**4.A.1 The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews and acts upon the findings.**

Barton Community College engages in a biennial [Instructional (Program) Review process](file:///%5C%5Camshare4%5Cshared%5CACCREDITATION%20EVIDENCE%20TEAM%5CCRITERION%204%5C00%20EVIDENCE%20FOR%20UPLOAD%2022%5C4.A.1%5CProcess%20Map%20Instructional%20Review.pdf), which supports the mission of the College. The review provides opportunities for faculty to assess the status, evaluate the effectiveness, and reflect on the successes and challenges of their divisions and programs. Moreover, the process serves to identify the needs, priorities, and future direction of those programs.

As evidenced by the [Instructional (Program) Review - Historical Timeline](file:///T%3A%5CACCREDITATION%20EVIDENCE%20TEAM%5CCRITERION%204%5C00%20EVIDENCE%20FOR%20UPLOAD%2022%5C4.A.1%5CInstructional%20Review%20Historical%20Timeline.pdf), the College continuously endeavors to improve the Review Process. In 2016, administrators and representatives from the assessment team, in consultation with the HLC Assessment Academy Mentor, examined the program review process and identified concerns and process gaps. This review resulted in four recommendations. As the Review process matured, the goals continued to guide process improvement. Examples of Process Maturity Indicators include:

* Concern: Focus attention on the assessment of student learning within the program
* Concern: Alignment of Program Review with Barton’s Mission, Core Priorities, and ENDs Statements
* **Process Gap: Consistent use of one reporting format** – Representatives of the Instructional Division, in
* Concern: Require additional program information for marketing, operations, and goals

[Instructional Review Template](file:///%5C%5C%5C%5Camshare4%5C%5Cshared%5C%5CACCREDITATION%20EVIDENCE%20TEAM%5C%5CCRITERION%204%5C%5C00%20EVIDENCE%20FOR%20UPLOAD%2022%5C%5C4.A.1%5C%5C2021-2023%20Instructional%20Review%20Template.pdf) –

**ACTS UPON FINDINGS**

I need to develop the narrative for this section. I am thinking about using the MLT review as the example.

[Assessment Summary Report](file:///%5C%5Camshare4%5Cshared%5CACCREDITATION%20EVIDENCE%20TEAM%5CASSESSMENT%5CASSESSMENT%20SUMMIT%5CAssessment%20Summit%20Report_2022%20v3.0.pdf)

* [Assessment of Student Learning Responses](file:///%5C%5Camshare4%5Cshared%5CACCREDITATION%20EVIDENCE%20TEAM%5CCRITERION%204%5C00%20EVIDENCE%20FOR%20UPLOAD%2022%5C4.A.1%5CAssessment%20of%20Student%20Learning%20Responses%20rev.pdf)
* [Example: 2021-2023 Instructional Review - MLT](file:///%5C%5Camshare4%5Cshared%5CACCREDITATION%20EVIDENCE%20TEAM%5CCRITERION%204%5C00%20EVIDENCE%20FOR%20UPLOAD%2022%5C4.A.1%5C2021-2023%20Instructional%20Review%20MLT.pdf)
	+ Strategic Planning Section
	+ Goal Setting
	+ Review process aligns with institutional Budget and Strategic Planning Timelines

A timeline/journey map for Program Review (Instructional Review) is given in the Assessment Summit Report (2022).

Program Assessment Reports are available which demonstrate analysis of the data and Instructional reviews document decisions/expected actions based upon the data.

Videos were provided (by the Coordinator or Assessment) to faculty to provide specific guidance on using assessment data to make planning and budgetary decisions.