Program Review Process and Timeline
Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture

Overview
The Program Review Process was developed to evaluate educational programs and general education as well as student services at the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. In addition, this process meets commission rule 4 (281 NAC 4:06). The foundation of the process is a Continuous Improvement Process (Plan, Do, Check, Act). The benefits include:
- Providing supervisors with a data tool that goes beyond basic data reporting so they can conduct more effective evaluations of quality instruction and service
- Increasing efficiency by using a common data reporting tool for the college
- Supporting NCTA’s continuous improvement initiatives related to accreditation
- More effectively demonstrating accountability

Reporting information required to the Nebraska Coordinating Commission
- An established program review process that evaluates the program
- The need for the program in the state of Nebraska at the institution
- The demand for the program by students
- Efficiency of the program
- Justification if the program is below CCPE thresholds

Common Goal
Evaluating programs and services with a Quality Improvement model is based on the tenets of the continuous improvement philosophy. It provides maximum flexibility as a model of framework allowing colleges to customize the process. The Program Review Process uses data to guide performance improvement and program enhancement. Essential to this process is a critical analysis of data to determine the root cause of performance gaps as well as identify and evaluate strategies to improve performance.
The purposes of the Program Review Process are to:
- Identify factors of program/service quality through quantitative and qualitative analysis
- Facilitate program/service continuous improvement through data based decisions
- Design and implement innovative programs by anticipating future trends
- Ensure responsiveness and accountability to customers and stakeholders
- Improve overall organizational performance practices and capabilities
- Create a “Culture of Evidence” whereby systematic analysis can be conducted and shared across the college to identify and communicate best practices, early challenges and corrective measures

Elements of the Process
- Snapshot Data Report – week 10 (Aug 5), 21 (Oct 21) and 43 (March 21) – qualitative and quantitative measures
- Graduate Follow-up information
- Division Enrollment – Head Count, Student Credit Hours and FTE’s
- Instructional Area Enrollment (options) - Head Count, Student Credit Hours and FTE’s
- Program Retention – Fall to Spring and Fall to Fall (cohort)
- Cost per FTE per division
- Degrees awarded per academic year
- Certificates awarded per academic year
- Full-time faculty per division
- Part-time faculty per division
- FTE per faculty
Threshold
The threshold has been set by the Nebraska Coordinating Commission. It states that each program needs to have 10 graduates per academic year or the program is in jeopardy of being put on probation or discontinued. If the program falls below the threshold justification for keeping the program may be outlined in the Coordinating Commission report.

- Less than two years and associates degrees = 10 degrees awarded per academic year

Timeline and Action Steps
- Collect data annually – July 30
- Complete Annual report from Divisions - November 30
  - Every seven years complete annual report for BOR – November 30
- Final report submitted to the Dean’s office – February 15
  - Every Seven years report to the Board of Regents – February 15
- Every seven years final report is submitted to the Nebraska Coordinating Commission – June 30
Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education
Review of Existing Instructional Programs

Institution: _______________________________  Program: _______________________________

I certify the following:

- the information provided regarding this program is accurate
- the above named institution has in place a procedure for reviewing instructional programs and a copy of the procedure has been provided to the Commission
- such review took place on or about ________________________
- such review was presented to the institutions governing board on ________________________
- the governing boards action was: ________________________________

Signed: ___________________________________________  ______________________
(Chief Academic Officer or designated representative)  (Date)

Evidence of Demand and Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>5 yr avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours (SCH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Full-time Equivalency (FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH/Faculty FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of Degrees and Awards |       |       |       |       |       |         |
| (list degrees/awards separately) |       |       |       |       |       |         |

Evidence of Need (provide a statement below or attach documentation)

Justification if the program is below CCPE thresholds (provide a statement below or attach documentation)

__________________________________________________________________________________________

For CCPE staff use only

Reviewers & Date: