

Community College of Philadelphia
Academic Affairs

Quality and Viability Indicators (QVI)
Annual Program Review

Background

One of the recommendations in the Academic Master Plan (2006-2009) was to “review program outcomes on an annual basis and identify expectations for improvement.” During 2008-2009, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Academic Affairs Deans created a template that identified quality indicators and viability indicators (QVI). The template was presented at a meeting of the Department Heads during the 2009-2010 academic year. Department Heads provided feedback and some modifications were made based on their suggestions. During the summer of 2010, three Department Heads agreed to pilot the QVI to provide additional feedback. Programs in the pilot were: Automotive Technology, Medical Assisting, and Paralegal Studies. Department Heads and Deans provided feedback based on their experience. The QVI was refined based on feedback from the Department Heads in the pilot and the Deans. The QVI was shared with the Student Outcomes Committee of the Board. The 2010-2011 academic year was the first year that the QVI was required by programs in all departments.

Purpose of the Quality/Viability Indicators (QVI)

The QVI has objectives that are similar to those of the Academic Program Audits:

- To ensure curriculum relevancy
- To ensure student achievement goals, student enrollment goals, teaching and learning goals, and programmatic goals are achieved
- To evaluate course and program outcomes and assessment practices
- To assist in meeting compliance standards and requirements
- To recognize program strengths, and yield recommendations for program improvements, changes, and (in some cases) termination

The major differences are:

- The QVI is intended for annual review versus the five year timeframe of the academic program audit
- The QVI can be completed in a shorter period of time than the two to three semesters usually required to complete an academic program audit
- The QVI does not include the services of an academic auditor
- The QVI is a less comprehensive report than the academic program audit

The QVI should be used by Faculty, Department Heads and Deans to have a discussion about individual academic programs. Reviewing data from the QVI on an annual basis should help set goals and objectives for the next year. Additionally, the information helps build the five year academic program audit. By the time the audit is being prepared, there should be no surprises.

While the information from the QVI is primarily intended to help Program Faculty, it is important for Faculty to realize that the results are shared with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and with the Board of Trustees through the Student Outcomes Committee of the Board.

Who Needs to Complete a QVI and When?

Department Heads should ensure that all associate degree programs complete a QVI each year. There are two exceptions. First, in the year that an academic program starts, it is unlikely that there is sufficient data to do the QVI. Therefore, a new program will not need to complete the Annual Program Review (the QVI) until there is a year of data available. Second, in the year that an Academic Program Audit is due, programs completing the audit are exempt because the information in the audit overlaps the QVI information. Deans are responsible for monitoring the process in their respective divisions.

During the fall semester there will be an optional meeting for department heads and other faculty who need to complete the QVI. The workshop is intended to increase understanding and consistency in application of the QVI.

The QVI is due to the appropriate Dean on June 30th the end of the fiscal year. After completion of the QVI but before the fall semester, QVI results should be reviewed with the Vice President for Academic Affairs. When the QVIs for each division are completed, the results of the QVIs are plotted on a graph as a summary. This summary is shared with the Student Outcomes Committee of the Board during the fall semester.

[Step-by-Step Guide to Quality Indicators](http://www.ccp.edu/vpacaff/pdfs/QUALITY-INDICATORS-2011-2012.pdf)

<http://www.ccp.edu/vpacaff/pdfs/QUALITY-INDICATORS-2011-2012.pdf>

The QVI leads to average scores on Quality indicators and average scores on Viability Indicators. For each indicator rank the program using the scale on the template. Because the QVI was developed for both transfer, and career programs, some indicators may not apply. If an indicator does not apply, NA (not applicable) is the appropriate response. When the average for the indicators is computed, NAs will not be included in the denominator. For example, there are 9 Quality Indicators. If a program is not externally accredited, sum the rankings for 8 indicators and divide the sum by 8 (not by 9) to compute the program average on quality indicators.

Quality Indicator 1 – Student Learning Outcomes

As this point, every program has student learning outcomes at the course and program level. Therefore no one should have a score below 2. Higher scores are associated with having a plan and then implementing the plan. To get the highest score, per Middle States standards, Faculty need to have completed one cycle of course and program assessments for at least 20% of course level outcomes and program level outcomes. That is the Faculty should have gathered direct assessment data, determined whether the data meets the program's benchmarks, and made changes (or celebrated that there is no need for change). Always supply comments or documentation to support the ranking.

Quality Indicator 2 - Professional Development

The professional development indicator applies to full time Faculty in the program only. If there are no full time Faculty in the program, put down NA. This indicator provides a chance to show that people in the program are remaining up to date. This information may come from professional development that was arranged by the program or department and that all or many of the Faculty attended or Faculty may provide information about what they have done in terms of professional development individually. Some disciplines require continuing professional education to maintain certification or a license.

Quality Indicator 3 – Faculty Evaluation

Because all departments are required to have an evaluation plan for all Faculty (full and part time), no program should get less than a 2 on this indicator. Higher scores are associated with implementing the evaluation plan and using the information to encourage continuous improvement.

Quality Indicator 4 – Faculty Engagement

This indicator asks for information on Faculty engagement. Faculty need to actively participate in programs/departments if the College is going to meet mission-based goals. Thinking about this indicator may help spread tasks among Faculty so that most of the work is not done by a few people. Again, this indicator pertains to full time Faculty. While the College community appreciates the contributions of adjuncts, it is clear that they may have more competing responsibilities than full time Faculty and should not be included in this assessment. However, to recognize the efforts of adjuncts, comments could be added. If there are no full time Faculty in the program, the appropriate response would be NA.

Quality Indicator 5 – Accreditation

This indicator only applies to those programs that currently are reviewed by an external program accreditor (not Middle States regional accreditation). The indicator asks for the current status of accreditation. Thus, the status for this indicator will probably remain constant for multiple years. All programs that are not externally accredited by an external program accreditor will have an NA.

Quality Indicator 6 – Facility Oversight

This indicator only applies to programs that have dedicated facilities (e.g., science labs). All others will have an NA.

Quality Indicator 7 – Program Alliances

While this indicator clearly pertains to career programs, it can also be used by transfer programs. Programs do not have to limit their ideas of alliances to those listed. Providing comments about these external relationships should clarify for the reader why a particular rank was assigned.

Quality Indicator 8 – Academic Program Innovation

This is an important opportunity to think about best practices developed in the program or “borrowed” from other institutions. To get the highest ranking the practice has to be used and assessed for effectiveness.

Quality Indicator 9 – Strategic Planning

This item really focuses on the extent to which the Faculty are creating plans to help identify and implement goals and objectives. It requires thinking forward about the directions Faculty want to go to keep programs up-to-date and vibrant.

[Step-by-Step Guide to Viability Indicators](http://www.ccp.edu/vpacaff/pdfs/QUALITY-INDICATORS-2011-2012.pdf) (Page 6)
<http://www.ccp.edu/vpacaff/pdfs/QUALITY-INDICATORS-2011-2012.pdf>

Viability Indicator 1 – Documented Need

This item is for career programs. The State and City have identified programs that are considered high priority. Colleges, however, have been able to document local priorities. See (http://www.ccp.edu/vpacaff/pdfs/HighPriorityOccupationPrograms2010_2011.pdf)

Viability Indicator 2 – Enrollment

Some career programs have limits determined externally. If that is the case, use the percent to maximum figure. For programs that do not have pre-determined maxima, it is easier to use the % difference from the previous year. See [Academic Performance Measures and Transfer Outcomes](http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM) (<http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM>). Go to Academic Program Reports, select the drop down menu for your College/Division. Once you have selected the appropriate Division, you must select the Effectiveness Indicator Type to choose either headcount enrollment or FTE. Next click the View button to run your query. Programs may use either headcount fall to fall or spring to spring or FTEs fall to fall or spring to spring and then look for the percent of difference.

Viability Indicator 3 – Cost to Operate

This calculation comes from the College. Each year the most and least costly programs will be calculated based on the most recent information from the Budget Office. This information will be located on **final two pages** of this document.

Viability Indicator 4 – Benefit

Programs should indicate which of the 8 ways to document benefit are achieved by the program.

Viability Indicator 5 – Fall to Fall Retention

The College calculates this information. See [Academic Performance Measures and Transfer Outcomes](http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM) (<http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM>). Go to Academic Program Reports, select the drop down menu for your College/Division. Once you have selected the appropriate Division, you must select the Effectiveness Indicator, *Academic Performance/Persistence* Type. Next click the View button to run your query. Finally, click the *Fall to Fall Persistence* Tab at the top of the menu.

Viability Indicator 5 – Fall to Spring Retention

The College calculates this information. See [Academic Performance Measures and Transfer Outcomes](http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM) (<http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM>). Go to Academic Program Reports, select the drop down menu for your College/Division. Once you have selected the appropriate Division, you must select the Effectiveness Indicator, *Academic Performance/Persistence* Type. Next click the View button to run your query. Finally, click the *Fall to Spring Persistence* Tab at the top of the menu.

Viability Indicator 6 – Graduation Rates

The College calculates this information. This indicator was revised to align with the College information about graduation rate. Look at the % supplied by the College.. See [Academic Performance Measures and Transfer Outcomes](http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM) (<http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM>). Go to Academic Program Reports, Academic Performance/Persistence, College-Wide Total, next click View. Click the Success at Departure Tab at the top, on the chart displayed choose the most recent Spring term for the total college-wide graduation percent. To find the percentage of graduates for your particular program to compare to college-wide graduate rates, follow these steps:

- Click Back to Menu
- Select your Division from the Select/College Division drop Box
- Click View
- Click Success at Departure
- Choose the most recent Spring term for the total percent of graduates from your program

Viability Indicator 7 – Transfer Rates

This indicator applies primarily to transfer programs. Transfer rates are supplied by the College. See [Academic Performance Measures and Transfer Outcomes](http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM) (<http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM>). Select [Transfer Rates by Exit Status](#) from the drop down menu. Select your

Program from the drop down menu. Default term is Fall 2005, however, you can elect to change this using the drop down menu.

Viability Indicator 8 – Employment Rates

The information that the College has at this point is unreliable. Therefore, do not use this indicator for 2011-2012. Everyone should indicate NA.

Viability Indicator 9 – Degrees awarded

This information is supplied by the College. See [Academic Performance Measures and Transfer Outcomes](http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM) (<http://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM>). Go to Academic Program Reports, select the drop down menu for your College/Division. Once you have selected the appropriate Division, you must select the Effectiveness Indicator, *Academic Performance/Persistence* Type. Next click the View button to run your query. The default Tab at the top of the menu is *Degrees Awarded*.

Calculation

First calculate a score for the quality indicators. Add up the rankings for each indicator used. Divide the sum by the number of indicators used.

Next calculate a score for the viability indicators. Add up the rankings for each indicator used. Divide the sum by the number of indicators used.

QUALITY INDICATORS
Revised 11/16/2011

Student Learning Outcomes – Standard 14 in Characteristics of Excellence states that “Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution’s students have the knowledge, skills and competencies consistent with institutional goals and that students at graduation have achieved appropriate higher education goals.” It further states that the “institution must articulate statements of expected student learning at the institutional, program and individual course levels...”

Examples of outcomes measures include: graduation rates, pass rates on certifying examinations, student GPA in core courses.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Student Learning Outcomes	Clearly articulated and documented expectations of student learning outcomes at the program and course levels. Evidence of the use of outcomes data to inform programmatic directions.	Clearly articulated and documented expectations of student learning outcomes at the program and course levels. Plans for the use of outcomes data to inform programmatic directions to include specific timelines.	Articulated and documented expectations of student learning outcomes at the program and course levels. No formal plan for collection or use of data.	Articulation of student learning outcomes at only the program or course level. No articulation for collection or use of data.	No articulation of student learning outcomes at the program or course level.

QUALITY INDICATORS

Professional Development - Professional Development is an important function in support of the College’s mission and refers to a coherent, diverse array of activities that lead to documented improvement in the knowledge, performance and satisfaction of employees. Thus Professional Development activities impact program innovation and quality.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Professional Development– Full Time Faculty	100 to 90% of the full time faculty have engaged in professional development activities in the past year related to their discipline.	89% to 80% of the full time faculty have engaged in professional development activities in the past year related to their discipline.	79% to 70% of the full time faculty have engaged in professional development activities in the past year related to their discipline.	69% to 60% of the full time faculty have engaged in professional development activities in the past year related to their discipline.	Fewer than 60% of the full time faculty have engaged in professional development activities in past year related to their discipline.

Faculty Evaluation - Faculty evaluation is an important component of quality assurance. Academic programs must establish procedures for fair review of faculty performance that is both developmental and summative.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Faculty Evaluation	The program has an established and approved plan for evaluation of full and part time faculty and has used the plan to guide continuous improvement.	The program has a plan for faculty evaluation that is approved and implemented but the information is not used to guide continuous improvement.	The program has an approved plan but implementation is limited.	There is sporadic review of faculty but no plan.	There is no program evaluation of faculty.

QUALITY INDICATORS

Faculty Engagement – Full time faculty serve a critical role in ensuring that the College meets its mission. The Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association standards on excellence support faculty participation in “academic, professional, research and service programs.”

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Faculty Engagement	At least 90% of full time faculty are engaged in department and college activities	At least 80% of full time faculty are engaged in department and college activities	At least 70% of full time faculty are engaged in department activities and/or college activities	At least 60% of full time faculty are engaged in department activities and/or college activities	Fewer than 60% of full time faculty are engaged in department and/or college activities

Accreditation - Accreditation is a process in which certification of a competency, authority, or credibility is presented in a specified subject or area of expertise. Accreditation also refers to the fact that the college maintains the integrity of the program based on the standards of a duly recognized and respected accrediting organization. The accreditation process ensures that the college’s certification practices are acceptable, typically meaning that they are competent to test and certify third parties to behave ethically, and employ suitable quality assurance measures. This measure may not apply to all programs.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Accreditation	Latest program accreditation review results in reaccreditation for the maximum number of years and recognition or commendation.	Latest program accreditation review results in reaccreditation for the maximum number of years.	Latest program accreditation review results in reaccreditation for less than the maximum number of years.	Latest program accreditation review results in probationary status.	Latest program accreditation review results in a withdrawal of accreditation.

QUALITY INDICATORS

Facility Oversight - As noted in Middle States Standard 3, the effective and efficient uses of the institution’s resources (including facilities) are analyzed as part of ongoing mission-based outcomes assessment. This measure may not apply to all programs.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Facility Oversight	The program has a facility plan, which includes assessment of program facilities and identifies suggestions for improvement.	The program faculty are engaged in systematic review of program facilities and have communicated any facility needs to the College administration.	The program faculty are engaged in sporadic review of program facilities and are aware of any facility needs.	Program faculty react to facility issues that develop but do not engage in review of the facilities associated with the program.	The program faculty do not engage in any review of the facilities associated with the program.

Programmatic Alliances – Alliances involve a collaboration intended to strengthen the ability of a program to accomplish its goals. The benefits from the alliance are expected to be greater than those that would accrue from individual efforts. Examples of potential strategic alliances include:

1. Partnerships with regional employers
2. Partnerships with community based agencies
3. Partnerships or agreements with educational institutions
4. Collaboration with professional organizations
5. Active, external advisory committee

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Programmatic Alliances	Program faculty have established at least one external alliance and there is evidence of beneficial outcomes from the relationship.	Program faculty have established at least one external alliance and is actively engaged in maintaining the relationship.	Program faculty have established at least one alliance but there is no or limited engagement.	Program faculty are discussing potential alliances.	Program faculty have not considered potential alliances.

QUALITY INDICATORS

Academic Program Innovation – Innovative programs continuously advance new approaches to teaching and learning. They embrace changes to help students achieve academic performance outcomes.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Academic Program Innovation	Program faculty are engaged in continuous development of innovative practices that have been shared with other professionals (e.g., at a conference; in a publication).	Program faculty use multiple innovative practices to maximize program outcomes. Data has informed programmatic decision making and planning.	Program faculty have implemented at least one innovative practice within the past two years.	Program faculty have identified at least one innovative practice for consideration.	Program faculty do not engage in discussion or implementation of innovations for the program

Strategic Planning - Standard 2 in Characteristics of Excellence states that “Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.”

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Strategic Planning	A strategic plan is developed and there is evidence that the plan is used for decision making	A strategic plan is in place but has not been used for decision making.	Program faculty are engaged in the creation of a strategic plan or are engaged in fulfilling a list of program goals/objectives.	Program goals/objectives identified but little or no work toward completion.	No evidence of program goals/objectives.

VIABILITY INDICATORS

Documented Need – The following chart provides guidelines for use when A.A.S. career programs are evaluating whether there is an employer need and an occupational demand for programs preparing graduates for High Priority Occupations as identified by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

1. The program is primarily occupational and includes an occupational title identified by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a High Priority Occupation (HPO).
2. The occupation is not identified on the [Statewide High Priority Occupations list](#), but the local/regional WIB (Workforce Investment Board) has documented employer need for the career program in Philadelphia and individual employers have formally identified the workforce need in Philadelphia.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Documented Need	The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania approves the program as preparing graduates for a High Priority Occupation (HPO).	The occupation is not on the Statewide HPO list, but the Regional High Priority Occupation Application has been approved for a HPO program in the Philadelphia region.	The occupation is not on the Statewide HPO list, but employer documentation and Philadelphia WIB data has been secured indicating the career program is preparing graduates for an occupation considered in demand in the Philadelphia area.	The occupation is not on the Statewide HPO list. The program faculty have identified at least three local employers who have a workforce need and who are willing to support the program (e.g. serving on an advisory committee).	The occupation is not on the list Statewide High Priority Occupations (HPO) list. Program faculty are unable to document an employer-based workforce need or a career demand for the program in the City of Philadelphia.

VIABILITY INDICATORS

Enrollment – Enrollment figures for the program are based on College defined numbers at specified periods of time.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Enrollment	90% of program enrollment capacity or program enrollment growth of at least 10% over prior year	80% of program enrollment capacity or program enrollment growth of at least 5% over prior year	70% of program enrollment capacity or program enrollment growth 2% over prior year	60% of program enrollment capacity or program enrollment less than 2% growth over prior year	Program enrollment is less than 60% of capacity or decline in enrollment

Cost to Operate – The College produces data on department and program costs on an annual basis. These costs are based on all course offerings (main campus, regional centers, distance education and other off campus sites). Costs are delineated as cost per credit hour produced and as direct cost per FTE. The definition of direct cost is all expenses charged against the instructional cost center plus an allocation of fringe benefits

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Cost to Operate	Cost per credit hour and direct cost per FTE for the program are both among the five least costly programs.	Cost per credit hour and direct cost per FTE for the program are both between the five least costly programs and the median.	Cost per credit hour and direct cost per FTE for the program are both in the range slightly above or below the median for program cost.	Cost per credit hour and direct cost per FTE for the program are both between the median and the top five most costly programs.	Cost per credit hour and direct cost per FTE for the program are both among the five most costly programs.

VIABILITY INDICATORS

Benefit – refers to the fact that the program contributes to the fiscal, strategic, and mission related goals of the College. The Benefit of the program can be demonstrated in the following ways:

1. The program supports the goals and objectives of the major plans of the College (e.g. Strategic Plan, Academic Master Plan, Enrollment Management Plan, Diversity Plan, Technology Plan).
2. The program has been responsible for bringing positive name recognition to the College through
 - a. Program or co-curricular activities that have enhanced the image of the College on a local or national level (e.g. programs with high school students, professional development activities for external groups, providing a direct service to the community, etc.)
 - b. Faculty expertise, faculty publications and/or presentations, awards, publicity, and/or citations that speak to program excellence.
3. The program has brought in revenue beyond tuition and fees through donations or successful grant funded projects that support the mission and goals of the program and the College and contribute to faculty development and/or student success.
4. Innovative and creative nature of the program distinguishes it from other programs in the area.
5. Only program or one of a limited number of programs in the Philadelphia area whereby the program is so significant to the College that not to have the program would have a negative consequence for the College.
6. Excellence of the program is recognized by key partnerships in the Philadelphia area.
7. Program supports, to a great extent, other areas of the College that would suffer if the program were not active.
8. Program meets a designated need of the city and/or region.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Benefit	Program is able to demonstrate achievement of 6 to 8 of the above items.	Program is able to demonstrate achievement of 4 to 5 of the above items.	Program is able to demonstrate achievement of 2 to 3 of the above items.	Program is able to demonstrate one of the above items.	Program cannot demonstrate any of the above items.

VIABILITY INDICATORS

Fall to Fall Retention - Retention figures are based on College defined numbers which track the reenrollment of full and part-time students in a least one college level course after their first year at the College.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Fall to Fall Retention	Retention rate is 80% or is in the top quartile for the College	Retention rate is 70% or is in second quartile for the College	Retention rate is 60% or is at the College median or mean	Retention rate is 50% or is in the third quartile for the College	Retention rate is below 50% or in the lowest quartile for the College.

Fall to Spring Retention – Retention figures are based on College defined numbers. These numbers are based on the reenrollment in the second semester for new full and part-time students in the fall semesters.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Fall to Spring Retention	Retention rate is 80% or is in the top quartile for the College	Retention rate is 70% or is in the second quartile for the College	Retention rate is 60% or is at the mean or the median for the College	Retention rate is 50% or is in the third quartile for the College	Retention rate is below 50% or in the lowest quartile for the College.

VIABILITY INDICATORS

Graduation Rates – refers to the percent of students who receive an associate’s degree or certificate from the college. Compare your program graduation outcomes to the most recent Spring College-wide average.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Graduation Rates	Program graduation percentage is greater than 2% above the College-wide average.	Program graduation percentage is 2% above the College-wide average.	Program graduation percentage is equal to the College-wide average.	Program graduation percentage is less than 2% below the College-wide average.	Program graduation percentage is more than 2% below the College-wide average.

Transfer rates – refers to the percent of students who transfer from the College within 6-12 months of the date of their graduation. Transfer rates are associated solely with students who have been matriculated at CCP and transfer to a college or university.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Transfer rates	The percentage of students who successfully transferred within 6-12 months after graduation has increased by 10% or more as compared to the previous year.	The percentage of students who successfully transferred within 6-12 months after graduation has increased by less than 10% as compared to the previous year.	There was no increase or decrease in the percentage of students who successfully transfer within 6-12 months after graduation as compared to the previous year.	The percentage of students who successfully transferred within 6-12 months after graduation has decreased by less than or equal to 10% as compared to the previous year.	The percentage of students who successfully transferred within 6-12 months after graduation has decreased by more than 10% as compared to the previous year.

VIABILITY INDICATORS

Employment of graduates- The College Mission indicates that students are enabled to “...meet the changing needs of business, industry and the professions. The ability of graduates to secure employment after graduation is important to the economy of the region. **(DO NOT USE FOR 2011-2012)**

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Employment related to field of studies shortly after graduation	90-100% of program graduates are employed within 8 months of graduation	70-89% of program graduates are employed within 8 months of graduation	50-69% of program graduates are employed within 8 months of graduation	30-49% of program graduates are employed within 8 months of graduation	Less than 30% of graduates are employed within 8 months of graduation

Degrees awarded – Programs show progress in degree completion, consistent with College goals.

INDICATOR	4	3	2	1	0
Degrees awarded	The number of degrees the program has awarded has increased by more than or equal to 10% as compared to the previous year.	The number of degrees the program has awarded has increased by less than 10% as compared to the previous year.	There was no increase or decrease in the number of degrees the program has awarded as compared to the previous year.	The number of degrees the program has awarded has decreased by less than or equal to 10% as compared to the previous year.	The number of degrees the program has awarded has decreased by more than 10% as compared to the previous year.