

APPENDIX A

Board of Trustees Program Review Objectives and Process Alignment

(Dinner Presentation to Board of Trustees, Wednesday, November 18, 2015)

Institutional Self-Assessment: Evidence that the current program review process fulfills Board policy intent.

---Excerpt from LCCC Academic Program Review Policy 10.2: Program Review Objectives

Program review should:

A. Generate meaningful knowledge about how well academic programs are contributing to the attainment of the College's mission;

1. Programs are required to express support of mission in self-study template (I.A.1).
2. Evidence of student transformation is generated in the template section II.B.2 requiring description of learning research findings. Descriptions of transformation methods are found in sections related to the design of curriculum and design of instructional methods.
3. Programs' annual assessment plans display in self-studies under feedback sections and show program strategies for transforming student learning. Evaluating whether the transforming strategies are effective is a core purpose of assessment planning.

B. Provide for regular evaluation of each academic program with enough frequency to establish a cycle of planning and assessment for continuous improvement;

1. Procedure 10.2 states that program reviews are scheduled over a five-year period to ensure every credit-bearing academic program is reviewed within this timeframe.
2. Embedded in the review process is evaluation and display of annual planning for student learning and organizational effectiveness. Programs are strongly encouraged to support their five-year action plans with supporting annual assessment plans to add discipline and annual reporting of progress to action planning. Continuous improvement is verified and critiqued by annual peer review of assessment planning and again through specific and repetitive requirements in the self-study template for programs to show evidence of continuous improvement that relates to evaluation data.
3. The template structure adheres to the AQIP continuous improvement methodology of a. process design based on stakeholder needs, b. feedback results, and c. data-driven improvements.
4. Review procedure (10.2P) requires programs scoring at underdeveloped levels, as determined by peer review, to submit follow-up reports demonstrating improvement or describing completed planning to achieve improvement.

C. Incorporate objective input, process, and outcomes components to provide a holistic perspective of programs' current efficacy and guide planning for improvement; and

1. Review procedure (10.2) requires internal peer-reviewers to score programs' performance using the Program Review Rubric. Individual reviewer scores are aggregated to display programs' performance levels for each template section. The performance measures provide a diagnostic display of programmatic strengths and weaknesses for guiding improvement at the program and institutional levels.

D. Lead to the development of actionable and appropriate plans for program improvement.

1. The review process includes an action planning step that uses a template structured to encourage action.
2. The process includes an accountability section (IV.A.3) where programs must report on the success of their action plan goals that were formed in the previous program review.
3. The peer review process ensures that the action plan goals are appropriate and it provides advice on how to improve planning.
4. The follow-up reporting step ensures continued work on programs' underdeveloped processes after the formal program review period is over. Follow-up reports are included in the original self-studies as supplements to be reviewed in the next cycle of program review.

APPENDIX B
Executive Summaries of Ten Program Review Self-Studies

School	Arts and Humanities
Program Area	Art
Major Programs	A.A. Art, (62 credits)
Review Period	Fall 2009 to Fall 2014
Self-Study Developed	AY 2014-2015
Review Status	Academic Standards Determination of Approval Status
Program Leaders	Ron Medina and Daniel Maw
Committee Chair	Kim Bender
Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee Reviewers	Nicole Bryant: Dean - Arts & Humanities DeeJaay Beals: Faculty -- BATS Melvin Hawkins: Dean – BATS Jose Fierro: Vice President, Academic Affairs Kari Brown-Herbst, Melissa McAllister: Chair of SLA Committee Julie Gerstner: Student Services Representative Herry Andrews: Administration and Finance Representative Jeff Shmidl: Faculty – Business Management

A. Mission, Vision, Values

Mission

The LCCC program of study in art is designed to provide students with training in the concepts, techniques, and methods unique to two and three-dimension visual art mediums. Through a program of study that includes art history, theory, appreciation, and studio art, degree seeking students and community members have academically directed access to the knowledge, skills and attitudes required for traditional and new approaches to problem solving in specific visual art media.

Matriculation through the visual art program of study at LCCC provides students with general education, as well as artistic skill development leading to both professional career development and an A.A. degree or beyond. Completing a degree, transferring to a four-year institution, working as professionals, or simply pursuing education/training in visual art are signposts of program success.

Vision

The visual arts have historically served to communicate ideas and feelings that cannot be expressed verbally. The expressive or aesthetic dimension common to the arts disciplines has been (and continues to be) an important component of an advancing civilization. An understanding of the arts is valued for the insights it provides into the human condition, for the basis it provides for self-knowledge, and for the connection it makes with unique visual-spatial realms of intellectual functioning.

Through partnerships with the LCCC Foundation, community groups, and on campus committees such as the LCCC Cultural Committee; the LCCC Art Department shares its academic pursuit and value in the visual arts with the community at large. In ongoing donor and college supported series of visiting artists, their gallery shows and lectures, the LCCC Art Department expands the availability and accessibility of the ever growing culture of visual arts. Many of these lasting professional partnerships develop into return visits creating opportunities for credit and non-credit courses during the summer session instructed by professionals in the visual arts field. At other times, these professional partnerships have

led to community and college purchases of artwork for public display resulting in permanent public relationship with the LCCC Art Department.

Values

As required in following the Mission Statement of the College and curriculum development, the college's core competencies are directly built into course requirements and activities. Student are exposed to problem solving issues developed around personal concepts, social issues, historical relevance, and aesthetic analysis in the visual arts. The study and creation of visual arts, being a form of communication, and the academic and social experiences embedded in the program, enhance student's visual communication skills and awareness of cultural and aesthetic issues. Collaborative and individual communication skills are enhanced as they are introduced to and expected to incorporate direction and suggestion from instructors, syllabi and other written course materials, and engage in group dialogues with their peers about course and program content. Advanced students are provided with increasing amounts of individual responsibility and problem solving in their own learning as they advance through the program. Throughout the program, students are required to evaluate their own work and the work of others as a part of critical thinking in the art curriculum. In conclusion of the program, the student is must provide a self-reflective written and visual portfolio as evidence of their ability to think critically, communicate effectively, apply socially, respond with awareness and content, through the personal images, objects, and statements they create.

B. Brief Program Summary

The Laramie County Community College (LCCC) art program began in fall 1969. The original curriculum was designed by one instructor to accommodate transfer to regional four-year institutions and meet the requirements of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. In the beginning, most of the classes were in two-dimensional (2-D) art, serving approximately 100 students in six to eight different courses. The first classes were taught in Building A and the present Administration Building (then Building B).

In the fall of 1973, a second full-time instructor joined the department. She designed the three-dimensional program: jewelry, sculpture and ceramics. This was articulated with the University of Wyoming and Colorado State University for transferability. The three dimensional (3-D) program required different facilities, so the art department was moved to Building D (now part of the automotive training space). A year later a gas-fired raku kiln was constructed outside Building D. In 1975, a 60-cubic-foot downdraft salt kiln was added, enhancing the firing processes for sculpture and ceramics students.

As with the two-dimensional area, the three-dimensional classes grew from single sections of 10 to 12 students in 1973 to five sections of 15 students each in 1977-78. By 1988, LCCC offered two sections of ceramics with 20 students and one of sculpture with 12 to 18 students. Additionally, LCCC offered one section of art history, with an occasional second section at night.

In 1981, the art department moved into new quarters in the Fine Arts Building and the old quarters were renovated for other purposes and the kilns torn down. This made the art studios larger than in Building D. The jewelry and ceramics studios were (and continue to be) unsurpassed in the state of Wyoming. By 1988, the combined two-dimensional and three-dimensional art classes listed 30 sections each year.

In May of 1988, the one full-time instructor in three-dimensional art retired, leaving LCCC with one full-time instructor in two-dimensional art. The following semester most classes were covered through the use of adjunct instructors. In 1989, a full-time instructor was hired in the three-dimensional art area. The last of the original art instructors retired in 1992 and the position was filled with another full-time instructor. This instructor stayed until 2003 and the position was again filled with another full-time instructor.

In the early 1990's, there was a restructuring of contact hours within the art program. Prior to this time, all art classes followed the LCCC lecture class format. Classes were realigned to conform to a lab class format. This allowed art classes to match the standard accepted by other colleges and universities. Full transfer of credit was now available to LCCC students from most other institutions.

Today the LCCC art department has three full-time instructors and two adjunct instructors. The art department serves approximately 460 students per year in over 80 different courses. Each semester, the art department offers multiple sections of Beginning Drawing, Ceramics I/II/III, Metals I/II/III, and General Art: History. The art department also has a schedule of summer sections, as well as an online course in the form of General: Art History.

Recently, two new gas-fired kilns have been purchased to replace the old and inefficient kilns. This has allowed for added sections to be offered in ceramics and sculpture. A new printmaking equipment was added to the 2-D Design/Life-Drawing classroom which has also led to additional course offerings. There has been an expansion in class sections of jewelry, painting and art history. The Esther and John Clay Summer Watercolor Workshop and the LCCC Summer Sculpture Workshop are well established programs outside the normal academic course offerings, bringing students and guest faculty from across the nation to LCCC. The art department is presently working with community members to establish program priorities and how they translate to facilities needs as part of a larger fine and performing arts building project. Articulation meetings with UW and Colorado institutions are also guiding these decisions.

C. Program Objectives

The LCCC program of study in art is designed to provide students with training in the concepts, techniques, and methods unique to two and three-dimension visual art mediums. Through a program of study that includes art history, theory, appreciation, and studio art, degree seeking students and community members have academically directed access to the knowledge, skills and attitudes required for traditional and new approaches to problem solving in specific visual art media.

Program Level Learning Competencies:

1. Facilitate the development of the knowledge, skills and motivation that will enable students to pursue learning experiences on their own, both in general education and in art.
2. Achieve optimum development of students' aesthetic awareness and its relationship with their other academic, vocational and leisure-time skills.
3. Develop a solid foundation of art knowledge, skills and attitudes needed for successful transfer to a four-year institution and/or art institute.
4. Introduce students to the language of the visual arts through exposure to a variety of media, vocabulary, history, theory, and materials.

5. Enable students to apply visual techniques and vocabulary necessary to design 2-D and 3-D works of art based on foundational ideas presented in art history and theory.
6. Provide students with hands-on experiences with studio materials and instruction so that they are able to develop individual solutions to studio situations that can apply to day-to-day problem-solving skills.

Organizational Effectiveness Outcomes

1. Develop articulation based completion curriculum based on standing articulations to benefit student matriculation.
2. Created new relationships with a more broad group of articulating institutions.
3. Evaluate, define, and establish levels of professional development for faculty that benefit the academic setting and college at large.
4. Evaluate and analyze annual completion data for needed revisions or documentation of successful curricular activities.

D. Success of Past Review Action Goals

Concerns regarding instruction delivery and MFA level faculty have been assisted by the hiring of Daniel Maw for the fall of 2012. This has decreased the program's reliance on adjunct instruction.

Facilities concerns remain a hindrance to articulation with the University of Wyoming, as lack of ventilation prevent oil painting from being incorporated into our painting courses. Our facilities limitations also affects articulation of our sculpture courses, as we cannot safely work with materials required in comparable UW courses.

E. Abbreviated Data Summary: Key Performance Indicators

Program of Study:

Art

A. Participation	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
A.1 Annual FTE (KPI A.1.a)	154.25	4	169.67	4	4
A.2 Number of "participants" enrolled (KPI A.1.b)	446	4	460.67	4	
A.3 Number of "concentrators" enrolled	15	5	18.33	5	
B. Success	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
B.1 Course success rate (KPI A.7)	68.30%	1	74.84%	2	2
B.2 Graduation rate for "concentrators" (KPI A.4)	9.52%	1	34.07%	2	
B.3 Number of Associates and workforce degrees/certificates awarded (KPI C.2.a, D.2.a)	2	1	4.00	2	
B.4 Number of "concentrators" matriculating to university (KPI C.3)	0	1	2.67	4	
B.5 University matriculation rate (KPI C.3)	0%	1	14%	2	
B.6 Number of in-field job placements (KPI D.3)					
B.7 In-field job placement rate (KPI D.3)					
B.8 Licensure/certification pass rate (KPI D.5)					
B.9 Achievement of program competencies (KPI A.5)					
B.10 Achievement of course competencies (KPI A.5)					
C. Learning Environment	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
C.1 Percent of sections taught by full-time faculty (KPI F.3.a)	69.23%	3	61.22%	3	2
C.2 FTE student to FTE faculty ratio (KPI F.2)	11.80	1	11.86	1	
C.3-7 CCSSE benchmark ratings (KPI I.2.a – KPI I.2.e)					
D. Efficiency	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
D.1 Average credits to completion (KPI F.1.a)	53.50	4	64.56	2	2
D.2 Average time to completion (KPI F.1.b)	5.82	2	6.06	2	
D.3 Average section fill rate (KPI F.4)	50.60%	1	52.42%	1	
D.4 Core expenditures per FTE (KPI G.1)	\$2,312.57	2	\$2,074.46	3	

F. Program Achievements Over the Review Period

Over the last five years the LCCC Art Department has accomplished numerous successes that tie directly back to supporting the Mission Statement outlined by the college. Student achievements include: student establishment of co-op gallery in downtown Cheyenne, participation in Light's On Cheyenne events at the Hynd's building, exhibit of student art work at international exhibit in Houston, TX, and an example of continuous/seamless life-long learning with a student now entering their graduate MFA program at the University of Montana, MT. Departmental success in out-reach and involvement with the community at large include programs involving international visiting artists as instructors i.e. Jenny Morgan, Richard Nodkin, and Kit White.

G. Discovery Listing of Program Strengths, Concerns, Opportunities, and Recommendations

Challenges:

-Facilities are not adequate to enable LCCC to offer a comprehensive set of transferable courses. For example, the ventilation systems on all campuses are not adequate to enable LCCC to safely offer oil painting courses, and the University of Wyoming will not accept painting courses for transfer credit unless oils are one of the materials used in those courses.

-Staffing credentials and staffing levels are also a concern. While supervisors on the main LCCC campus in Cheyenne have made a priority of employing MA-level faculty members so that courses transfer, the adjunct instructors on branch (regional) campuses do not all have master's degrees or higher.

-There is a need to strengthen communication between the art instructors on the ACC and the full-time faculty members at the Cheyenne campus. There is a need for curriculum development and aligned syllabi. For some reason it seems to be very difficult to schedule a joint work session.

Strengths:

-The majority of art courses are designed to provide students with the same course of study offered through the University of Wyoming for the first two years of a Bachelor of Arts degree in visual art. In addition, several courses: Art History I (ART 2010), Art History II (ART 2020), General Art (ART 1000), and General Art: History (ART 1010) fulfill general education humanities elective requirements for non-art students pursuing an A.A. degree. Other programs such as Mass Media/Multimedia require some of the art theory courses (specifically Foundation: Two Dimensional) as a prerequisite for 2-D and 3-D animation as well as Computer Graphics.

-The core two and three-dimensional studio classes (as well as the metals classes) are offered with multiple sections each semester in drawing, ceramics, and metals. Painting, Life-Drawing, and Watercolor are single-section offerings each semester with an increasing demand to open new sections in the painting and watercolor classes. The theory classes (Two and Foundation: Three Dimensional) are offered every other year, and Sculpture, Printmaking, and Handbuilt Ceramics courses are offered at least once each year. The service classes (i.e., the lecture classes mentioned above) are offered every semester. It should be noted that Art History I and II are required for art majors as well as fulfilling general education requirements for non-art majors.

-The 3-D facility includes a 5000-square-foot studio with two large gas kilns and an array of electric kilns.

This offers the student the opportunity to investigate multiple firing ranges from raku to stoneware to porcelain.

- The LCCC Art Department has an excellent metals studio for support of the jewelry curriculum.

- The Esther and John Clay Fine Art Gallery is a 1000-square-foot facility hosting rotating exhibits of prominent visual arts.

- The Cheyenne location offers students access to museums and art festivals across northern Colorado and southeastern Wyoming.

- There is a strong community service tradition and a collaborative relationship with students and faculty at Laramie County School District #1.

- Summer workshop programs in watercolor and sculpture are offered each year and attract students and guest faculty from across the nation.

- Assisting the LCCC Foundation with the annual Ed and Caren Murray Art Series.

The program has strong and consistent enrollment by art majors, general-education students, and community members.

Concerns:

One concern for the art department is a lack of fluid transfer for students from LCCC to University of Wyoming. UW does not accept many of LCCC's art courses based on differences in materials usage and a more narrow offering of curricular opportunities, both of these differences (materials and curricular opportunities) are connected to LCCC facilities and space limitations.

- Of major concern is the current practice of stacking studio classes. Due to low enrollments in the advanced sections of life-drawing, painting, watercolor, drawing, metals, and ceramics classes, art instructors have been required to teach three levels at the same time during each class period. Ideally, LCCC should offer separate sections for each drawing, painting, watercolor, metals, and ceramics class. The current practice of stacking classes is reminiscent of the one-room schoolhouse and is not conducive to providing our art students with an optimum educational experience. Providing unique section offerings for the advanced art courses has budget and staffing implications that will be addressed later in this review. Recommended steps that would address these program limitations/weaknesses have not been implemented as of fall 2015. These issues were identified in the previous program review and have not yet been improved.

Challenges:

One of the challenges facing the art department is facilities limitations that translate into curricular limitations. Specifically, limitations in space and ventilation create barriers to teaching with oil paints or creating larger sculptures in metal. Further, the nuanced requirements for art facilities space limit the ability to complete on-site renovations, as the art courses cannot relocate to other areas on campus during renovation periods.

Opportunities:

The revision and standardization of art programming in the state of Colorado has opened new opportunities for the art program to partner with Colorado universities for fluid student transfer. Increased funding to the visiting artist series creates additional opportunities for community exposure, recruiting, and co-curricular learning opportunities. Increased reporting and metrics in connection to student course fees and supply needs will increase the knowledge and assessment of course fees and supply costs, to better align the two.

H. Summary of Review Action Plan Goals

1. Increase enrollment for program specific and community member students.
2. Maintain and continuing articulation with regional accredited institutions. Continue participation in the WICHE Passport Program to expand articulation to other participating national institutions.
3. Continued consistent collection and analysis of institutional competency data.
4. Continued participating in obtaining an updated facility for the fine and performing arts.

I. Program Review Rubric: A Numerical Summary of Reviewer Evaluation

In accordance with program review procedure 10.2P, reviewers score self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric, which defines scoring using a five-point scale (1-5). Any section scoring below three is designated as undeveloped. The Academic Standards Committee may require programs to provide a follow-up report on undeveloped sections.

Displayed below is the program review rubric for Art. It includes two sets of scoring by the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee. Reviewers evaluated the self-study content in February and March 2015, and their aggregated scoring appears in the Total column. In March, the program responded to this scoring by writing program responses to reviewer feedback comments in sections scoring below 3 (undeveloped) on the five-point scale. The Program Review Subcommittee evaluated the self-study a second time in fall 2015 to re-score sections below a score of 3 based on the program responses. Often programs provided content and uploaded documents that persuaded the reviewers to adjust rubric scores upward. Reviewers had the liberty to score independently of their individual previous scores, so self-study scores could rise or fall. Reviewers did not score sections with scores at three or above, and these sections are blacked out in the A.S. Adjusted column.

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (undeveloped processes).

2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (undeveloped processes).

3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores

at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).

4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.

5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in yellow-shaded cells make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Sections are defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring (AQIP Maturity Scale) is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

After the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee completes its scoring of programs' self-studies, and programs have completed their responses to Subcommittee feedback comments, The Subcommittee reviews the program written responses that relate to sections scoring below three and enters readjusted scores that can result in higher or lower scores.

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

Program Name: Art		
I. Program Summary (The review process does not include this self-study section in the scoring rubric)		
II. Knowledge Distribution	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design		
1. Process to design the curriculum	3.00	3.00
a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)	3.00	2.33
b. Participation in the institution's curriculum management process (MCORS)	3.25	2.67
c. Developmental education: Effectiveness of student placement and success in college-level courses	3.25	3.00
d. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.00	3.33
e. Program-specific education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.00	3.00
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment	2.75	2.75
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	2.63	2.50
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	2.75	2.75
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	2.38	2.50
6. KPI indicators: Learning Environment and Student Success sections of program percentiles averaged	2.25	2.75
SECTION AVERAGE	2.84	2.78
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	3.00	2.67
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.50	2.50
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	2.63	3.00
SECTION AVERAGE	2.71	2.72
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.50	2.75
SECTION AVERAGE	2.50	2.75
III. Organizational Effectiveness	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors		

B. Design of the organization		
1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures	2.20	
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	3.20	
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	2.70	
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	3.00	
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	4.00	
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	3.20	
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	3.40	
7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	3.00	
a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	
8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	3.00	
9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.06	
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	3.20	2.67
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.40	2.00
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.20	3.33
SECTION AVERAGE	2.93	2.67
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.00	
IV. Program Planning	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design of program planning		
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)	2.80	2.25
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning	2.00	2.25
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress	2.00	2.25

4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning	2.40	2.25
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities	2.20	2.50
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years	2.90	2.75
SECTION AVERAGE	2.85	2.38
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.80	2.75
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.00	2.50
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings	2.60	2.75
SECTION AVERAGE	2.83	2.67
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.00	2.50
SECTION AVERAGE	2.00	2.50
V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)	2.00	
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)	1.67	
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages	2.33	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.00	
SELF STUDY AVERAGE =	2.66	2.66

Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale for Continuous Improvement						
Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point	Total	A.S. Adjusted
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and operational goals.	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.	2.33	

School	Business, Agriculture and Technical Studies
Program Area	Automotive Technology
Major Programs	A.A.S. Automotive Technology (61-63 credits), Certificate of Completion Automotive Technology (33 credits)
Review Period	Fall 2009 to Fall 2014
Self-Study Developed	AY 2014-2015
Review Status	Academic Standards Determination of Approval Status
Program Leaders	Dave Curry and Robert LaFaso
Committee Chair	Kim Bender
Academic Standards	Meghan Kelly: Librarian
Program Review	Karen Lange: Dean – Library
Subcommittee	Kari Brown-Herbst, Jonathan Carrier: Chair of SLA Committee
Reviewers	Julie Gerstner: Student Services Representative
	Herry Andrews: Administration and Finance Representative

A. Mission, Vision, Values

Mission

The Automotive program prepares students to effectively enter the workforce in the field of automotive repair. We maintain classes in accordance with ASE (Automotive Service Institute) and NATEF (National Automotive Teachers Education Foundation) in order to maintain a quality level of education to meet and exceed the expectations of industry. The Automotive program meets or exceeds the mission and vision statements set forth by LCCC. The program takes the statements from the college as its own. Our mission statement links to section 3, workforce development, of the LCCC mission statement.

Values

By following National Automotive Teachers Education Foundation (NATEF) and industry standards in our training facility we insure Quality graduates who are prepared for a career in the automobile industry.

Respect for the training needs of the industry, especially local businesses. We have an advisory committee that meets twice a year, you can request minutes from the school of BATS Administrative Assistant.

Faculty professional development: NATEF requires 20 hours per year of professional development which insures our students get current state of the art quality education

B. Brief Program Summary

The automotive technology program is designed to prepare students for employment in the automotive industry. The program also offers courses for those who want to upgrade their skills or meet some personal objective of learning about automotive technology. The nine-month program is designed for full-time students, and the courses are offered in a sequence of blocks. The block varies from three to four weeks in length depending on the number of credits for each course. Classes are held from 9 a.m. to 4:10 p.m. Monday through Thursday. The automotive technology courses are designed to prepare students for the ASE certification exam.

The Automotive Technology program has had full enrollment, with a wait list each semester for 10 years, 20 semesters in a row. The reason for the high enrollment is NATEF certification. It guides us for all course curriculum content and design. NATEF completes an on-sight assessment of our Automotive Program every five years. Our advisory committee meets twice each year and helps us tweak our curriculum, and the purchase of

tools and equipment to better suit the needs of our community. One recommendation of the advisory committee was to develop and change our certificate program into two diploma programs. Engine management/performance, and Under-car/H.V.A.C. This enables graduates to reach the workforce sooner, with the same high quality of knowledge that they received in the past. If you wish to learn more about our NATEF Certification, you can find more information online at: <http://www.natef.org/Home.aspx>

The Automotive Program also supports Skills USA, a club at LCCC that enables students to compete in 1 of 20 or more different areas that covers more than just vocational fields. The Skills USA club competes at State Conference each year, where our chapter has taken first place in Automotive Technology at state 5 years running. We won a gold medal at Nationals in Quiz Bowl, in Kansas City Missouri in June, 2014. Our Positive attitude, and sportsmanship during the state and national conference reflects well upon high school and other college students. This provides another avenue to keep our enrollment full each semester, and reflects greatly upon our college as a whole.

When the Flex Tech Building is finished Automotive Technology will have space enough to start a second section of Automotive Classes. This will further meet and exceed the demands of students for our classes at our community college. To facilitate this we will need \$150,000 of new equipment; such as, 5 new lifts, 10 new benches, and 6 new tool sets.

C. Program Objectives

The program will develop students' capacity/ability to Diagnose and repair engine drivability problems. The program will develop students' capacity/ability to Diagnose and repair undercar issues, and HVAC.

Below is an example of competences in engines class. Our accreditation requires 20 hours of professional development each year. As I attend these classes I use information to keep our lecture's current to the industry. Examples of areas of improvement are:

1. Hybrid vehicle training from American Honda,
2. Electric vehicle training thru American Honda,
3. Direct Injection Training thru American Honda,
4. Vehicle technology and Trends 2014 (SEMA), and
5. Vehicle Technology and Trends 2015 (SEMA).

D. Success of Past Review Action Goals

The previous program review did not produce action plan goals.

E. Abbreviated Data Summary: Key Performance Indicators

Program of Study

Automotive Technology

A. Participation	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
A.1 Annual FTE (KPI A.1.a)	56.833	2	53.611	2	3
A.2 Number of "participants" enrolled (KPI A.1.b)	64	2	65.333333	2	
A.3 Number of "concentrators" enrolled	3	3	11.666667	4	
B. Success	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
B.1 Course success rate (KPI A.7)	0.9113	5	0.9054784	5	4
B.2 Graduation rate for "concentrators" (KPI A.4)	0.357142857	3	0.3695349	3	
B.3 Number of Associates and workforce degrees/certificates awarded (KPI C.2.a, D.2.a)	19	5	10.666667	4	
B.4 Number of "concentrators" matriculating to university (KPI C.3)					
B.5 University matriculation rate (KPI C.3)					
B.6 Number of in-field job placements (KPI D.3)					
B.7 In-field job placement rate (KPI D.3)					
B.8 Licensure/certification pass rate (KPI D.5)					
B.9 Achievement of program competencies (KPI A.5)					
B.10 Achievement of course competencies (KPI A.5)					
C. Learning Environment	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
C.1 Percent of sections taught by full-time faculty (KPI F.3.a)	0.916666667	4	0.9	5	4
C.2 FTE student to FTE faculty ratio (KPI F.2)	18.775	3	20.00625	3	
C.3-7 CCSSE benchmark ratings (KPI I.2.a – KPI I.2.e)					
D. Efficiency	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
D.1 Average credits to completion (KPI F.1.a)	77.42105263	1	65.521303	2	3
D.2 Average time to completion (KPI F.1.b)	5.240102309	3	4.1009917	4	
D.3 Average section fill rate (KPI F.4)	1.073611111	5	1.0787963	5	
D.4 Core expenditures per FTE (KPI G.1)	\$2,284.12	2	\$2,972.55	2	

F. Program Achievements over the Review Period

- The Automotive program has had full enrollment for 19 semesters in a row, with a wait list each semester.
- The graduates that complete the program complete at an academic level, ready to enter the workforce.
- Over the last 5 years, the advisory committee has approved major equipment purchases such as: a new Hunter Alignment Machine, and 3 new lifts.
- For 10 years we have participated in Skills USA. 8 of the last 10 years we have won a gold medal at the state competition in Casper. Gold medal winners are taken to nationals in Kansas City, Missouri. Last year we received a gold medal at state in automotive and placed 34th at nationals.
- Our club provides community services such as carwashes, free oil changes, and Rent-A-Tech. Our lowest participation in the car washes was 50 cars, and we average 100-150 cars each time. Each year we help give free oil changes, during the college free for all (Managed by Jeri Greigo). Every year we help on average 20-30 people with free oil changes.

G. Discovery Listing of Program Strengths, Concerns, Opportunities, and Recommendations

Strengths:

1. Sustaining Accreditation
2. Maintaining working, industry level equipment.
3. Faculty Credentials are constantly being updated
4. Strong relationship with advisory committee which is comprised of companies in the area.
5. Strong relationship with industry professionals in the area.
6. Students maintain a high level of success after completing the program.

Challenges:

1. Develop a stronger learning assessment system.
2. Maintaining a fleet of up to date vehicles on a limited budget.

Opportunities:

1. Expansion of space because of the flex tech building opening.
2. A chance to open a second set of Automotive Classes.

The Automotive Program is always making its best effort to maintain its strengths, and to eliminate concerns within the program. Our strengths according to students from previous surveys are:

The faculty is legitimately interested in the subject, he enjoys teaching and is very personable.

Students have fun learning while in class.

The class has lots of hands on experience.

Concerns:

Concerns with the program are minimal, students would like textbooks to be cheaper and newer and more shop cars at their disposal to learn on.

Some challenges the program faces are acquiring the shop cars are a limited budget. Any cars that we receive either have to be donated, or paid for at a very low price, which limits the amount and quality of cars the program is able to obtain. However the program uses every opportunity to acquire new knowledge for the students such as going to the SEMA show every year. Also recently the instructor went to hybrid vehicle training from Honda of America in order to learn how to work on hybrid cars safely, and the differences between hybrid and normal vehicles, so he could pass the knowledge on to his students.

The automotive program has many strengths as a program. We have had full enrollment for the past 10 years (20 semesters). Current numbers for fall 2015 suggests this pattern will continue as well. We work actively with the community in order to provide not only a quality education for students, but also a great work environment, and a service to the students of the college. The Program is also developing new assessment planning in order to improve graduation rates. One concern our program does have is lack of funds for shop vehicles. We have a huge opportunity to expand the automotive program with the Diesel program leaving. Having the second half of our shop will grant us the ability to have a second set of classes; however, we have a great challenge in being able to acquire funds to supply this second set of classes with the tools and equipment needed to succeed. Another challenge would be to improve year to year monitoring in order to sustain momentum with attaining

goals. The program is looking towards the new chairperson and the Dean of BATS for guidance on how to improve monitoring.

H. Summary of Review Action Plan Goals

1. The primary goal of the automotive program is to maintain ASE/NATEF Accreditation. This accreditation provides a national view of the educational needs of students within the field of automotive technology.
2. When the Diesel Technology Program leaves the building, the Automotive Program will have the full building to themselves. In order to facilitate the needs of the stakeholders and students, the program plans to start a second set of classes in the other half of the shop.

I. Program Review Rubric: A Numerical Summary of Reviewer Evaluation

In accordance with program review procedure 10.2P, reviewers score self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric, which defines scoring using a five-point scale (1-5). Any section scoring below three is designated as undeveloped. The Academic Standards Committee may require programs to provide a follow-up report on undeveloped sections.

Displayed below is the program review rubric for Automotive Technology. It includes two sets of scoring by the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee. Reviewers evaluated the self-study content in September 2015, and their aggregated scoring appears in the Total column. In October, the program was given an opportunity to respond to this scoring by writing program responses to reviewer feedback comments in sections scoring below 3 (undeveloped) on the five-point scale. The Program Review Subcommittee did not review the Automotive Technology self-study a second time as the program did not provide responses to the review feedback comments in the rubric-scored sections by the required deadline; no new scores appear in the A.S. Adjusted column.

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

- 1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (**undeveloped processes**).
- 2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (**undeveloped processes**).
- 3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).
- 4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.
- 5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in yellow-shaded cells make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Sections are defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring (AQIP Maturity Scale) is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

After the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee completes its scoring of programs' self-studies, and programs have completed their responses to Subcommittee feedback comments, The Subcommittee reviews the program written responses that relate to sections scoring below three and enters readjusted scores that can result in higher or lower scores

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

Program Name: Automotive Technology

I. Program Summary (The review process does not include this self-study section in the scoring rubric)

II. Knowledge Distribution	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design		
1. Process to design the curriculum	3.33	
a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)	3.00	
b. Participation in the institution’s curriculum management process (MCORS)	2.33	

c. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.00	
d. Program-specific education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.33	
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment	3.33	
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	3.00	
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	3.33	
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	2.67	
6. KPI indicators: Learning Environment and Student Success sections of program percentiles averaged	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.03	
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	3.33	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.33	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.33	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.00	
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.67	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.67	2.67
III. Organizational Effectiveness		A.S. Adjusted
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors		
B. Design of the organization		
1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures	3.00	
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	2.67	
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	3.00	
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	3.00	
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	4.00	
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	3.00	
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	3.00	
7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	2.33	
a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	
8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	3.00	

9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	2.50	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.97	2.97
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.67	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.00	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	2.67	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.44	2.44
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.67	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.67	2.67
IV. Program Planning	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design of program planning		
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)	2.00	
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning	3.00	
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress	3.50	
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning	2.00	
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities	3.50	
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years	2.50	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.75	2.75
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.50	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.00	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.50	2.50
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.00	
V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success	Total	A.S. Adjusted

A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)	3.50	
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)	3.00	
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages	2.50	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.00	
SELF STUDY AVERAGE =		2.81
2.81		

Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale for Continuous Improvement

Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point		
					Total	A.S. Adjusted
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.		
					2.00	

School	Business, Agriculture and Technical Studies
Program Area	Computer Science
Major Programs	A.S. Computer Science (60 credits), A.S. Computer Science – Business Concentration (62 credits)
Review Period	Fall 2009 to Fall 2014
Self-Study Development	AY 2014-2015
Review Status	Academic Standards Determination of Approval Status
Program Leaders	Rob VanCleave
Committee Chair	Kim Bender
Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee Reviewers	Starla Mason: Faculty – Health Sciences and Wellness Michele Albert: Faculty – Math and Sciences Terry Harper: Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs Kari Brown-Herbst, Jonathan Carrier: Chair of SLA Committee Julie Gerstner: Student Services Representative Herry Andrews: Administration and Finance Representative

A. Mission, Vision, Values

Mission

Computer Science has grown from a specialization in mathematics or business or electrical engineering to an independent, broadly based area of study covering all aspects of the use and understanding of computers and the computation process.

- The Computer Science program prepares student to transfer and complete a baccalaureate degree at UW and other institutions of higher learning. We offer two A.S. degrees, Computer Science and Computers and Business option. See [articulation agreement](#).

Students are inspired through hands on programming activities throughout their CS courses, and exposed to different programming languages and platforms.

Values

- Currency in the field of Computer Science
- Student learning proficiency in applying the software development cycle to solve problems
- Successful student transfer to 4 year institutions of higher learning
- Effective collaboration among the faculty in the development of curriculum and instruction

B. Brief Program Summary

Since the 1950's the computer has developed from a novelty with a few technical numerical applications to a ubiquitous tool, essential to science and technology, to business and finance, to government, to communications, and even to entertainment. "Computer" can even mean personal devices, such as phones, tablets, glasses, and other wearable devices. As a result, Computer Science has grown from a specialization in mathematics or business or electrical engineering to an independent, broadly based area of study covering all aspects of the use and understanding of computers and the computation process. The Computer Science A.S. degree at LCCC provides a foundation for students to continue on and complete a Baccalaureate degree at a 4 year college or university in the many specialized concentrations in the broad category of Computer Science. This program has been articulated with the University of Wyoming, and satisfies the first two years of a B.S. in Computer Science.

Computer Science is part of the Computer Information Systems department, and currently has 2 full-time faculty. They articulate annually with U.W. and other community colleges in the state that offer Computer Science programs.

We are located on the second floor of the Business and Technology building, and have a dedicated programming lab/classroom and access to at least 3 other computer labs for instruction. We provide all software needed to our students for free.

Enrollment during any given semester has been 25-35 students per semester in programming courses.

C. Program Objectives

- Develop students' capacity and abilities to apply the software development cycle to design and implement algorithms to solve a variety of problems using critical thinking and problem solving skills.
- Develop and sustain processes to maintain effective transferability of curriculum to 4 year institutions of higher education.
- Sustain program currency by development of faculty in curriculum and instructional expertise.

D. Success of Past Review Action Goals

The previous program review covered both Computer Science and all the Computer Information Systems program (Summary attached below). The goals set forth that are germane to Computer Science are as follows:

1. Recruit more majors
2. Enhance transferability with U.W.

The first goal we did not achieve to our satisfaction, and have included that as one of our action plan goals in our current assessment plan.

The second one we did achieve, and have true 2+2 articulation agreement with the Computer Science department at U.W.

E. Abbreviated Data Summary: Key Performance Indicators

Program of Study

Computer Science

A. Participation	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
A.1 Annual FTE (KPI A.1.a)	167.92	4	168.44	4	4
A.2 Number of "participants" enrolled (KPI A.1.b)	570	4	570.67	4	
A.3 Number of "concentrators" enrolled	8	4	8.33	3	
B. Success	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
B.1 Course success rate (KPI A.7)	62.42%	1	61.51%	1	3
B.2 Graduation rate for "concentrators" (KPI A.4)	37.50%	3	50.07%	4	
B.3 Number of Associates and workforce degrees/certificates awarded (KPI C.2.a, D.2.a)	5	2	3.33	2	
B.4 Number of "concentrators" matriculating to university (KPI C.3)	3	4	3.666667	4	
B.5 University matriculation rate (KPI C.3)	100%	5	67%	5	
B.6 Number of in-field job placements (KPI D.3)					
B.7 In-field job placement rate (KPI D.3)					
B.8 Licensure/certification pass rate (KPI D.5)					
B.9 Achievement of program competencies (KPI A.5)					
B.10 Achievement of course competencies (KPI A.5)					
C. Learning Environment	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
C.1 Percent of sections taught by full-time faculty (KPI F.3.a)	84.21%	4	71.95%	4	4
C.2 FTE student to FTE faculty ratio (KPI F.2)	20.69	4	21.31	4	
C.3-7 CCSSE benchmark ratings (KPI I.2.a – KPI I.2.e)					
D. Efficiency	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
D.1 Average credits to completion (KPI F.1.a)	68.80	1	60.35	3	3
D.2 Average time to completion (KPI F.1.b)	6.00	2	4.24	4	
D.3 Average section fill rate (KPI F.4)	75.90%	3	78.87%	4	
D.4 Core expenditures per FTE (KPI G.1)	\$154.75	5	\$150.36	5	

F. Program Achievements over the Review Period

- We have articulated a 2+2 degree plan with the University of Wyoming.
- We have created a new program that includes a 4 semester pathway for both Computer Science and Computer Science/Business option.
- Faculty have attended and on 2 occasions presented at the WyDec (Wyoming Distance Education Conference) the past 5 years.
- One faculty member was awarded the statewide "Master Distance Educator" award in 2010.
- All faculty have been trained in use of the LMS (Learning Management System, currently D2L) and all Computer Science courses are offered both face-to-face and online.
- One faculty member has attended the national ITC (Instructional Technology Conference) 3 times, and presented once.
- Re-designed our Computer Science track programming languages to better serve our students, resulting in one textbook for two 4 hour classes (COSC 1030 and 2030), while still meeting U.W. expectations.

G. Discovery Listing of Program Strengths, Concerns, Opportunities, and Recommendations

Knowledge Distribution

- Strengths
 - Matriculation rate
 - Graduation rate

- Faculty expertise
- student/faculty ratio
- Full time faculty teaching courses
- Technology (hardware and software)
- Active and productive articulation with UW and the other community colleges
- Challenges
 - currency due to ever changing technology
 - Coordination and recruitment with the secondary schools in our area
- Opportunities
 - Sought after credentials for graduating students
 - New scholarship monies
 - Outreach to secondary schools

Organizational Effectiveness

- Strengths
 - Annual FTE
 - Cost effectiveness (core expenditures per FTE)
- Opportunities
 - Stronger evaluation capacity of course and program student satisfaction
- Concerns
 - Low enrollment
 - Poor completion rates online
- Challenges
 - recruitment

Planning

- Strengths
 - Annual assessment planning
 - 4 assessment planning goals
 - 2 action goals
- Concerns
 - Follow through, we must take decisive action to achieve our goals
- Opportunities
 - Aquila gives us a platform to keep ourselves on track
 - We can emphasize the importance of planning with new faculty coming on board soon
- Challenges
 - The field, and job market, is ever changing and long term planning can be difficult

H. Summary of Review Action Plan Goals

1. Increase course completion rates
2. Majors will complete their degrees

I. Program Review Rubric: A Numerical Summary of Reviewer Evaluation

In accordance with program review procedure 10.2P, reviewers score self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric, which defines scoring using a five-point scale (1-5). Any section scoring below three is designated as undeveloped. The Academic Standards Committee may require programs to provide a follow-up report on undeveloped sections.

Displayed below is the program review rubric for Computer Science. It includes two sets of scoring by the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee. Reviewers evaluated the self-study content in February and March 2015, and their aggregated scoring appears in the Total column. In March, the program responded to this scoring by writing program responses to reviewer feedback comments in sections scoring below 3 (undeveloped) on the five-point scale. The Program Review Subcommittee evaluated the self-study a second time in fall 2015 to re-score sections below a score of 3 based on the program responses. Often programs provided content and uploaded documents that persuaded the reviewers to adjust rubric scores upward. Reviewers had the liberty to score independently of their individual previous scores, so self-study scores could rise or fall. Reviewers did not score sections with scores at three or above, and these sections are blacked out in the A.S. Adjusted column.

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

- 1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (**undeveloped processes**).
- 2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (**undeveloped processes**).
- 3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).
- 4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.
- 5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in yellow-shaded cells make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Sections are defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring (AQIP Maturity Scale) is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

After the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee completes its scoring of programs' self-studies, and programs have completed their responses to Subcommittee feedback comments, The Subcommittee reviews the program written responses that relate to sections scoring below three and enters readjusted scores that can result in higher or lower scores.

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

Program Name: Computer Science

I. Program Summary (The review process does not include this self-study section in the scoring rubric)

II. Knowledge Distribution		Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design			
1. Process to design the curriculum		3.00	2.80
a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)		2.25	2.10

b. Participation in the institution's curriculum management process (MCORS)	2.75	2.35
c. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	2.75	2.80
d. Program-specific education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.00	3.00
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment	3.50	3.20
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	3.50	3.30
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	2.75	3.00
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	2.50	2.10
6. KPI indicators: Learning Environment and Student Success sections of program percentiles averaged	2.75	2.80
SECTION AVERAGE	2.88	2.75
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	2.25	2.45
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.00	2.00
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	2.00	3.00
SECTION AVERAGE	2.08	2.48
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.00	#DIV/0!
III. Organizational Effectiveness	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors		
B. Design of the organization		
1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures	2.25	2.95
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	2.00	2.20
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	2.50	2.32
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	1.50	2.10
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	3.00
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	2.25	2.05
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	2.00	2.20
7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	2.25	2.25
a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	4.00

8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	2.25	2.85
9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	1.33	2.10
SECTION AVERAGE	2.25	2.55
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.00	1.80
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	1.50	1.75
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	1.75	2.80
SECTION AVERAGE	1.71	2.12
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.00	1.80
SECTION AVERAGE	2.00	1.80
IV. Program Planning	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design of program planning		
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)	2.00	2.25
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning	2.25	2.05
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress	2.75	3.20
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning	2.00	2.05
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities	2.50	2.70
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years	2.25	2.45
SECTION AVERAGE	2.29	2.45
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	1.75	2.00
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	1.75	2.00
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings	2.00	2.40
SECTION AVERAGE	1.83	2.20
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.00	2.60
SECTION AVERAGE	2.00	2.60

V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success			Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)			2.67	3.17
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)			2.33	2.13
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages			2.00	2.50
SECTION AVERAGE			2.33	2.60
SELF STUDY AVERAGE =			2.06	2.50

Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale for Continuous Improvement

Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point	Total	A.S. Adjusted
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and operational goals.	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.	2.00	

School	Health Sciences and Wellness
Program Area	Diagnostic Medical Sonography
Major Programs	A.A.S. Diagnostic Medical Sonography (96 credits)
Review Period	Fall 2009 to Fall 2014
Self-Study Development	AY 2014-2015
Review Status	Academic Standards Determination of Approval Status
Program Leaders	Adrienne Wade and Sheridan Hanson
Committee Chair	Kim Bender
Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee Reviewers	Nicole Bryant: Dean - Arts & Humanities Robin Duncan: Faculty – Health Sciences and Wellness Karen Lange: Dean - Library Meghan Kelly: Librarian Kari Brown-Herbst, Melissa McAllister: Chair of SLA Committee Julie Gerstner: Student Services Representative Herry Andrews: Administration and Finance Representative Jeri Griego, Denise Rogers: Faculty – Accounting Seth Robbins, Larry Van Why: Faculty – Diesel Technology

A. Mission, Vision, Values

Mission and Vision

The LCCC DMS Program is dedicated to providing quality education for its students in order to promote excellence in the art and science of sonography. Guided by the Mission of the College, the program strives to provide academic and clinical experiences that produce competent and compassionate sonographers with a commitment to performance of quality imaging and the pursuit of lifelong learning.

We are all bound by a basic understanding that our students, regardless of how they arrive at LCCC, yearn for a better life by engaging in the process of acquiring knowledge. Thus, we are compelled to aid this transformation by offering diverse educational experiences designed to be inspirational for all those involved in the learning process. While we recognize our work is diverse, the entirety of the work we do is grounded in the four foundation elements of the comprehensive community college mission:

1. To prepare people to succeed academically in college-level learning (academic preparation)
2. To engage our students in learning activities that will prepare and advance them through the pursuit of a baccalaureate degree (transfer preparation)
3. To develop individuals to enter or advance in productive, life-fulfilling occupations and professions (workforce development)
4. To enrich the communities we serve through activities that stimulate and sustain a healthy society and economy (community development)

Values

Students must comply with the “Code of Ethics” contained in the SDMS Standards of Ethics.

Increase our completion rate from beginning of program to end to 100%

Implement a Vascular Sonography certificate program.

Expanding our number of accepted students.

B. Brief Program Summary

The DMS program was developed at the prompting of the local sonography/medical community. The communities of interest include current DMS students as well as prospective students who are actively taking the necessary steps to apply to the program to include completing the prerequisites, 16 hours of observation, submission of three reference forms, and completing the application packet. The faculty of the LCCC DMS Program are available to answer any advising questions during the week via email, phone or face-to-face to help the students with the application process as well as current students who need guidance as they progress through the program.

As former students of the program, our past graduates are also considered communities of interest by providing reference letters, keeping them updated on educational opportunities and regional job openings, and continue to help answer their questions about our profession as they arise. Graduate satisfaction is crucial to the success and the reputation of the program. To ensure the students are acquiring a quality education, the program utilizes a graduate survey, which is administered 5-6 months post-graduation. The information from the survey is used to address any deficiencies in the program or to enhance smaller items in the program administration.

Employers of our graduates are communities of interest, and their satisfaction is monitored on an annual basis. Surveys are sent out in October or November for that year's set of graduates. The program is fortunate to have a very high response rate with which to evaluate its graduates. The program uses this data from employers to adjust the curriculum to better align our program goals with the expectation of the employers.

Representative sonographers are members of the DMS Program's Advisory Committee. In addition to the sonographers a radiologist (medical advisor), graduates, two student representatives, the Program Director, the Clinical Coordinator and the Dean of the School of Health Sciences and Wellness are also members. This group meets at least once each year, and looks at the overall program effectiveness in terms of outcomes assessment, employer needs, graduate needs/deficiencies, and sets long-term goals for the program. This committee provides suggestions for improving any areas of concern, and may recommend program/policy changes as corrective actions.

With the compilation of communities of interest listed above, the patient is the ultimate benefactor of a well-functioning program. The patient will receive the best care possible when students are educated and guided in both the didactic and clinical settings.

Our program is organized in a somewhat unique manner, in which our students participate in classroom and scan-lab activities for 12 months prior to the 1336 hours (3 semesters) clinical internship. Our program is arranged this way for two reasons: The first is most of our clinical affiliate sites are at a distance. Wyoming is a remote state with population centers scattered over a large geographical area. In most cases it is unreasonable for students to report between clinical sites and campus on a daily basis. The second is most of our clinical affiliates appreciate having students who have performed competencies in the lab, and can hone skills on site, rather than learn anew the protocols and image documentation. Clinical sites have requested that students enter the clinical setting with more scanning experience before working with patients. While the students are in their clinical internship of their education, they continue their didactic education through web enhanced learning, independent learning and assignments, and they participate in bi-semester seminars on campus.

We currently only accept nine students into our program every summer. We are looking at ways of increasing this number to approximately 12 over the course of the next few years. As word about our program spreads, we are able to find additional clinical site opportunities for our students.

Currently, the DMS Program graduates graduate with skills, knowledge, attitudes and abilities needed to practice as a general sonographer. Student graduate with practical knowledge and skills to complete the following sonography procedures: Abdomen, Small Parts, Obstetrics, Gynecology, Physics, Instrumentation, and Limited Vascular.

DMS Programs Graduate have enjoyed 100% national registry pass rates and 100% employment rates, thus proving they have acquired all the necessary attributes of a professional sonographer.

The accredited program began in 2008 and we received our initial accreditation on March 19, 2010. The first graduation class was in 2010 with six students. Class of 2011 graduated four, Class of 2012 graduated eight, Class of 2013 and 2014 graduated seven and Class of 2015 graduated nine.

C. Program Objectives

The sonography profession requires the ability to provide diagnostic sonographic imaging utilizing critical thinking skills to make judgments in the process. Sonographers are professionals who must possess high level skills in diagnostic sonographic techniques under the guidance of a licensed physician. A sonographer is responsible for providing excellent patient care and gathering adequate data necessary for diagnoses to be determined.

The LCCC DMS Program's goal is to prepare competent entry-level sonographers in the cognitive (knowledge), psychomotor (skills), and affective (behavior) learning domains. Graduates of the LCCC DMS Program will be able to perform, at a minimum, the following objectives:

•**Goal 1:** Graduates of this program will be technically proficient, being able to consistently produce images of high diagnostic quality.

Outcomes:

1. Students will obtain, review and integrate pertinent patient data to facilitate optimum diagnostic results
2. Students will select appropriate technical factors when scanning patients.
3. Students will perform sonographic procedures appropriately and accurately recording all anatomic and physiologic information for interpretation by a physician.
4. Students will document and present complete and accurate sonographic findings to the interpreting physician in order to facilitate patient diagnosis.
5. Students will maintain optimal function of the sonographic equipment.
6. Students will assist physician during invasive ultrasound guided procedures.

•**Goal 2:** Graduates of this program demonstrate problem solving and critical thinking skills.

Outcomes:

1. Students will manipulate technical variables to obtain optimal diagnostic images.
2. Students will evaluate images for diagnostic quality, identifying appropriate solutions for poor image quality.

•**Goal 3:** Graduates of this program will demonstrate communication skills

Outcomes:

1. Students will demonstrate effective oral communication skills with patients and all members of the healthcare team.
2. Students will demonstrate effective written communication skill

•**Goal 4:** Students will provide consistent high quality patient care

Outcomes:

1. Students will provide customer relations skills in patient care and education to promote overall well-being
2. Students will adapt exam positioning and protocols due to patient condition
3. Students will employ a safe work environment

•**Goal 5:** Students will consistently manifest a professional attitude and honor the SDMS Code of Ethics

Outcomes:

1. Students will act in a professional manner within recognized ethical and legal standards
2. Students will demonstrate a respect for diversity and the ability to work with others and special patient populations

• **Goal 6:** Graduates will have a high potential for advancement and leadership

Outcomes:

1. Students will demonstrate workplace behavior conducive to professional advancement
2. Students will differentiate between the ARDMS and ARRT exam(s), and additional certification opportunities
3. Students will demonstrate a commitment to lifelong learning.

•**Goal 7:** Graduates of the program will be successfully employed in an entry-level position

Outcomes:

1. Students will pass the ARDMS SPI on the first attempt.
2. Students will pass the ARDMS AB and/or OB on the first attempt
3. Of those pursuing employment, students will be gainfully employed within 6 months post-graduation.
4. Students will complete the program.
5. Students will express satisfaction with their education
6. Employers will express satisfaction with LCCC graduate performance

D. Success of Past Review Action Goals

In the 2012 Program Review the areas for improvement were as follows:

1. The availability of certain exam types have proven difficult for some students in the clinical setting. Specifically second and third trimester obstetrical exams and carotid vascular examinations.

2. Obtaining enough high quality clinical sites has been difficult for the program. Most clinical sites can only accommodate one student at a time. This has necessitated the need to send students out further distance sites. Students are advised of the possibility of relocation but it still can cause hardship for student families and finances.

Since the 2012 Program Review the DMS program has improved on the low rated areas. We now have more clinical sites where students are obtaining second and third trimester obstetrical exams. Carotids are considered a vascular study and we are not currently accredited in vascular. However, we have been able to add some clinical sites that are high in the vascular training as well as general ultrasound training.

We have added an additional eight high quality clinical sites in the Denver and Northern Colorado area along with Casper, WY most recently. Our students that are from Colorado have more available sites within commuting distance and our Wyoming students have a wider selection of clinical sites.

We will continue to monitor these areas and look for more ways to improve as our program grows.

E. Abbreviated Data Summary

Program of Study

Diagnostic Medical Sonography

A. Participation	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
A.1 Annual FTE (KPI A.1.a)	38.17	1	36.89	1	1
A.2 Number of "participants" enrolled (KPI A.1.b)	16	1	15.33	1	
A.3 Number of "concentrators" enrolled	0	1	5	2	
B. Success	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
B.1 Course success rate (KPI A.7)	100.00%	5	100.00%	5	4
B.2 Graduation rate for "concentrators" (KPI A.4)	100.00%	5	100.00%	5	
B.3 Number of Associates and workforce degrees/certificates awarded (KPI C.2.a, D.2.a)	7	3	7.67	3	
B.4 Number of "concentrators" matriculating to university (KPI C.3)					
B.5 University matriculation rate (KPI C.3)					
B.6 Number of in-field job placements (KPI D.3)					
B.7 In-field job placement rate (KPI D.3)					
B.8 Licensure/certification pass rate (KPI D.5)					
B.9 Achievement of program competencies (KPI A.5)					
B.10 Achievement of course competencies (KPI A.5)					
C. Learning Environment	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
C.1 Percent of sections taught by full-time faculty (KPI F.3.a)	100.00%	5	89.17%	5	3
C.2 FTE student to FTE faculty ratio (KPI F.2)	9.31	1	9.35	1	
C.3-7 CCSSE benchmark ratings (KPI I.2.a – KPI I.2.e)					
D. Efficiency	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
D.1 Average credits to completion (KPI F.1.b)	64.00	2	72.95	1	3
D.2 Average time to completion (KPI F.1.a)	2.73	5	3.42	5	
D.3 Average section fill rate (KPI F.4)	100.00%	5	96.20%	5	
D.4 Core expenditures per FTE (KPI G.1)	\$4,889.09	1	\$5,484.88	1	

F. Program Achievements over the Review Period

The DMS Program uses the various assessment tools to ensure the effectiveness of the DMS program. These are done on a weekly basis to adjust courses to student needs, as well as on a course level to ensure our graduates can meet national standards. Survey results are used to make changes to the curriculum to ensure our program mirrors national

and employment standards. We are happy to report that our assessments have continually come back as excellent and therefore only minor adjustments have been needed to be made to the program curriculum.

Below is a chart of assessment result for the DMS Program.

Program Measure	Annual Results	Composite 3-Year Average
Abdomen – ARDMS National Exam Pass Rate	2012: 100% 2013: 100% 2014: 100%	100%
OB/GYN – ARDMS National Exam Pass Rate	2012: 100% 2013: 100% 2014: 100%	100%
Ultrasound Physics – ARDMS National Exam Pass rate	2012: 100% 2013: 100% 2014: 100%	100%
Employment Rates (Full-time within 6 months post-graduation)	2012: 100% 2013: 100% 2014: 100%	100%

G. Discovery Listing of Program Strengths, Concerns, Opportunities, and Recommendations

Knowledge Distribution

Strengths: The LCCC DMS Program received accreditation status in 2008. Since that time, the program has established a strong reputation for graduating students who are well prepared, and motivated with a high level of initiative. Areas that have helped contribute to this success are the low faculty-to-student ratio, excellent teaching and lab facilities, administrative and community support, supportive clinical facilities, and a healthy applicant pool. To date, the program has a low attrition rate, a 100% ARDMS pass rate and 100% job placement. Please see the Program's Assessment matrix below.

Limitations (area that need improvement): The number one challenge the DMS Program faces at this point is aging equipment and the need to stay current with the new technology trends. LCCC Administration is aware of this need, and is actively looking for means of funding for additional equipment. (Budget requests come out in the spring.)

Another challenge we face is clinical site availability, but this appears to be subsiding as word spreads about the program and the quality of the education the students receive from the program. Most of our clinical sites are at a distance from the LCCC campus, but we are also finding that as word about our program grows, students are coming to LCCC outside of the immediate Cheyenne area and are requesting clinical sites that are at a distance. In addition to the above listed limitations, if the need arises, it may be somewhat challenging to recruit adjunct faculty due to time constraints and low adjunct pay compared to industry wages.

Organizational Effectiveness

STRENGTHS

- High job placement rates
- Instructor availability
- High employer and graduate satisfaction
- Healthy applicant pool
- Low attrition
- Continued expansion of sonography's clinical use
- Few sonography programs in the area
-

WEAKNESSES (CHALLENGES)

- Constant need to update/repair equipment
- Cost – low student to faculty ratio
- Difficulty in attracting Adjunct Faculty
- Clinical site inconsistencies (exam protocols & evaluations)

H. High-Impact Dialogues Among Peer Reviewers and Program Faculty

Knowledge Distribution Section

Program Self-Study Narrative (Sept - Mid-Jan)

The DMS program relies heavily on its advisory committee as a process for program improvement.

This group consists of the Program Director, the Clinical Coordinator and other didactic faculty as applicable, one-first year student, one second-year student representative, approximately

8 sonographers from the community and a radiologist.

With the exception of the program faculty and the student representative, members serve 5 year terms. Members are chosen on a volunteer basis, but may also be nominated based on their status as a recent graduate, an employer and/or their involvement in the health care industry.

The advisory committee meets twice a year, during the fall and spring semester. The program routinely uses its advisory committee members as a resource for program improvement. The program's advisory committee assists the program in the following ways:

- i. Reviewing and providing feedback on proposed curriculum changes and the workplace resources available to implement them;
- ii. Ensuring the currency of the curriculum;
- iii. Providing up-to-date information on the anticipated workforce needs in the community and region;
- iv. Providing feedback on the performance trends of LCCC graduates beyond the employer surveys used in the program;
- v. Assisting the program with student recruitment; and
- vi. Serving as an additional resource for the program to acquire equipment and supplies to better meet student needs.

Internal Review Comments (Jan - Mid-March)

SLA - 4/6/2015 - no comments

mkelly/rduncan 4/3/15 Is there a specific curriculum change that can be identified as coming from the surveys or advisory meetings. Please attach actual surveys.

jpgriego/drogers 4/7/2015 -- Why not include a discussion of the survey that is sent to graduates and the employers of graduates? This could provide useful feedback for program improvement.

kbender - 4/8/15 - Below are links to the program's assessment plan for evaluation of student learning. Explain if the program considers this as part of its feedback information or a resource for measuring student learning in the coming years. Discuss the plan's role.

srobbins 4/12/15

D. Kortum 4.15 -- No comments.

K. Lange 4/15/15

Program Response to Review Comments (Mid-March to April)

mkelly/rduncan -

One area that is part of the current curriculum that needs improvement is training our students on endovaginal exams. We do not get a lot of volunteers for this area, which means our students are not learning endovaginal scanning until they start their clinical rotation. Feedback for a Clinical Instructor on the annual surveys would like to see the student's knowledge and ability to scan endovaginal to be improved. I have requested 'One-Time Funding' for a ScanTrainer, which I did not receive but will continue to ask for money. The ScanTrainer will provide a hands-on training that is as real as scanning real woman. It trains the student on the correct pressure, scan plane, image quality and so much more.

I have added the surveys and the response survey support the need for more endovaginal scanning.

kbender -

We feel that the learning assessments provide both, evaluation of student learning of consistently producing high-quality images and demonstrating critical thinking and problem solving skills. The ScanTrainer mentioned above helps with both learning assessments and provide the student with the education needed to be highly successful. The surveys are our way of making sure faculty and clinical instructors are meeting the needs of students and employers while teaching the students. Without the surveys we will not know how we are accomplishing our learning assessments or not. I plan to include the learning assessments on the surveys for this next year to get a more realistic feel for if we are meeting the learning assessments

I. Summary of Review Action Plan Goals

1. Increase student retention rate to 100%
2. Maintain a 100% pass rate on National Board Certification
3. Expand program offerings into a vascular certification online

J. Program Review Rubric: A Numerical Summary of Reviewer Evaluation

In accordance with program review procedure 10.2P, reviewers score self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric, which defines scoring using a five-point scale (1-5). Any section scoring below three is designated as undeveloped. The Academic Standards Committee may require programs to provide a follow-up report on undeveloped sections.

Displayed below is the program review rubric for Medical Diagnostic Sonography. It includes two sets of scoring by the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee. Reviewers evaluated the self-study content in February and March

2015, and their aggregated scoring appears in the Total column. In March, the program responded to this scoring by writing program responses to reviewer feedback comments in sections scoring below 3 (undeveloped) on the five-point scale. The Program Review Subcommittee evaluated the self-study a second time in fall 2015 to re-score sections below a score of 3 based on the program responses. Often programs provided content and uploaded documents that persuaded the reviewers to adjust rubric scores upward. Reviewers had the liberty to score independently of their individual previous scores, so self-study scores could rise or fall. Reviewers did not score sections with scores at three or above, and these sections are blacked out in the A.S. Adjusted column.

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

- 1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (**undeveloped processes**).
- 2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (**undeveloped processes**).
- 3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).
- 4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.
- 5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in yellow-shaded cells make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Sections are defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring (AQIP Maturity Scale) is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

After the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee completes its scoring of programs' self-studies, and programs have completed their responses to Subcommittee feedback comments, The Subcommittee reviews the program written responses that relate to sections scoring below three and enters readjusted scores that can result in higher or lower scores.

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

Program Name: Sonography

I. Program Summary (The review process does not include this self-study section in the scoring rubric)

II. Knowledge Distribution

	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design		
1. Process to design the curriculum	3.31	3.58
a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)	3.75	3.60

b. Participation in the institution's curriculum management process (MCORS)	2.94	3.20
c. Developmental education: Effectiveness of student placement and success in college-level courses	2.63	3.00
d. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	2.44	3.20
e. Program-specific education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.25	3.30
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment	3.25	3.00
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	2.56	2.95
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	2.75	3.00
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	2.63	2.55
6. KPI indicators: Learning Environment and Student Success sections of program percentiles averaged	2.57	3.00
SECTION AVERAGE	2.93	3.13
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	3.38	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.88	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.13	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.09	
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.81	3.00
SECTION AVERAGE	2.81	3.00
III. Organizational Effectiveness	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors		
B. Design of the organization		
1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures	3.06	3.40
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	2.50	3.20
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	3.33	3.20
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	2.89	3.40
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	1.00	1.00
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	3.78	3.60
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	3.22	3.10

7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	2.94	2.60
a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	3.00
8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	3.22	3.50
9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	2.89	3.20
SECTION AVERAGE	2.89	3.02
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	3.17	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	3.00	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.33	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.17	
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.00	
IV. Program Planning	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design of program planning		
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)	2.72	
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning	3.56	
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress	3.28	
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning	2.44	
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities	2.89	
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years	3.33	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.04	
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.89	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.89	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings	3.22	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.00	

C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.89	3.00
SECTION AVERAGE	2.89	3.00
V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)	3.14	
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)	3.00	
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages	3.71	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.29	
SELF STUDY AVERAGE =		3.08

Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale for Continuous Improvement

Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point	Total	A.S. Adjusted
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and operational goals.	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.	3.29	

School	Health Sciences and Wellness
Program Area	Emergency Medical Services - Paramedics
Major Programs	A.A.S. Emergency Medical Services (68 credits), Credit Diploma, Emergency Medical Services - Paramedic (42 credits)
Review Period	Fall 2009 to Fall 2014
Self-Study Developed	AY 2014-2015
Review Status	Academic Standards Determination of Approval Status
Program Leaders	Patrick Currie and Amy Long
Committee Chair	Kim Bender
Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee Reviewers	Kari Brown-Herbst, Melissa McAllister: Chair of SLA Committee Julie Gerstner: Student Services Representative Herry Andrews: Administration and Finance Representative Jeff Shmidl: Faculty – Business Administration Rob VanCleave: Faculty – Computer Information Systems Clint Reading: Faculty – Biology (Natural Science) Jennifer Anderson: Faculty – Nursing Bryan Boatright: Faculty – Wind Energy

A. Mission, Vision, Values

Mission

The goal of the Laramie County Community College Paramedic Program is to prepare competent entry level EMT-Paramedics in the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective EMS learning domains. The program strives to develop individuals to enter or advance in the Emergency Medical Services workforce fulfilling their goal of becoming a paramedic.

Values

The paramedic program use various means to drive its activity and planning. On the smallest scale the program assesses every lecture and lecturer via the student to help drive individual class changes. Then, the semester courses as a whole are also assessed internally by LCCC. Lastly the program also uses surveys via the accrediting body (CoAEMSP/CAAHEP) to assess students and employers annually. Changes are then discussed and implemented as soon as possible. The program advisory committee also meets bi-annually to discuss changes and drive the program forward.

The programs specific values are listed below.

LCCC Emergency Services Core Values

Loyalty	I will operate with integrity and support my fellow students and program
Courage	I will have the courage to provide excellent care to all patients in all environments
Commitment	I am committed to the Paramedic Program, becoming a Paramedic and lifelong learning
Competency	I will strive to gain the knowledge and skills to become a competent provider

B. Brief Program Summary

The Paramedic and EMT program (EMS) at Laramie County Community College is part of the Health Science and Wellness School.

The program is physically located in the Training Center at LCCC. Most of the core classes are held in room TC 115. The program also has a dedicated lab and storage space in TC 125.

This program was created in 2004 with the help of the City of Cheyenne (Cheyenne Fire and Rescue). The city had a desire to add paramedics to their fleet of fire engines to provide a higher level of care to the citizens of Cheyenne. In collaboration with Mary Ellen Tast and the Workforce and Community Development Division, a program was born. After the initial offering and supplementation of the city's needs, the program was able to continue the Paramedic Program on a yearly basis to meet community needs and student interest. Cheyenne Fire and Rescue and American Medical

Response continue to support personnel attending the paramedic program to meet future demands of their agencies. The success of the initial program spawned several other ancillary courses. EMT-Basic, EMT-Intermediate and CPR courses are now available at LCCC. CPR is now offered on a weekly basis and the Emergency Services Program is also an American Heart Secure Training Site. In 2008, Patrick Currie, Program Manager, created Wyoming's first degree for Emergency Medical Service Providers. EMS students now have the option to obtain an Associate of Applied Science degree in Emergency Medical Services in addition to their certifications.

The program was accredited by CAAHEP/CoAEMSP in 2010 and recently underwent another successful site visit in 2014.

C. Program Objectives

The paramedic program has three distinct phases. Didactic, clinical and vehicular (field).

The first competency is based off the first phase of the program, or the majority of the didactic portion of the program. Courses EMGT 2500 through EMGT 2590 are sequentially linked and completed in a modular fashion. The student will successfully complete the didactic portion of the program with an overall average of 80% or above to move on to the next phase.

The modular topics are listed below. The students complete these in a sequential fashion.

1. Paramedic Preparatory
2. Paramedic Anatomy and Physiology
3. Paramedic Pharmacology
4. Paramedic Airway
5. Paramedic Cardiology
6. Paramedic Medical
7. Paramedic Trauma
8. Paramedic Special Populations/Operations

Next the students complete the course EMGT 2600 which consist of their clinical time in a hospital setting. The clinical phase of the program is where students apply their knowledge gained in the didactic portion of the program while encountering real patients and emergencies in the controlled clinical setting. Students visit a host of clinical sites gaining more experience and comfort when dealing with medical and traumatic emergencies. Students are evaluated during and upon completion of each 12 hour assigned shift. See "clinical evaluation" attached. Students are evaluated by a physician, registered nurse or paramedic during their shifts.

Lastly, the students complete the vehicular portion of their program. The vehicular/field phase is the next portion of the paramedic program. Students will pass this phase of the program by successfully completing the required field hours (500), receiving an overall average on their clinical evaluations of 3 or higher and meeting the minimum competencies (skills/assessments) set forth by the program. See "Competencies" below. Areas evaluated during each field shift are knowledge base, assessment skills, treatment/patient management, communication skills, scene management, documentation and affective behavior. Students are expected to perform at a high level, scoring 3 or higher on average for their vehicular evaluations. Students are also expected to meet the minimum vehicular skill and assessment competencies. Students then organize all their vehicular and clinical documentation in a document to showcase their experiences compared to the program competencies.

D. Success of Past Review Action Goals

No action plan goals identified in previous review.

E. Abbreviated Data Summary: Key Performance Indicators

Program of Study

EMS Paramedic

A. Participation	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
A.1 Annual FTE (KPI A.1.a)	72.08333	2	66.638888	2	2
A.2 Number of "participants" enrolled (KPI A.1.b)	76	2	71.333333	2	
A.3 Number of "concentrators" enrolled	2	2	8.333333	3	
B. Success	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
B.1 Course success rate (KPI A.7)	0.939698492	5	0.93826	5	4
B.2 Graduation rate for "concentrators" (KPI A.4)		1	0.5637255	4	
B.3 Number of Associates and workforce degrees/certificates awarded (KPI C.2.a, D.2.a)	12	4	9	4	
B.4 Number of "concentrators" matriculating to university (KPI C.3)					
B.5 University matriculation rate (KPI C.3)					
B.6 Number of in-field job placements (KPI D.3)					
B.7 In-field job placement rate (KPI D.3)					
B.8 Licensure/certification pass rate (KPI D.5)					
B.9 Achievement of program competencies (KPI A.5)					
B.10 Achievement of course competencies (KPI A.5)					
C. Learning Environment	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
C.1 Percent of sections taught by full-time faculty (KPI F.3.a)	0.8125	4	0.8486111	4	4
C.2 FTE student to FTE faculty ratio (KPI F.2)	15.03787879	3	15.757576	3	
C.3-7 CCSSE benchmark ratings (KPI I.2.a – KPI I.2.e)					
D. Efficiency	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
D.1 Average credits to completion (KPI F.1.b)	44.25	5	53.216667	4	3
D.2 Average time to completion (KPI F.1.a)	2.20807666	5	3.8238649	5	
D.3 Average section fill rate (KPI F.4)	0.6291	2	0.6384963	2	
D.4 Core expenditures per FTE (KPI G.1)	\$2,791.55	2	\$3,814.92	1	

F. Program Achievements Over the Review Period

The most significant achievement was the successful continuing reaccreditation site visit in November 2014. We are awaiting the official results and anticipate continued accreditation through CAAHEP/CoAEMSP in the spring of 2015.

G. Discovery Listing of Program Strengths, Concerns, Opportunities, and Recommendations

Strengths -

1. Staff! We have a strong cadre of subject matter experts, most of whom work in our local EMS system in Laramie County and the region.
2. Support of LCCC. We are a unique program and past and current administrations have been flexible allowing us to provide the best program possible.
3. Strong curriculum and accreditation standards. These areas help us maintain a quality program.
4. Equipment and training tools. In our tenth year, we have acquired a plethora of equipment to train EMS students.
5. Variety of clinical and vehicular sites. Over our history we have expanded the available sites for our students to perform at.

Concerns and Challenges -

1. Challenge to remain the premier paramedic program in the region.
2. Maintaining clinical sites and gathering new sites for future programs.
3. Continuing growth and exploring new educational delivery means.

H. Summary of Review Action Plan Goals

1. The program will go through the accreditation process again in 2020. The goal is to successfully complete the process for the third time.

I. Program Review Rubric: A Numerical Summary of Reviewer Evaluation

In accordance with program review procedure 10.2P, reviewers score self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric, which defines scoring using a five-point scale (1-5). Any section scoring below three is designated as undeveloped. The Academic Standards Committee may require programs to provide a follow-up report on undeveloped sections.

Displayed below is the program review rubric for EMS Paramedics. It includes two sets of scoring by the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee. Reviewers evaluated the self-study content in February and March 2015, and their aggregated scoring appears in the Total column. In March, the program responded to this scoring by writing program responses to reviewer feedback comments in sections scoring below 3 (undeveloped) on the five-point scale. The Program Review Subcommittee evaluated the self-study a second time in fall 2015 to re-score sections below a score of 3 based on the program responses. Often programs provided content and uploaded documents that persuaded the reviewers to adjust rubric scores upward. Reviewers had the liberty to score independently of their individual previous scores, so self-study scores could rise or fall. Reviewers did not score sections with scores at three or above, and these sections are blacked out in the A.S. Adjusted column.

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

- 1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (**undeveloped processes**).
- 2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (**undeveloped processes**).
- 3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).
- 4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.
- 5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in yellow-shaded cells make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Sections are defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring (AQIP Maturity Scale) is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

After the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee completes its scoring of programs' self-studies, and programs have completed their responses to Subcommittee feedback comments, The Subcommittee reviews the program written responses that relate to sections scoring below three and enters readjusted scores that can result in higher or lower scores.

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

Program Name: Paramedics

I. Program Summary (The review process does not include this self-study section in the scoring rubric)

II. Knowledge Distribution

Total

A.S.
Adjusted

A. Design

1. Process to design the curriculum

3.86

a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)

3.71

b. Participation in the institution's curriculum management process (MCORS)	3.14	
c. Developmental education: Effectiveness of student placement and success in college-level courses	3.57	
d. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	2.86	
e. Program-specific education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	2.71	
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment	3.00	
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	3.43	
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	3.57	
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	3.29	
6. KPI indicators: Learning Environment and Student Success sections of program percentiles averaged	4.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.38	
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	3.00	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.71	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.57	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.10	
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.71	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.71	
III. Organizational Effectiveness		Total
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors		
B. Design of the organization		
1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures	2.38	3.00
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	3.25	3.00
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	3.00	3.50
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	3.00	3.50
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	2.50
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	3.25	3.50
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	2.50	2.50
7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	3.00	3.00

a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	3.00
8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	3.00	3.00
9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	3.38	3.00
SECTION AVERAGE	2.98	3.05
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	3.88	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	3.25	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.88	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.67	
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.75	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.75	
IV. Program Planning	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design of program planning		
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)	3.00	3.00
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning	3.00	3.00
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress	2.50	2.00
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning	2.75	3.00
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities	2.63	3.00
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years	2.50	2.50
SECTION AVERAGE	2.73	2.75
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	3.00	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	3.00	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings	3.38	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.13	
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.38	1.50
SECTION AVERAGE	2.38	1.50

V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success			Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)			3.17	
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)			3.17	
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages			3.67	
SECTION AVERAGE			3.33	
SELF STUDY AVERAGE =			3.16	3.16

Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale for Continuous Improvement							
Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point		Total	A.S. Adjusted
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and operational goals.	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.			
						3.08	

School	Math & Sciences
Program Area	History
Major Programs	A.A. History (61-62 credits)
Review Period	Fall 2009 to Fall 2014
Self-Study Developed	AY 2014-2015
Review Status	Academic Standards Determination of Approval Status
Program Leaders	Mary Ludwig and Patty Kessler
Committee Chair	Kim Bender
Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee Reviewers	DeeJaay Beals: Faculty – BATS Michele Albert: Faculty – Math and Sciences Melvin Hawkins: Dean – BATS Kari Brown-Herbst, Melissa McAllister: Chair of SLA Committee Julie Gerstner: Student Services Representative Herry Andrews: Administration and Finance Representative Jose Fierro: Vice President, Academic Affairs Scott Moncrief: Faculty –Education J. O'Brien: Faculty – Mass Media/Multimedia

A. Mission, Vision, Values

Mission

LCCC's History Program is committed to introducing students to the breadth and depth of the human experience through a comparative study of past and contemporary societies and cultures. It also serves to develop their ability to conduct research, analyze and assess evidence, and articulate sound conclusions both orally and in writing. All of our students acquire knowledge and skills that help them develop as informed, engaged, and thoughtful citizens. The study of history, therefore, plays a unique and central role in liberal arts curriculum. History majors in particular will be prepared to pursue successful careers as teachers, academics, lawyers, civil servants, journalists, and of course historians in private or public agencies.

The History Program provides students a firm academic foundation for successful transfer to four-year institutions and with the critical-thinking skills necessary to succeed academically as they continue their college career.

Values

The LCCC History Program values

- the outstanding educational experiences for all students,
- the development of skills that support students growth as informed, engaged and thoughtful citizens, and
- the continued professional development of faculty.

In support of the continual pursuit of the provision of an outstanding educational experience for students and the development of skills that support students' growth as informed, engaged and thoughtful citizens, the History Program has developed and published clear program goals and competencies that direct our faculty's development of course outlines and materials.

B. Brief Program Summary

Laramie County Community College's History Program dates back to the establishment of the college in 1969. The college employs two full-time historians to oversee the entire program. In 1969, LCCC offered six history courses; all transferred to the University of Wyoming and are still being offered in 2014. In the last twenty years the history offerings at LCCC have changed dramatically. Various specialized history courses have been added to the current history

program. In an effort to provide courses of interest to our students and the residents of Laramie County, LCCC has sixteen history courses that are currently taught, five of which cross-list as Religious Studies courses.

Part of this substantial increase was due to student requests for an increase in the number of religion courses offered at LCCC. In the 1990s, we responded by adding the following classes: New Testament, History of Christianity, Holocaust, and The History of Islam. Additionally, students begin inquiring whether LCCC could possibly offer a degree in Religious Studies. In consultations with the Arts and Humanities department, the Social Sciences department developed a Religious Studies concentration associated with the History AA. Students now could major in history and take religion courses for their electives and fulfill the requirements for a history degree with a concentration in religion. These courses are cross-listed under religion and history. With the course map developed as part of the approved articulation with UW, students are able to complete an AA in History within 60 credit hours and successfully transfer.

The History faculty have also engaged in moving Topics courses that are commonly taught to fully articulated courses. Recently, American Revolution and Holocaust were both accepted at UW as articulated courses. The History and Philosophy of Islam was properly articulated and is now accepted as HIST/RELI 2320 History of Islam. With the conscientious alignment with the University of Wyoming, students can be assured that their coursework within the History program will be accepted for credit.

The History program is able to offer the variety and level of classes that it does due to the impactful contribution of a wonderful set of adjunct faculty. Adjuncts within the department currently teach History of Christianity, History of Islam, New Testament, History of the U.S. West, Topics: U.S. Civil War, and Mexican Civilization. Because of the depth of knowledge that adjuncts bring to the table, the History program can provide the community with insight into various historical topics.

The History faculty, both full-time and adjunct, have impacted both students and the community at large. Student transformations occur on a regular basis with classroom work and development over the course of the program. For example, a recent History student entered the History program after suffering from a workplace accident. This student had pursued a career as an auto mechanic, but due to an injury, was no longer able to engage in the work in a timely manner. Rather than accepting early retirement and disability, this student decided to pursue a degree in History with the goal of teaching at the secondary level. Initially, his skills were not up to par. He shared that when he originally went to college years before, he had gone on an athletic scholarship and had dropped out after not succeeding academically. However, with guidance over how to write papers effectively and mentoring regarding academic and career-based decisions, this student went on to graduate from LCCC and is scheduled to graduate from the University of Wyoming this upcoming year. An example of his student work is listed below to demonstrate the level of achievement he was able to attain at LCCC.

Along with having an impact on students' lives, the History faculty also makes a concerted effort to give back to the community. The History faculty regularly act as volunteer speakers for a variety of organizations, including Cowgirls of the West, Daughters of the American Revolution, the Wyoming State Museum, Leadership Wyoming, and more. History instructor Patty Kessler serves on the University of Wyoming Historic Preservation Board and is on the WYOHHistory.org Board. Due to the actions of the History adjunct Mike Kassel, the History program established an internship with the Wyoming Governors' Mansion and the Frontier Days Old West Museum. These organizations have offered students a wonderful avenue to experience public history and give back to the community. In addition, History instructor Mary Ludwig has applied for and received grants to bring cultural programs onto campus. This allowed Carl Wilkins to speak on his experiences as a survivor of the Rwanda genocide, and another grant allowed for Created Equal programs to be sponsored on campus, including a speaking engagement by Freedom Rider George Blevins.

C. Program Objectives

The History Department Faculty has identified the specific objectives of its curriculum. The following are the learning outcomes that we would like to see each History student graduate with. We are continuously and actively assessing our program to ensure that these learning outcomes are being met.

1. Students shall be able to demonstrate thinking skills by analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating historical information from multiple sources.
2. Students will develop the ability to distinguish between fact and fiction while understanding that there is no one historical truth.
3. Students will produce well researched written work that engages with both primary sources and the secondary literature.
4. Students will develop an informed familiarity with multiple cultures.
5. Students will employ a full range of techniques and methods used to gain historical knowledge.
6. Students will develop an ability to convey verbally their historical knowledge.
7. Students will demonstrate their understanding of cause and effect along with their knowledge of the general chronology of human experience.

D. Success of Past Review Action Goals

The 2008 History Program lists the following as action goals:

- Convert ARP 133 into a full multimedia classroom.
- Provide funding for an additional faculty member who could teach history and political science courses.
- Continue funding for training in technology for full-time and part-time faculty.
- Provide funding and opportunities for faculty training (full-time and part-time) to better meet the needs of students.

Currently, ARP 133 is a full multimedia classroom. The ACC campus also provides fully prepared, technologically advanced classrooms. With the addition of Patty Kessler as the History Instructor for ACC on a full time basis, LCCC has met goal two. The Center for Learning Technologies provides ample opportunities for adjuncts to receive technical training. History faculty have requested funding for continuing educational opportunities and professional development, such as attending the Organization of American Historians annual meeting and attending annual History articulation meetings sponsored by the University of Wyoming.

Currently, with Aquila recently being acquired, the History faculty now have a means to track annual program assessment data for ongoing review.

E. Abbreviated Data Summary: Key Performance Indicators

Program of Study:

History

A. Participation	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
A.1 Annual FTE (KPI A.1.a)	241.83	5	247.39	5	5
A.2 Number of "participants" enrolled (KPI A.1.b)	848	5	851.00	5	
A.3 Number of "concentrators" enrolled	7	4	9.67	4	
B. Success	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
B.1 Course success rate (KPI A.7)	61.26%	1	61.77%	1	2
B.2 Graduation rate for "concentrators" (KPI A.4)	30.00%	2	30.56%	2	
B.3 Number of Associates and workforce degrees/certificates awarded (KPI C.2.a, D.2.a)	8	3	5.33	3	
B.4 Number of "concentrators" matriculating to university (KPI C.3)	1	2	1.00	2	
B.5 University matriculation rate (KPI C.3)	33%	3	17%	3	
B.6 Number of in-field job placements (KPI D.3)					
B.7 In-field job placement rate (KPI D.3)					
B.8 Licensure/certification pass rate (KPI D.5)					
B.9 Achievement of program competencies (KPI A.5)					
B.10 Achievement of course competencies (KPI A.5)					
C. Learning Environment	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
C.1 Percent of sections taught by full-time faculty (KPI F.3.a)	32.00%	1	27.55%	1	3
C.2 FTE student to FTE faculty ratio (KPI F.2)	24.42	5	25.38	5	
C.3-7 CCSSE benchmark ratings (KPI I.2.a – KPI I.2.e)					
D. Efficiency	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
D.1 Average credits to completion (KPI F.1.a)	48.25	5	54.19	4	4
D.2 Average time to completion (KPI F.1.b)	4.45	3	3.84	5	
D.3 Average section fill rate (KPI F.4)	71.13%	2	72.80%	3	
D.4 Core expenditures per FTE (KPI G.1)	\$590.15	5	\$564.15	5	

F. Program Achievements over the Review Period

The History program has had several achievements since the last program review in 2008. The History program achieved its all-time high in graduates in the spring of 2014 by graduating eight students. LCCC also hired another full-

time historian for the ACC campus; this move has allowed for greater collaboration and academic success on both campuses. The History department received a National Endowment of the Humanities grant to present the series Created Equal for the Cheyenne community. This entailed a five-part program that brought as many as 87 people at one time to the campus to see the presentation of Freedom Rider George Blevins. The History department has also sponsored and supported other speaking engagements, including the photographer of the Afghan Women's Project Peggy Kesley who came in conjunction with humanitarian Greg Mortenson, Heart Mountain survivor Sam Mihara, Rwanda genocide witness Carl Wilkins, Holocaust survivor Estelle Nadel, activist and writer Winona LaDuke, and the African Maafa program which included a variety of speakers and cultural presentations. This community engagement is on track to continue, with visits by Vietnam veteran and veterans' advocate Frederick Downs scheduled to speak in spring 2015 along with another presentation by Sam Mihara. The History faculty at ACC has also co-sponsored presentations over the anniversary of the Berlin Wall, traveling exhibit The Literature of Prescription, and photographer Sarah Wiles' photo-documentary study over the Northern Arapaho. In addition, internships have been established with the Wyoming Governors' Mansion and Frontier Days Old West Museum.

G. Discovery Listing of Program Strengths, Concerns, Opportunities, and Recommendations

Strengths

- History course enrollment is strong and cost is minimal for quality educational experience for students.
- The full-time and part-time faculty are highly qualified with a broad range of backgrounds and experience.
- LCCC offers an expansive variety of history classes and allows students to focus on a religious studies option.
- History courses strive to improve critical-thinking skills in students, an area that is essential in a student's college career.
- History courses fulfill the Human Culture - Cultural Awareness need that makes up part of the LCCC General Education core.
- Three History courses fulfill the Wyoming Legislative mandate that covers the Wyoming Constitution requirement.
- History courses are offered in a variety of formats, day, evening and online in order to meet the needs of students.
- The History faculty collaborate and work well together.
- The History faculty provide cultural and social events that are open to the entire community.
- The History faculty have established outreach to secondary schools and have collaborated with them to put on cultural and social events.
- Faculty involvement in campus improvement (Learning Commons, Advising Model, etc.)
- Faculty involvement in students' lives (intrusive advising, volunteer participation within the Writing and Communications Center)
- The multitude of courses that fit into the Wyoming State Statute requirement, Human Culture - Cultural Awareness requirement and the Global and Diversity courses that articulate to the University of Wyoming and are still required there.

Concerns:

- The current Chair system that has recently been implemented has taken History faculty out of the line of communication for making decisions within the department, for example, when classes are added or cancelled with no opportunity for consultation over this.
- The expectations and system for approving MCORs and General Education Applications are time consuming and often take up time that History faculty would otherwise be using to work with students and for class preparation.
- There is a lack of collaboration between the Advising Center and the programs, and this creates the possibility that the goals and nature of the History program are not being properly communicated to students, and students are not being encouraged to meet with individual faculty.
- A significant concern for the future of History and Religious Studies courses is the reduction of Social Science and Humanities courses required as part of the General Education requirements. The History faculty feel that this could

have a negative impact on courses that no longer fit into the needs of the student and that this will detract from providing a solid foundation for a liberal arts education.

Challenges and Opportunities:

- Based on the statistical data, not enough students are succeeding in History courses. However, this data reflects only whether a student passed or not; it does not reflect if the student completed the coursework and did the necessary work to succeed in class. The History faculty would like to suggest that when grades are due, the ability to identify students who did not complete the class is provided as an option. This would provide a much more accurate finding on the success of each class. As of now, student success rates only reflect the simplest data result and not the effort and responsibility of the student.
- The History program is also challenged by the low number of History majors. Programs are often evaluated based on the number of majors they graduate. In History, the job market does not support a high amount of majors that stay solely within the field of History. However, a History major provides students with the ability to move into other fields, including Museum Studies (the History Department currently has three different institutions that provide internships for our students), Law, Public Administration, Education, and Public History. With proper advising, students will understand that these opportunities exist.
- The History department is also challenged by the lack of technical training for adjuncts when it comes to new and revised expectations for common course assessment and data collection. The Chair system does not encourage a formal means for History faculty and the adjuncts within the department to work together. Rather, the Chair is formally responsible for providing the adjuncts with training and collaboration. The problem with this in Social Sciences is that whoever is Chair ends up being responsible for adjuncts in academic areas outside of their expertise. The History faculty believe that those within the academic department should be the ones who work closely with their adjuncts.

H. Summary of Review Action Plan Goals

1. The History Program's 5-year action goal is to provide ongoing cultural community programming and learning opportunities in cooperation with other institutions and institutional programs that provides cultural opportunities on campus and engages both students and community members. This goal will enable LCCC and ACC to engage in public outreach and encourage both students and community members to interact in the larger community with the goal of involving students and community members in campus activities and expanding civic awareness.

I. Program Review Rubric: A Numerical Summary of Reviewer Evaluation

In accordance with program review procedure 10.2P, reviewers score self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric, which defines scoring using a five-point scale (1-5). Any section scoring below three is designated as undeveloped. The Academic Standards Committee may require programs to provide a follow-up report on undeveloped sections.

Displayed below is the program review rubric for History. It includes two sets of scoring by the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee. Reviewers evaluated the self-study content in February and March 2015, and their aggregated scoring appears in the Total column. In March, the program responded to this scoring by writing program responses to reviewer feedback comments in sections scoring below 3 (undeveloped) on the five-point scale. The Program Review Subcommittee evaluated the self-study a second time in fall 2015 to re-score sections below a score of 3 based on the program responses. Often programs provided content and uploaded documents that persuaded the reviewers to adjust rubric scores upward. Reviewers had the liberty to score independently of their individual previous scores, so self-study scores could rise or fall. Reviewers did not score sections with scores at three or above, and these sections are blacked out in the A.S. Adjusted column.

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

- 1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (**undeveloped processes**).
- 2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (**undeveloped processes**).
- 3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).
- 4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.
- 5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in yellow-shaded cells make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Sections are defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring (AQIP Maturity Scale) is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

After the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee completes its scoring of programs' self-studies, and programs have completed their responses to Subcommittee feedback comments, The Subcommittee reviews the program written responses that relate to sections scoring below three and enters readjusted scores that can result in higher or lower scores.

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

Program Name: History

I. Program Summary (The review process does not include this self-study section in the scoring rubric)

II. Knowledge Distribution

Total

A.S.
Adjusted

A. Design

1. Process to design the curriculum

3.00

a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)

3.80

b. Participation in the institution's curriculum management process (MCORS)	4.20	
c. Developmental education: Effectiveness of student placement and success in college-level courses	3.80	
d. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	4.00	
e. Program-specific education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	4.40	
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment	3.80	
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	2.60	
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	4.00	
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	3.80	
6. KPI indicators: Learning Environment and Student Success sections of program percentiles averaged	3.60	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.75	
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	3.80	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	3.00	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.20	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.33	
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.40	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.40	
III. Organizational Effectiveness		A.S. Adjusted
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors		
B. Design of the organization		
1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures	3.00	
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	2.83	
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	4.00	
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	3.33	
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	5.00	
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	4.00	
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	4.00	
7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	3.33	

a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	4.00	
8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	3.50	
9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	3.67	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.70	
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	3.33	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.83	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.67	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.28	
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.67	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.67	
IV. Program Planning	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design of program planning		
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)	3.50	2.75
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning	3.33	2.75
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress	1.00	2.80
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning	0.83	2.60
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities	0.83	2.50
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years	3.00	2.75
SECTION AVERAGE	2.08	2.69
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	3.33	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.17	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings	3.83	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.11	
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.83	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.83	

V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success		Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)		3.75	
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)		4.25	
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages		4.00	
SECTION AVERAGE		4.00	
SELF STUDY AVERAGE =		3.40	3.41

Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale for Continuous Improvement					Total	A.S. Adjusted
Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point		
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and operational goals.	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.	3.00	

School	Business, Agriculture and Technical Studies
Program Area	HVAC-R
Major Programs	A.A.S. HVAC (60 credits), Credit Diploma HVAC Basic Technician (18 credits), Credit Diploma, HVAC/R Advanced Technician (17 credits)
Review Period	Fall 2009 to Fall 2014
Self-Study Developed	AY 2014-2015
Review Status	Academic Standards Determination of Approval Status
Program Leaders	Dave Curry and Rob McNabb
Committee Chair	Kim Bender
Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee Reviewers	Michele Albert: Faculty – Math and Sciences Meghan Kelly: Librarian Kari Brown-Herbst, Jonathan Carrier: Chair of SLA Committee Julie Gerstner: Student Services Representative Herry Andrews: Administration and Finance Representative

A. Mission, Vision, Values

Mission

The HVAC/R Program is focused on working with industry partners within the community to provide students with a flexible, inspired curriculum that can change with technology, motivating program participants to be competitive in the HVAC/R job market. The program's mission and vision statement is aligned with the workforce development portion of LCCC's mission statement.

Values

The HVAC/R program utilizes Air Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute (AHRI) and industry standards to ensure quality graduates who are prepared for and motivated to begin a career in the HVAC/R industry.

Safety according to OSHA standards

Respect for the training needs of the industry, especially local businesses. We have an advisory committee that meets twice a year. Minutes from the HVAC/R Advisory Committee meetings can be obtained by requesting them from the school of BATS Administrative Assistant.

Faculty professional development: Faculty are encouraged to seize every professional development opportunity in order ensure the program keeps pace with changing industry technologies and standards

B. Brief Program Summary

Since its inception, The HVAC/R program has undergone a complete transformation. Beginning as an associate of applied science degree program requiring 72 credit hours to complete, now is comprised of two pathways. Students begin with the Basic HVAC/R Technician Certificate program which is a sixteen week credit diploma focused on allowing participants to enter the workforce as soon as possible. This pathway is a direct result from feedback provided by local industry during HVAC/R Advisory Committee meetings. Once they enter the workforce, students can continue their education by pursuing the Advanced HVAC/R Technician Certificate program, a sixteen week credit diploma that provides students in advanced HVAC/R skills in industrial and light commercial applications. Technicians that have completed both programs are considered compliant with Department of Labor classroom requirements for advancement to the Journeyman technician skill level. Technicians who have completed both programs are eligible to pursue an AAS in HVAC/R that incorporates general education as well as business management curricula. The intent is to prepare students for advancement toward the master HVAC/R skill level.

C. Program Objectives

- To ensure that all students are certified under section 608 of the Clean Air Act.
- Encourage student participation in the AHRI/NATE industry competencies exams.
- Provide students with the skills that satisfy the classroom training requirement specified by the Department of Labor for advancement toward the Journeyman HVAC/R technician trade skill level.

D. Success of Past Review Action Goals

This is the program's first program review.

E. Abbreviated Data Summary: Key Performance Indicators

Program of Study

HVAC-R

	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
A. Participation					
A.1 Annual FTE (KPI A.1.a)	11.58	1	15.64	1	1
A.2 Number of "participants" enrolled (KPI A.1.b)	15	1	16.67	1	
A.3 Number of "concentrators" enrolled	1	2	2.67	2	
B. Success					
B.1 Course success rate (KPI A.7)	77.78%	3	77.19%	3	2
B.2 Graduation rate for "concentrators" (KPI A.4)	16.67%	1	5.56%	1	
B.3 Number of Associates and workforce degrees/certificates awarded (KPI C.2.a, D.2.a)	7	3	3.67	2	
B.4 Number of "concentrators" matriculating to university (KPI C.3)					
B.5 University matriculation rate (KPI C.3)					
B.6 Number of in-field job placements (KPI D.3)					
B.7 In-field job placement rate (KPI D.3)					
B.8 Licensure/certification pass rate (KPI D.5)					
B.9 Achievement of program competencies (KPI A.5)					
B.10 Achievement of course competencies (KPI A.5)					
C. Learning Environment					
C.1 Percent of sections taught by full-time faculty (KPI F.3.a)	100.00%	5	100.00%	5	3
C.2 FTE student to FTE faculty ratio (KPI F.2)	7.82	1	7.95	1	
C.3-7 CCSSE benchmark ratings (KPI I.2.a – KPI I.2.e)					
D. Efficiency					
D.1 Average credits to completion (KPI F.1.a)	44.86	5			2
D.2 Average time to completion (KPI F.1.b)	4.88	3			
D.3 Average section fill rate (KPI F.4)	23.75%	1	33.89%	1	
D.4 Core expenditures per FTE (KPI G.1)	\$8,069.49	1	\$5,719.51	1	

F. Program Achievements over the Review Period

The HVAC/R program is still relatively new having just the third group of completing students in the fall of 2014. New recruiting strategies have resulted in the largest class to date that will complete the basic technician certificate at the close of the spring 2015 semester. After listening to our industry partners and developing a program that met their needs, we will continue to pursue an aggressive dialogue with industry as well as follow changes in standards and technologies to provide a technical education program that will continue to provide students with the tools that they need to remain competitive.

G. Discovery Listing of Program Strengths, Concerns, Opportunities, and Recommendations

This particular program practice cannot be evaluated until the data has been gathered, and reports have been generated. The HVAC/R program will have input for this particular item by the end of the fall 2016 semester.

H. Summary of Review Action Plan Goals

1. The goal of the HVAC/R Program is to establish an evaluation process that informs a development of the curriculum so that it can change with community requirements and new technologies. This will ensure students receive relevant skills to remain competitive in the workforce.
2. The completion of the Flex-tech Building will result in unused instructional space in CTEC. The goal is to re-purpose this space to support the HVAC/R and BAS programs. This will include additional classrooms, a data center simulator, and variable air volume system simulator.

I. Program Review Rubric: A Numerical Summary of Reviewer Evaluation

In accordance with program review procedure 10.2P, reviewers score self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric, which defines scoring using a five-point scale (1-5). Any section scoring below three is designated as undeveloped. The Academic Standards Committee may require programs to provide a follow-up report on undeveloped sections.

Displayed below is the program review rubric for HVAC-R. It includes two sets of scoring by the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee. Reviewers evaluated the self-study content in September 2015, and their aggregated scoring appears in the Total column. In October, the program was given an opportunity to respond to this scoring by writing program responses to reviewer feedback comments in sections scoring below 3 (undeveloped) on the five-point scale. The Program Review Subcommittee did not review the HVAC-R self-study a second time as the program did not provide responses to the review feedback comments by the required deadline; no new scores appear in the A.S. Adjusted column.

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

- 1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (**undeveloped processes**).
- 2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (**undeveloped processes**).
- 3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).
- 4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.
- 5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in yellow-shaded cells make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Sections are defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring (AQIP Maturity Scale) is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

After the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee completes its scoring of programs' self-studies, and programs have completed their responses to Subcommittee feedback comments, The Subcommittee reviews the program written responses that relate to sections scoring below three and enters readjusted scores that can result in higher or lower scores

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

Program Name: HVAC-R

I. Program Summary (The review process does not include this self-study section in the scoring rubric)

II. Knowledge Distribution		Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design			
1. Process to design the curriculum		3.00	

a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)	3.33	
b. Participation in the institution's curriculum management process (MCORS)	2.67	
c. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.00	
d. Program-specific education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.00	
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment	3.67	
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	3.33	
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	3.00	
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	2.67	
6. KPI indicators: Learning Environment and Student Success sections of program percentiles averaged	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.07	
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	2.67	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	3.00	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	2.33	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.67	2.67
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.00	
III. Organizational Effectiveness		A.S. Adjusted
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors		
B. Design of the organization		
1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures	2.67	
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	2.33	
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	3.00	
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	3.00	
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	3.33	
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	3.33	
7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	3.00	

a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	
8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	2.00	
9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	2.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.79	2.79
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	3.33	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.00	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	2.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.39	2.39
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.33	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.33	2.33
IV. Program Planning	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design of program planning		
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)	2.50	
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning	3.00	
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress	2.50	
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning	3.00	
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities	3.50	
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years	2.50	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.83	2.83
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	3.50	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.00	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings	2.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.50	2.50
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.50	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.50	2.50

V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success		Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)		3.00	
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)		2.50	
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages		2.50	
SECTION AVERAGE		2.67	2.67
SELF STUDY AVERAGE =		2.52	2.52

Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale for Continuous Improvement

Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point	Total	A.S. Adjusted
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and operational goals.	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.	2.00	

School	Arts and Humanities
Program Area	Music
Major Programs	A.A. Music (61-64 credits)
Review Period	Fall 2009 to Fall 2014
Self-Study Developed	AY 2014-2015
Review Status	Academic Standards Determination of Approval Status
Program Leaders	Judy Ransom
Committee Chair	Kim Bender
Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee Reviewers	Robin Duncan: Faculty – Health Sciences and Wellness Michele Albert: Faculty – Math and Sciences Karen Lange: Dean - Library Kari Brown-Herbst, Melissa McAllister: Chair of SLA Committee Julie Gerstner: Student Services Representative Herry Andrews: Administration and Finance Representative Meghan Kelly: Faculty – Librarian James Burghard: Faculty – Homeland Security Sarah Hughes, Celeste Hooper: Faculty – Physical Therapist Assistant

A. Mission, Vision, Values

Mission:

The Music Department is a component of the School of Arts and Humanities. The mission of the Music Program is to transform the lives of music students in two ways: 1) facilitate and develop individual musicianship and skill on a primary instrument through inspired performance, and 2) prepare them for successful transfer to a four-year institution.

Vision:

The Music Program seeks to prepare students to transfer, complete their degree and begin successful careers in music. In addition, the program facilitates collaboration between students and community members to produce high quality performances for the College and the greater Cheyenne community.

Program Values:

The Music Program values drive its activity and planning. They are listed as follows:

- The placement of primary emphasis on development of student musicianship and music preparation for further education or a professional career.
- Production of high quality Associate of Arts degrees that are accepted at four-year baccalaureate programs and generate high rates of successful transfer for music students.
- Community service and enrichment through inspired performances.
- Program goals: The Music Program supports its values through the achievement of its goals:
- To provide opportunities for musical growth through listening, studying, composition and performance.
- To encourage the development of effective work habits in the study of music, including time management and practice techniques that produce desired results.
- To encourage music students to understand the importance of music in society through personal involvement, such as outreach activities, concerts, and participation in community events.
- To encourage music students to seek and appreciate excellence in all musical experiences and activities.
- To encourage the aspiration for personal achievement, economic self-sufficiency, and public usefulness.

B. Brief Program Summary

The LCCC music program faculty consists of two full-time faculty, one in vocal music and the other instrumental music. Currently two additional adjunct faculty teach Aural Skills and direct the Jazz Ensemble. Applied faculty include the

following: Voice/Piano (2), Clarinet, Saxophone, Low Brass, French Horn, Guitar, and Percussion. Additional applied faculty are employed as needed to teach Flute, Bassoon, and Strings.

A summary of facilities includes: Two (2) faculty offices, one (1) adjunct office, one (1) large classroom/ensemble rehearsal space equipped with smart board and sound system, one (1) Piano Lab with 12 keyboards, six (6) practice rooms, four (4) of which double as applied teaching spaces. The Music Library and music storage space is housed in an electrical room next to the piano lab.

Current student enrollment includes 15 music majors and 10-12 non majors who participate in ensembles and take applied lessons. MUSC 1000 Introduction to Music typically populates with 10-15 non-majors in addition to music majors, who take the course to fulfill a gen-ed requirement. Performing ensembles typically average 20-25 members (vocal) and around 40 (instrumental), but due to recent changes in the program the average this semester is slightly lower: the new Mixed Ensemble: eight (8), Collegiate Chorale: 16, Jazz Ensemble: 10, and Cantorei: 12. Community members continue to support the ensembles with their participation but they usually do not enroll for course credit. It is anticipated that these recent enrollment numbers will increase in the future.

The LCCC music program is characterized by its ensembles and academic courses, all of which lead to the AA degree in music. The following narrative describes the performing ensembles from 2006 to the present.

Jazz Band

The LCCC Jazz band is an auditioned ensemble whose repertoire includes “big band” music and jazz standards. Improvisation is cultivated and encouraged. The ensemble regularly performs at the Cheyenne Civic Center and other invitational venues in the region and across the country.

Annual Jazz Band performances at the Cheyenne Civic Center include:

1. "Fallin' for Jazz" concerts with guest jazz ensembles have included those from Cheyenne high schools. In 2013 the jazz ensemble from the Lyons, CO was invited to perform in response to the flood damage to their school in September.
2. Holiday GALA concerts with other department ensembles hosted by the President and given to the college and community.
3. Spring jazz concerts, also with guest ensembles and musicians

Collegiate Chorale

The Collegiate Chorale is a non-auditioned large ensemble that performs a variety of challenging repertoire twice each semester. Instrumental majors are encouraged to sing in Collegiate Chorale as it improves their overall musicianship and provides opportunities to perform choral repertoire. Performing venues include the larger churches in Cheyenne. The chorale also performs at the annual Holiday GALA at the Civic Center and at Commencement.

Vocal Ensemble Cantorei

Cantorei is an auditioned chamber ensemble dedicated to learning challenging mostly a cappella works. The ensemble is regularly invited to perform on campus and in the community. It is considered the ambassador performing ensemble for the college. Members are required to also be enrolled in Collegiate Chorale, forming a core group of singers whose skills elevate the performance quality. Cantorei is featured in music department concerts with its own repertoire.

Wind Symphony/Mixed Ensemble

LCCC Wind Symphony is the college large instrumental ensemble. It is non-auditioned and accepts non-majors in addition to music majors. Voice majors are encouraged to enroll as it improves musicianship and provides opportunities

to perform instrumental repertoire. The ensemble performs annually at the Cheyenne Civic Center and commencement ceremonies. From before 2006 until 2014 membership included students and community members. Beginning spring 2015 the ensemble is reorganized as the Mixed Ensemble, open only to student majors and non-majors. However, students are encouraged to participate in the Wind Symphony, now a community ensemble that meets one night a week.

The LCCC music program offers a wide variety of academic courses and a carefully structured two-year plan that leads to an AA degree in music. Sequenced courses include Theory I-IV, taken concurrently with the Aural Skills I-IV and Class Piano I-IV sequences. Students may not progress to the next level in any sequence until they have successfully completed the previous one. MCOR documents are being developed for these and other courses in the program and include course competencies that lead to program and institutional competencies.

Other courses in the program include the music history sequence, beginning spring of the freshman year with Introduction to Music, followed by the Historical Survey sequence I-II in the second year of study. The introductory course gives a broad overview of Western Music, while the two-semester Historical Survey provides more in-depth study.

Additional program electives include proposed STEM course Music Sound Technology, Introduction to Conducting, Introduction to Music Education, and Applied Study. Music majors must take applied lessons on their primary instrument and perform in an ensemble each semester of their enrollment in the program.

Finally, the music program also offers a wide variety of electives available to students with broad interests. They include chamber ensembles, jazz improvisation and additional applied study on a secondary instrument. It has been found that students discover they are proficient on several instruments and are encouraged to develop those skills to better prepare them for a career in music education.

C. Program Objectives

Music Program learning competencies are compatible with those developed by the National Association of Schools of Music and include three components: Basic Musicianship, Performance, and Basic Analysis. The following is excerpted from the NASM 2013-2014 handbook for two-year degree granting institutions (<http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/>)

Basic Musicianship competencies are developed in the following activities that are part of courses in the degree program.

1. *The acquisition and development of skills and basic understanding* of musical properties such as rhythm, melody, harmony, timbre, texture, and form. Students have opportunities to develop a comprehensive grasp of the interrelationships of these elements as they form a basis for listening, composing, and performing by responding to, interpreting, creating, analyzing, and evaluating music.
2. *Access to and development of a repertory for study* that includes various cultures and historical periods in courses such as sight-singing, ear-training, harmony, keyboard harmony, composition, or music literature, or in studies combining concepts and skills in varying degrees of integration.

Performance competencies include the following performance based activities, such as ensemble and applied study.

1. *Opportunities to study performance privately or in classes* throughout the two-year period. The studies are intended to develop the highest level of performance on the major instrument and also to develop keyboard competencies.
2. Essential experiences and goals include the following:

- The development of technical skills adequate to meet the needs of artistic self-expression
- Performance of a cross-section of music from the various styles represented in the complete repertory of the particular performance medium
- The ability to read at sight
- Growth in artistry, technical skills, collaborative competence, and knowledge of repertory through regular ensemble experiences.

3. *Students participate in at least one chamber or large ensemble each semester throughout the two-year period.*

Basic Analysis competencies are developed in courses like theory and music history. The theory sequence allows students to analyze the formal properties of music, while the study of music history places works in historical context and the greater historical perspective.

- Opportunities to develop *basic analytical knowledge* and skills including *an understanding of music in both its cultural and historical contexts*.
- Participation in a multidisciplinary setting or in courses with a music emphasis.
- Ability to place compositions into historical and stylistic perspective.

D. Success of Past Review Action Goals

At the time of the last program review (2006, below) the following goals were articulated for the music program to meet client and stakeholder needs

Goal One: Prepare music students for successful transfer and completion of a four-year degree. Outcome: A-attained.

Description: Course additions to the program have been successful. Students who complete their degree are at the top of their class and beginning successful careers in music education:

1. Music History Sequence is offered every year
2. Elective courses Jazz Improvisation, Conducting and additional small ensembles and applied study are now available
3. Significant progress in formal articulation with regional institutions
4. Program modifications to reduce total required credits for graduation
5. Built-in program flexibility to better facilitate transfer

Goal Two: Produce department concerts that would attract, engage and enrich the community. Outcome: A-attained.

Description: Outreach efforts have raised awareness of the music program and gained popularity with community stakeholders

1. Themed concerts such as "Fallin' for Jazz", "Music that goes bump in the night", "The British are coming!"
2. Performances of major works as a result of community collaboration
3. Premier of commissioned works and guest artists with ensembles
4. Invitation to participate in jazz festivals
5. Revival of the Madrigal Dinner

Goal Three: Build an adequate facility to accommodate program growth. Outcome: B-partially attained/D-not attained.

Description: Plans were made for a fine arts building and a timeline established for completion around 2010. Instead, the following renovations were made in the existing music area, and new plans are discussed for a facility to be completed in 2020:

1. Piano labs are now equipped with computers and FINALE music software.
2. Renovation of FA 118 as a combined rehearsal and classroom
3. The installation of smart board technology (in FA 118)

Remaining need (not inclusive):

- Acoustically sound practice and rehearsal areas
- Adequate storage space
- Adequate office/studio space
- Dedicated rehearsal space for the various ensembles
- Dedicated performance space

Goal Four: Develop a cohort of music majors to maintain program quality and attract new talent each year (minimum 10-15 new music majors each year in a program of 35+ music majors). Outcome: D-not attained.

Description: From 2006-2013 the recruiting strategy involved multiple school visits, music faculty participation in festival judging and honor performances and other activities, connecting with students and their directors and access to generous music scholarships. In fall 2013 the music department initiated the process for NASM accreditation. With the decline in enrollment that has been postponed. The following shows recent trends in new major recruiting, total program enrollment and graduation rates (see below).

Year	New scholarship majors	# Total in the program	Graduated/transferred scholarship majors
2011	18	38	2012 2
2012	13	32	2013 4
2013	7	28	2014 6
2014	1	15	2015 11 (anticipated)

E. Abbreviated Data Summary: Key Performance Indicators

Program of Study

Music

A. Participation	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
A.1 Annual FTE (KPI A.1.a)	102.25	4	111.86111	4	4
A.2 Number of "participants" enrolled (KPI A.1.b)	226	3	258.33333	3	
A.3 Number of "concentrators" enrolled	12	5	17.333333	5	
B. Success	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
B.1 Course success rate (KPI A.7)	0.8331	4	0.8031354	3	3
B.2 Graduation rate for "concentrators" (KPI A.4)	0.142857143	1	0.2981064	2	
B.3 Number of Associates and workforce degrees/certificates awarded (KPI C.2.a, D.2.a)	6	3	5.3333333	3	
B.4 Number of "concentrators" matriculating to university (KPI C.3)	2	3	4.3333333	5	
B.5 University matriculation rate (KPI C.3)	67%	4	42%	4	
B.6 Number of in-field job placements (KPI D.3)					
B.7 In-field job placement rate (KPI D.3)					
B.8 Licensure/certification pass rate (KPI D.5)					
B.9 Achievement of program competencies (KPI A.5)					
B.10 Achievement of course competencies (KPI A.5)					
C. Learning Environment	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
C.1 Percent of sections taught by full-time faculty (KPI F.3.a)	0.772727273	4	0.7654691	4	3
C.2 FTE student to FTE faculty ratio (KPI F.2)	11.84075342	2	11.901267	2	
C.3-7 CCSSE benchmark ratings (KPI I.2.a – KPI I.2.e)					
D. Efficiency	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
D.1 Average credits to completion (KPI F.1.b)	68.66666667	1	62.761905	2	2
D.2 Average time to completion (KPI F.1.a)	4.140543007	4	5.564182	2	
D.3 Average section fill rate (KPI F.4)	0.377457759	1	0.3342453	1	
D.4 Core expenditures per FTE (KPI G.1)	\$3,185.05	1	\$2,878.57	2	

F. Program Achievements over the Review Period

The LCCC Performing Ensembles are the face of the College in the community. They perform at all major venues in Cheyenne, including the Civic Center, St. Mark's Episcopal Church, St. Mary's Cathedral, First Presbyterian Church, First Baptist Church, and St. Christopher's Episcopal Church. In addition, the auditioned ensembles have brought recognition to the college in venues across the continent. The following represents a brief summary of performing highlights since 2006:

Jazz Band

2006: The LCCC Jazz band started with one student member and a complement of community musicians.

2010: Invitational performance at the National Association of Jazz Educators in Winnipeg, Manitoba

2013, 2014: The band experienced growth to full student complement of music majors and non-majors (10-15), three non-students and one faculty member for a performance at the Reno Jazz Festival in April.

2010 - 2014: Annual invitational performances at the Greeley Jazz Festival in Colorado.

The Jazz Band has consistently received high ratings for ensemble, individual solo work, style, music selection, and overall musicianship. Until recently there was discussion of forming a second jazz ensemble due to its popularity.

Collegiate Chorale

2007: Premier Wyoming/Western U.S. performance of L'Homme Armee, by Karl Jenkins.

2007 – 2011, 2013: Annual Cheyenne Choral Festival, St. Mary's Cathedral collaborative performance with the Capital Chorale and Cheyenne high schools

2010: Premier Wyoming / Western U.S. performance of the Stabat Mater by Karl Jenkins.

- 2013: 1) Performances at St. Mary's Cathedral: Barber Agnus Dei, Faure Requiem
2) Collaboration with LCCC Brass Consort and guest organist Jim Kosnik at St. Mary's Cathedral in a performance of works including a commissioned choral work
- 2014: 1) Collaboration with Capital Chorale in a performance of Rutter Gloria
2) Choir tour to Norfolk Virginia in reciprocal concert at Kosnik's church to reprise commissioned work
3) Revival of the Madrigal Dinner at St. Mark's Parish Hall for the college and community

Cantorei

2008, 2010: Cantorei gave adjudicated performances in Virginia Beach, VA resulting in high ratings

2013, 2015: Invitation to perform opening ceremonies for the American Veterans Traveling Memorial at Lions Park, Cheyenne

April 2015: Combined performance of the Beethoven 9th Symphony with Cheyenne Chamber Singers, U-W choirs and the Cheyenne Symphony Orchestra

Wind Symphony

2007 – 2013: "Music that goes bump in the night" Halloween concert that included a carved pumpkin contest and spooky music. Highly successful in the community.

2006 – 2014: Winter / Spring popular "theme" programs designed to entertain the community and educate the ensemble. Recent themes included "The British are Coming!", "Traveler's Tales (based on the travels of Marco Polo), and an African-based program. Also highly successful with the community.

2008: Student composition premiered at "Bump" concert based on Edgar Lee Masters' Spoon River Anthology, with narration.

2011: Student composition premiered at "Bump" concert. This student composer is now enjoying his first year as a music educator in Wyoming.

2012: Invitation to perform at Walden HS in Walden, CO.

G. Discovery Listing of Program Strengths, Concerns, Opportunities, and Recommendations

Knowledge Distribution

Strengths:

- *Dedicated faculty.* Full and part-time faculty are committed to student success in the program and demonstrate this commitment on a daily basis. Faculty members are often found in their offices late at night and on weekends, and make themselves available to students whenever possible.
- *Rich selection of elective courses.* The LCCC music program offers a wide variety of electives that further prepare music majors planning to become music educators: Introduction to Conducting, Jazz Improvisation, additional applied instruction, and multiple ensemble participation opportunities.
- *Talented students.* The current cohort of music majors is among the strongest and most talented, generating high quality public performances and producing quality work in their courses.
- *Successful alumnae.* Music majors who successfully transfer and complete their degree are well prepared to face the challenges of teaching in the public schools.
- *Music Budget support.* The current operating budget for music allows faculty to purchase instructional materials, maintain and repair instruments, hire student employees, and otherwise carry on the daily administration of the department.

Concerns:

- *Changes in scholarship allocations.* It is recognized that in the past, the stewardship of LCCC scholarship dollars does not reflect graduation rates, which are the benchmark of success at LCCC. This change has severely impaired music faculty and staff ability to recruit new majors to the program.
- *Changes in student cohort in the music program.* While it is admirable that the music department seeks to reach out to the college community to recruit student participants, these efforts are not attracting music majors who form the core of performing ensembles and fill program courses in the degree. Thus the cohort of program participants is shifting from mostly music majors to mostly non-majors.
- *Facility.* None of the dedicated spaces in the music area are acoustically sound-proof. This means rehearsals, music instruction, practicing, and other daily music activities are heard throughout the hall.

Challenges:

- *Cross-road in the program.* There will need to be a decision about the music program's viability in the future. It is not clear how current recruiting efforts will ensure enough enrollment of music majors to allow courses to be taught as they have in the past.
- *Community involvement.* The Cheyenne community is committed to its involvement in the future of the LCCC music program. Opportunities exist for members of the community to work with music faculty and administration to establish short- and long-term strategies for building the program in whatever form it takes.
- *3 Facility improvement.* Create adequate performing, teaching and rehearsal space for music majors at LCCC.

Opportunities:

- *Reach out to music participants and other non-majors.* One option is a redesigned music program that serves mostly non-major participants who seek to enrich their college experience by engaging in music activities. There is also the introduction of an interdisciplinary arts degree designed for students who are unsure of their major but want a broad experience in arts courses, such as music, theater, art, and the humanities.
- *Transparency.* The college seeks opportunities to promote strategies for improvement and document ongoing progress. This is done through public forums and regularly scheduled community reports. At all times the administration works in tandem with faculty, students, and community members to ensure transparency and future success.

- *Fine Arts Building*. Much depends on the outcome of discussions about the future of the music program. A building such as the one being considered will either house mostly performance space for music and theater, or it will be more comprehensive, housing classroom and office space for all the Humanities disciplines in addition to performance spaces for the Arts.

Program Organizational Effectiveness

Strengths:

- Concerts that are well received in the community
- High visibility in the community through invitational concerts and performances
- High level of student satisfaction as evidenced in enrollment in numerous electives
- Strong rapport between faculty and students
- 2006-2013 strong recruiting

Concerns:

- High turnover of music adjunct faculty resulting in FT faculty overload
- Departure of legacy faculty

Challenges:

- Continue the tradition of high quality concerts
- Continued re-organization of the music curriculum to meet needs of changing clientele

Opportunities:

- Participate in discussions and plans for new Fine Arts building
- Expand degree opportunities to include meta-major or Interdisciplinary degree in the Arts

H. Summary of Review Action Plan Goals

1. The current administration would like to see more participation in the performing ensembles by current LCCC students who are non-majors. In response, a new goal of increased music participation by 10-20% is identified, beginning spring 2015.
2. Recruit 5-10 new music majors for the fall of each academic year.

I. Program Review Rubric: A Numerical Summary of Reviewer Evaluation

In accordance with program review procedure 10.2P, reviewers score self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric, which defines scoring using a five-point scale (1-5). Any section scoring below three is designated as undeveloped. The Academic Standards Committee may require programs to provide a follow-up report on undeveloped sections.

Displayed below is the program review rubric for Music. It includes two sets of scoring by the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee. Reviewers evaluated the self-study content in February and March 2015, and their aggregated scoring appears in the Total column. In March, the program responded to this scoring by writing program responses to reviewer feedback comments in sections scoring below 3 (undeveloped) on the five-point scale. The Program Review Subcommittee evaluated the self-study a second time in fall 2015 to re-score sections below a score of 3 based on the program responses. Often programs provided content and uploaded documents that persuaded the reviewers to adjust rubric scores upward. Reviewers had the liberty to score independently of their individual previous scores, so self-study scores could rise or fall. Reviewers did not score sections with scores at three or above, and these sections are blacked out in the A.S. Adjusted column.

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

- 1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (undeveloped processes).
- 2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (undeveloped processes).
- 3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).
- 4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.
- 5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in yellow-shaded cells make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Sections are defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring (AQIP Maturity Scale) is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

After the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee completes its scoring of programs' self-studies, and programs have completed their responses to Subcommittee feedback comments, The Subcommittee reviews the program written responses that relate to sections scoring below three and enters readjusted scores that can result in higher or lower scores

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

Program Name: Music

I. Program Summary (The review process does not include this self-study section in the scoring rubric)

II. Knowledge Distribution

	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design		
1. Process to design the curriculum	3.50	
a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)	3.33	
b. Participation in the institution’s curriculum management process (MCORS)	3.50	

c. Developmental education: Effectiveness of student placement and success in college-level courses	3.33	
d. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.33	
e. Program-specific education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.33	
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment	3.67	
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	2.83	
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	3.17	
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	3.33	
6. KPI indicators: Learning Environment and Student Success sections of program percentiles averaged	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.30	
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	2.83	3.25
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.50	2.30
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.17	2.87
SECTION AVERAGE	2.83	2.81
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.00	
III. Organizational Effectiveness	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors		
B. Design of the organization		
1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures	3.14	
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	3.29	
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	3.29	
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	2.71	
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	4.00	
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	3.29	
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	3.00	
7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	2.29	
a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	

8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	3.29	
9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	3.71	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.18	
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.43	2.75
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.29	2.83
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.14	2.86
SECTION AVERAGE	2.62	2.81
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.57	2.83
SECTION AVERAGE	2.57	2.83
IV. Program Planning	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design of program planning		
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)	3.00	
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning	3.00	
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress	3.29	
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning	2.57	
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities	3.14	
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years	3.14	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.02	
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.86	2.83
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.43	2.58
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings	3.29	3.05
SECTION AVERAGE	2.86	2.82
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	3.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	3.00	

V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success		Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)		3.00	3.20
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)		2.60	2.80
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages		3.20	3.04
SECTION AVERAGE		2.93	3.01
SELF STUDY AVERAGE =		2.93	3.02

Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale for Continuous Improvement							
Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point		Total	A.S. Adjusted
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and operational goals.	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.			
						2.38	

School	Math and Sciences
Program Area	Paralegal
Major Programs	A.A.S. Paralegal (64 credits), Certificate of Completion Paralegal (30-32 credits)
Review Period	Fall 2009 to Fall 2014
Self-Study Developed	AY 2014-2015
Review Status	Academic Standards Determination of Approval Status
Program Leaders	Jodi Weppner
Committee Chair	Kim Bender
Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee Reviewers	DeeJaay Beals: Faculty -- BATS Melvin Hawkins: Dean – BATS Terry Harper: Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs Kari Brown-Herbst, Jonathan Carrier: Chair of SLA Committee Julie Gerstner: Student Services Representative Herry Andrews: Administration and Finance Representative

A. Mission, Vision, Values

Mission:

The mission of the Paralegal program is to develop individuals to enter or advance in productive, life-fulfilling occupations as Paralegals. The program inspires students to learn by providing practical applications in coursework. The program supports the workforce aspect of the LCCC Mission statement.

Values:

The program seeks to sustain viability in the legal community by maintaining approval through the American Bar Association.

The Paralegal programs' purpose is to prepare students' to graduate and possess the necessary skills and education to seek employment as a Paralegal. By design, the program gives the student a strong foundation that not only enables their success as a Paralegal student, but also provides the basis for a successful, life-sustaining career.

The study and application of legal research and writing to practical legal skills such as drafting legal documents enhance the student's ability to prepare for a career as a paralegal, as well as develops and enhances the students' written communication skills.

B. Brief Program Summary

The Paralegal program at LCCC first accepted students in the spring semester 1988, and received initial approval by the American Bar Association in February 1996. The Paralegal program is part of the Justice Studies Department at LCCC which oversees both the Paralegal program and the Criminal Justice program. The Paralegal program offers students the opportunity to complete an Associate of Applied Science degree. The program also offers students who have previously completed a Bachelor's degree the option to complete a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate. The Paralegal program resides in the School of Math and Science and in the overall disciplinary area of Social Science. The Associate of Applied Science degree requires students to complete general education, approved electives and paralegal specific courses. The Post-Baccalaureate certificate requires students to complete the paralegal specific courses only.

Paralegals are “[p]ersons who, although not members of the legal profession, are qualified through education, training or work experience, who are employed or retained by a lawyer, law office, governmental agency, or other entity in a capacity or function which involves the performance, under the ultimate direction and supervision of an attorney, of specifically delegated substantive legal work, which work, for the most part, requires a sufficient knowledge of legal concepts that, absent that legal assistant, the attorney would perform the task.” (Definition provided by the American

Bar Association.) Therefore, paralegals are not allowed to practice law or represent clients in court, however, paralegals can perform numerous substantive legal duties under the supervision of the licensed attorney. The paralegal program at LCCC is approved by the American Bar Association. The paralegal career is consistently listed as one of the top ten rising careers. The Paralegal program employs one full-time faculty/educational staff and a number of adjunct instructors chosen according to their expertise in particular areas of the law. Student enrollment in the Paralegal program has been trending upward for the past five years, refer to Exhibit 1.1 Enrollment in document sources below.

C. Program Objectives

- The student will demonstrate their capacity/ability to effectively draft a variety of legal documents.
- The student will demonstrate their capacity/ability to effectively conduct legal research and apply legal research to legal writing.
- The student will be prepared to be an effective Paralegal by demonstrating and utilizing research, document drafting and organizational skills required of the career.
- The student will demonstrate their ability to effectively interview clients and witnesses.
- The student will demonstrate an understanding of the evolving paralegal field and career opportunities within the Paralegal field.
- The student will demonstrate an understanding of the ethical rules governing the practice of law.
- The program will maintain ABA approval status.

D. Success of Past Review Action Goals

The Paralegal program last completed a program review as part of the comprehensive Justice Studies program review which was completed and the executive summary presented to the LCCC Board of Trustees in spring 2011. Some of the areas of opportunity/challenges noted were the continuing in advising load for the program coordinator and that the University of Wyoming does not have a corresponding program which makes the opportunity of articulation with the University of Wyoming difficult at best.

The introduction of the new holistic advising model has significantly decreased the advising load of the program director. The program director remains as a guide for students in the program on specific program issues and placement opportunities, the majority of advising is completed in the advising center. The program director has met with the advisors and has provided guidance on the proper advising sequence for the program.

The second area of opportunity/challenge is the lack of a corresponding program at the University of Wyoming. As the University of Wyoming is the only four year institution in the state, the opportunity of articulation with UW would be ideal, but the lack of a corresponding program makes that nearly impossible for the Paralegal program. The closest related program is at Chadron State College in Nebraska which offers a bachelor's degree in Legal Studies. The Paralegal program will be in contact with CSC during the 2015-16 academic year to determine if an articulation agreement can be reached.

In addition to the information provided above, the recommendations/action plan goals from the previous program review included:

1. maintain current funding in both adjunct and supply lines - to date funding has been maintained or increased as necessary
2. explore options for other bachelor completion programs with other four year colleges/universities for continued program growth - see above information concerning seeking an articulation agreement with CSC during the 2015-16 academic year

3. continue to survey graduates of paralegal program - as stated previously in another section, the current graduate/employer survey tool will be presented to the Paralegal advisory board for evaluation of effectiveness and efficiency, the survey tool is on hold until this evaluation is complete, and

4. explore the possibility of offering an introductory class in the program online - the program's ABA approval does not allow for online offering at this time.

E. Abbreviated Data Summary: Key Performance Indicators

Program of Study

Paralegal

A. Participation	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
A.1 Annual FTE (KPI A.1.a)	30.91667	1	31.1666678	1	2
A.2 Number of "participants" enrolled (KPI A.1.b)	42	1	39	1	
A.3 Number of "concentrators" enrolled	3	3	7.33333333	3	
B. Success	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
B.1 Course success rate (KPI A.7)	86%	4	86%	4	4
B.2 Graduation rate for "concentrators" (KPI A.4)	83%	5	78%	5	
B.3 Number of Associates and workforce degrees/certificates awarded (KPI C.2.a, D.2.a)	9	4	7.66666667	3	
B.4 Number of "concentrators" matriculating to university (KPI C.3)					
B.5 University matriculation rate (KPI C.3)					
B.6 Number of in-field job placements (KPI D.3)					
B.7 In-field job placement rate (KPI D.3)					
B.8 Licensure/certification pass rate (KPI D.5)					
B.9 Achievement of program competencies (KPI A.5)					
B.10 Achievement of course competencies (KPI A.5)					
C. Learning Environment	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
C.1 Percent of sections taught by full-time faculty (KPI F.3.a)	33%	1	22%	1	1
C.2 FTE student to FTE faculty ratio (KPI F.2)	9.328703704	1	9.08678286	1	
C.3-7 CCSSE benchmark ratings (KPI I.2.a – KPI I.2.e)					
D. Efficiency	current result	score	3 year average	score	Average Score
D.1 Average credits to completion (KPI F.1.b)	49.55555556	5	51.9685185	5	2
D.2 Average time to completion (KPI F.1.a)	3.703703704	1	6.439298299	1	
D.3 Average section fill rate (KPI F.4)	0.317222222	1	0.33388526	1	
D.4 Core expenditures per FTE (KPI G.1)	\$2,549.26	2	\$2,484.45	3	

F. Program Achievements over the Review Period

The Paralegal program has had several achievements since the last program review in 2010. The program consistently has very good success rates in courses. The program maintains roughly a 70% placement rate of students who wish to work in the paralegal career field. The program is in the final stages of re-approval with the American Bar Association. A revised re-approval report was sent to the ABA in May 2015 and the program will host a site team either in the fall of 2015 or the spring of 2016. The program expects to be reapproved following the site team visit and recommendation to the ABA. The Paralegal program (with the Criminal Justice program) is planning to co-host "You Be the Judge" with State Supreme Court and the State Law Library in the fall 2015 semester.

G. Discovery Listing of Program Strengths, Concerns, Opportunities, and Recommendations

Knowledge Distribution

Strengths:

The Paralegal program has used the data provided to address needs in the program. For example, KPI data on annual FTE and participants enrolled has led to the program choosing an organizational effectiveness outcome of increasing enrollment. Conversely, also using KPI data the program has chosen to recognize one of its strengths in graduation rates to choose an organizational effectiveness outcome of maintaining completion rates.

Stakeholder feedback is considered a strength with feedback from the ABA process, the advisory committee and student feedback.

The ability for students to complete the program on either the Cheyenne or the ACC campuses is also a strength.

The program is designed to cater to working students with all of the core paralegal program courses taught in the evening, this is also a strength of the program.

A comprehensive sequenced program that allows for graduation from A.A.S. within four semesters and graduation from the Certificate option within three semesters.

Diverse faculty all with legal or paralegal background and expertise in the specific legal topic in which they teach.

ABA approval of the program.

Opportunities:

Anticipated collaborations with Public Relations and Admissions to assist in the goal of increasing enrollment.

Concerns:

Lower KPI scores in annual FTE, number of "participants" enrolled, percent of sections taught by full-time faculty, FTE student to FTE faculty ratio, average time to completion, and average section fill rate.

Lack of a corresponding program at UW which makes articulation nearly impossible.

The Paralegal program is challenged by the lack of technical training for adjunct instructors in various required areas such as common course assessment and data collection.

Lack of consistent leadership.

Planning

Opportunities:

The Paralegal program scores lower in the KPI indicators of annual FTE, number of "participants" enrolled, percent of sections taught by full-time faculty, FTE student to FTE faculty ratio, average time to completion, and average section fill rates. Some of these challenges will be addressed by the programs designation of organizational effectiveness outcomes and the 5 year program goal.

The action plan goals set for the program are recognized as an opportunity to engage the advisory board in determining if any redesign to the program curriculum is necessary.

H. High-Impact Dialogues Among Peer Reviewers and Program Faculty

Participation in LCCC curriculum management process (MCORS)

Program Self-Study Narrative (Sept - Mid-Jan)

The Paralegal program has completed MCORS for LEGL 1500, Introduction to Paralegal Studies, LEGL 2550, Evidence and Investigation and LEGL 2650, Criminal Law and Procedure. An MCOR has also been completed for BADM 2010, Business Law I which can be used as an elective course in the Paralegal program core.

The Paralegal Program needs to complete MCORS for LEGL 1710, Legal Research and Writing I, LEGL 1720, Legal Research and Writing II, LEGL 2500, Civil Procedure and Litigation, LEGL 1800, Law Office Management, LEGL 2560 Probate Practices and Procedures, LEGL 2570, Torts, LEGL 2610 Family Law, LEGL 2630, Real Estate and Property Law, LEGL 2670, Constitutional Law, LEGL 2680, Administrative Law, LEGL 2830, Computer Applications in the Law and LEGL 2990, Paralegal Internship.

These MCORS will be completed during the 2015-2016 academic year.

The program will work with the advisory board over the next academic year to complete program competencies, and will work to develop relationships between the course level competencies and the program level competencies.

Internal Review Comments (Jan - Mid-March)

TH- Consider adding a clear reference to course mapping as it more than the aligning of competencies between courses and the program.

MH - reviewed 9/23/15

kbender/10-02: Related to the above TH comment, please describe the program's curriculum mapping activity or its plans to develop a curriculum map. Consider completing a portion of the attached Curriculum Map Template displayed below in Directory Sources as an example of how some courses relate to selected program-level learning competencies. Program level competencies are described in Part I-A-3. This might be a useful tool to use with the advisory committee as it helps identify more program competencies.

DC - Reviewed. No additional comments.

MH - Verified changes were made 11/14/15

MK 11/16/15 - reviewed

Program Response to Review Comments (Mid-March to April)

The Paralegal curriculum map has been completed and uploaded.

[Note: This program response, while brief, resulted in a best practice production of a program curriculum map, one of the first developed on campus and now available for sharing by others in the Best Practices Locator available on Eagles Eye and available in Appendix B.]

I. Summary of Review Action Plan Goals

1. The Paralegal program's 5 - year action goal is to increase completion rates in both the A.A.S. and post-baccalaureate Certificate option. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the employment of paralegals or legal assistants is projected to grow 17% from 2012 to 2022. This goal will enable LCCC to continue to provide well prepared and educated graduates to meet this projected need in the paralegal career
2. The Paralegal program's second 5 - year action goal is to explore redesigning the curriculum of the Paralegal program to better meet the needs of graduates and employers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the employment of paralegals or legal assistants is projected to grow 17% from 2012 to 2022. This goal will enable LCCC to continue to provide well prepared and educated graduates to meet this projected need in the paralegal career.

J. Program Review Rubric: A Numerical Summary of Reviewer Evaluation

In accordance with program review procedure 10.2P, reviewers score self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric, which defines scoring using a five-point scale (1-5). Any section scoring below three is designated as undeveloped. The Academic Standards Committee may require programs to provide a follow-up report on undeveloped sections.

Displayed below is the program review rubric for Paralegal. It includes two sets of scoring by the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee. Reviewers evaluated the self-study content in February and March 2015, and their aggregated scoring appears in the Total column. In March, the program responded to this scoring by writing program responses to reviewer feedback comments in sections scoring below 3 (undeveloped) on the five-point scale. The Program Review Subcommittee evaluated the self-study a second time in fall 2015 to re-score sections below a score of 3 based on the program responses. Often programs provided content and uploaded documents that persuaded the reviewers to adjust rubric scores upward. Reviewers had the liberty to score independently of their individual previous scores, so self-study scores could rise or fall. Reviewers did not score sections with scores at three or above, and these sections are blacked out in the A.S. Adjusted column.

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

- 1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (**undeveloped processes**).
- 2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (**undeveloped processes**).
- 3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).
- 4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.
- 5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in yellow-shaded cells make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Sections are defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring (AQIP Maturity Scale) is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

After the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee completes its scoring of programs' self-studies, and programs have completed their responses to Subcommittee feedback comments, The Subcommittee reviews the program written responses that relate to sections scoring below three and enters readjusted scores that can result in higher or lower scores.

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

Program Name: Paralegal

I. Program Summary (The review process does not include this self-study section in the scoring rubric)

II. Knowledge Distribution		Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design			
1. Process to design the curriculum		2.67	3.50
a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)		3.33	3.60
b. Participation in the institution’s curriculum management process (MCORS)		2.33	3.17

c. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.33	3.20
d. Program-specific education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.00	3.20
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment	3.00	2.60
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	3.00	3.40
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	2.67	3.17
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	2.33	3.33
6. KPI indicators: Learning Environment and Student Success sections of program percentiles averaged	2.33	3.40
SECTION AVERAGE	2.80	3.26
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	3.33	3.20
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.33	2.39
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	3.00	3.20
SECTION AVERAGE	2.89	2.93
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.33	2.83
SECTION AVERAGE	2.33	2.83
III. Organizational Effectiveness	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors		
B. Design of the organization		
1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures	3.00	3.40
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	2.75	3.17
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	3.50	3.80
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	2.75	3.50
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	2.00	2.00
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	2.25	2.80
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	3.00	3.40
7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	3.00	2.60
a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	2.00	2.00
8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	3.25	3.40

9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	2.75	3.00
SECTION AVERAGE	2.75	3.01
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.50	2.92
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.50	2.75
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	2.25	3.00
SECTION AVERAGE	2.42	2.89
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.50	3.17
SECTION AVERAGE	2.50	3.17
IV. Program Planning	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design of program planning		
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)	2.50	2.67
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning	2.25	3.17
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress	3.00	3.20
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning	3.00	3.60
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities	3.00	3.20
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years	3.25	3.80
SECTION AVERAGE	2.83	3.27
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.25	3.17
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	2.00	2.00
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings	2.50	2.83
SECTION AVERAGE	2.25	2.67
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.25	3.00
SECTION AVERAGE	2.25	3.00
V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success	Total	A.S. Adjusted

A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)	2.67	3.00
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)	2.67	3.00
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages	3.33	3.50
SECTION AVERAGE	2.89	3.17
SELF STUDY AVERAGE =	2.56	2.96

Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale for Continuous Improvement

Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point		
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.	Total	A.S. Adjusted
					2.00	

School	Business, Agriculture and Technical Studies
Program Area	Welding Technology
Major Programs	A.A.S. Welding (65 credits), Credit Diploma, Welding Technology – Combination Welding (23 credits), Credit Diploma, Welding Technology – Advanced Pipe Welding (18 credits)
Review Period	Fall 2009 to Fall 2014
Self-Study Developed	AY 2014-2015
Review Status	Academic Standards Determination of Approval Status
Program Leaders	Dave Curry and Sam Graham
Committee Chair	Kim Bender
Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee Reviewers	Starla Mason: Faculty – Health Sciences and Wellness DeeJaay Beals: Faculty - BATS Melvin Hawkins: Dean – BATS Karen Lange: Dean – Library Kari Brown-Herbst, Jonathan Carrier: Chair of SLA Committee Julie Gerstner: Student Services Representative Herry Andrews: Administration and Finance Representative

A. Mission, Vision, Values

Mission:

The LCCC Welding Program is dedicated to welding training and education excellence. The program educates and trains individuals in the use and application of welding skills and technologies as part of LCCC's workforce mission. Develops and disseminates welding training and educational materials, and conducts certification research and qualifications for the welding students, assuring continued growth and self-sufficiency. The Welding Program has been designed to provide a comprehensive coverage of current welding practices found in many industries.

Vision:

The long-range vision of the program is to be the premier welding training program statewide.

Values:

- Sustainable growth in student enrollment over time
- Achievement of a safe student learning environment
- Support AWS certification of students
- Successful transition of students into the work force with high employment rates.
- Meaningful relationship with the advisory committee that supports community engagement.

B. Brief Program Summary

Laramie County Community College has been training students for successful careers in the welding industry since the fall of 2013. Our dedicated staff has developed a largely hands on curriculum that incorporates real world training. Our programs are designed to match employers' needs and are taught by knowledgeable professionals with real world experience. When completed our program will consist of two diplomas, Basic Combination Welding and Advanced Pipe Welding. Upon completion we will offer a pathway for an AAS Degree in Industrial Technology. The program enrolled 15 students during the last semester. We anticipate enrollment to increase when we move into the Flex Tech building in the fall of 2016. At this time our current building has only 12 work stations. That will increase to 20 workstations in the Flex Tech building.

C. Program Objectives

- The goal is to prepare the students for certification.
- Prepare students to enter into the workforce with the skills needed to succeed.
- Move to Flex Tech.

- Utilize Perkins Funding effectively.

D. Success of Past Review Action Goals

This welding program is new and has no previous Action Plan Goals.

E. Abbreviated Data Summary

No summary is available from Institutional Research because the welding program has no historical data; it is a new program.

F. Program Achievements over the Review Period

Welding Technology is a relatively new program. The college adopted a program from other colleges throughout the state. As we move forward with the program, I have developed a program that meets industry standards and will allow the program to meet the student needs.

G. Discovery Listing of Program Strengths, Concerns, Opportunities, and Recommendations

The Welding program is a new program. At this time we have no KPI's. In the future more information will become available. It is my belief that many of these topics will be addressed within the next school year. As we move forward to the new FLEX Tech building will bring some major challenges to the program.

Strengths:

The strength in assessment of our student's ability to pass and apply AWS D1.1 Code welding activities was the faculty's ability to pin point problem areas in welding technique. With the ability to obtain data in certain areas, we discovered where we needed to concentrate our attention to detail in our welding technique instruction. This test requires a considerable amount of coupon preparation. In the future assessments, we need to allow more time in this area.

Challenges:

The number of students we accommodate will double.

Machines will need to be purchased to handle the student load.

Just the move from the existing building to the new could cause potential problems.

Another challenge would be the fluctuation in the economy. As the demand for pipe welders slows, the pipe welders will take the jobs of the entry level students coming out of the program. This makes it imperative that the training we offer allows the student to compete for those jobs.

Opportunities:

At this time our program has a waiting list to get into the program. We have never advertised the program. So as we move into the future, advertisement will become a priority.

In the fall of 2016 we will move into the Flex Tech building. There will be an additional 8 welding stations moving our program from 12 to 20. There will also be the possibility to move from 20 stations to 40 stations to meet future demands

Concerns:

Student retention, and recruitment of students. When the new courses are in place in the fall of 2015 we will begin to take the data from the program and will be better prepared to face our concerns.

H. Summary of Review Action Plan Goals

1. The goal of the Welding Technology is to implement a new program that will better prepare the students for employment with the industry of today, and to monitor and evaluate for continued improvement.
2. Program will develop the new space available to welding in the new Flex Tech building to match student and industry needs.

I. Program Review Rubric: A Numerical Summary of Reviewer Evaluation

In accordance with program review procedure 10.2P, reviewers score self-study sections using the Program Review Rubric, which defines scoring using a five-point scale (1-5). Any section scoring below three is designated as undeveloped. The Academic Standards Committee may require programs to provide a follow-up report on undeveloped sections.

Displayed below is the program review rubric for Welding. It includes two sets of scoring by the Academic Standards Program Review Subcommittee. Reviewers evaluated the self-study content in September 2015, and their aggregated scoring appears in the Total column. In October, the program was given an opportunity to respond to this scoring by writing program responses to reviewer feedback comments in sections scoring below 3 (undeveloped) on the five-point scale. The Program Review Subcommittee did not review the Welding self-study a second time as the program did not provide responses to the review feedback comments by the required deadline; no new scores appear in the A.S. Adjusted column.

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations

Scoring Guide for Part One

- 1 = Program does not meet program review template “Assumed Practices” description (undeveloped processes).
- 2 = Program performs in between levels one and three (undeveloped processes).
- 3 = Program meets the program review template “Assumed Practices” description and scores at the 20th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators (see Notes below).
- 4 = Program performs in between levels three and five.
- 5 = Program exceeds program review template “Assumed Practices” description (exceptional processes) and scores at the 60th percentile or above on the related KPI indicators.

Notes: The assumed practices and guidelines for each section component will appear in the online template. Hard copies of the template will be available. A KPI indicator in the below table represents the average of a section’s available percentile scores for a program. For example, the participation section percentile score in the below rubric represents the average of its three related percentile scores (annual FTE, number of

Program Review Rubric: Quality Performance Expectations*

*For Part One, aggregated PRS scores below level three in yellow-shaded cells make the respective section(s) eligible for follow-up reporting. Sections are defined as Design, Self-Evaluation, Improvements, and Capacity for Future Success. Part Two scoring (AQIP Maturity Scale) is for information purposes and informs institutional continuous improvement.

After the Academic Standards Subcommittee for Program Review completes its scoring of programs' self-studies, and programs have completed their responses to Subcommittee feedback comments, Academic Standards (A.S.) reviews the subcommittee scoring and the program written responses that relate to sections scoring below three and determines if some section scores will receive an adjustment upward.

Part One: Scoring of Individual Program Review Template Sections Using the Above the Scoring Guide

Program Name: Welding

I. Program Summary (The review process does not include this self-study section in the scoring rubric)

II. Knowledge Distribution		Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design			
1. Process to design the curriculum		3.00	
a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)		2.75	

b. Participation in the institution's curriculum management process (MCORS)	2.50	
c. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	3.00	
d. Program-specific education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies	2.50	
2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment	2.75	
3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & career	2.75	
4. Process to ensure academic integrity	2.75	
5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions	2.75	
6. KPI indicators: Learning Environment and Student Success sections of program percentiles averaged	2.25	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.70	2.70
B. Ongoing program self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement	2.50	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	1.75	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	2.75	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.33	2.33
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.50	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.50	2.50
III. Organizational Effectiveness	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors		
B. Design of the organization		
1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures	2.50	
2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff	2.38	
3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement	2.88	
4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure)	3.13	
a. KPI indicator: Participation section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	
5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: Diversity of relationships and ease of formation (include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)	2.38	
6. Process to sustain effective communication among faculty/staff and participation in institutional governance	2.38	
7. Process for monitoring finances and developing and sharing budget information	1.75	
a. KPI indicator: Efficiency section of program percentiles averaged	3.00	

8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, & technology for students and faculty/staff	2.38	
9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or concerns identified in the previous program review	2.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.52	2.52
C. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.50	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	1.25	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings	2.25	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.00	2.00
D. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	1.50	
SECTION AVERAGE	1.50	1.50
IV. Program Planning	Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Design of program planning		
1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)	2.25	
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning	2.25	
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress	1.75	
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning, both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning	1.50	
5. Description of program's engagement in this program self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities	2.50	
6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years	2.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.04	2.04
B. Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform process improvement and adapt to change		
1. Process to develop a comprehensive feedback system for the program: instruments and methods	2.25	
2. Program research findings: results and analysis	1.25	
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings	2.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	1.83	1.83
C. Improvements and/or changes implemented during the five-year review period. Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements	2.00	
SECTION AVERAGE	2.00	2.00

V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success		Total	A.S. Adjusted
A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next 5 years (diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)		2.33	
B. Program plans to manage change over the next cycle (e.g., capacity to self-evaluate for continuous improvement)		2.33	
C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages		2.33	
SECTION AVERAGE		2.33	2.33
SELF STUDY AVERAGE =		2.07	2.07

Part Two: Overall Program Rating Based on AQIP Maturity Scale

Integrated 5 points	Aligned 4 points	Systematic 3 points	Reacting 2 points	Candidate 1 point	Total	A.S. Adjusted
The Program's work is accomplished through stable, well designed processes. Processes are managed by responsible individuals or groups. Key processes are regularly monitored and improved in collaboration with other affected units. Efficiencies across units are sought and achieved through analysis, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and	The program groups operations into processes that are stable, consciously managed, and regularly evaluated for improvement. It strives to make sure that what it learns is shared among school units. Coordination among units and departments is a major emphasis. Its processes address the school or institution's key goals and strategies. People relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.	The program increasingly does its work by repeatable processes with clear, explicit goals. It designs "proactive" processes that prevent (rather than discover) problems. Processes that do not work effectively are evaluated and improved. It promotes closer coordination among school or institutional units	The program views work as isolated tasks and activities rather than processes. Operations primarily respond to immediate needs or problems and do not concentrate much on anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit, poorly defined, or disputed. There are lots of informal, varying procedures and processes. "Putting out fires" gets more attention than preventing them.	The program is either new or disrupted so that it has yet to attain the "Reacting Level" of AQIP's maturity scale.	2.00	

APPENDIX C
A Complete Listing of Action Plan Goals (21) by Program

Art

1. Increase enrollment for program specific and community member students.
2. Maintain and continuing articulation with regional accredited institutions. Continue participation in the WICHE Passport Program to expand articulation to other participating national institutions.
3. Continued consistent collection and analysis of institutional competency data
4. Continued participating in obtaining an updated facility for the fine and performing arts.

Automotive

1. The primary goal of the automotive program is to maintain ASE/NATEF Accreditation. This accreditation provides a national view of the educational needs of students within the field of automotive technology.
2. When the Diesel Technology Program leaves the building the Automotive Program will have the full building to themselves. In order to facilitate the needs of the stakeholders and students, the program plans to start a second set of classes in the other half of the shop.

Computer Science

1. Increase course completion rates
2. Majors will complete their degrees

Diagnostic Sonography

1. Increase student retention rate to 100%
2. Maintain a 100% pass rate on National Board Certification
3. Expand program offerings into a vascular certification online

History

1. The History Program's 5-year action goal is to provide ongoing cultural community programming and learning opportunities in cooperation with other institutions and institutional programs that provides cultural opportunities on campus and engages both students and community members. This goal will enable LCCC and ACC to engage in public outreach and encourage both students and community members to interact in the larger community with the goal of involving students and community members in campus activities and expanding civic awareness.

HVAC-

1. The goal of the HVAC/R Program is to establish an evaluation process that informs a development of the curriculum so that it can change with community requirements and new technologies. This will ensure students receive relevant skills to remain competitive in the workforce.
2. The completion of the Flex-tech Building will result in unused instructional space in CTEC. The goal is to re-purpose this space to support the HVAC/R and BAS programs. This will include additional classrooms, a data center simulator, and variable air volume system simulator.

Music

1. The current administration would like to see more participation in the performing ensembles by current LCCC students who are non-majors. In response, a new goal of increased music participation by 10-20% is identified, beginning spring 2015.
2. Recruit 5-10 new music majors for the fall of each academic year.

Paralegal

1. The Paralegal program's 5 - year action goal is to increase completion rates in both the A.A.S. and post-baccalaureate Certificate option. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the employment of paralegals or legal assistants is projected to grow 17% from 2012 to 2022. This goal will enable LCCC to continue to provide well prepared and educated graduates to meet this projected need in the paralegal career
2. The Paralegal program's second 5 - year action goal is to explore redesigning the curriculum of the Paralegal program to better meet the needs of graduates and employers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the employment of paralegals or legal assistants is projected to grow 17% from 2012 to 2022. This goal will enable LCCC to continue to provide well prepared and educated graduates to meet this projected need in the paralegal career.

Paramedics


1. The program will go through the accreditation process again in 2020. The goal is to successfully complete the process for the third time.

Welding

1. The goal of the Welding Technology is to implement a new program that will better prepare the students for employment with the industry of today, and to monitor and evaluate for continued improvement.
2. Program will develop the new space available to welding in the new Flex Tech building to match student and industry needs.

APPENDIX D
Best Practices Locator: Program Review 2014-2015

Best Practices Locator
Program Review 2014-2015

(When using links, Alt+ will return you to your previous location)

I. Program Summary

A. Overview

1. Mission and vision
[I.A.1 Mission and vision](#) HISTORY
2. Values of program/unit faculty
[I.A.2 Program values](#) MUSIC
3. Program objectives, including program level student learning competencies
[I.A.3 Program objectives, including learning competencies](#) ART
4. Engagement of LCCC strategic planning strategies
[I.A.4 Engagement of LCCC strategic planning strategies](#) HISTORY
5. Broad summary of program/unit work
[I.A.5 Broad summary of program work](#) HISTORY
[I.A.5. Broad summary of program work](#) ART
6. Significant program achievements over the review cycle
[I.A.6 Significant program achievements over the review cycle](#) DIAGNOSTIC
[I.A.6 Significant program achievements over the review cycle](#) SONOGRAPHY
[I.A.6 Significant program achievements over the review cycle](#) HISTORY
7. Developing Value in Programming
[I.A.7 Developing value in programming](#) HISTORY

B. Program Data Presentation: Program Profile Data and Program Review KPIs

II. Knowledge Distribution

A. Design

1. Process to design the curriculum
[II.A.1 Process to Design the Curriculum](#) PARALEGAL
[II.A.1 Process to Design the Curriculum](#) DIAGNOSTIC
[II.A.1 Process to Design the Curriculum](#) SONOGRAPHY
- a. Responding to student and stakeholder needs (internal and external)
(e.g., identified key student sub-groups and needs, advisory boards, professional associations and others)
[II.A.1.a Responding to student and stakeholder needs](#) DIAGNOSTIC
[II.A.1.a Responding to student and stakeholder needs](#) SONOGRAPHY
- b. Participation in curriculum management process
(include MCORS, course mapping, articulation of courses)
- c. Developmental Education: Effectiveness of Student Placement and Success in College-Level Courses

d. General education: Degree/Certificate coherency and relationship with institutional competencies

II.A.1.d General Education

**PARALEGAL
HISTORY**

II.A.1.d General Education

2. Process to design and manage the instructional strategies: pedagogy, delivery modes, use of technologies, learning environment (space, class size, others), experiential learning structure with internships, service learning or others, and rigor (include design of even rigor and competencies across modes)

II.A.2 Design and manage instructional strategies

MUSIC

3. Process to align with student services: student engagement, co-curricular activities, advising, tutoring, & Career

II.A.3 Process to align with Student Services

HVAC-R

4. Process to ensure academic integrity

II.A.4 Process to ensure academic integrity

HISTORY

5. Process to align curriculum with secondary education and receiving institutions (articulation/evenness of rigor)

6. Related KPI indicator(s): Learning environment and student success program percentiles

B. Results: Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform continuous process improvement and adapt to change

1. Process to develop and sustain a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement

2. Program research findings: results and analysis (illustrated with tables and graphs)

3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed and meaning of findings

II.B.3 Discovery: Strengths, Concerns, Challenges, and Opportunities

COMPUTER SCIENCE

C. Improvements implemented during the last five years (e.g., how many course changes and their effects).

III. Organizational Effectiveness of Program

A. Cultural summary of the program: informal workings related to group attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors

B. Design of the organization

1. Process for developing and managing policies and procedures

2. Process for hiring, orienting, evaluating, developing, and rewarding faculty and staff

3. Process for program interaction with its discipline: professional engagement

III.B.3 Program interaction with its discipline

PARALEGAL

4. Process for managing program demand that includes program promotion (marketing and exposure) (Include communicating the curriculum to potential and current users)

- a. KPI participation program percentiles average

III.B.4 Managing program demand

PARALEGAL

5. Process for developing collaborations and partnerships: diversity of relationships and ease of formation (Include systematic management of engagement with the local community and economic needs)

6. Process to develop and sustain effective communication among program faculty/staff members and with other campus entities.

III.B.6 Communication

HVAC-R

7. Process for developing efficiencies of operation, enrollment management, and budget planning
 - a. KPI efficiency program percentiles average (D4-cost per FTE)

8. Process for determining resources: library, office space, IR data, and technology for students and faculty/staff

III.B.8 Process for determining resources: library, space, IR services, & technology

**DIAGNOSTIC
SONOGRAPHY**

III.B.8 Process for determining resources: library, space, IR services, & technology

ART

9. Process for tracking & improving low-rated areas or areas of concern identified in the previous program review

C. Results: Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform continuous process improvement and adapt to change

1. Process to develop and sustain a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement
2. Program research findings: results and analysis
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings

D. Improvements implemented during the last five years (e.g., list organizational changes & their effects)

(Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements.)

IV. Program Planning

A. Design of program planning

1. Responding to the changing needs of students and stakeholders (internal and external)
2. Summarize the alignment of program planning
(e.g., linking of past goals to annual planning, to program review action planning, and to LCCC strategic planning)
3. Process for monitoring success on the most recent cycle of program review action goals & a report of progress
4. Process for developing and sustaining the program's annual planning for both student learning evaluation and program organizational effectiveness planning. (Include the alignment and integration strategies)
5. Description of program's engagement in this program review self-study, in developing its action goals and meeting targeted LCCC strategic planning priorities

6. Description of the Program's Action Plan Goals Active for the Next Five Years

IV.A.6 Action Plan Goal

HVAC-R

B. Results: Ongoing self-evaluation and feedback to inform planning process improvement and adapt to change

1. Process to develop and sustain a comprehensive feedback system to inform program improvement
2. Program research findings: results and analysis
3. Discovery: strengths, concerns, challenges, opportunities revealed, and meaning of findings

C. Improvements implemented during the last five years (e.g. how many planning changes and their impact)

(Explain the program's process for making the transition from evaluation and findings to defining improvements.)

V. Conclusion: Capacity for Future Success

- A. Explanation of how the program will strengthen its resiliency over the next five years (features of resiliency include diversity of function and personnel, self-organizing capacity, adaptive capacity, and organizational learning)
- B. Program demonstrates that it has the capacity to effectively manage change over the next review cycle (e.g., capacity to forecast or scan the environment for client NEEDS, capacity to design appropriate program responses, capacity to self-evaluate for learning program strengths and concerns in PERFORMANCE, and the capacity for transforming evaluation findings into improvements).
- C. Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning to compensate for resource shortages.

V.C.1 Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning for resource shortages **ART**

Supplement to Best Practices Locator

I.A.1 Mission and vision

HISTORY

LCCC's History Program is committed to introducing students to the breadth and depth of the human experience through a comparative study of past and contemporary societies and cultures. It also serves to develop their ability to conduct research, analyze and assess evidence, and articulate sound conclusions both orally and in writing. All of our students acquire knowledge and skills that help them develop as informed, engaged, and thoughtful citizens. The study of history, therefore, plays a unique and central role in liberal arts curriculum. History majors in particular will be prepared to pursue successful careers as teachers, academics, lawyers, civil servants, journalists, and of course historians in private or public agencies.

The History Program provides students a firm academic foundation for successful transfer to four-year institutions and with the critical-thinking skills necessary to succeed academically as they continue their college career.

I.A.2 Program values

MUSIC

- The placement of primary emphasis on development of student musicianship and music preparation for further education or a professional career.
- Production of high quality Associate of Arts degrees that are accepted at four-year baccalaureate programs and generate high rates of successful transfer for music students.
- Community service and enrichment through inspired performances

I.A.3 Program objectives, including learning competencies

ART

The LCCC program of study in art is designed to provide students with training in the concepts, techniques, and methods unique to two and three-dimension visual art mediums. Through a program of study that includes art history, theory, appreciation, and studio art, degree seeking students and community members have academically directed access to the knowledge, skills and attitudes required for traditional and new approaches to problem solving in specific visual art media.

Program Level Learning Competencies:

1. Facilitate the development of the knowledge, skills and motivation that will enable students to pursue learning experiences on their own, both in general education and in art.

2. Achieve optimum development of students' aesthetic awareness and its relationship with their other academic, vocational and leisure-time skills.
3. Develop a solid foundation of art knowledge, skills and attitudes needed for successful transfer to a four-year institution and/or art institute.
4. Introduce students to the language of the visual arts through exposure to a variety of media, vocabulary, history, theory, and materials.
5. Enable students to apply visual techniques and vocabulary necessary to design 2-D and 3-D works of art based on foundational ideas presented in art history and theory.
6. Provide students with hands-on experiences with studio materials and instruction so that they are able to develop individual solutions to studio situations that can apply to day-to-day problem-solving skills.

Organizational Effectiveness Outcomes

1. Develop articulation based completion curriculum based on standing articulations to benefit student matriculation.
2. Created new relationships with a broader group of articulating institutions.
3. Evaluate, define, and establish levels of professional development for faculty that benefit the academic setting and college at large.
4. Evaluate and analyze annual completion data for needed revisions or documentation of successful curricular activities.

I.A.4 Engagement of LCCC strategic planning strategies

HISTORY

The History Program related to the Laramie County Community College Strategic Plan Strategies Ai, Bii, Diii, Ei, and Eii as indicated in the LCCC Strategic Plan, 2013-2020.

A.i. Target populations in the community that are under-represented in the LCCC student body: The History Program proposes to offer history classes at the Cheyenne VA Medical Center or at the Pointe Frontier Retirement Community. These locations would provide a population of students who are often overlooked and under-served and would promote a goal of lifelong learning.

B.ii. Develop and deliver a strong, holistic system of student advising that assigns every student a single case manager to follow her/him throughout their educational journey: The support of this strategy is self-evident. Our faculty have been exemplary in their efforts to retain majors in our program as well as to encourage their completion of their degree. A clear example of this would point to the History Program's record breaking graduation rate in the spring of 2014. Professor Ludwig personally contacted and met with each student enrolled in the History Program and assisted them in the development of a clear plan to reach their goal of graduation. The efforts on the part of Professor Ludwig and of others teaching for the History Program demonstrate our commitment to recruiting, retaining, and matriculating our students. However, this approach to advising is not reserved only to History Program students--our faculty have their thumbs on the pulse of all of our students and provide advice and assistance whenever possible in an effort to encourage every student's success in college and the accomplishment of their goals.

D.iii. Completely redesign our academic programs so that college-ready, full-time students would be able to complete certificate programs in one year, and associate degrees in two years: The History Program has successfully renewed its articulation agreement with the University of Wyoming History Department. Students graduating from our program with an AA will be able to flawlessly transfer from LCCC to the University History Program with having earned 60 hours of credit.

E.i. Develop and implement a LCCC General Education Core that stems from essential learning outcomes, ensure it is incorporated into all transfer programs (AA and AS degrees), and when completed results in a Certificate of General Studies: All of the History Program's courses already had been approved as part of LCCC's General Education Core and

meet the requirements for Human Culture--Cultural Awareness. In addition, three of our classes are approved for the State Constitutionally mandated V requirement--United States and Wyoming Constitution.

E.ii. Ensure that all applied programs (Certificates and AAS degrees) include coursework, stand-alone or integrated, that leads to institutional students learning outcomes: The majority of our courses are integrated courses that incorporate information literacy, verbal communication, and cultural awareness.

I.A.5 Broad summary of program work

HISTORY

Laramie County Community College's History Program dates back to the establishment of the college in 1969. The college employs two full-time historians to oversee the entire program. In 1969, LCCC offered six history courses; all transferred to the University of Wyoming and are still being offered in 2014. In the last twenty years the history offerings at LCCC have changed dramatically. Various specialized history courses have been added to the current history program. In an effort to provide courses of interest to our students and the residents of Laramie County, LCCC has sixteen history courses that are currently taught, five of which cross-list as Religious Studies courses.

Part of this substantial increase was due to student requests for an increase in the number of religion courses offered at LCCC. In the 1990s, we responded by adding the following classes: New Testament, History of Christianity, Holocaust, and The History of Islam. Additionally, students begin inquiring whether LCCC could possibly offer a degree in Religious Studies. In consultations with the Arts and Humanities department, the Social Sciences department developed a Religious Studies concentration associated with the History AA. Students now could major in history and take religion courses for their electives and fulfill the requirements for a history degree with a concentration in religion. These courses are cross-listed under religion and history. With the course map developed as part of the approved articulation with UW, students are able to complete an AA in History within 60 credit hours and successfully transfer.

The History faculty have also engaged in moving Topics courses that are commonly taught to fully articulated courses. Recently, American Revolution and Holocaust were both accepted at UW as articulated courses. The History and Philosophy of Islam was properly articulated and is now accepted as HIST/RELI 2320 History of Islam. With the conscientious alignment with the University of Wyoming, students can be assured that their coursework within the History program will be accepted for credit.

The History program is able to offer the variety and level of classes that it does due to the impactful contribution of a wonderful set of adjunct faculty. Adjuncts within the department currently teach History of Christianity, History of Islam, New Testament, History of the U.S. West, Topics: U.S. Civil War, and Mexican Civilization. Because of the depth of knowledge that adjuncts bring to the table, the History program can provide the community with insight into various historical topics.

The History faculty, both full-time and adjunct, have impacted both students and the community at large. Student transformations occur on a regular basis with classroom work and development over the course of the program. For example, a recent History student entered the History program after suffering from a workplace accident. This student had pursued a career as an auto mechanic, but due to an injury, was no longer able to engage in the work in a timely manner. Rather than accepting early retirement and disability, this student decided to pursue a degree in History with the goal of teaching at the secondary level. Initially, his skills were not up to par. He shared that when he originally went to college years before, he had gone on an athletic scholarship and had dropped out after not succeeding academically. However, with guidance over how to write papers effectively and mentoring regarding academic and career-based decisions, this student went on to graduate from LCCC and is scheduled to graduate from the University of Wyoming this upcoming year. An example of his student work is listed below to demonstrate the level of achievement he was able to attain at LCCC.

Along with having an impact on students' lives, the History faculty also makes a concerted effort to give back to the community. The History faculty regularly act as volunteer speakers for a variety of organizations, including Cowgirls of the West, Daughters of the American Revolution, the Wyoming State Museum, Leadership Wyoming, and more. History instructor Patty Kessler serves on the University of Wyoming Historic Preservation Board and is on the WYOHHistory.org Board. Due to the actions of the History adjunct Mike Kassel, the History program established an internship with the Wyoming Governors' Mansion and the Frontier Days Old West Museum. These organizations have offered students a wonderful avenue to experience public history and give back to the community. In addition, History instructor Mary Ludwig has applied for and received grants to bring cultural programs onto campus. This allowed Carl Wilkins to speak on his experiences as a survivor of the Rwanda genocide, and another grant allowed for Created Equal programs to be sponsored on campus, including a speaking engagement by Freedom Rider George Blevins.

I.A.5. Broad summary of program work

ART

The Laramie County Community College (LCCC) art program began in fall 1969. The original curriculum was designed by one instructor to accommodate transfer to regional four-year institutions and meet the requirements of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. In the beginning, most of the classes were in two-dimensional (2-D) art, serving approximately 100 students in six to eight different courses. The first classes were taught in Building A and the present Administration Building (then Building B).

In 1981, the art department moved into new quarters in the Fine Arts Building and the old quarters were renovated for other purposes and the kilns torn down. This made the art studios larger than in Building D. The jewelry and ceramics studios were (and continue to be) unsurpassed in the state of Wyoming. By 1988, the combined two-dimensional and three-dimensional art classes listed 30 sections each year.

In the early 1990's, there was a restructuring of contact hours within the art program. Prior to this time, all art classes followed the LCCC lecture class format. Classes were realigned to conform to a lab class format. This allowed art classes to match the standard accepted by other colleges and universities. Full transfer of credit was now available to LCCC students from most other institutions.

Today the LCCC art department has three full-time instructors and two adjunct instructors. The art department serves approximately 460 students per year in over 80 (LOOK THIS # UP) different courses. Each semester, the art department offers multiple sections of Beginning Drawing, Ceramics I/II/III, Metals I/II/III, and General Art: History. The art department also has a schedule of summer sections, as well as an online course in the form of General: Art History.

Recently, two new gas-fired kilns have been purchased to replace the old and inefficient kilns. This has allowed for added sections to be offered in ceramics and sculpture. A new printmaking equipment was added to the 2-D Design/Life-Drawing classroom which has also led to additional course offerings. There has been an expansion in class sections of jewelry, painting and art history. The Esther and John Clay Summer Watercolor Workshop and the LCCC Summer Sculpture Workshop are well established programs outside the normal academic course offerings, bringing students and guest faculty from across the nation to LCCC. The art department is presently working with community members to establish program priorities and how they translate to facilities needs as part of a larger fine and performing arts building project. Articulation meetings with UW and Colorado institutions are also guiding these decisions.

I.A.6 Significant program achievements over the review cycle

DIAGNOSTIC SONOGRAPHY

The DMS Program uses the various assessment tools to ensure the effectiveness of the DMS program. These are done on a weekly basis to adjust courses to student needs, as well as on a course level to ensure our graduates can meet national standards. Survey results are used to make changes to the curriculum to ensure our program mirrors national and employment standards. We are happy to report

that our assessments have continually come back as excellent and therefore only minor adjustments have been needed to be made to the program curriculum.

Below is a chart of assessment result for the DMS Program.

Program Measure	Annual Results	Composite 3-Year Average
Abdomen – ARDMS National Exam Pass Rate	2012: 100% 2013: 100% 2014: 100%	100%
OB/GYN – ARDMS National Exam Pass Rate	2012: 100% 2013: 100% 2014: 100%	100%
Ultrasound Physics – ARDMS National Exam Pass rate	2012: 100% 2013: 100% 2014: 100%	100%
Employment Rates (Full-time within 6 months post-graduation)	2012: 100% 2013: 100% 2014: 100%	100%

I.A.6 Significant program achievements over the review cycle

HISTORY

The History program has had several achievements since the last program review in 2008. The History program achieved its all-time high in graduates in the spring of 2014 by graduating eight students. LCCC also hired another full-time historian for the ACC campus; this move has allowed for greater collaboration and academic success on both campuses. The History department received a National Endowment of the Humanities grant to present the series Created Equal for the Cheyenne community. This entailed a five-part program that brought as many as 87 people at one time to the campus to see the presentation of Freedom Rider George Blevins. The History department has also sponsored and supported other speaking engagements, including the photographer of the Afghan Women's Project Peggy Kesley who came in conjunction with humanitarian Greg Mortenson, Heart Mountain survivor Sam Mihara, Rwanda genocide witness Carl Wilkins, Holocaust survivor Estelle Nadel, activist and writer Winona LaDuke, and the African Maafa program which included a variety of speakers and cultural presentations. This community engagement is on track to continue, with visits by Vietnam veteran and veterans' advocate Frederick Downs scheduled to speak in spring 2015 along with another presentation by Sam Mihara. The History faculty at ACC has also co-sponsored presentations over the anniversary of the Berlin Wall, traveling exhibit The Literature of Prescription, and photographer Sarah Wiles' photo-documentary study over the Northern Arapaho. In addition, internships have been established with the Wyoming Governors' Mansion and Frontier Days Old West Museum.

I.A.7 Developing value in programming

HISTORY

The History Program is perpetually reviewing and revising its program to enhance its value to students in the adoption of enhanced learning experiences through the integration of on-line resources, innovative approaches to content delivery, in the hiring of full-time faculty, the training and oversight of adjunct faculty, and through the development of interdisciplinary approaches to program development. The Program currently offers two to three on-line courses during each academic term (including the summer) in US History to 1865 and US History from 1865. These courses have been developed by Instructor Ludwig. There currently are two on-line instructors, one of which is Instructor Ludwig. A third instructor will be trained and available to teach a section of the US to 1865 course in the summer of 2015. The Program will continue to work on the expansion of on-line offerings and in the training of on-line faculty. Currently, the History

Program's new full-time hire will begin this training in the spring of 2015 and begin teaching an on-line section of US to 1865 in the summer of 2015.

The addition of another full-time faculty member enhances our ability to work collaboratively to research, develop, and implement innovative ways in which to deliver content. For example, Instructor Kessler has been integrating the concept of flipped-classes into her curricula for the past year. In this process students prepare for in-class interpretive activities related to materials and assignments completed outside of class time. This provides an opportunity for students to interact in classroom/group activities that serve to reinforce concepts reviewed in assignments conducted outside of the classroom and gives the instructor an opportunity to facilitate students learning process in a more concrete manner than that with a preponderance in the delivery of information as opposed to that material's internalization. This was most effective in providing opportunities for students' to analyze and synthesize data collected from primary sources such as immigration statistics to the British Colonies in the 17th and early 18th centuries and a study of economic production in the northern and southern colonies to identify the factors that would have contributed to the growth of the institution of slavery during this same time period. In this exercise, students would have been asked to read and review statistical data available in an on-line resource and have brought their interpretation of this data to class where they would collaborate in a group project to interpret and analyze their findings. This approach to teaching and learning provides an interactive, proactive environment in which students are intimately engaged with the factors that defined social, political, and economic policy through the early history of the United States.

Both full-time faculty members on the Cheyenne and Laramie campuses are intimately involved with the hiring and training of history adjunct faculty. Instructor Ludwig provides at least two opportunities a semester for adjunct and full-time faculty to meet concerning policies and procedures, the delivery of content, and for sharing concerns, teaching strategies, and success stories. Changes in policies and procedures and syllabi revisions are shared with all adjunct faculty.

All history faculty incorporate lessons that support writing, reading, note-taking, and study skills into their curriculum throughout the semester. These assignments and activities are designed to demonstrate students' mastery of these skills in the delivery and interpretation of content learned throughout the term.

II.A.1 Process to Design the Curriculum

PARALEGAL

The paralegal program maintains currency in curriculum based on the requirements of ABA approval. ABA approval helps to structure the program curriculum.

The paralegal program curriculum development is impacted and reviewed by the Paralegal Advisory Committee.

All paralegal students are required to complete 5 required Paralegal core courses and 5 Paralegal core elective courses.

Students take required courses in the ideal sequence as follows: introduction to paralegal studies and legal research and writing I, simultaneously in their first semester, then take legal research and writing II and evidence and investigation in the second semester. These courses build more developed writing skills and expectations that will be required in the civil procedure and litigation course. Some examples of the more developed writing skills include proper legal citation, proper document mechanics, and the ability to review and recognize errors in grammar, citation and specific sections of proper legal documents. Within each semester students have the opportunity to take courses in various legal topics. Every class in the program offers practical written applied assignments designed to prepare students for the paralegal career. The Paralegal program's sequencing of classes directly supports the program's competencies:

Program-Level Learning Competencies

- Student will demonstrate their capacity/ability to effectively draft a variety of legal documents.
- Students will demonstrate their capacity/ability to effectively conduct legal research and apply legal research to legal writing.
- Students will be prepared to be an effective Paralegal by demonstrating and utilizing research, document drafting and organizational skills required of the career.
- Students will demonstrate their ability to effectively interview clients and witnesses.
- Students will demonstrate an understanding of the evolving paralegal field and career opportunities within the Paralegal field.
- The student will demonstrate an understanding of the ethical rules governing the practice of law.

The Paralegal program director attends national Paralegal educator conferences for professional development and works with adjunct instructors and the Paralegal advisory board to implement new strategies in the paralegal program.

PROGRAM SEQUENCING

1ST SEM./TERM	COURSE NUMBER	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS
GenEd: CS	COLS 1000	Introduction to College Success: First Year Seminar	3
GenEd: CW	ENGL 1010	English I: Composition	3
Program Rqmts	LEGL 1500	Introduction to Paralegal Studies	3
Program Rqmts	LEGL 1710	Legal Research and Writing I	3
GenEd: QR	MATH 1010	Problem Solving	3
SUBTOTAL CREDITS			15
2ND SEM./TERM	COURSE NUMBER	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS
GenEd: CV	CO/M 1010 or CO/M 1015	Public Speaking or Foundations of Communication	3
Program Rqmts	LEGL 1720	Legal Research and Writing II	3
Program Rqmts	LEGL 2550	Evidence and Investigation	3
Program Rqmts		Program Elective from various disciplines	3
SUBTOTAL CREDITS			12
OPTIONAL SUMMER TERM			
PROGRAM RQMTS	LEGL 1800 or LEGL 2830	LAW OFFICE MANAGEMENT OR COMPUTER APPLICATIONS IN THE LAW	3
PROGRAM RQMTS		Program Elective from various disciplines	3
SUBTOTAL CREDITS			6
3RD SEM./TERM	COURSE NUMBER	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS
GenEd: WS	POLS 1000 or HIST 1211 or HIST 1221 or HIST 1251	American and Wyoming Government or History to 1865 or History from 1865 or Wyoming History	3
Program Rqmts	LEGL 2500	Civil Procedure and Litigation	3
Program Rqmts	LEGL	Legal Elective	3
Program Rqmts		Program Elective from various disciplines	3
Program Rqmts		Program Elective from various disciplines	3
SUBTOTAL CREDITS			15
4TH SEM./TERM	COURSE NUMBER	COURSE TITLE	CREDITS
Program Rqmts	Legl Elective which may be BADM 2010	Business Law I or Legal Program elective	3
Program Rqmts	LEGL	Legal Elective	3

Program Rqmts	LEGL	Legal Elective	3
LAB		Choose course from General Education Lab Science approved course list	4
Program Rqmts		Program Elective from various disciplines	3
SUBTOTAL CREDITS			16
TOTAL CREDITS			64

Refer to MCOR's listed in the Curriculum Management process section.

Please refer to the Paralegal program curriculum map attached below.

Curriculum Mapping															
I= introduces R= reinforced E= emphasize M= mastery															
Program Competencies	Intro to Paralegal Studies	Legal Research and Writing I	Legal Research and Writing II	Evidence and Investigation	Civil Procedure and Litigation	Law Office Management	Probate Practices and Procedures	Torts	Family Law	Real Estate and Property Law	Criminal Law and Procedure	Constitutional Law	Administrative Law	Computer Applications in the Law	Paralegal Internship
The student will demonstrate their capacity/ability to effectively draft a variety of legal documents.	I	IRE	IRE	REM	REM	R	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	REM
The student will demonstrate their capacity/ability to effectively conduct legal research and apply legal research to legal writing.		IE	IRE	RM	RM	R	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	REM
The student will be prepared to be an effective Paralegal by demonstrating and utilizing research, document drafting and organizational skills required of the career.	I	IE	IRE	REM	REM	R	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	REM
The student will demonstrate their ability to effectively interview clients and witnesses.	I			REM			R	R	R				RE		REM
The student will demonstrate an understanding of the evolving paralegal field and career opportunities within the Paralegal field.	I			REM	REM	REM	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	REM
The student will demonstrate an understanding of the ethical rules governing the practice of law.	IE	IE	IRE	IRE	IRE	IRE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	REM

II.A.1 Process to Design the Curriculum

DIAGNOSTIC SONOGRAPHY

The curriculum for the program is composed of two integrated educational components: didactic and clinical, allowing a variety of learning activities to be used by the program. To support student learning, program faculty in didactic courses employ several different learning activities. New material is typically introduced using textbook assignments and a traditional lecture format utilizing PowerPoint presentations. Once students have required the basic foundation knowledge they need, students apply their knowledge in active learning activities which include:

Laboratory activities Case Studies

Practical Examinations Simulated Patient Exams

Extensive DMS Lab Practice Time Small Group Projects

Writing Assignments – Journal Article Review Problem Based Learning Activities

To further reinforce learning, students are assigned to a clinical education center during their second year, allowing them to perform sonographic procedures on actual patients under one-on-one instructional supervision. The didactic and clinical coursework within the curriculum are directly correlated to each other and arranged in a sequential manner, thus allowing students to reinforce and build on past learning experiences and allowing students the opportunity to immediately apply their classroom knowledge in a real-life situation.

The required competencies of the program are arranged in a logical sequence, moving from simple to more complex procedures as the student advances in his/her education. Students are given the entire semester to complete all of the objectives, allowing them time to complete the procedures which they have just learned during the semester.

Summer

Course Name	Instructor	Instructor Credentials	Credit Hours
DMS Beginning Clinical Experience	Sheridan Hanson	RDMS (ABD, OB/GYN)	6
Intro to Diagnostic Medical Sonography	Adrienne Wade	RDMS (ABD, OB/GYN), RVT	3
Cross-Sectional Anatomy	Sheridan Hanson	RDMS (ABD, OB/GYN)	3

Fall

Course Name	Instructor	Instructor Credentials	Credit Hours
Sonography Clinical Experience I	Sheridan Hanson	RDMS (OB/GYN, ABDOMEN)	11
Registry Review I	Sheridan Hanson	RDMS (ABD, OB/GYN)	1
Ultrasound Physics I	Sheridan Hanson	RDMS (OB/GYN, ABD)	2
OB/GYN Sonography I	Adrienne Wade	RDMS (ABD, OB/GYN), RVT	3
Abdominal Sonography I	Sheridan Hanson	RDMS (ABD,OB/GYN)	3

Spring

Course Name	Instructor	Instructor Credentials	Credits Hours
Sonography Clinical Experience II	Sheridan Hanson	RDMS (OB/GYN, ABDOMEN)	13 credits
Registry Review II	Adrienne Wade	RDMS (ABD, OB/GYN), RVT	1 credit
OB/GYN Sonography II	Adrienne Wade	RDMS (ABD, OB/GYN), RVT	3
Abdominal Sonography II	Sheridan Hanson	RDMS (ABD, OB/GYN)	3
Ultrasound Physics II	Sheridan Hanson	RDMS (ABD, OB/GYN)	2
Intro to Vascular Sonography	Adrienne Wade	RDMS (ABD, OB/GYN), RVT	3

Ensuring Comparable Course Content in all Sections

The DMS program only offers one section of each course taught using an approved course syllabus, because of this there have been no problems between sections.

However, because the program utilizes 19 different clinical sites with one or more clinical supervisors employed by that site assigned to instruct and evaluate students, the program does work to ensure that instruction remains as consistent as possible at each clinical site a student may be assigned to. The program uses the following mechanisms to ensure as much consistency as possible between clinical supervisors:

1. All clinical supervisors are provided with a position description outlining their duties and are given a faculty handbook.
2. Both the Program Director and the Clinical Coordinator visit each clinical education center approximately twice a semester while students are completing their clinical education hours. This allows program faculty to directly observe students applying their knowledge and skills in a workplace setting, provides direct one-on-one communication with the Clinical Supervisors throughout the semester, and allows any clinical deficiencies to be identified at various points throughout the semester, rather than at the end of the evaluation period, when it may be too late to correct them

II.A.1.a Responding to student and stakeholder needs

DIAGNOSTIC SONOGRAPHY

The program regularly solicits input from a variety of its stakeholders, including students, graduates, employers, radiologists, and others. The methods that the program uses are described below:

Students:

Each class elects one student representatives who serves for the duration of the program. The student representatives are responsible for bringing concerns of individual students and/or his/ her class to the attention of program faculty. Each representative also attends Program Advisory Committee meetings to provide a student voice and perspective for program governance and policy issues.

Students are also occasionally directly asked by the program director and/or clinical coordinator for their opinions regarding program policies and/or implementation issues during regularly scheduled classes.

Graduates:

The program utilizes a graduate survey which is administered after 6 months of graduation. This information is used and reported in the JRC-DMS Annual report. Additionally, the graduate surveys are used to address deficiencies in the program or to enhance smaller items in the program administration. These surveys were vital in the initial development of the program and help adjust the curriculum to ensure student success. The program has had a 100% response rate to these surveys for the past three years.

Employers:

Employer satisfaction is also monitored on an annual basis. Surveys are sent each November for that year's set of graduates. The program is fortunate to have a very high response rate with which to evaluate its graduates. The program uses this data from employers to adjust the curriculum to better align our program goals with the expectation of employers.

Advisory Committee Members:

In addition to completing surveys, representative sonography employers are members of the DMS Program's Advisory Committee. Its membership is composed of the Program Director, the Clinical Coordinator, the Dean of the Health Sciences and Wellness Division, a radiologist (medical director), sonographers from the community, program graduates, and two student representatives. This group meets once each spring semester and fall semester. The Advisory Committee's looks at overall program effectiveness in terms of outcomes assessment, employer needs, graduate needs/deficiencies, and sets long-term goals for the program. This committee provides suggestions for improving any areas of concern, and may recommend program/policy changes as corrective actions.

One example of responsiveness was the Introduction to Vascular Sonography, which was an addition to the program at the request of multiple clinical sites in order to prepare students for vascular exams that would be performed during their internship.

II.A.1.d General Education

PARALEGAL

General education requirements in the paralegal program are required only for students in the A.A.S. option. The certificate option in the Paralegal program is a post-baccalaureate certificate, general education requirements are met with the students' completion of the baccalaureate degree. General education requirements for the A.A.S. option are: COLS 1000, ENGL 1010, CO/M 1010 or 1015, POLS 1000 or HIST 1211, 1221, or 1251, MATH 1010 or the Quantway Pathway, and a 4 credit hour STEM requirement. The majority of the general education requirements in the program are set according to the college's general education requirement. The program still requires a 4 credit hour lab science to meet ABA guidelines.

The program leverages general education courses such as ENGL 1010 to assist the student in research and document drafting requirements. ENGL 1010 also helps the students understand the need for use of proper grammar and spelling requirements necessary in legal research and document drafting. Courses such as HIST, POLS, or PSYC, for example, assist the student in research and the proper documentation of academic sources, all of which are critical to a Paralegal student understanding the requirement and necessity of proper citation in legal work. Many paralegal students may end up working in a situation where their job description includes general office administration in addition to traditional paralegal work, courses in the business department can assist the student in better understanding those duties.

II.A.1.d General Education

HISTORY

The History program plays a significant role in General Education curriculum. First of all, three courses, HIST 1211, 1221, and 1251 all meet the V requirement as the Wyoming State Statute. Each of these courses has a defined common course assessment that has been approved via Academic Standards. The means to assess this has also been implemented in these courses as of fall 2014. It is expected that with the common course assessments and the standardization of common course assessments, that data will be gathered in the coming semesters regarding this requirement.

In addition to meeting the V requirement, History courses also meet the Human Culture - Cultural Awareness Institutional Competency. As of yet, all History and Religion courses that are currently being taught have approved MCORs, and the General Education application has been approved for all History and Religion courses. History faculty foresee that this process will be complete for the remaining History and Religion courses that will be taught in the future and will be completed by the time students sign up to take the classes. Below, the approved MCOR for HIST 2000, American Revolution, and the approved General Education for Human Culture - Cultural Awareness demonstrate how this process has progressed.

History students are encouraged to take their General Education courses in a timely manner. The current articulation agreement between UW and LCCC contains a suggested course curriculum map that demonstrates this. It can be found below.

II.A.2 Design and manage instructional strategies

MUSIC

The music program has a variety of delivery systems unique to the courses themselves. They are described in groups according to modes of learning and the acquisition of skills.

Cognitive/Analytical (Written and Aural Music Theory, Music History, Music Sound Technology and related courses)

The text for each course is interactive with multiple opportunities to listen, solve problems, and create original works that reflect the ongoing learning process. State-of-the-art recording equipment, sound system, smart board technology and access to the internet facilitate discovery, learning, and opportunity to reflect and evaluate. There is constant exchange of information and questions between instructor and students as they seek to understand and assimilate new information.

Skill Development (Applied lessons, large and small ensembles, piano proficiency)

Students have access to printed and recorded works from all stylistic periods through the use of YouTube, CDs, and other media. Repertoire is developed for the specific instrument or ensemble. Individual lessons utilize the piano and recording/playback technology for evaluative purposes. Juried performances typically take place in the large classroom (FA 118), and a sophomore recital is given off campus in a more formal setting. Ensemble repertoire is programmed for concert performance and tied to cognitive/analytical competencies. Performances are given at various venues in the community and recorded for evaluative and archival purposes. Piano proficiency courses utilize electronic keyboards that allow students to practice using headphones, perform ensemble works, and conduct peer evaluation. Piano texts include an audio CD to reinforce skills acquired in class. Students in Level IV piano also hone skills during choral rehearsals by giving pitches and playing short excerpts as needed.

MUSC 0200 is an unusual addition. It is a line item for zero credit that documents attendance at master classes and student convocations, and transfers to the four-year institution. This mirrors what music majors are required to do at their transfer institution: establish a record of attendance at a specified number of concerts, recitals, master classes. There are several significant outcomes:

- Peer evaluation and supportive feedback during master classes
- Opportunity to learn from faculty and other students in an informal setting
- Opportunity to hear solo repertoire outside primary instrument
- Preparation for convocation and jury
- Formal recital opportunity to perform prepared repertoire
- Preparation for audition to transfer institution

This requirement connects performance literature to cognitive/analytical and skill-developing courses

II.A.3 Process to align with Student Services

HVAC-R

The HVAC/R program works closely with an assigned liaison in student services to ensure students complete mandatory orientations and COLS 1000 freshman seminars. At-risk students are identified during the recruiting process and assigned a case-worker that continues to support them throughout their experience at LCCC. Student performance is closely monitored to ensure early intervention should they begin to struggle with the course material or external life experiences. This arrangement between student services and the HVAC/R program has helped produce a retention rate of 92 % during the spring 2015 semester.

II.A.4 Process to ensure academic integrity

HISTORY

The faculty within the History program utilize a variety of methods to both prevent academic dishonesty and to discover when it has occurred. First, all faculty are required to include within their syllabi information covering the Student Handbook, which provides an explanation of what constitutes academic dishonesty for all students. In addition, faculty engage in several alternative methods to avert the temptation to cheat.

Many syllabi include comprehensive statements regarding the class' academic dishonest policy. The following is an example of this practice:

Academic Honesty: Plagiarism will not be tolerated; a plagiarized paper will automatically receive a zero. You are also expected to do your own work. Students who write the paper together and turn in essentially the same copy will receive an automatic zero. You are required to turn your papers and the written portion of the debates into the turnitin.com site.

Students who are found to be cheating on discussions, tests, papers or any assignment related to class will receive an automatic F in the class and will be reported to the LCCC Care Team.

The D2L website also allows papers to be turned into a drop box in which an originality check occurs. Many faculty use this option when utilizing D2L.

Assignments within the History Department are often antithetical to academic dishonesty. For example, many assignments require using primary resources. The use of these resources makes it quite difficult to find pre-made work on historical subjects. In addition, the faculty regularly change the assignments, books, and subjects covered in papers, debates, research projects, and historical investigations. The variety of assignments and the originality of assignments discourages the recycling of papers and the use of plagiaristic resources.

The History faculty's creation of tests also discourages academic dishonesty. Tests are regularly written from scratch each semester. In the History online courses, the tests are created by the faculty; pre-made course tests based on the testing bank from the textbook are not used. This practice resulted from the discovery that students in the past had been able to access the textbook questions online. In addition, the online tests are timed, and students do not have the ability to review portions of the tests without being under the supervision of the instructor.

While eliminating all academic dishonesty may not be achievable, the commonly used practices within the History department dissuade plagiaristic practices and encourage the production of original work.

II.B.3 Discovery: Strengths, Concerns, Challenges, and Opportunities

- Strengths
 - Matriculation rate
 - Graduation rate
 - Faculty expertise
 - student/faculty ratio
 - Full time faculty teaching courses
 - Technology (hardware and software)
 - Active and productive articulation with UW and the other community colleges
- Challenges
 - currency due to ever changing technology
 - Coordination and recruitment with the secondary schools in our area
- Opportunities
 - Sought after credentials for graduating students
 - New scholarship monies
 - Outreach to secondary schools
- Concerns:
 - Enrollment numbers
 - Student course success rates

III.B.3 Program interaction with its discipline

The program director continually maintains her communication with professional affiliations and professional peer to perpetuate the process of professional and program development in the program curriculum. As stated previously, the program is approved by the American Bar Association. This approval gives credibility to the program. ABA approval is known to students and the employers who will hire graduates as a statement of academic integrity and rigor. The program is also a member of the American Association for Paralegal Educators (AAfPE). The program director attends national and regional AAfPE conferences when time and travel budgets allow. Attendance at conferences allows the program director to learn new and innovative techniques of teaching in the paralegal area. These techniques are brought back to the program and shared with both the adjunct faculty during faculty meetings and the paralegal advisory committee. The program director is a licensed attorney and a member of both the Wyoming State Bar and the Laramie County Bar Association. The program director has on several occasions made presentations to the local bar on the proper utilization of a paralegal and presented to the state Paralegal association on ethics and evidence. These contacts and presentations assist attorneys who will be hiring graduates of the program to understand what a paralegal can do for them and how hiring a paralegal will benefit their practice. The membership in both the state and local bar associations allows to the program director to maintain direct contact with the employer pool that will employee graduates of the program.

As stated previously, nearly all of the adjunct instructors in the program are licensed and practicing attorneys hired for their expertise in the topics they teach. All of the attorneys are members of the Wyoming Bar Association and several

are also members of other professional organizations that allow them to bring the most current issues in the topics they teach to the classroom.

III.B.4 Managing program demand

PARALEGAL

The Paralegal program manages student demand by monitoring KPI participation indicators and past enrollment patterns. In looking at the KPI data, FTE enrollment can be considered a weakness. The average data number for participation is 2, which is not the lowest, but is an option for improvement. Based on that KPI number, the Paralegal program has chosen "increase enrollment" as one of its organizational effectiveness outcomes in the program's assessment plan.

The program seeks to strengthen student persistence by developing a clear pathway to finishing both the A.A.S degree and the Certificate option. The paralegal program core courses are taught in a sequence and students are advised of that sequence and the proper way to work through the program. The program information on the LCCC website clearly establishes the program sequence as well as providing potential students with important information about the paralegal career.

III.B.6 Communication

HVAC-R

The HVAC/R program currently has one full-time employee and one adjunct who teaches the mechanical piping course for approximately 8 weeks. There is currently no need for weekly meetings with HVAC/R instructors. Monthly meetings are held between the Dean of the School of BATS and faculty. Meetings will occur with HVAC/R faculty as enrollments increase and the program gains additional full-time and adjunct faculty. At that time meetings between instructors will take place on a monthly basis prior to the school meeting to identify issues that require discussion among other program faculty. In addition, current HVAC/R faculty contribute to institutional services such as the student course questionnaire committee and faculty senate to communicate its interests to institutional level processes, as well as articulate information from the institutional processes to CTEC faculty.

III.B.8 Process for determining resources: library, space, IR services, & technology

DIAGNOSTIC SONOGRAPHY

We evaluate the programs' effectiveness each year through our surveys sent out to our students, clinical sites and advisory committee. All of these stakeholders provide valuable feedback and help us to determine what we need in order to be successful. As stated below in the chart, we take into consideration the feedback and we look for means to improve. i.e. garnishing equipment from clinical sites and asking for one time moneys for large purchases.

#	RESOURCE	PURPOSE (S)	MEASURE-MENT SYSTEM	DATE MEASURED	RESULTS – ANALYSIS (COMPOSITE SUMMARY)	ACTION PLAN
5	LAB EQUIP-MENT AND SUPPLIES	To provide students with the equipment and exercises that will adequately prepare them for clinical practice.	1. Student resource surveys, questions II.A.5 & B.5-7 2. Program personnel resource surveys, questions II.A.5 & B.5-7	1.October each year	1. Majority of students surveyed in 2013 rated the Laboratory Equipment and Supplies at or above the "cut score" of 3 on a 5 point Likert scale. 2. All program personnel surveyed in 2013 rated the Laboratory Equipment and Supplies at or above the "cut score" of 4 on a 5 point Likert scale.	1. Five students indicated a need for more updated and variety of equipment. The Program is currently pursuing funding to purchase a new machine. Also in talks with a clinical site that is considering donating a newer machine.

III.B.8 Process for determining resources: library, space, IR services, & technology **ART**

Library materials are routinely purchased to support student research topics on art, art history, artists, methods and techniques. Books on the subjects of painting, drawing, sculpture, ceramics, printmaking, and metals are used by our art students for inspiration, seeing examples and learning more about techniques. As of April 2010, the art sections of the library collection included 2,213 titles in the circulating collection and 53 reference titles. For analysis purposes, we examined the following Library of Congress classification sections of the collection: Fine Arts – N; and the ceramics, pottery, glass and metals/jewelry-making subject areas of the TP, TS and TT classification sections. Approximately 44% of the book collection was published from 1990 to the present; however, date of publication is not a primary issue in building a collection to support many topics in art.

IV.A.6 Action Plan Goal

HVAC-R

The completion of the Flex-tech Building will result in unused instructional space in CTEC. The goal is to re-purpose this space to support the HVAC/R and BAS programs. This will include additional classrooms, a data center simulator, and variable air volume system simulator.

V.C.1 Strength of resource growth and/or contingency planning for resource shortages

ART

The Art Department utilizes previous annual budgets to plan for upcoming years. At present, student studio fees are kept low and consistent across different courses. Should the need arise, there is the possibility of raising those fees or tailoring them to the specific costs associated with each course. Faculty communicate with administration in the form of School of A&H meetings to discuss budgetary considerations and plan for the future. Just this spring, the Art Department has utilized its scholarship budget to award money for summer and fall 2015 courses. The Art Department also has community support for the Esther and John Clay Fine Art Gallery, workshops, and visit artists. As scholarships have been re-allocated in the School of Art and Humanities, the art faculty are developing strategies to make use of new funds to increase enrollment and retain talented students.