program Reviews by connecting enrollments/retention data to costs data by means of a program efficacy metric (e.g., total program revenues divided by total program costs). Use this metric to adjust academic program support and/or inform decisions to phase out chronically underperforming programs, as appropriate. (4.89 on scale of 1-5)*

- d. Improve academic budgeting processes. Organize academic cost centers according to programs outlined in Appendix 2 of Program Review Guide. Establish annual costs information for each academic offering. Provide updated budget information on regular bases. (4.67 on scale of 1-5)*