For information, contact Institutional
Effectiveness: (915) 831-6740

2.03.01.18   Program Review   APPROVED: September 19, 2003   REVISED: June 30, 2017
Year of last review: 2019
AUTHORIZING BOARD POLICY: 2.03.01

Classification: Administrative
Responsible Vice President or Associate Vice President: Vice President of Research, Accreditation and Planning
Designated Contact: Director of Institutional Effectiveness

OBJECTIVE: To assess the current and future viability of credit and non-credit instructional programs and to make recommendations on program improvement and viability. The Program Review Committee's authority concerning program viability is limited to recommending that the Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education review a program's strengths and weaknesses and the program's capacity to improve its service to students and the community. The final decision on continuation rests with the President of the College. The foregoing shall constitute the charge of the Program Review Committee.

PROCEDURE:

I.   Program Review Committee Composition

A.   The committee shall consist of twenty-one voting members. It shall be composed of six faculty* members from each of the following instructional areas: career and technical education and credit transfer/credit developmental. There shall be no more than three faculty/administrators from the non-credit instructional area. In addition, there shall be one representative from each of the following areas of the College: librarians, counselors, administrators from an area other than non-credit, professional staff and classified staff. The president of the Faculty Association shall be a permanent member of the committee. Resource persons shall include representatives from Research, Accreditation and Planning, the Curriculum Office, the Budget Office, Admissions/Registration, and the Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education, all of whom shall serve as resource, non-voting members. For proxy voting, see the *Program Review Proxy Voting Form* attached to this procedure.

B.   There shall be two co-chairs, one of whom shall be declared the chair-elect, who shall serve as the senior co-chair during the following academic year, and both officers shall be elected from the voting members of the committee. Decisions of the committee shall require a majority of the voting members to be present and shall be made by a simple majority of the voting members.

C.   Terms of the committee members shall be for three years and shall rotate on a staggered basis with approximately one-third of the committee changing membership each year. Rotation shall take place prior to the beginning of the academic year. There shall be an orientation for new members and interested staff during Fall Faculty Development; the Office of Institutional Effectiveness shall inform new members of the orientation. The officers of the committee shall conduct the orientation.

D.   Attendance of committee members at all meetings is expected. The Chair shall ensure that each member is sent two notifications about the date, place and time of each meeting. Excessive absence (missing one-half of the meetings during a semester) may result in a member's removal from the committee, as per College Procedure 2.01.01.14: *Committees*. The committee chair shall be responsible for enforcing the attendance requirements.

II.   Program Evaluation Criteria

The committee evaluates instructional programs based on performance indicators or at the request of the Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education. The committee makes recommendations on program improvement and on program viability to the Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education.

A.   **Definitions:** Instructional Programs are an instructional course or group of related courses for which students may or may not receive college credit upon completion. Courses taken for credit are grouped as

* Note: The word "faculty" denotes instructors, counselors and librarians.

transfer/developmental and occupational courses. Non-credit courses include courses taken through the EPCC Language Institute, and/or as requested by the Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education. Courses shall be grouped under the discipline that staffs and schedules them. The words "program" and "discipline" may be used interchangeably in Program Review documents. Imbedded and Enhanced Skills certificates shall be evaluated as part of the program. Programs shall be evaluated District-wide, using data by campus where possible, every year. Courses or sequences of courses shall be evaluated only if they appear in the College Catalog or non-credit class schedule of the year during which the committee evaluates the programs and only if three consecutive years of data are available. Fields of Study and Areas of Concentration without program-specific courses will not be evaluated.

B.   **Evaluation:**

1.   Evaluation shall include, where applicable, data on a program's mandatory accreditation status. The data shall include whether the program is accredited. If the program is not fully accredited, an explanation for the program's status shall be provided.

2.   Evaluation shall also include data indicating a program's performance, which shall be reviewed as follows:

   a.   Instructional Programs will be classified as: Credit Transfer/Credit Developmental, Career and Technical Education, or Non-credit.
   b.   Performance indicators, for each instructional program, shall be grouped under one of two headings:

      1)   Viability Indicators shall constitute measures that track the minimum performance levels required for program maintenance. There shall be two types of Viability Indicators for career and technical education programs:

         a)   State-mandated indicators shall address students' demonstrated ability to advance in their studies and transfer or secure employment.
         b)   Instructional Support indicators shall measure critical non-classroom efforts to support student learning.
         c)   Student Learning Outcomes shall indicate student learning as a result of class instruction and learning activities.

      2)   Quality Indicators shall encompass measures beyond minimal program performance.

   c.   Performance indicators shall possess a:

      1)   Title (e.g. Enrollment Trends)
      2)   Measure (e. g. whether or not there is increasing enrollment)
      3)   Data source (e.g. Master Class Schedule)
      4)   Standard (e.g. a numerical goal or a yes/no performance; for information only, some indicators have a second threshold of especially unacceptable performance which is scored "Not Met/Critical" as appropriate)

   d.   Data shall be collected for the previous three academic years prior to the academic year in which the committee makes recommendations (except as noted in the attached indicators, the most recent data shall be applied.)
   e.   Data shall be evaluated to determine whether the indicators' standards are "Met" or "Not Met."
   f.   The *Program Review Report* shall indicate, when possible, the data collected at each site, or by area for those programs embracing disparate divisions (e.g. EPCC Language Institute).
   g.   Applicable indicators for which there is no supporting data shall be evaluated "Not Met."
   h.   Indicators that are not applicable to a program shall not be evaluated.
   i.   Data used to score credit program performance include concurrent continuing education students, auditing students, and senior citizens.
   j.   Power Pack courses (December-January) are included with the fall semester data.
   k.   Indicators whose data are pending are ignored in calculating performance scores.
   l.   For those programs meeting 50% or fewer of their Viability Indicators, and/or failing to meet the "No. of Graduates" or "Student Success" indicators, the IE Office shall provide to

the Deans/Directors the IR Office data used to score Viability and Quality Indicators as "Not Met," and a *Program Review Data Discrepancy Form,* which is attached to this procedure, shall be included with the data.

3.   Voting members of the committee shall not vote on any recommendations pertaining to their own programs.

III.   PROCESS:

A.   April: The Program Review Committee (PRC) reviews this procedure and may recommend changes to the appropriate vice president. No changes will be made to the Program Review procedure without prior consultation with the Committee. The Committee will be notified in writing by the appropriate Vice President of any changes required to comply with SACSCOC requirements or State law.

The PRC recommends objectives or a Plan of Action for itself for the following academic year. This Plan of Action is submitted by the Chair in the *Standing Committee Chairs' Year-End Improvement Report.*

B.   May: The PRC requests Institutional Research (IR) to provide, by September 8, data required by the indicators to the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Office that will prepare a *Program Review Report* on program performance.

1.   The IR Office shall ensure that State data reported by CIP or other state program code are broken down for each EPCC program which may fall under a CIP or other code that embraces many disciplines, some of which may not be offered by the College.

2.   If an indicator requires data for multiple years, the IR Office shall provide separate data for each year and a combined number or other finding for the entire multi-year period.

3.   IR shall send, as necessary, requests for data to applicable program Deans/Directors by June 1. Data requests for all indicators except Career and Technical Education Student Learning Indicator 6 (Student Licensure/Certification, as applicable) shall be returned by June 15. The data for Career and Technical Education Student Learning Indicator 6 (Student Licensure/Certification, as applicable) are due August 15. If the data requests are not returned by their respective dates, the indicator scores pertaining to the requested data shall be zero. When more than one Dean/Director and District-wide Coordinator are responsible for a program, they shall confer amongst each other in order to prepare a joint, consolidated response to the data requests.

4.   The IR Office shall prepare a *Discrepancy Report* indicating any discrepancies in the College Banner database with respect to class optimums and maximum class size, and shall request clarification, if necessary, from the Registrar and the Physical Plant.

C.   August: The IR Office shall prepare for each program or discipline a report entitled *Data Associated with the Indicated Program Review Discipline.* The report shall indicate the associations that are essential to ensure accurate *Program Review Reports.* The report shall be sent to appropriate Dean(s)/Director(s), by August 1. The Dean(s)/Director(s)/Coordinator(s) shall be asked to review the report(s). If the reports contain errors, the Dean(s)/Director(s)/Coordinator(s) shall contact the IR Office to resolve discrepancies. After the report(s) have been determined to be correct, the Dean(s)/Director(s)/Coordinator(s) shall sign and return the report(s) to the IR Office by August 15 to indicate that the associations in the report are correct. Only after the signed report(s) have been received by IR can the *Program Review Report* be prepared.

The associations shall include:

1.   The discipline or program name.
2.   The name of the Dean of the District Coordinator who helps to staff and schedule the courses associated with the discipline or program.
3.   The name of the District Coordinator.
4.   The name(s) of other Deans supervising the discipline or program courses.
5.   The campuses where the discipline or program courses were taught.
6.   Majors associated with the discipline or program.
7.   Course prefixes, course numbers and course titles associated with the discipline or program. The list of courses shall indicate those courses applicable during each of the three (3) academic years prior to the academic year in which the Program Report is sent to the Program Review Committee.

8. The optimum for each course. The optimum (No. of students that can be adequately taught in a section of the course) is set by the VP of Instruction and Workforce Education. Dean(s)/Director(s)/ Coordinators should study the report to ensure that the proper optimums have been accurately recorded in the College mainframe computer. Changes to optimums must be approved by the Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education. Changes to optimums shall affect data that are recorded after the changes are made.

D. September 10: The IE Office sends a *Program Review Report* to Deans/Directors and to District-wide discipline coordinators. The *Program Review Report* shall include the time frame of the data, Area Improvement Plans and, where applicable, data submitted by the Dean/Director on a program's mandatory accreditation status. The data shall include whether the program is accredited. If the program is not fully accredited, the Dean's/Director's explanation for the program's accreditation status shall be provided in the report.

As the PRC shall not be the forum for resolving Deans'/Directors' concerns about the accuracy of the IR data used to create the *Program Review Report*, the following process shall be followed to ensure that the report is accurate:

1. Upon receiving the report and its accompanying support data, if any, Deans/Directors disputing the data must complete a *Program Review Data Discrepancy Form* for each program about which there is a concern and send the report to the IE Office by September 20. If the *Program Review Data Discrepancy Form* is not submitted by September 20, the report shall be considered correct.
2. The IE Office in consultation with the IR Office, shall review the submitted *Program Review Data Discrepancy Forms*, and the IR Office shall make the final determination as to the data to be used in the report. The IE Office shall maintain a file of the completed forms and shall inform the Program Review Committee if a determination requires a change in the Program Review procedure.
3. The IE Office shall submit corrected *Program Review Reports*, as necessary, by October 1, to the Deans/Directors, District-wide Coordinators and to the PRC.

    In the *Program Review Report*, programs meeting and/or exceeding all of their Viability and Quality standards (except "Sections taught by Full-Time Faculty") shall be declared "Exemplary"; those meeting and/or exceeding all of their Viability standards shall be declared "Viable"; and those meeting 50% or fewer of their Viability standards (or, if they are career and technical education programs, do not meet both the "No. of Graduates" or "Student Success" indicators) shall be declared "In Need of Formal Review."

E. October: Following the receipt of the *Program Review Report*, the PRC shall meet to evaluate instructional programs based on their achievement of the Viability and Quality Indicators or at the request of the Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education.

To facilitate planning, budget adjustments and the removal of programs from the College Catalog in a timely manner, credit programs shall be reviewed first, prioritized by the severity of deficiencies (those with the lowest viability scores and those with a viability score of fifty-percent (50%) or less for three or more consecutive year(s). Subsequently, the committee shall review the continuing education programs.

The Chair shall notify the Dean(s)/District Coordinators and the appropriate Vice President if a career and technical education program does not meet either the "No. of Graduates" or "Student Success" indicators. Upon initial review of the *Program Review Report* by the committee, the Chair shall notify the Dean(s)/District Coordinators, and the appropriate Vice President if a program falls into the "Critical" area of performance measured by one or more indicators.

When a program meets fifty-percent (50%) or fewer of its Viability Indicators, or, if it is a career and technical education program, does not meet both the "No. of Graduates" or "Student Success" indicators, the Dean/Director and District-wide Coordinator shall be required to appear before the committee to discuss the status of unmet Viability and Quality Indicators. The Chair shall be responsible for notifying, by letter, the appropriate Dean/Director and District-wide Coordinator that their program has been selected for review. The notification shall include:

-   The date and time of the meeting
-   The names of responsible persons expected to attend: Deans/Directors/District-wide Coordinators
-   A *Program Review Justification Form,* which is attached to this procedure. (If the Dean/Director wishes to indicate extenuating circumstances that resulted in unmet Viability

and/or Quality indicators, the Dean/Director may complete the form and bring it to the scheduled Program Review Committee meeting.)

- A list of topics which the Dean/Director and District-wide Coordinator should be prepared to address, within a 30-minute time period, at the scheduled PRC meeting. When more than one Dean/Director and District-wide Coordinator are responsible for a program, they shall confer amongst each other, before appearing before the committee in order to prepare a joint, consolidated response to the findings of the report. The response must not include student names or student ID numbers. The list of topics shall include:

  - Viability Indicators not met (e.g. extenuating circumstances, if applicable)
  - Strengths of the program
  - Contemplated corrective actions for unmet indicators
  - Achievement of objectives of previous year's Area Improvement Plans

F.   The committee shall make recommendations on:

1.   The viability of programs whose Deans/Directors and District-wide Coordinators appeared before the committee. The committee shall consider indicator findings, the extenuating circumstances indicated on the *Program Review Justification Form*, and the testimony of the program's Dean/Director and District-wide Coordinator in determining program viability.

      a.   If a program is being reviewed by the committee for the first time, the committee shall vote on program viability immediately after hearing the testimony of the program's Dean/Director and District-wide Coordinator and shall immediately thereafter verbally inform the program's Dean/Director and District-wide Coordinator of the decision. The IE Office shall ensure that the decision is communicated to the full-time members of the discipline within 20 working days.

      b.   If the same program is reviewed the second year, the committee will only review the program's plans for improvement.

      c.   If the same program is reviewed the third or more consecutive year(s), the committee shall review the program as if doing so for the first time.

The committee Chair shall inform the Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education by memorandum of the recommendations of the committee and shall forward the memo to the IE Office, which shall maintain a file of such memos. When recommending that the Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education "review a program's strengths and weaknesses and the program's capacity to improve its service to students and the community," the recommendation shall indicate whether or not the committee recommends the possibility of closure.

The Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education will take the committee's recommendation to the President. The Vice President will subsequently notify the committee and, if needed, the Curriculum Office Director, of the President's decision.

2.   Program improvement for all programs. Deans/Directors shall submit an Area Improvement Plan(s) that addresses unmet Viability and Quality Indicators for these programs. If data available by site indicate that indicators are unmet at a particular site, the Dean/Director at the site must submit an Area Improvement Plan(s) that addresses unmet Viability and Quality Indicators at his or her site; at the discretion of the Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education, a District Area Improvement Plan(s) that addresses the identified unmet Viability and Quality Indicators may also be submitted. Programs shall adhere to the planning procedures of the Office of Institutional and Community Planning.

      The Institutional Effectiveness Office, in consultation with the Office of Institutional and Community Planning, shall contact those disciplines submitting Area Improvement Plans to ensure that subsequent *Program Review Reports* indicate the extent to which strategies were implemented and indicate the results of the implementation.

G.   Depending on the resources available, the College shall support programs in meeting Area Improvement Plans that address unmet Viability or Quality indicators.

H.   A copy of all correspondence between the Chair of the PRC and program Deans/Directors, District-wide Coordinators and Vice President of Instruction and Workforce Education shall be kept on file in the IE Office.

El Paso
Community
College

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA DISCREPANCY FORM

Deans/Directors: If, after reviewing the attached Program Review data, you feel that some data are inaccurate, please complete the form below in accordance with Section III. C of College Procedure 2.03.01.18: *Program Review*. Completed copies of this form shall be on file in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Use additional sheets, if necessary.

Program Name: _____

VIABILITY /QUALITY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR(S) IN DISPUTE	DISPUTED DATA	CORRECT DATA (Supporting materials must be attached)

Completed by:_____   Date Completed:_____
              (Typed Name)

Dean/Director's signature:_____   **Date Signed:**_____   **9/19/03**

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF RESEARCH, ACCREDITATION AND PLANNING

El Paso
Community
College

PROGRAM REVIEW JUSTIFICATION FORM

Deans/Directors: This form has been sent to you by the Program Review Committee, because your program has been selected for review. If you wish to indicate extenuating circumstances that resulted in unmet Viability and/or Quality indicators, please complete the form below and bring it to the Program Review Committee meeting that has been scheduled for you, as specified in College Procedure 2.03.01.18: *Program Review*. Completed copies of this form shall be on file in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Use additional sheets, if necessary.

Program Name: _____

INDICATOR	JUSTIFICATION

Completed by:_____   **Date Completed:**_____
              (Typed Name)

Dean/Director's signature:_____   **Date Signed:**_____   **9/19/03**

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF RESEARCH, ACCREDITATION AND PLANNING

El Paso
Community
College

PROGRAM REVIEW KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Note: Some standards have critical thresholds, which, for information only, indicate especially unacceptable performance.

CREDIT PROGRAMS

Viability Indicators

1. CREDIT TRANSFER/CREDIT DEVELOPMENTAL

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Contact/Credit Hours per FT Faculty	Sufficient contact/credit hours, District-wide, disregarding lecturers, for FT faculty workload (per College policy), based on total no. of contact/credit hours for all courses in the discipline for last 3 years (Fall, Spring) and total no. of full-time faculty teaching during Fall and Spring of the last 3 years. (Excluding C.E. courses) (Unduplicated) (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Versions of programs share the same results) Source : *Program Review Status Form* completed by Dean of District Discipline Coordinator/CE Dean/Director	Yes; in red if No
2. Class Fill Rate	Data by District/Site. 1) Percent of classes 75% full (optimum fill rate) on census date, based on no. of students (including concurrent students) in each section for last 3 years on census date, excluding MILS (UTEP ROTC), MUAP (independent Music study), MUSR (recitals), Independent Study, Virtual College of Texas, classes whose instructors are not paid by EPCC. Optimum (set by VP of Instruction and Workforce Education): No. of students that can be adequately taught in a section of the course. 2) For information only, District average fill rate appears in the row below the foregoing data: Total number of seats filled divided by the total number of seats available) Room capacity (set by Physical Plant): No. of chairs/equipment in a room. If the room capacity is below the optimum, the room capacity is used to score the indicator. 3) For information only, the measure (Item 1) is also calculated to exclude concurrent students. Source: Master Class Schedule (Mainframe)	80%; in red if decreased <50%
3. Enrollment Trends (N/A to Developmental English & Math)	Data by District/Site. 1) Seat count (including concurrent students) is increasing or is level, or, if decreasing, does not decrease more than 5 percent from the benchmark year (1st yr of the last 3 yrs). Seat counts for all the program-specific courses are added together to determine the seat count. 2) For information only, appears the unduplicated number of students by academic year. 3) For information only, the measure (Item 1) is also calculated to exclude concurrent students. Source: Banner	Enrollment (Including concurrent) increased, level or decreased no more than 5%; in red if decreased >10%.
4. Revenue Sufficiency (N/A to Developmental English & Math)	For each of the 3 previous years, program credit hours x average fall tuition per credit hour + state reimbursement (dollar reimbursement per contact hour by program x total contact hours per program x current reimbursement percentage rate) is greater than or equal to program budget + overhead costs (33% of entire program budget.) (For information only, the surplus above, or the deficit below, the program budget + overhead costs appears after the foregoing result and for each of the 3 previous years, with "Yes" or "No" preceding the amounts as appropriate) Excludes grant and external funding. When multiple programs are under the same budget, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Faculty salaries are included in expenses. (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Versions of programs share the same results) Sources: Student Banner Files, Budget Office, *Public Community/Junior & Technical College Basis of Legislative Appropriations*	Yes
5. Full-Time Faculty in Discipline	At least 1 FT instructor whose primary teaching load is in the discipline. (Sept. 1-May 1 of latest academic year) (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Versions of programs share the same results) Sources: Master Class Schedule (Mainframe), Fac. Employment Status (Mainframe)	Yes; in red if No
6. Student Learning Outcomes (Except Dev. English & Dev. Math)	For each 2-year cycle, has the program documented and implemented the recommendations for its active Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and completed its assessment process (which can include drafting new SLOs and selecting a method of assessment, conducting assessment, reviewing findings and making recommendations) for its active SLOs? Source: SLO Assessment Task Force (All fields must have data for applicable cycle—no blank fields)	Yes

2. CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

1. State-Mandated

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. No. of Graduates	No. of graduates within latest 5-year period (Fall, Spring, Summer) for which State data are available, based on no. of graduates for each program (Since the State counts awards, rather than persons, graduates with more than 1 award are counted more than once) (For information only, after the Current Score is printed the latest 5-yr total of awards known to the College, but not yet available from the State.) Source: Annual Data Profile, Mainframe	25; in red if decreased <15
2. Student Success	Percent of students employed/transfer/enter military w/in 1 yr. of grad., based on the no. of graduates for each program for last 3 years for which State data are available and the number of those graduates who are employed, have transferred to another institution or have entered the military within one-year of graduation. (Additional documentation may be provided by District-wide Coordinator.) Source: Annual Data Profile and/or Automated Student and Adult Learner Follow-up System	90%; in red if decreased <50%

2. Instructional Support

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Workforce Demand	Whether the sum of new and replacement jobs in the field forecast for El Paso and Hudspeth Counties and the New Mexico counties of Dona Ana, Luna and Otero during the 5 years following the publication of the *Program Review Report* meets or exceeds the number of graduates during the 5 years preceding the publication of the report. To ensure that the data include career paths addressed by the program, each program shall provide the IE Office with a list of jobs for which it prepares graduates. (See Emsi Report) Sources: Mainframe/State Lonestar, Emsi Database	Yes
2. Contact/Credit Hours per FT Faculty	Sufficient contact/credit hours, District-wide, disregarding lecturers, for FT faculty workload (per College policy), based on total no. of contact/credit hours for all courses in the discipline for last 3 years (Fall, Spring) and total no. of full-time faculty teaching during Fall and Spring of the last 3 years. (Excluding C.E. courses) (Unduplicated) (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Versions of programs share the same results) Source: *Program Review Status Form* completed by Dean of District Discipline Coordinator/CE Dean/Director	Yes; in red if No
3. Class Fill Rate	Data by District/Site. 1) Percent of classes 75% full (optimum fill rate) on census date, based on no. of students (including concurrent students) in each section for last 3 years on census date, excluding MILS (UTEP ROTC), MUAP (independent Music study), MUSR (recitals), Independent Study, Virtual College of Texas, classes whose instructors are not paid by EPCC. Optimum (set by VP of Instruction and Workforce Education): No. of students that can be adequately taught in a section of the course. 2) For information only, District average fill rate appears in the row below the foregoing data: Total number of seats filled divided by the total number of seats available) Room capacity (set by Physical Plant): No. of chairs/equipment in a room. If the room capacity is below the optimum, the room capacity is used to score the indicator. 3) For information only, the measure (Item 1) is also calculated to exclude concurrent students.) Source: Master Class Schedule (Mainframe)	80%; in red if decreased <50%
4. Enrollment Trends	Data by District/Site. 1) Seat count (including concurrent students) is increasing or is level, or, if decreasing, does not decrease more than 5 percent from the benchmark year (1st yr of the last 3 yrs). Seat counts for all the program-specific courses are added together to determine the seat count. 2) For information only, appears the unduplicated number of students by academic year. 3) For information only, the measure (Item 1) is also calculated to exclude concurrent students. Source: Banner	Enrollment (Including concurrent) increased, level or decreased no more than 5%; in red if decreased >10%.
5. Full-Time Faculty in Discipline	At least 1 FT instructor whose primary teaching load is in the discipline. (Sept. 1-May 1 of latest academic year) (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Versions of programs share the same results) Sources: Master Class Schedule (Mainframe), Fac. Employment Status (Mainframe)	Yes; in red if No
6. Student Learning Outcomes	For each 2-year cycle, has the program documented and implemented the recommendations for its active Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and completed its assessment process (which can include drafting new SLOs and selecting a method of assessment, conducting assessment, reviewing findings and making recommendations) for its active SLOs? Source: SLO Assessment Task Force (All fields must have data for applicable cycle—no blank fields)	Yes

Quality Indicators

1. CREDIT TRANSFER/CREDIT DEVELOPMENTAL

1. Stakeholder Satisfaction/Progress

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Student Satisfaction with Program	Data by District/Site. Percent of satisfaction, based on fall/spring % of students satisfied with labs & technology for the last 3 years (Fall, Spring). (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses: Excellent: 1, Good: 1, Acceptable: 1, Weak: 0, Unacceptable: 0. Average of 1=Satisfaction) Source: Credit Student Faculty Evaluation	80%

Indicator	Measures	Standard
2. Student Evaluation of Faculty	Data by District/Site. Percent of satisfaction, based on fall/spring overall average % of responses for last 3 years to question: "Would you recommend the instructor?" Source: Credit Student Faculty Evaluation	80%
3. Eligible to Advance to Next Level (Except Credit Transfer)	Data by District/Site. Percent of developmental students receiving credit for course, based on no. of students in each course on the census date and the % receiving a "C" for the course, for previous 3 years. (English, Math, Reading/RESL). Source: Credit Academic History	65%

2. Instructional Support

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Full-Time Faculty Development	For most recent year, percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the fall semester (1st day of fall Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams) and percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the spring semester (1st day of spring Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams). If FT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: Faculty Development Records	100%
2. Part-Time Faculty Development	For most recent year, percent of PT teaching Faculty at 1 prof. development activity during the fall semester (1st day of fall Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams) and percent of PT teaching Faculty at 1 prof. development activity during the spring semester (1st day of spring Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams). If PT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: Faculty Development Records	75%
3. Sections taught by Full-Time Faculty	Data by District/Site. Percent of Fall and Spring sections taught by FT Faculty for last 3 years, excluding MILS (UTEP ROTC), MUAP (independent Music study), MUSR (recitals), Independent Study, Virtual College of Texas, classes whose instructors are not paid by EPCC. Sources: Master Class Schedule (Mainframe), Fac. Employment Status (Mainframe)	50%
4. Course Syllabus	Reviewed/revised within the last 3 years, based on no. of course syllabi in the program and the revision date of each syllabus. Source: Course Syllabus (Curriculum Office)	Yes

2. CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

1. Stakeholder Satisfaction/Progress

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Student Satisfaction with Program	Data by District/Site. Percent of satisfaction, based on fall/spring percent of students satisfied with labs & technology for the last 3 years. (Fall, Spring) (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses: Excellent: 1, Good: 1, Acceptable: 1, Weak: 0, Unacceptable = 0. Average of 1=Satisfaction) Source: Credit Student Faculty Evaluation	80%
2. Student Evaluation of Faculty	Data by District/Site. Percent of satisfaction, based on fall/spring overall instructor performance averaged percent of student satisfaction with instructor overall performance for last 3 years, based on question: "Would you recommend instructor?" Source: Credit Student Faculty Evaluation	80%
3. Graduate Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on percent of cumulative graduates satisfied with "usefulness of my major courses with respect to my job," "availability of courses in my major," and "level of technology in my major" for previous 3 years. (Combined average of all three responses) Source: Graduate Survey	80%
4. Employer Satisfaction	Percent of employer satisfaction with EPCC graduates, based on no. of employers responding to a survey and the no. of employers satisfied with EPCC graduates for last 3 years. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Dean/District-wide Coordinator. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the eight responses: Excellent = 1, Good = 1, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction) Source: Employer Survey	80%
5. Advisory committee Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on the overall, averaged percent of satisfaction of each program advisory committee for the last 3 years. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the eleven responses: Excellent = 1, Good = 1, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction.) When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Source: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes	80%
6. Student Licensure/Certification, As Applicable	Percent of graduates/completers receiving licensure/certification, based on annual pass rate for the most recent year. Source: THECB Statewide Annual Licensure Report	90%

2. Instructional Support

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Full-Time Faculty Development	For most recent year, percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the fall semester (1st day of fall Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams) and percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the spring semester (1st day of spring Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams). If FT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: Faculty Development Records	100%

2. Part-Time Faculty Development	For most recent year, percent of PT teaching Faculty at 1 prof. development activity during the fall semester (1st day of fall Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams) and percent of PT teaching Faculty at 1 prof. development activity during the spring semester (1st day of spring Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams). If PT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: Faculty Development Records	75%
3. Sections taught by Full-Time Faculty	Data by District/Site. Percent of sections taught by FT Faculty for last 3 years, excluding MILS (UTEP ROTC), MUAP (independent Music study), MUSR (recitals), Independent Study, Virtual College of Texas, classes whose instructors are not paid by EPCC. Sources: Master Class Schedule (Mainframe), Fac. Employment Status (Mainframe)	50%
4. Course Syllabus	Reviewed/revised within the last 3 years, based on no. of course syllabi in the program and the revision date of each syllabus. Source: Course Syllabus (Curriculum Office)	Yes
5. Advisory Committee Meetings	Held at least once annually, based on the meeting date(s) of each program advisory committee for the last 3 years. When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Sources: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes, *Program Review Status Form* completed by Dean of District Discipline Coordinator/CE Dean/Director	Yes
6. DACUM	Completion within last 5 years, based on the completion date of each program DACUM. Source: DACUM Audit (Curriculum Office)	Yes
7. DACUM findings	Incorporated, as appropriate, into curriculum, based on the most recent DACUM Audit for each program. Source: DACUM Audit (Curriculum Office)	Yes
8. Secondary Articulation Agreements, as appropriate	Percent of ISD requests for articulation addressed through analysis of EPCC course objectives for last 3 years. Source: Curriculum Office	100%
9. Post-Secondary Articulation Agreements, as appropriate	Written evidence of attempted or revised articulation within the last 3 years. Source: *Program Review Status Form* completed by Dean of District Discipline Coordinator/CE Dean/Director	Yes
10. Program Accreditation, As Applicable	Maintains/actively seeking voluntary accreditation, based on documentation of accreditation or application for accreditation for last 3 years. Source: *Program Review Status Form* completed by Dean of District Discipline Coordinator/CE Dean/Director	Yes
11. Community Benefit/Service	Percent of advisory members acknowledging that the program is meeting community needs for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of advisory members indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that the program is meeting community needs. When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Source: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes	85%
12. Program Need	Percent of employers acknowledging that the program is needed for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of employers indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that each program is needed. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Dean/District-wide Coordinator; the list shall be the same as that used for Career and Technical Education Student Learning Indicator No. 4: Employer Satisfaction. Source: Employer Survey	85%
13. Competitive Advantage: Quality	Percent of respondents acknowledging EPCC meets/exceeds quality of proprietary schools for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of the business community indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that each program's quality meets or exceeds that of proprietary schools. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Dean/District-wide Coordinator; the list shall be the same as that used for Career and Technical Education Student Learning Indicator No. 4: Employer Satisfaction. (Combined average of responses on both the Advisory Committee Survey and the Employer Survey) Sources: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes, Employer Survey	85%

NON-CREDIT PROGRAMS

LANGUAGE INSTITUTE

Viability Indicators

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Contact Hours per FT Faculty	Sufficient contact hours, District-wide, for FT faculty workload (as per College policy), based on total no. of contact hours for all courses for last 3 years (Fall, Spring,) and total number of full-time faculty teaching during Fall and Spring of the last three year (Unduplicated). Sources: *Program Review Status Form* completed By Dean of District Discipline Coordinator/CE Dean/Director, Fac. Employment Status (Mainframe)	Yes
2. Class Fill Rate	Percent of classes 75 percent full (optimum fill rate) on census date, based on no. of students in each section for last 3 years on census date. (For information only, District average fill rate appears in comments column: Total number of seats filled divided by the total number of seats available) Source: Master Calendar Schedule (Mainframe)	80%
3. Enrollment Trends (All Language Dev. Areas of study only)	Seat count is increasing or is level, or, if decreasing, does not decrease more than 5 percent from the benchmark year (1st yr. of the last 3 yrs. Seat counts for all area of study courses are added together to determine the seat count. (For information only, appears the unduplicated number of students by term and by year) Sources: Banner	Yes
4. Revenue Sufficiency	For the academic year prior to the academic year of the *Program Review Report*, revenue (tuition & fees plus state reimbursement) meets or exceeds expenditures. (For information only, the surplus above, or the deficit below, the breakeven point appears after the foregoing result) Sources: Assistant Registrar CE, Student Banner Files, Budget Office, *Public Community/Junior & Technical College Basis of Legislative Appropriations*	Yes
5. Student Learning Outcomes	For each 2-year cycle, has the program documented and implemented the recommendations for its active Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and completed its assessment process (which can include drafting new SLOs and selecting a method of assessment, conducting assessment, reviewing findings and making recommendations) for its active SLOs? Source: SLO Assessment Task Force (All fields must have data for applicable cycle—no blank fields)	Yes

Quality Indicators

1. Stakeholder Satisfaction/Progress

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Student Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on percent of students satisfied with "Labs" & "Technology" for the last 3 years. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses: Excellent = 1, Good = 1, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction.) Source: *Credit and Language Institute Student Evaluation of Instructor Performance*	80%
2. Student Evaluation of Faculty (Program Summary)	Percent of satisfaction, based on overall instructor performance averaged percent of student satisfaction with instructor overall performance for last 3 years. Based on: The instructor's overall performance. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses: Excellent: 1, Good: 1, Acceptable: 1, Weak: 0, Unacceptable: 0. An average of 1: Satisfaction) Source: Non-credit Student Faculty Evaluation	80%

2. Instructional Support

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Full-Time Faculty Development	For most recent year, percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the fall semester (1st day of fall Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams) and percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the spring semester (1st day of spring Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams). If FT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: Faculty Development Records	100%
2. Course Outlines	Reviewed/revised within last 3 years, based on revision date of each program course outline. Source: CE Administrators/Dean/Director	Yes

MASSAGE THERAPY

Viability Indicators

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Contact Hours per FT Faculty	Sufficient contact hours, District-wide, for FT faculty workload (as per College policy), based on total no. of contact hours for all courses for last 3 years (Fall, Spring,) and total number of full-time faculty teaching during Fall and Spring of the last three year (Unduplicated). Sources: *Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director, Fac. Employment Status (Banner)	Yes
2. Class Fill Rate	Percent of classes 100 percent full (optimum fill rate, at least 8 students minimum in all classes) on census date, based on no. of students in each section for last 3 years on census date. (For information only, District average fill rate appears in comments column: Total number of seats filled divided by the total number of seats available) Source: Master Calendar Schedule (Banner)	100%
3. Enrollment Trends	Seat count is increasing or is level, or, if decreasing, does not decrease more than 5 percent from the benchmark year (1st yr. of the last 3 yrs. Seat counts for all area of study courses are added together to determine the seat count. (For information only, appears the unduplicated number of students by term and by year) Sources: Banner	Yes
4. Revenue Sufficiency	For the academic year prior to the academic year of the *Program Review Report*, revenue (tuition & fees) meets or exceeds expenditures. (For information only, the surplus above, or the deficit below, the breakeven point appears after the foregoing result) Sources: Assistant Registrar CE, Student Banner Files, Budget Office, *Public Community/Junior & Technical College Basis of Legislative Appropriations* Tabled: See Christy	Yes
5. Full-Time Faculty in Discipline	At least 1 FT instructor whose primary teaching load is in the discipline. (Sept. 1-May 1 of latest academic year) (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Versions of programs share the same results) Sources: Master Class Schedule (Banner), Fac. Employment Status (Banner)	Yes
6. Student Licensure/Certification, As Applicable	Percent of graduates/completers receiving licensure/certification, based on annual pass rate for the most recent year. Source: THECB Statewide Annual Licensure Report	90%
7. No. of Graduates/ Completers	No. of graduates/completers within latest 5-year period (Fall, Spring, Summer) for which State data are available, based on no. of graduates/completers for each program (Since the State counts awards, rather than persons, graduates/ completers with more than 1 award are counted more than once) (For information only, after the Current Score is printed the latest 5-yr total of awards known to the College, but not yet available from the State.) Source: Annual Data Profile, Banner, THECB	25 / < 15
8. Student Success	Percent of students employed w/in 1 yr. of grad., based on the no. of graduates/completers for each program for last 3 years for which State data are available and the number of those graduates/completers who are employed within one-year of graduation. (Additional documentation may be provided by District-wide Coordinator.) Source: Annual Data Profile and/or Automated Student and Adult Learner Follow-up System, THECB	90%/ <50%
9. Workforce Demand	Whether the sum of new and replacement jobs in the field forecast for El Paso and Hudspeth Counties and the New Mexico counties of Dona Ana, Luna and Otero during the 5 years following the publication of the *Program Review Report* meets or exceeds the number of graduates during the 5 years preceding the publication of the report. To ensure that the data include career paths addressed by the program, each program shall provide the IE Office with a list of jobs for which it prepares graduates. (See Emsi Report) Sources: C.E. Director	Yes

Quality Indicators

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Student Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on percent of students satisfied with "Required labs" & "Technology" averaged for the last 3 years. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses: Excellent = 1, Good = 1, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction.) Source: *Non-credit Student Evaluation of Instructor Performance*	80%
2. Student Evaluation of Faculty	Percent of satisfaction, based on overall instructor performance averaged percent of student satisfaction with instructor overall performance for last 3 years. Based on: The instructor's overall performance. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses: Excellent: 1, Good: 1, Acceptable: 1, Weak: 0, Unacceptable: 0. An average of 1: Satisfaction) Source: Non-credit Student Faculty Evaluation	80%
3. Full-Time Faculty Development	For most recent year, percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the fall semester (1st day of fall Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams) and percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the spring semester (1st day of spring Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams). If FT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: Faculty Development Records	100%

Indicators	Measures	Standard
4. Course Syllabus	Reviewed/revised within last 3 years, based on revision date of each program course outline. Source: *Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director	Yes
5. Graduate Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on percent of cumulative graduates satisfied with "usefulness of my major courses with respect to my job," "availability of courses in my major," and "level of technology in my major" for previous 3 years. (Combined average of all three responses) Source: Graduate Survey	80%
6. Employer Satisfaction	Percent of employer satisfaction with EPCC completers, based on no. of employers responding to a survey in the program field and the no. of employers satisfied with EPCC completers for last 3 years. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Director. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the eleven responses: Excellent: 1, Good: 1, Acceptable: 1, Weak: 0, Unacceptable: 0. Average of 1=Satisfaction) Source: Employer Survey Has own survey	80%
7. Advisory committee Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on the overall, averaged percent of satisfaction of each program advisory committee for the last 3 years. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the eleven responses: Excellent = 1, Good = 1, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction.) When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Source: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes	80%
8. Advisory Committee Meetings	Held at least once annually, based on the meeting date(s) of each program advisory committee for the last 3 years. When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Sources: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes, *Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director	Yes
9. Program Accreditation, As Applicable	Maintains/actively seeking voluntary accreditation, based on documentation of accreditation or application for accreditation for last 3 years. Source: *Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director	Yes
10. Community Benefit/Service	Percent of advisory members acknowledging that the program is meeting community needs for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of advisory members indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that the program is meeting community needs. When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Source: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes	85%
11. Program Need	Percent of employers acknowledging that the program is needed for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of employers indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that each program is needed. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Dean/District-wide Coordinator; the list shall be the same as that used for Career and Technical Education Student Learning Indicator No. 4: Employer Satisfaction. Source: Employer Survey	85%
12. Competitive Advantage: Quality	Percent of respondents acknowledging EPCC meets/exceeds quality of proprietary schools for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of the business community indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that each program's quality meets or exceeds that of proprietary schools. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Dean/District-wide Coordinator; the list shall be the same as that used for Career and Technical Education Student Learning Indicator No. 4: Employer Satisfaction. (Combined average of responses on both the Advisory Committee Survey and the Employer Survey) Sources: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes, Employer Survey	85%

NAIL TECHNICIAN

Viability Indicators

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Contact Hours per FT Faculty	Sufficient contact hours, District-wide, for FT faculty workload (as per College policy), based on total no. of contact hours for all courses for last 3 years (Fall, Spring,) and total number of full-time faculty teaching during Fall and Spring of the last three year (Unduplicated). Sources: *Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director	Yes
2. Class Fill Rate	Percent of classes 100 percent full (optimum fill rate, at least 8 students minimum in all classes) on census date, based on no. of students in each section for last 3 years on census date. (For information only, District average fill rate appears in comments column: Total number of seats filled divided by the total number of seats available) Source: Master Calendar Schedule (Banner)	100%
3. Enrollment Trends	Seat count is increasing or is level, or, if decreasing, does not decrease more than 5 percent from the benchmark year (1st yr. of the last 3 yrs. Seat counts for all area of study courses are added together to determine the seat count. (For information only, appears the unduplicated number of students by term and by year) Sources: Banner	Yes
4. Revenue Sufficiency	For the academic year prior to the academic year of the *Program Review Report*, revenue (tuition & fees) meets or exceeds expenditures. (For information only, the surplus above, or the deficit below, the breakeven point appears after the foregoing result) Sources: Assistant Registrar CE, Student Banner Files, Budget Office, *Public Community/Junior & Technical College Basis of Legislative Appropriations*	Yes

Indicators	Measures	Standard
5. Full-Time Faculty in Discipline	At least 1 FT instructor whose primary teaching load is in the discipline. (Sept. 1-May 1 of latest academic year) (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Versions of programs share the same results) Sources: Master Class Schedule (Banner), Fac. Employment Status (Banner)	Yes
6. Student Licensure/Certification, As Applicable	Percent of graduates/completers receiving licensure/certification, based on annual pass rate for the most recent year. Source: THECB Statewide Annual Licensure Report	90%
7. No. of Graduates/ Completers	No. of graduates/completers within latest 5-year period (Fall, Spring, Summer) for which State data are available, based on no. of graduates/completers for each program (Since the State counts awards, rather than persons, graduates/ completers with more than 1 award are counted more than once) (For information only, after the Current Score is printed the latest 5-yr total of awards known to the College, but not yet available from the State.) Source: Annual Data Profile, Banner, THECB	25 / < 15
8. Student Success	Percent of students employed w/in 1 yr. of grad., based on the no. of graduates/completers for each program for last 3 years for which State data are available and the number of those graduates/completers who are employed within one-year of graduation. (Additional documentation may be provided by District-wide Coordinator.) Source: Annual Data Profile and/or Automated Student and Adult Learner Follow-up System, THECB	90%/ <50%
9. Workforce Demand	Whether the sum of new and replacement jobs in the field forecast for El Paso and Hudspeth Counties and the New Mexico counties of Dona Ana, Luna and Otero during the 5 years following the publication of the *Program Review Report* meets or exceeds the number of graduates during the 5 years preceding the publication of the report. To ensure that the data include career paths addressed by the program, each program shall provide the IE Office with a list of jobs for which it prepares graduates. (See Emsi Report) Sources: C.E. Director	Yes

Quality Indicators

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Student Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on percent of students satisfied with "Required labs" & "Technology" averaged for the last 3 years. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses: Excellent = 1, Good = 1, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction.) Source: *Non-credit Student Evaluation of Instructor Performance*	80%
2. Student Evaluation of Faculty	Percent of satisfaction, based on overall instructor performance averaged percent of student satisfaction with instructor overall performance for last 3 years. Based on: The instructor's overall performance. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses: Excellent: 1, Good: 1, Acceptable: 1, Weak: 0, Unacceptable: 0. An average of 1: Satisfaction) Source: Non-credit Student Faculty Evaluation	80%
3. Full-Time Faculty Development	For most recent year, percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the fall semester (1st day of fall Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams) and percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the spring semester (1st day of spring Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams). If FT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: Faculty Development Records	100%
4. Course Syllabus	Reviewed/revised within last 3 years, based on revision date of each program course outline. Source: *Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director	Yes
5. Graduate Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on percent of cumulative graduates satisfied with "usefulness of my major courses with respect to my job," "availability of courses in my major," and "level of technology in my major" for previous 3 years. (Combined average of all three responses) Source: Graduate Survey	80%
6. Employer Satisfaction	Percent of employer satisfaction with EPCC completers, based on no. of employers responding to a survey in the program field and the no. of employers satisfied with EPCC completers for last 3 years. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Director. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the eleven responses: Excellent: 1, Good: 1, Acceptable: 1, Weak: 0, Unacceptable: 0. Average of 1=Satisfaction) Source: Employer Survey (Uses survey of Cosmetology)	80%
7. Advisory committee Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on the overall, averaged percent of satisfaction of each program advisory committee for the last 3 years. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the eleven responses: Excellent = 1, Good = 1, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction.) When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Source: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes	80%
8. Advisory Committee Meetings	Held at least once annually, based on the meeting date(s) of each program advisory committee for the last 3 years. When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Sources: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes, *Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director	Yes

Indicators	Measures	Standard
9. Program Accreditation, As Applicable	Maintains/actively seeking voluntary accreditation, based on documentation of accreditation or application for accreditation for last 3 years. Source: *Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director	Yes
10. Community Benefit/Service	Percent of advisory members acknowledging that the program is meeting community needs for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of advisory members indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that the program is meeting community needs. When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Source: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes	85%
11. Program Need	Percent of employers acknowledging that the program is needed for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of employers indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that each program is needed. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Dean/District-wide Coordinator; the list shall be the same as that used for Career and Technical Education Student Learning Indicator No. 4: Employer Satisfaction. Source: Employer Survey	85%
12. Competitive Advantage: Quality	Percent of respondents acknowledging EPCC meets/exceeds quality of proprietary schools for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of the business community indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that each program's quality meets or exceeds that of proprietary schools. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Dean/District-wide Coordinator; the list shall be the same as that used for Career and Technical Education Student Learning Indicator No. 4: Employer Satisfaction. (Combined average of responses on both the Advisory Committee Survey and the Employer Survey) Sources: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes, Employer Survey	85%

TEXAS PEACE OFFICER

Viability Indicators

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Contact Hours per FT Faculty	Sufficient contact hours, District-wide, for FT faculty workload (as per College policy), based on total no. of contact hours for all courses for last 3 years (Fall, Spring,) and total number of full-time faculty teaching during Fall and Spring of the last three year (Unduplicated). Sources: *Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director	Yes
2. Class Fill Rate	Percent of Phase 1 classes 100 percent full (optimum fill rate, at least 22 students per class) on census date, based on no. of students in each section for last 3 years on census date. (For information only, District average fill rate appears in comments column: Total number of seats filled divided by the total number of seats available) Source: Master Calendar Schedule (Banner)	100%
3. Enrollment Trends	Seat count is increasing or is level, or, if decreasing, does not decrease more than 5 percent from the benchmark year (1st yr. of the last 3 yrs. Seat counts for all area of study courses are added together to determine the seat count. (For information only, appears the unduplicated number of students by term and by year) Sources: Banner	Yes
4. Revenue Sufficiency	For the academic year prior to the academic year of the *Program Review Report*, revenue (tuition & fees) meets or exceeds expenditures. (For information only, the surplus above, or the deficit below, the breakeven point appears after the foregoing result) Sources: Assistant Registrar CE, Student Banner Files, Budget Office, *Public Community/Junior & Technical College Basis of Legislative Appropriations, Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director	Yes
5. Full-Time Faculty in Discipline	At least 1 FT instructor whose primary teaching load is in the discipline. (Sept. 1-May 1 of latest academic year) (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Versions of programs share the same results) Sources: Master Class Schedule (Banner), Fac. Employment Status (Banner)	Yes
6. Student Licensure/Certification, As Applicable	Percent of graduates/completers receiving licensure/certification, based on annual pass rate for the most recent year. Source: THECB Statewide Annual Licensure Report	90%
7. No. of Graduates/ Completers	No. of graduates/completers within latest 5-year period (Fall, Spring, Summer) for which State data are available, based on no. of graduates/completers for each program (Since the State counts awards, rather than persons, graduates/completers with more than 1 award are counted more than once) (For information only, after the Current Score is printed the latest 5-yr total of awards known to the College, but not yet available from the State.) Source: Annual Data Profile, Banner	25 / < 15
8. Student Success	Percent of students employed w/in 1 yr. of grad., based on the no. of graduates/completers for each program for last 3 years for which State data are available and the number of those graduates/completers who are employed within one-year of graduation. (Additional documentation may be provided by District-wide Coordinator.) Source: Annual Data Profile and/or Automated Student and Adult Learner Follow-up System See Steve Smith	90%/ <50%

Indicators	Measures	Standard
9. Workforce Demand	Whether the sum of new and replacement jobs in the field forecast for El Paso and Hudspeth Counties and the New Mexico counties of Dona Ana, Luna and Otero during the 5 years following the publication of the Program Review Report meets or exceeds the number of graduates during the 5 years preceding the publication of the report. To ensure that the data include career paths addressed by the program, each program shall provide the IE Office with a list of jobs for which it prepares graduates. (See Emsi Report) Source: C.E. Director	Yes

Quality Indicators

Indicators	Measures	Standard
1. Student Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on percent of students satisfied with "Required labs" & "Technology" averaged for the last 3 years. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses: Excellent = 1, Good = 1, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction.) Source: *Non-credit Student Evaluation of Instructor Performance*	80%
2. Student Evaluation of Faculty	Percent of satisfaction, based on overall instructor performance averaged percent of student satisfaction with instructor overall performance for last 3 years. Based on: The instructor's overall performance. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses: Excellent: 1, Good: 1, Acceptable: 1, Weak: 0, Unacceptable: 0. An average of 1: Satisfaction) Source: Non-credit Student Faculty Evaluation	80%
3. Full-Time Faculty Development	For most recent year, percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the fall semester (1st day of fall Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams) and percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the spring semester (1st day of spring Faculty Development week through the last day of final exams). If FT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: Faculty Development Records	100%
4. Course Syllabus	Reviewed/revised within last 3 years, based on revision date of each program course outline. Source: *Program Review Status Form* completed by CE Director	Yes
5. Graduate Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on percent of cumulative graduates satisfied with "usefulness of my major courses with respect to my job," "availability of courses in my major," and "level of technology in my major" for previous 3 years. (Combined average of all three responses) Source: Graduate Survey	80%
6. Employer Satisfaction	Percent of employer satisfaction with EPCC completers, based on no. of employers responding to a survey in the program field and the no. of employers satisfied with EPCC completers for last 3 years. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Director. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the eleven responses: Excellent: 1, Good: 1, Acceptable: 1, Weak: 0, Unacceptable: 0. Average of 1=Satisfaction) Source: Employer Survey	80%
7. Advisory committee Satisfaction with Program	Percent of satisfaction, based on the overall, averaged percent of satisfaction of each program advisory committee for the last 3 years. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the eleven responses: Excellent = 1, Good = 1, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction.) When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Source: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes	80%
8. Advisory Committee Meetings	Held at least once annually, based on the meeting date(s) of each program advisory committee for the last 3 years. When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Sources: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes, *Program Review Status Form* completed by Director	Yes
9. Program Accreditation, As Applicable	Maintains/actively seeking voluntary accreditation, based on documentation of accreditation or application for accreditation for last 3 years. Source: *Program Review Status Form* completed by Director	Yes
10. Community Benefit/Service	Percent of advisory members acknowledging that the program is meeting community needs for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of advisory members indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that the program is meeting community needs. When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Source: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes	85%
11. Program Need	Percent of employers acknowledging that the program is needed for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of employers indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that each program is needed. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Dean/District-wide Coordinator; the list shall be the same as that used for Career and Technical Education Student Learning Indicator No. 4: Employer Satisfaction. Source: Employer Survey	85%
12. Competitive Advantage: Quality	Percent of respondents acknowledging EPCC meets/exceeds quality of proprietary schools for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of the business community indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that each program's quality meets or exceeds that of proprietary schools. Where applicable, the employers shall be surveyed from a list provided by the Dean/District-wide Coordinator; the list shall be the same as that used for Career and Technical Education Student Learning Indicator No. 4: Employer Satisfaction. (Combined average of responses on both the Advisory Committee Survey and the Employer Survey) Sources: Advisory Committee Survey & Minutes, Employer Survey	85%

For College Procedure
2.03.01.18: *Program Review*

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE PROXY VOTING FORM*

This is to certify that the undersigned, a voting member of **the El Paso Community College Program Review Committee**, has designated _____ as her or his
<div align="center">Name of designee (Committee member)</div>

representative to cast all votes and express all approvals or disapprovals that said member may be entitled

to cast or express at the **Program Review Committee** meeting to be held on _____.
<div align="center">Date of Meeting</div>

In no event shall this proxy be valid for a period longer than the day of the meeting for which it is

given. This proxy must be presented by the designee at the meeting to ensure her/his participation. This

proxy shall be revocable, at any time, at the request of the undersigned voting member prior to the start of

the meeting on _____.
<div align="center">Date of Meeting</div>

_____   _____
Signature of Voting Member Unable to Attend Meeting   Date of Signature

_____

* A quorum is at least 11 voting members. (Resource and Administrative Liaisons do not vote.) The Committee approved (April 23, 2015) the
  following guidelines and steps for proxy voting: The person acting as proxy must already be a voting member of the Committee. A voting
  member can only serve as proxy for one person. The committee member who will be absent will need to fill out the proxy form, sign it, and give
  it to the person who will be casting the vote. The person acting as proxy will bring the signed form to the meeting and give the signed form to
  the chairperson as proof that she/he is permitted to vote for the absent member. The proxy form is only good for that specific missed meeting.