
Academic Affairs Deliverables

Institution Mission:

Bristol Community College provides an accessible, innovative and inclusive education that prepares students to navigate and succeed in our ever-changing world.

Vision:

Advancing a vibrant, diverse community through education, learner by learner

Mission:

The Office of Academic Affairs provides oversight and leadership for all credit-bearing academic programs, instruction, and support services at all College locations, including online.

Activities and areas of responsibility include oversight of curriculum, planning, budget administration, staffing, professional development for faculty and professional staff, development of degree and certificate programs, and various professional accreditations.

The fundamental goal of the Office of Academic Affairs is to promote student learning by fostering excellence in teaching and an environment that promotes individual students to develop into critical thinkers and autonomous learners.

Equity Commitment:

Bristol Community College's academic programs strive to provide equitable educational opportunities to all students and create a sense of belonging. We engage students in rigorous learning, striving to transform attitudes and beliefs to position our students to become agents of change and serve as leaders in our communities.

Strategic Initiatives:

Equity and Student Success: Share responsibility for the success of our students and employees by improving equity-mindedness and ensuring institutional support that closes equity gaps.

Objective 1: Advance an inclusive college culture grounded in equity-mindedness.

Objective 2: Recruit, retain and develop a diverse community of employees

Objective 4: Assess existing programs and implement new innovative and evidence-based initiatives geared toward closing equity gaps.

State Equity Agenda Principles:

We must:

- Recognize that clarity in language, goals, and measures is vital to racially equitable practices
 - Promote culturally sustainable campus climates in which all students can thrive and are regarded in the totality of their human dignity “Culturally sustainable” means recognizing, maintaining, and developing cultural identity and diversity, as they are assets, not weaknesses (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Paris 2012)
 - Create and cultivate an inclusive environment to encourage the support and participation of relevant stakeholders
 - Acknowledge the experience and knowledge of people of color, and seek to engage people of color in the pursuit of racial equity in meaningful ways
 - Incentivize the development and support the implementation of equity-minded, evidence-based solutions
-

Comprehensive Program Review External Peer Review Guide

Purpose

The External Peer Review is the culminating validation step of the Comprehensive Program Review. The review provides an independent assessment of program effectiveness, strengths, challenges, opportunities, and alignment with institutional priorities, workforce needs, transfer readiness, student success, and continuous improvement goals.

The review should focus on:

- Quality and completeness of the program review report
- Evidence supporting program conclusions
- Student success and equity outcomes
- Curriculum relevance
- Labor market and/or transfer alignment
- Program assessment practices
- Resource and infrastructure needs
- Future planning and recommendations

Timeline and Deliverables

Deliverable #1

End of Fall Semester

Submission of Draft Comprehensive Program Review Report

Prepared by:

- Program Chair/Coordinator
- Department Faculty
- Dean

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Year 5 Instructions

Deliverables include:

All sections outlined in the Program Review Template:

- Executive Summary
- Program Narrative
- Mission Statement
- Program Goals
- Program Learning Outcomes
- Curriculum Map Review
- Analysis of Program Data
- Curriculum & Instruction
 - High Impact Practices
 - Culturally Responsive & Inclusive Practices
 - Labor Market Alignment and/or Transfer Readiness
- Program Learning Outcome Assessment
- Course SLO Analysis
- Faculty Preparedness & Professional Development
- SMARTIE Goal Summary
- Appendices and Supporting Evidence

The draft should be considered substantially complete and ready for external review.

January

Review Planning Meeting

Participants:

- Program Chair/Coordinator
- Dean
- Director of Institutional Assessment
- Selected Review Body

Purpose:

- Confirm reviewing body
- Review expectations
- Discuss evaluation rubric
- Clarify evidence expectations
- Establish review timeline
- Determine review process and meeting schedule

The Director of Institutional Assessment will facilitate an orientation session to review:

- Program review purpose
- Evaluation process
- Rating scale
- Evidence expectations

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Year 5 Instructions

- Reviewer responsibilities
- Final reporting expectations

Deliverable #2

External Peer Review Complete and Submitted

By June 30

Reviewing body submits:

1. Completed Evaluation Rubric
2. Narrative Findings
3. Recommendations Report
4. Summary of Strengths
5. Areas for Improvement
6. Resource Recommendations
7. Final Overall Assessment

Submitted to:

- Dean
- Director of Institutional Assessment

Selection of the Reviewing Body

Decision Process

The Program Chair/Coordinator, in consultation with the Dean, will determine which review body will conduct the external peer review. This decision should occur no later than January. The selected review body will determine its own review process

Option 1: Program Advisory Board Review

Programs with an established advisory board are encouraged to utilize that body as the external peer review group. This option is particularly appropriate for career-focused programs that maintain active engagement with employers, industry representatives, transfer partners, or other disciplinary experts. Advisory board members bring specialized professional expertise and firsthand knowledge of current workforce expectations, allowing them to evaluate the program's effectiveness through an industry and practitioner lens.

An advisory board review provides valuable feedback regarding curriculum relevance, workforce alignment, career readiness, and the degree to which program outcomes reflect employer expectations and professional standards. Advisory board members are well-positioned to assess whether graduates are developing the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed in the field, identify emerging labor market trends, and offer recommendations for strengthening program responsiveness to industry needs. Their perspective helps validate the program's relevance and ensures continuous alignment between academic preparation and workforce demand.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Year 5 Instructions

Appropriate When

Programs have:

- Active advisory boards
- Strong industry representation
- Career-focused programs
- Specialized professional expertise

Advantages

Advisory board members can provide:

- Industry perspective
- Workforce relevance
- Employer expectations
- Career readiness validation
- Current labor market trends
- Professional standards review

Option 2: Workforce Training Committee Review

Programs that do not have an established advisory board, are primarily transfer-oriented, or would benefit from a broader institutional perspective may choose to utilize the College's Workforce Training Committee as the external peer review body. This option is especially useful for programs with multidisciplinary connections, emerging workforce pathways, or broader institutional and community impact.

The Workforce Training Committee offers a comprehensive perspective that extends beyond a single discipline or industry sector. Committee members can provide insights into regional workforce trends, community and employer needs, institutional strategic priorities, and opportunities for cross-program collaboration. Their review helps assess how effectively a program contributes to workforce development goals, responds to evolving economic demands, and aligns with institutional initiatives related to student success, career pathways, and community engagement. This broader perspective can help identify opportunities for innovation, partnerships, and program growth that support both institutional and regional workforce objectives.

Appropriate When

Programs:

- Do not have established advisory boards
- Are transfer-oriented
- Have broader workforce implications
- Would benefit from cross-disciplinary review

Advantages

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Year 5 Instructions

Committee members can provide:

- Institution-wide workforce perspective
- Cross-program insight
- Strategic alignment review
- Community workforce needs assessment
- Broader economic considerations

Reviewer Orientation

The Director of Institutional Assessment will facilitate reviewer training.

Topics include:

Understanding Program Review

- Purpose
- Expectations
- Scope of review

Evaluation Framework

- Rating scale
- Evidence standards
- Documentation requirements

Reviewer Responsibilities

- Objective evaluation
- Evidence-based commentary
- Constructive feedback
- Identification of strengths and opportunities

Rating Scale and Explanation

Rating	Description
DNA	Does Not Apply
IE	Insufficient Evidence / Unable to Respond
1	Practices are being discussed/explored but not yet implemented
2	Practices are partially being met
3	Practices are being met
4	Practices go beyond the recommended criterion

For consistency across all program reviews, reviewers should use the following definitions when assigning ratings. The focus should be on the quality of evidence provided, the degree of implementation, assessment of effectiveness, and evidence of continuous improvement.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Year 5 Instructions

Insufficient Evidence / Unable to Rate Insufficient documentation, data, or evidence is provided to determine whether the criterion is being met. Additional information is needed before a meaningful rating can be assigned.

Practices are being discussed/explored but not yet implemented The program has identified the criterion as important and discussions, planning, exploration, or preliminary development activities have begun. However, there is little or no evidence of implementation, assessment, or measurable outcomes.

Practices are partially being met The program has implemented some aspects of the criterion, but efforts may be inconsistent, limited in scope, not fully integrated, or lacking sufficient assessment data. Evidence demonstrates progress, but additional work is needed to achieve the intended outcomes.

Practices are being met The program demonstrates consistent and intentional implementation of the criterion. Appropriate evidence is provided to support effectiveness, and the practice is integrated into program operations, curriculum, assessment, or planning processes. Results are reviewed and used to inform continuous improvement.

Practices go beyond the recommended criterion The program demonstrates exemplary practice that exceeds expectations. Implementation is comprehensive, evidence-based, well documented, and regularly evaluated for effectiveness. The program can demonstrate measurable impact, innovation, leadership, or best practices that may serve as a model for other programs or departments.

Instructions for Reviewers

For each section of the Comprehensive Program Review, reviewers are expected to complete three components to ensure a consistent, evidence-based evaluation process. First, reviewers should Rate the Criterion Measures by assigning a rating using the approved program review scale (DNA, IE, 1, 2, 3, or 4). Ratings should reflect the extent to which the criterion is implemented, supported by evidence, assessed for effectiveness, and embedded within departmental practices.

Second, reviewers should provide Reasoning and Evidence to support the rating assigned. This narrative should explain the rationale for the evaluation by highlighting key strengths, areas for improvement, notable findings, and examples presented within the report. Reviewers should focus on how effectively the program demonstrates achievement of the criterion, references assessment findings, uses data to inform decision-making, and engages in continuous improvement. The narrative should clearly connect the assigned rating to the evidence presented in the report.

Third, reviewers should identify the Evidence Reviewed and, if applicable, note any additional evidence that would strengthen the evaluation. This section should document the materials, data, reports, assessment results, meeting minutes, surveys, curriculum documents, labor market analyses, or other supporting documentation that informed the reviewer's assessment. If important information was missing or insufficient to support a rating, reviewers should specify what additional evidence should be collected, reviewed, or incorporated in future program review cycles to provide a more comprehensive evaluation.

Together, these three components ensure that all ratings are transparent, evidence-based, and actionable while providing meaningful feedback to support program improvement, planning, and future decision-making.

Reviewer Guidance

When assigning a rating, reviewers should consider:

1. Evidence of Implementation
Is there documentation showing the practice exists and is being utilized?
2. Evidence of Effectiveness
Is there assessment data, feedback, outcomes, or other evidence demonstrating impact?
3. Continuous Improvement
Has the program used findings, feedback, or assessment results to make improvements?
4. Scope and Sustainability
Is the practice systematic, ongoing, and integrated into program operations?

The scale should be applied consistently across all sections of the Comprehensive Program Review, including Program Mission Statement, Program Goals, Program Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Mapping, Program Data Analysis, High Impact Practices, Culturally Responsive and Inclusive Practices, Labor Market Alignment/Transfer Readiness, Learning Outcomes Assessment, Faculty Preparedness, and SMARTIE Goals.