Components of Continuous Improvement (CI)
2013 - 2018

A. CI Process, Cycle, and Process Lead

1. CI Process: Comprehensive Program Review.

2. CI Cycle (semester/year & frequency): At least once every 5 years in spring semester. Career technical education programs undergo comprehensive review every two years.

3. CI Process Lead: Dean IPE.

B. Participants, Tasks & Evidence in Evaluation/Review Process

4. Who or what is evaluated?
   
   • Programs, services, offices, and campuses.

5. Who informs those responsible for conducting the evaluation, and when are they informed?
   
   • Dean IPE informs administrators, faculty and staff in December of the preceding semester.

6. Who conducts the evaluation? When (which years and specific months) and how frequently is the evaluation conducted?
   
   • Relevant faculty, staff, administrators conduct the review once every 5 years in February and March.

7. What instruments, forms and/or data are utilized in the evaluation?
   
   • Comprehensive review of academic programs. Student learning and achievement outcomes data are analyzed.
   • Comprehensive review of services, offices and non-instructional programs. Service area outcomes data are analyzed.

8. Who reviews content for quality and completeness? When and how frequently do quality checks occur?
   
   • From February through April, the supervising administrator reviews content after the comprehensive review is completed, and each time a draft is required.
9. Who has oversight/broadly reviews content? When and how frequently does oversight occur?

- Divisional VPs provide oversight as needed from February through April to ensure work is complete and at threshold level quality.
- IPE staff check overall consistency, quality and completeness across comprehensive reviews as possible during the spring semester.
- The corresponding governance council in early fall, and subsequently the CPC later in the fall, review the comprehensive program reviews, or summaries thereof, and make budgetary recommendations as needed.

10. Who maintains the list of all elements (persons, programs, outcomes, etc.) to be evaluated? Who tracks completion of evaluations/maintains the master list of evaluations completed and those yet to be completed?

- Divisional VPs track completion for comprehensive reviews within their purview.
- Dean IPE maintains the list of all programs/services/offices to be reviewed comprehensively in each particular year within the overall cycle, and the master list of comprehensive reviews completed each year.

11. When and where are the evaluations housed, who places them there, and who has access? Who maintains the entire set of evaluations completed?

- Divisional VPs, and Area Deans in Academic Affairs, place completed comprehensive reviews in appropriate folders in the Google drive in May. eLumen is expected to be utilized starting in spring 2016.
- Dean IPE maintains the completed comprehensive reviews in the Google drive. eLumen is expected to be utilized starting in spring 2016.
- Dean IPE provides a publicly accessible list of completed comprehensive reviews annually on the IPE website.

C. **Participants, Tasks & Evidence in Making Improvements in Effectiveness**

12. Who decides what improvements/outcomes are needed and the level of targeted improvements/outcomes? How are these planned outcomes documented?

- Relevant faculty and their dean for academic programs.
- Relevant staff and their supervising administrator for services and non-instructional programs.
- Supervising administrators for offices.
- Planned outcomes are documented in comprehensive reviews.
13. Who is responsible for making improvements, and when (which specific months/years) are they implemented?

- Relevant faculty and their dean for academic programs.
- Relevant staff and their supervising administrator for services, offices and non-instructional programs.
- Improvements are typically planned and implemented over multiple consecutive years. Some improvements may be made immediately, whereas others that rely on resource allocation and modifications requiring staged, long term implementation may not be implemented for two, three or more years.

14. When (which specific months/years) and how frequently are improvements/outcomes measured, who measures them, and how are they documented? Who decides whether they were adequate leading into the next evaluation period?

- Improvements/outcomes across all SLOs are measured by relevant faculty for academic programs over multiple evaluation periods. Faculty report accumulated SLO and achievement data at the next scheduled comprehensive review, and determine whether outcomes are adequate.
- Improvements/outcomes across all SAOs are measured by the supervising administrator and staff for services, offices and non-instructional programs over multiple evaluation periods. Administrators report accumulated SAO data at the next scheduled comprehensive review, and determine whether outcomes are adequate.

D. Participants, Tasks & Evidence in Making Improvements in Process Effectiveness

15. Who evaluates the effectiveness of the overall CI process? When (which years and specific months) and how frequently is the process evaluated?

- IPE staff evaluate the effectiveness of the comprehensive review process annually in the fall semester, with input from persons who participated in the most recent process.

16. Who decides what improvements need to be made in the process, and how are they documented?

- Dean IPE decides which specific improvements to make in consultation with the CPC, Academic Senate, and/or other appropriate governance bodies and administrators.
- Appropriate modifications reflecting improvements are made in time lines, charts, forms and/or other documents.
- Dean IPE incorporates improvements in process revision as needed.
17. Who makes improvements to the process, and when (which years and specific months) are they implemented? [prior to or at the start of the next CI cycle]

- IPE staff make improvements, which are implemented in December prior to the next (spring) semester’s comprehensive review process.