Academic Program Review Report   3.20.17

Coordinator: Ferdinanda Florence

- ***ISSUE 1: Program Review Update***
- ***ISSUE 2: Raw data versus baseline analysis***
- ***ISSUE 3: Policy for programs seeking to move***

ISSUE 1
Program Review Update

Following is a sample of the kind of Excel spreadsheet that might be completed by Program faculty each year (or more often if needed).

PROGRAM OVERVIEW & MISSION
This portion of the table should be used to inform the Educational Master Plan.

Goals (pull-down menu)	Planned Action (s)	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking
Change program description			
Create new degree or certificate			
Delete degree or certificate			
Other:			

ASSESSMENT
This portion of the table should inform assessment and curriculum review.

Goals (pull-down menu)	Planned Action	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking
Update Program Learning Outcomes			
Complete PLO assessment			
Update Student Learning Outcomes			
Complete SLO assessment			
Create unified assessment rubric			
Analyze assessment results			
Other:			

CURRICULUM
This portion of the table should inform curriculum review.

Goals (pull-down menu)	Planned Action	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking

Create new course(s)			
Delete course(s)			
Modify course(s)			
Verify articulation			
Other:			

CAMPUS & COMMUNITY INTEGRATION

This portion of the table should inform the Educational Master Plan.

Goals (pull-down menu)	Planned Action	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking
Coordinate with SCC Counselors			
Coordinate with HS Counselors			
Advertise program			
Create bridge/ pathway			
Outreach to under-represented demographic(s)			
Other:			

STUDENT EQUITY & SUCCESS

This portion of the table should inform the Educational Master Plan.

Goals	Planned Action	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking
Increase retention and success rates			
Support for specific demographic(s)			
Other:			

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

List any professional development needs that would improve program functioning

Goals	Planned Action	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking
Professional development in subject area			
Professional development in pedagogy/teaching strategies			
Professional development in team building / other skills			
Other:			

RESOURCES

Human Resources Goals (to inform hiring decisions)	Planned Action	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking
Full time			
Part time			
Staff			
Other:			
Technology & Equipment Goals (to inform Technology Master Plan)	Planned Action	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking
New/upgraded technology--office			
New/upgraded technology--smartclassroom			
New/upgraded technology--lab			
New/upgraded technology--other			
New/upgraded equipment--office			
New/upgraded equipment--classroom			
New/upgraded equipment—other:			
Facilities Goals (to inform Facilities Master Plan)	Planned Action	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking
New/upgraded office			
New/upgraded classroom			
New/upgraded facility--other			
Library Resource Goals	Planned Action	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking
Purchase additional resources			
Reduce holdings of unused resources			
Other:			
Other Resource Goals	Planned Action	Person(s) Responsible	Priority ranking

ISSUE 2
Raw Data vs. Baseline Analysis

Following is the kind of raw data available for programs:

3.1 Student Success. Anecdotally describe how the program works to promote student success. Include teaching innovations, use of student support services (library, counseling, DSP, etc), community partnerships, etc.

Then, utilizing data from the office of Institutional Research and Planning, report on student success through course completion and retention data. Then, analyze by discipline success by gender, age, ethnicity, and on-line (may analyze other variables such as disability, English as a second language, day vs. night courses, etc. as appropriate).

Provide possible reasons for these trends AND planned action to equalize student success.

For complete data on completion and retention, see Appendix E: Course Completion.

Success by gender, College:

Success Rate (Gender)

	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014
Total	66.7%	67.3%	67.6%	67.1%	0.0%
Female	68.6%	68.5%	69.3%	68.4%	0.0%
Male	64.3%	65.7%	65.5%	65.3%	0.0%
Not Reported	63.1%	69.2%	64.0%	72.0%	0.0%

Success by gender, X:

3.1a - Success by Gender

Table shows success rate of students by student gender

	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Summer 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Summer 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Total	70%	76%	78%	74%	81%	78%	74%	94%	72%	77%	81%	75%	75%
Female	71%	76%	82%	77%	79%	81%	75%	95%	76%	79%	82%	78%	79%
Male	68%	76%	74%	71%	84%	75%	73%	92%	68%	75%	79%	71%	71%
Not Reported	90%	92%	60%	80%	100%	70%	73%	100%	69%	71%	82%	75%	67%

Success by ethnicity, College:

Success Rate (Ethnicity)

	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014
Total	66.7%	67.3%	67.6%	67.1%	0.0%
	81.8%	69.0%	47.1%	79.2%	0.0%
Am. Indian or Alaskan Native	68.5%	68.2%	66.9%	66.4%	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	69.9%	70.9%	71.0%	69.6%	0.0%
Black Non-Hispanic	53.9%	55.0%	55.7%	57.1%	0.0%
Hispanic	65.9%	64.9%	64.9%	65.5%	0.0%
Other	70.0%	70.6%	72.4%	72.3%	0.0%
White Non-Hispanic	71.5%	72.5%	73.0%	72.1%	0.0%

Success by ethnicity, X:

3.1c - Success by Ethnicity

Table shows success rate of students by student ethnicity

	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Summer 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Summer 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Total	70%	76%	78%	74%	81%	78%	74%	94%	72%	77%	81%	75%	75%
	50%						100%		100%	50%	100%	100%	13%
Am. Indian or Alaskan Native	64%	64%	100%	80%		70%	71%	100%	75%	82%	100%	40%	71%
Asian or Pacific Islander	78%	79%	82%	77%	89%	80%	76%	98%	77%	77%	85%	80%	81%
Black Non-Hispanic	62%	58%	73%	60%	68%	66%	60%	89%	56%	70%	69%	66%	63%
Hispanic	66%	77%	73%	78%	77%	76%	76%	96%	73%	77%	83%	68%	75%
Other	68%	84%	77%	78%	92%	87%	89%	78%	79%	100%	71%	67%	93%
White Non-Hispanic	73%	83%	81%	79%	89%	83%	79%	94%	77%	81%	83%	84%	79%

Success, online and face-to-face, College:

Success Rate (Instruction Method)

	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014
Total	66.7% 33,237	67.3% 30,924	67.6% 28,582	67.1% 27,163	0.0% 24,245
Lecture and/or discussion	68.1% 15,742	67.7% 15,632	68.1% 14,670	67.4% 13,941	0.0% 11,837
Lecture/Lab	69.0% 10,257	68.5% 9,107	67.3% 8,027	67.3% 7,656	0.0% 7,076
Online	60.1% 5,123	60.9% 4,571	64.1% 4,564	63.2% 4,190	0.0% 4,296

Success, online and face-to-face, X:

3.1c - Success by Modality

Table shows success rate of students by course delivery mode

	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Summer 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Summer 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Summer 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
Total	70%	76%	78%	74%	81%	78%	74%	94%	72%	77%	81%	75%	75%
Directed Study/Independ. Stu			100%	100%									
Dist. Ed Text one-way										77%			
Laboratory/Studio/Activity	92%	93%	75%	100%		100%	88%		71%	75%			81%
Lecture and/or discussion	70%	71%	74%	79%	89%	80%	76%	91%	67%	76%	86%	67%	73%
Lecture/Lab	73%	78%	81%	71%	96%	76%	72%	89%	74%	76%	85%	73%	73%
Online	65%	81%	81%	72%	74%	76%	75%	98%	77%	79%	79%	86%	77%

Committee members asked whether, instead of this kind of raw data charts, Institutional Research and Planning should instead provide data that shows to what extent the program diverges from the college threshold. At present, faculty are free to connect the dots and draw their own conclusions regarding what the charts show, but a basic, comparative data analysis could be provided for them.

ISSUE 3
Policy for programs seeking to move

Faculty members, in their program review report, have expressed interest in being in School A rather than School B. Deans of Schools A and B have agreed to a change, if that's what the faculty members want. However, the college lacks a procedure or policy regarding where programs "live."