

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

\*SLO data for 2011-2012 was not available (no courses scheduled for assessment).

1. **What do these results mean to you?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)
  
2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)
  
3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. **Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW****1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The actual data for Addiction Studies had to be extracted from the Counseling data provided. Enrollment and FTES are leveling off. Class sizes are consistently in the low 20s and Addiction Studies courses have not been canceled in a number of years. Course completion rates dipped from 85.4% in 2010-2011 to 75.3% in 2011-2012, but are still comparable to the campus average (75.4%). Students in the Addiction Studies program frequently stop coming to class, but do not officially drop themselves from the course. This affects course completion rates when the instructor is compelled to issue them an “F.” Student achievement (one degree and three certificates awarded in 2011-2012) remains constant over the past few years.

In summary, the Addiction Studies program is stable and currently meeting the needs of students and employers.

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

The Addiction Studies program was recently reaccredited by the California Association of Alcohol and Drug Educators (CAADE). The next renewal will be due in 2018. Keeping this program accredited is a significant workload, especially in light of the fact that there is not a full-time faculty member in the area.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

The Addiction Studies advisory committee is recommending that LTCC submit an application to become a continuing education provider. This will allow currently employed drug and alcohol counselors to obtain CEs in the Tahoe basin instead of commuting to Reno or Sacramento. The application process is lengthy and the cost is approximately \$250/year. Our lead instructor (Paul Gessford) is expected to retire after the fall 2013 quarter. Other qualified instructors are available, and the possibility of implementing distance education opportunities will be further explored in the upcoming academic year.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

\*SLO data for 2011-2012 was not available (no courses scheduled for assessment).

1. **What do these results mean to you?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)
  
2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)
  
3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. **Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW****1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The data for the Dental Assisting program is part of the “Allied Health” data package. Enrollments in the program are steady and class sizes average 22 students. Approximately 18 students finish the three-course sequence each year, thereby earning a short-term department certificate and a California Radiology Certificate (required to work in a California dentist office).

In summary, the Dental Assisting program is stable and currently meeting the needs of students and employers.

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

The Dental Assisting program was recently consolidated with the program at South Tahoe high school and is now housed in their state-of-the-art CTE building. Students completing the two courses at the high school are able to articulate directly into part two of the college series of courses.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

The Allied Health advisory committee supports the development of an 8-hour infection control course. This course is required to work in a dentist's office and will complement our current offerings in the program.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

\*SLO data for 2011-2012 was not available (no courses scheduled for assessment).

1. **What do these results mean to you?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. **Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW****1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The data for EMT and Emergency Response is part of the “Allied Health” data package. Enrollments in these courses are extremely robust. EMT sections fill each quarter and are often over-enrolled. Emergency Response courses (the prerequisite for EMT) have experienced a recent “upswing” and are rarely canceled. Students must pass the EMT course with an 80% or better grade in order to be eligible for the EMT National Registry Exam. LTCC is currently holding strong with a success rate of 90%+ on this exam; the national average is in the range of 65-70%.

In summary, the EMT/Emergency Response programs are healthy and stable. Students are being properly prepared for employment in pre-hospital positions.



**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

None.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

The college has been notified that required hours for this program will increase from 126 to 165. In addition to the associated changes that must be made to the curriculum, this increase represents a significant “strain” to instruction in terms of available instructors and required instructional aides to meet mandated ratios. The clinical placement hours are increasing from 12 to 24. This doubling of hours will require our community partners to agree to additional student placements in the emergency room and on ambulances. The EMT program is extremely “heavy” in terms of required administrative oversight to ensure compliance with county and national regulations. The program also involves a significant amount of student record keeping and coordination. The CTE department is currently strained to meet these workload requirements. The program could greatly benefit from a full-time faculty presence as well as a part-time coordinator/program technician position.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

---

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	94.75	3.50	1.75
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	88.33	9.50	2.17
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	89.20	7.20	3.60
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

\*SLO data for 2011-2012 was not available (no courses scheduled for assessment); a review of 2010-2011 data is provided here.

1. **What do these results mean to you?**

SLO program mastery is solid in the Medical Office Assistant program. Individual course SLO assessments support this observation.

2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**

Satisfied.

3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

MOA instructors are taking the SLO assessment process seriously and improvements are being made to instruction.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

**4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**

No

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

The MOA program is demonstrating strong performance in terms of course and program-level SLO mastery.

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

Program and course SLOs are adequate at this time.

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

Continue monitoring of SLO assessments and address any deficiencies as appropriate.

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW****1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The MOA program at LTCC is solid, but largely due to the success of the MOA-Administrative program. Enrollments and FTES have increased over the past five years due to the movement of the terminology courses to an online delivery format and the increasing demand for coding and billing courses to meet emerging workforce training needs. Student Success is strong (80.5%) and above the campus-wide average. DE successful completion rates are especially noteworthy (86.1% for 2011-2012). The Student Achievement data provided (i.e., degrees and certificates awarded) is incorrect. The error has been reported to the OIRP. There is more demand for the MOA-Administrative courses than the MOA-Clinical courses.

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

None.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

The viability of the MOA-Clinical program needs to be formally assessed. Class sizes are shrinking and recruiting adjuncts for the course is extremely challenging. Our current adjunct has just notified the college that she will no longer be teaching at the college.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

\*SLO data for 2011-2012 was not available (no courses scheduled for assessment).

1. **What do these results mean to you?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. **Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW****1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The Phlebotomy program consists of two courses and the associated data is part of the “Allied Health” data package. Enrollment in the courses is capped at 18 due to mandated student : instructor ratios and the availability of clinical placements at Barton’s laboratory. The course is offered once or twice a year based on certification cycles and Barton’s ability to accommodate students when they are ready to do their blood draws. This program typically “sells out” during the first day of open registration. Despite its extreme academic rigor, approximately 90%+ of the students who begin the program finish it with a grade of “B” or better. Successful completion allows students to take the national certification exam to become a Certified Phlebotomy Technician I. The most recent statistics available indicate that 96% our students pass this exam and are therefore eligible for employment as CPTs.

In summary, the Phlebotomy program is healthy and stable. Students are being properly prepared for employment as CPT 1s.

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

This CTE program requires recertification every two years. Of all the CTE programs at LTCC, it has the “heaviest” administrative and coordination needs. It takes a minimum of six months for the CTE program technician and phlebotomy instructor to properly prepare the certification package. That work began summer 2012 and will be completed in late January 2013. The courses cannot be offered again until the program is officially recertified (expected in March 2013). Accordingly, a spring-summer 2013 offering is planned.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

Recertification (and the associated workload issues for the department) is currently underway. The process will begin again later in 2013-2014 to ensure compliance by March 2015.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	17	75	8
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	89	11	0
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	N/A		
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	89	11	0
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	89	11	0
<b>Program SLO 6</b>	N/A		
<b>Program SLO 7</b>	89	11	0

What do these results mean to you?

**SLO #1 results are concerning, however the results come from 1 class we teach, not multiple which would have represented this SLO more accurately.**

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?  
**No, we are not satisfied with the results. We would have been able to successfully assess each program SLO more accurately had the Quantitative Data Spreadsheet included more data from more courses we teach.**
  
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
**Results were all taken from two classes taught in the Art Department, so results are inconclusive and too narrow to base any conclusions on, other than Art 220 is doing a great job representing the program SLO's it covers and Art 102 is not.**



**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?  
**Absolutely, Art 220 is a strong representative of the programs SLO's, as a result of the hard efforts of the faculty to clearly cover the course SLO's.**
  
5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
**Results were all taken from two classes taught in the Art Department so results are inconclusive and too narrow to base any conclusions on, other than Art 220 is doing a great job representing the program SLO's it covers and Art 102 is not.**
  
6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?  
**Overall our program SLO's are measuring the right things with 74% of students represented achieving mastery in all areas. We have no significant changes planned.**
  
7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?  
**We have no significant changes planned.**
  
8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:  
  
Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Yes**  
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Yes**  
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? **Yes**  
Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? **Yes**

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW**

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.  
**We are a very robust, strong, and diverse Art Department, which offers many challenging and enriching courses.**
  
2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.  
**We recently lost a fulltime Art technician staff position, which has caused workloads to become strained.**  
**Loosing repeatability in all Art courses has been very time consuming and discouraging, and in the future will take its toll on the success and strength of our Art students and program, as it will statewide.**
  
3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.  
**We have no significant changes planned.**

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	66.5%		33.5%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	66.5%		33.5%
<b>Program SLO 6</b>	100%		

What do these results mean to you?

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?

I'm dissatisfied with the percentage of students with no understanding of the Program Learning Outcomes.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

There needs to be some additional focus placed on Program Learning Outcomes 1 and 5.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

The assessment of DMA112 provided some disconcerting evidence as 67% of the students exhibited "No Understanding" of the Learning Outcomes..

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

These conclusions suggest that the instructor needs to focus more attention on attaining these Learning Outcomes.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

As we are establishing baselines this year, I believe it is important to assess the legitimacy of some of the Program Learning Outcomes.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

The actions that will be taken will be to focus more attention on gathering data and trying to fill in the gaps in Program Learning Outcomes 2, 3 and 4.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

This is a program that is currently being redesigned and reorganized. In 2007-08, there were only 7 students enrolled in DMA classes; in 2011-12, that number had grown to 130. This is a growing program that needs support.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

The growth of the program has been amazing, but it is a program that is heavily dependent on online instruction with 73.8% of the enrolled students being online.

Department/Program:  DMA  Division:  HUMANITIES  Academic Year (AY):  2012

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

While the overall successful completion rate averaging 76.45% is excellent, there is still a slight difference compared to the online rate of 73.425% - the gap in this program is much smaller than in others.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	58.12	30.35	11.47
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	62.58	27.98	9.55
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	57.12	34.12	8.64
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	85.00	15.00	0.00
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
	65.71	26.86	7.42

What do these results mean to you?

Given the relative percentage of Mastery, the Department feels that the faculty is effectively teaching their subject matter and achieving the Department’s Program SLOs.

2. Are you satisfied / dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

Although the combined percentages for Mastery and Some Understanding are satisfying, there is always a need for continuous improvement. For example, the two combined equal 92.57%, the Department would like to see more of that percentage in the Mastery level.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Clearly there is an immediate need to address Program SLO 1, Apply Critical and Analytical Thought in Diverse Business Situations in relation to the other Program SLOs. This is especially important because we consider this SLO to be the overarching SLO for the program. As a faculty group, we will explore possible options for increasing the focus of this Program SLO in our individual courses.

Additionally, Program SLO #3, Identify and Apply Basic Financial Analysis Tools and Critical Business Skills Needed to Plan and Manage Strategic Activities, is also less than satisfactory at the Mastery level.

However, its combined percentage (with Some Understanding) of 91.24% is acceptable given the complexity of the SLO.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

After carefully studying the Program SLO Quantitative Data, the Department notes the obvious disparity of results among the various course offerings especially when the level of financial v. nonfinancial content is taken into consideration relative to overall course content.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Given our answer in #4 above, the conclusion we draw from these results is that it is difficult to draw conclusions. Due to multiple factors, such as instructor academic freedom; individual instructor definitions of Mastery, Some Understanding, and No Understanding; and the diversity of our course offerings, it is difficult to identify program level trends in mapping course SLOs to Program SLOs.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

The Department thinks its Program SLOs are adequately measuring the “right” things. However, in the interest of continuous improvement and adapting to the changes in the business environment, please refer to #7 below.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

The Department is concerned about the mapping of Course-level SLOs to these Program SLOs. It is considering the following actions:

- Grouping of courses by concentration (i.e., Marketing, Accounting, Management) to better align Course SLOs to Program SLOs.
- Developing department-level grading rubrics for specific types of assignments (i.e., case analyses, journals, research papers, and presentations) to enhance the consistency in assessing course SLOs.
- Discussing the development of a department-wide series of definitions for Mastery, Some Understanding, and No Understanding again to enhance the consistency of our SLO results.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee?  Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee?  Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs?  Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)?  Y or N

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

Although the Department feels it is meeting the needs of its students, we are continually seeking ways to improve our program and its course offerings.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

The Department created a new course, BSN 105, Professional Communication, in order to address the need for students to learn interpersonal and small group communication skills and the development and implementation of formal business presentations.

The Department also created BSN 122, Organizational Behavior in order to provide our students with more comprehensive course offerings in our Management concentration.

Finally, the Department added BSN 115, Business Finance to its Global Business concentration in order to ensure these students develop relevant financial management skills and to adequately address Program SLO #3.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

The Department is focused on continuous improvement in various program areas. The following changes are anticipated:

- Eric, who is currently on his sabbatical, will return with additional knowledge and experience to develop effective online delivery of our courses in economics. This knowledge and experience should apply to other online courses as well.
- Treva, who will be on her sabbatical during the spring 2013 quarter, will research best practices of hybrid and online teaching. Her work should provide the Department with guidance in the development of effective pedagogy for hybrid and online course delivery.
- Jon is preparing the online addendums for his BSN 110A, 110B, and 110C, Principles of Accounting courses. This will provide business students with an alternative option for taking the accounting series.

These are examples of changes the Department is making to move forward in creating a pathway to obtain a business degree via an online delivery.



**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

**NOTE: There was no SLO data from 2011-2012 to be analyzed.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?
  
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?
7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?
8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:  
  
Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.
  - 1) Enrollment in Computer Applications (CAO) courses is declining.
  - 2) There is an ongoing problem of finding qualified adjunct faculty to teach CAO courses.
2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

Full time faculty member Jackie Lou was on reduced load and did not teach during Spring Quarter 2012.
3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.
  - 1) Full time faculty member Jackie Lou will be on sabbatical during Spring Quarter 2012.
  - 2) Full time CAO/CIS faculty member Mike Spina will be on sabbatical during Winter Quarter 2013.
  - 3) Many adult Nevada residents have enrolled in vocational CAO courses during past years. With the termination of the Good Neighbor Policy, the prohibitive cost of tuition for Nevada residents will have a negative effect on CAO course enrollments.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	100%		
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	85%	15%	
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

A review of the child development center’s SLO’s shows that all program level SLO’s were completed and assessed. Looking at the results of the parent survey, there was some concern with safety with regards to the age of the environment.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?  
Yes, I am extremely satisfied with the results.
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
That the CDC is operating as it should and that both students and parents are benefitting from the program.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?  
No, not really.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
That the CDC is an exemplary program fully committed to meeting the needs of both students and parents. We are achieving our goals of a safe, secure environment and providing a high quality experience for students to do their student teaching.
6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?  
I would say that we are measuring the “right” things as much as we can. The CDC is a student service and as such it is hard to measure “success” or mastery of skills.
7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?  
Continue to provide the high quality care for children and a high quality experience for students.
8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:  
  
Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.  
The child development center is one of the largest ancillary programs on campus and serves students, staff and faculty, and community members. It serves as a lab site for ECE students to participate in their practicum and student teaching requirements. It also serves as a model facility within the community.  
The CDC is staffed with a .50 classified director, 2 full time employees (lead teacher and operations assistant), 8 part-time classified employees, and 12 part-time temporary employees. Many of the part-time temporary employees have exceeded the definition of part-time temporary employees and should be considered regular part-time employees.  
The program itself is a high quality program with regards to daily operations; however the facility itself is in need of attention. It is definitely looking its age (19 + years old). New paint (inside and out), and some general maintenance upkeep is needed, especially with regards to the outdoor environments.

Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.  
This program has not experienced any “significant” changes over the past year.

2. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

Issues to be addressed during the upcoming academic year include:

- Investigate the cost and feasibility of converting part-time temporary employees into regular classified employees and/or come up with a plan to address this issue.
- Reclassify .50 classified director to 1.0 faculty with release time to direct the center
- Attention must be given to the outdoor environment as it relates to the safety of the children. Surfaces must be evened out, decks resurfaced and sanded, fences replaced or fixed, siding replaced.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

**There is no assessment data available**

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:  
  
Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.  
  
The Web Development program has seemed to steady as far as enrollment. Currently, only one section of each of the core classes can be offered each year. Courses in the program have not been taught online for several years. However, in winter 2013 quarter, 2 classes will be offered online. There were no applications submitted by adjuncts to teach these courses on-campus. Therefore, these classes had to be online if offered at all.  
There are a couple ideas for classes in which students have expressed an interest. The program would like to create one new course (a Content Management (CMS) course) and work with the Business department to offer an SEO/web marketing class that would/could be required for the degree/certificate.
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.  
  
The most significant change in the Web Development Program in the past year was getting a new Dean that oversees the program. It is a positive change.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

The program has 2 goals for the next academic year: 1) Increase interest in the program (including non-locals) and 2) Offer another class or 2.



## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

### PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	47.00	42.33	10.67
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	34.33	48.33	17.33
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	70.5	22.50	7.00
<b>Program SLO 6</b>	55.00	30.25	14.75

\*SLO data for 2011-2012 was not available (no courses scheduled for assessment); a review of 2010-2011 data is provided here.

1. **What do these results mean to you?**

SLO mastery is “all over the map” when individual course performance is considered. The strongest level of mastery to date is in the area of understanding professional ethics. The program SLO most in need of improvement relates to legal processes and procedures. This is not surprising due to the highly academic nature of the SLO.

2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**

CRJ instructors are generally satisfied with the results of the program SLO assessments. The courses attract students who are interested in a criminal justice career, but are often unaware of the academic rigor associated with the field. Individual course SLO assessments provide several suggestions for improvement of mastery.

3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

Course SLO assessments for CRJ104 and CRJ112 indicate a need to develop instructional strategies that will help students develop mastery related to legal processes and procedures.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.****4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**

Suggestions for student mastery on SLOs are relevant and should ultimately result in improved instruction. The “core” CRJ courses (CRJ101, 102, 103, 104) are by their nature very rigorous.

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

The CRJ program is solid, but there is room for improvement in terms of student learning and mastery of the program SLOs.

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

Program and course SLOs are adequate at this time.

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

Criminal Justice is a CTE program instructed completely by adjuncts. These adjuncts are professionals working in full-time/demanding careers. To the extent feasible, all CRJ adjuncts will be highly encouraged to attend faculty flex activities and apply for professional development funds toward the goal of improving instruction.

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW****1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The Criminal Justice program at LTCC has leveled off in terms of FTES generation and enrollments. Success rates are consistently solid (83.2%). The program is currently experience healthy class sizes (30+) and there appears to be increasing student interest in the certificate and degree programs.

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

The AS-T degree was developed last year and is now an option for students at LTCC. The CRJ advisory committee recommended retaining the AA degree in order to provide students with more flexibility in terms of their general education.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

With the creation of the AS-T degree, there is significant opportunity to expand the program via distance education. The CRJ advisory committee is currently resisting this idea, but we will pilot an online delivery offering of CRJ105 in 2013-2014. Additional data needs to be provided to the committee regarding the value of distance education and the advancements that have been made in this delivery mode over the past few years.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	32	68	0
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	35.25	64.75	0
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	68.4	31.6	0
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	72.33	27.67	0
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	0	0	0

What do these results mean to you?

Not a whole lot really because none of the primary classes that are our core were evaluated using SLOs and a majority of the SLOs were completed by a first time teacher who, clearly to me, didn't understand the process. These numbers aren't representative of what happened during the 2011-12 school year as it relates to SLOs.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

Very dissatisfied because I had nothing to do with them and I have little, or no, faith in the process, or understanding of the process, of those who did these SLOs. I am going to be required to talk with the individual who did these so that she knows how to assess. It appears that she went "overboard" in determining who achieved mastery and who only had some understanding. I will have to discuss with them what is meant by mastery. Of course, it will have to be taken into account if, perhaps, she really believes that a majority of the students only had some understanding of all of the SLOs. That may reflect on her teaching if a majority of the students are deemed moderately deficient.

All of this brings into question, for me, who is responsible for the adjuncts in a department in performing the SLOs. There is no indication anywhere that it is the full-time faculty member's responsibility. This is something, to my knowledge, which has never been addressed. In my department, I have attempted to shepherd the adjuncts in performing the SLOs. I have had at least two trainings including one with S. Pierce. Adjuncts understood that they were supposed to complete SLOs in their classes and then didn't do it. I have washed my hands of worrying about

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year (AY): \_\_\_\_\_

whether the adjuncts perform the SLOs, or not. There is a lack of direction from the Admin and Faculty in this process.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

One of the two instructors who did these SLOs doesn't understand the process. Their evaluative measures are deficient in terms of determining the difference between mastery and some understanding. I can say this because I have taught all of these classes before and, over a period of seven years, have witnessed how students have performed in these classes.

These SLOs, because they are so minimal in numbers with relationship to the number of classes we offer per year, and because they were not performed in large by individuals who understand the process, are not an appropriate representation of the success, or failure of the department in terms measuring the learning objectives of the students enrolled in the classes.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

Not really, for all of the above reasons. I don't consider this process valid.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

That I have to talk with the adjunct who did the assessments for 163A and 165 to see what was their process and the evaluation measures that were used. I am assuming it was misunderstood on her part.

It has to be determined who is responsible for the adjuncts who are doing the SLOs.

I need to be doing more of the assessing of the SLOs.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

I think they are ok—not great. They help in validating the learning process and the assessment helps to keep the students on task. I haven't done enough SLOs to really give an appropriate response to the second question.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

Once again, I want to discuss the results with the appropriate adjunct faculty member, find out who is responsible for training and encouraging the adjuncts to do the SLOs, and make sure I do mine, and do them well.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

Based on the data provided the Culinary Arts Department/Program is at the pinnacle of its tenure at the College. The FTEs are the highest ever recorded for the program. They are at the summit of a six year, progressively improving pattern for FTEs. The FTEs had a 36% increase during this year from the previous 2010-11 year. In that year we had a 15% decline in FTEs from 2009-10. The only reason I can think of for the decrease followed by a sharp increase is that the full-time faculty member was on sabbatical during one quarter and there were no summer classes during that same period. Our FTEs for last year were 43.394 with 849 student enrollments.

The figure which I am most pleased with is in the area of student achievement. We had, by far, the highest number of AA degrees. When combined with the 2 certificates of achievement numbers it is the best year for the Culinary Arts Program in terms of student achievement as well. These numbers don't count the numbers of departmentally generated basic career certificates which would add another 15, or so, in terms of student achievement.

The status of the Program, at this minute, is a little tenuous. We have had serious, serious difficulty with having enough qualified adjuncts to teach in the Program. We have been trying to fill the classes with new adjuncts with varied results. The lack of qualified adjuncts to teach the many courses we offer will eventually impact the program in an unknown fashion. We will need to limit offerings, or consider bringing in a full- or part-time instructor who is better qualified to teach the diversity of classes we offer.

The difficulties of operating this program for a lone instructor are taking a toll. This program, with its requirements of ordering, shopping for, storing, and utilizing food, tools, and equipment; maintaining receipts and managing budget; managing lab assistants, and adjuncts; coordinating with the sub program at the El Dorado County Jail; having the laboratory space impacted by outside programs (Community Ed, Snow Globe, ISSI, Foundation fundraiser); managing repairs and maintenance of aging equipment; in addition to all of the normal activities that all faculty have to do is a lot (more than?) one faculty member should have to handle without full-time help. I am incapable of thinking about, or acting upon, any future plans for this program. We have hit a wall.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

As already pointed out, the program had a significant increase in FTEs, enrollments, and student achievements last year. We offered new classes (Chinese Cuisine, Pies and Tarts) for the first time, and will be offering new classes this year for the first time. We were impacted by the presence of Community Education because we have had to accommodate with storage space, use of our equipment and materials, and dealing with untrained individuals working in a professional kitchen.

The most significant impact has been with the course offerings and enrollments which have been strong.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

I am assuming that we are referring to 2013-14. If that is the case, I would think we might want a segment in this report relating to the current year or, does #2 qualify under that idea?

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year (AY): \_\_\_\_\_

If we are talking about 2013-14 I believe that I might need to reduce the number of course offerings. I can't continue with the same loads and we seem to be incapable of attracting qualified instructors.

I can come up with a lot of ideas for the future of this program and the types of things that we could do. We are in one of the most interesting places in the world (Northern California) for the farming, production, and artistic creation of food and beverages. I am aware of an innovative program which is at Truckee Meadows Community College where the high school and post-secondary programs are combined in a four year sequence which is housed at Truckee Meadows in an 8 million dollar facility. My friends at the Culinary Institute of America are initiating a Culinary Science (as opposed to Culinary Arts) Baccalaureate, the first in the US. The Culinary Arts Profession has never been more popular and vibrant, thanks to all of the media on tv and elsewhere. The employment in the field was one of the first areas to come back strong in the economy, and has been growing steadily for 30 years.

There are many possibilities but, due to the nature and size of our program, the only thing I can do is to try to maintain the status quo. I would love to be involved in discussions about where to take this successful program from here. It just seems unlikely considering my workload and the limited involvement of the rest of the College.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	75%	25%	0
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	89%	0	11%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

- Survey results showed that all students agreed or strongly agreed that the DRC is meeting their needs regarding independence and self-advocacy. While 89% of those students surveyed indicated that they were effective in identifying their learning styles, strengths, and weaknesses, and were able to develop strategies the surveys indicated that the DRC staff should in the future work more with students in developing strategies to accommodate their learning differences.
2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?
    - Yes, the DRC staff is satisfied with survey results.
  3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
    - Generally speaking, the DRC staff continues to meet DRC student’s needs. However, as the needs of the students change and vary from quarter to quarter we must be willing to adapt and change ourselves to continue to meet their needs.



**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?
  - Not really as our course offerings have become limited we seem to have the correct focus with SLO's.
5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
  - See answer 4
6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?
  - While both Program SLO's address areas of importance and measure the "right" things, there have been so many changes within the department that we must review them and make sure that the "right" things are indeed being measured.
7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?
  - Given that 90-95% of Test Proctoring has been shifted to the TLC, certain components of SLO #1 need to be examined and re-written if deemed necessary. Also because the Learning Disabilities Assessment course has been eliminated and a wait-list policy is now in place, SLO #2 needs to be re-examined.
8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:
  - Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Y** or N
  - Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Y** or N
  - Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? **Y** or N
  - Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? **Y** or N

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW**

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.
  - The DRC maintains a healthy program for students with disabilities at LTCC. The number of students served, while not finalized for Summer or Fall 2012 MIS reporting, is anticipated to drop somewhat, reflecting enrollment at the college as a whole. A very high percentage of students are reporting that their needs are being met and they are getting the services they require for success at the college level. Course offerings have been reduced and courses that are offered have varying degrees of success in having enough students enrolled to run the class. This is something that DRC staff will address this year as well.
2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.
  - The percentage of time that Fulltime Faculty works in the DRC continues to be reduced seemingly on an annual basis. While Administration continues to support the DRC Budget with General Fund resources, more time is being assigned to DRC Faculty loads outside of the DRC. Currently only the Director is 1.0 FTE in the DRC while the Counselor and the LD Specialist are .7FTE and .6FTE respectively. Classified support once drastically reduced has been maintained at its current level of part-time hourly for the past two academic years.

Department/Program: DRC Division: Student Services Academic Year (AY): 12/13

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.
  - No significant changes are expected in the upcoming academic year at this time. It is worth noting that the DSPS Allocation has been reduced annually for four consecutive years and If that continues it could have significant impact on the program.

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

### PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	93%	4%	4%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	93%	4%	4%
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

1. **What do these results mean to you?**  
Some students study, some don't.
2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**  
Satisfied.
3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**  
These results mirror student effort & grades and SLO's are just additional work that show the same thing.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. **Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**  
No

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

- 1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

Bogged down by Administrative work, otherwise OK.

- 2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

- 3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

TMC and AS-T degree paperwork to be completed.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	59%	31%	11%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	72%	24%	4%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	54%	34%	12%
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

1. **What do these results mean to you?**  
Some students study, some don't.
2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**  
Satisfied.
3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**  
It mirrors student effort and grades and SLO's are just additional work that show the same thing.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. **Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**  
No

5. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**
  
6. **To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**
  
7. **Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**
  
8. **Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

- 1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

Bogged down by Administrative work, otherwise OK.

- 2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

GIS courses were cross listed with CIS to increase the adjunct hiring pool.

- 3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

TMC and AS-T degree paperwork to be completed.



## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

### PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	93%	4%	4%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	93%	4%	4%
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

1. **What do these results mean to you?**  
Some students study, some don't.
2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**  
Satisfied.
3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**  
These results mirror student effort & grades and SLO's are just additional work that show the same thing.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. **Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**  
No

5. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**
  
6. **To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**
  
7. **Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**
  
8. **Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

- 1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

Bogged down by Administrative work, otherwise OK.

- 2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

- 3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

TMC and AS-T degree paperwork to be completed.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

---

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	76.29	21.29	2.43
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	72.17	23.17	4.67
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	65	28.88	6.13
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you? Approximately ¾ of the biology students are achieving mastery in application of the scientific method to real-life situations/organisms, and are also achieving mastery in conveying how the cells, molecules, and sub-atomic structures correspond to properties of substances and structures. Almost 2/3 of our students achieved mastery in relating components of various biological systems.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?  
We are satisfied with results for Program SLOs 1 and 2. However, we feel we could improve the percentage of students achieving mastery in relating components of various biological systems (Program SLO 3).
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
We would like to improve students' abilities to relate components of biological systems to each other.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?  
We were very pleased with the Bio 210 SLO assessments.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The Biology Department instructors are very focused on delivering the best quality courses and educational experiences to all our students.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

We feel our Program SLOs measure the "right things". We do not plan to change them.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

We plan to assess courses on the schedule we created for this academic year.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y **But we need to make sure that the mapping we did at the very end of Spring Quarter 2012, from Program level to course level SLOs, are consistent with course to program SLO maps. Can someone help us with this?**

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

Between academic years and 2007-08 and 2011-12, Biology Department's FTES have remained relatively steady, fluctuating between 72.729 and 82.258. Our enrollments in the past five years have increased from 503 – 530. Our overall course completion rate has consistently remained between 80 and 90%. We think these results reflect not only the motivation and preparation of our students, but also the extraordinary time, care and effort that our instructors give to each class. We feel we "will" them to rise to the level of excellence they must achieve in order to be successful, not only here at LTCC, but also in their next educational or career endeavor.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

As indicated in last year's Unit Plan, we needed a door that entered directly to the laboratory prep room to avoid disrupting classes. The door has been installed and has been working well. All instructors and adjuncts appreciate the decreased disruption.

The Science Gallery was created to our delight last spring. Part of the gallery includes a diorama of a Kodiak bear, raccoon and hawk. We have a poster exhibit of the history of physics, and a display highlighting student posters. This quarter the student work focuses on genetic diseases.

We are looking forward to obtaining the Perry display cabinets to complete another diorama and provide space for rotating exhibits.

Currently, we are working on an A&P display of the whole human body. We are soliciting volunteers to donate bodies post mortem for this display (is anyone reading this?).

We are also soliciting bids for converting the pillar in the gallery into a model of a tree with local wildlife species included.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

We expect no significant departmental changes this year, however we have submitted an application to the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee for a Bio/Chem new faculty member to help alleviate the critical problems our departments have in finding and retaining qualified adjuncts.

We also require a change in the job description and classification for our lab manager, Kathy Strain. We realize that work is being done to address this, but thought it important to re-emphasize Kathy's value to this department, and the fact that she works WAAAAYYYY above her job description and classification level. (Can you tell it's Friday afternoon?)

-----

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

---

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved: (2011-2012)

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	78	11	11
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	74	13	13
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	77	11	12
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?  
 Student success is reasonable per these SLO results.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

Satisfied.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Student success is reasonable.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

No.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Student success is reasonable.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

The existing SLOs are well-aligned with the course content.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

None.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

The program is working well, with nearly 100% enrollment at the beginning of each academic year sequence. The only difficulty is finding adjunct faculty to teach approximately 50% of the CHM courses.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

Organic Chemistry (CHM201 & 202) have been eliminated due to the inability to find suitable adjunct faculty and low enrollment (of approximately 10 students per section).

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

None expectec.



**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

---

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	73.9	18.9	7.2
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	67.0	25.0	8.0
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	62.67	27.33	10.0
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

These results indicate that the majority of students taking physics are motivated and competent. Very few fail to understand the material.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

I am satisfied with the results of the SLO assessments for all three program SLO's, however I suspect a minor glitch in the SLO process for this year because department SLO 2 is mapped to only one course, Physics 208. Somehow Physics 105 SLO 3 got placed in Program SLO2.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Again, I conclude that most students taking physics are highly motivated and successful in their course work, and that the instruction is successful in motivating the students to learn.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

Yes, the assessment of SLO2 in physics 105 stands out because 54 percent of the class did not achieve mastery of the concepts covered in this assessment. This is unusual and inconsistent with most assessment results for the courses in this sequence. As noted in my assessment report, the topic (Archimede's principle) was covered in both lecture and lab, so the students had numerous opportunities to interact with the material, including hands-on activities.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

I conclude that this particular topic must require additional coverage. Other than that particular topic, the results of the course level assessments are good.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

I don't believe that the program SLO's are particularly well suited for Physics. (They were developed by faculty from various science disciplines).

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

I will consider revising the Program SLO's to be more specific to Physics.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N Yes

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N Yes

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N Yes

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

No – I don't believe they have been.

Department/Program: \_\_Physics\_\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_\_\_\_Science\_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year (AY): \_\_\_\_12/13\_\_\_\_\_

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

Enrollment in physics courses has remained fairly constant in recent years, with an average of 10 FTES generated by the department. This data does not reflect Astronomy which should be included in the data for this department.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

A new course (Physical, Science 102) was added to the course offerings last year. It was offered in Spring 2012 and also in Fall 2012, and failed to enroll an adequate number of students for the course to go in either quarter.

We increased the number of times Physical Science 111 (Astronomy) is offered. It was previously offered once per year and this year it will be offered in both fall and spring quarters.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

I do not anticipate any significant changes to the department this year. I am considering the possibility of increasing the units/hours of the calculus based physics sequence, and possibly making some slight modifications so that the courses align with the C – ID course identification numbering system.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	95%		5%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	95%		5%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	100%		

What do these results mean to you?

*It is hard to get an overall picture of the ECE department's success in meeting the program level SLO's since in all honesty, only one class has been assessed. However, the results from this class show that the majority of students completing the class successfully mastered the Program SLO's related to this course. These results show that to get a complete picture of the ECE dept., more SLO assessments need to be completed.*

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?  
*I am satisfied with the results from Program SLO 5, in that this is the one SLO that completely encapsulates what skills, abilities, & knowledge students need to have when completing ECE courses. This SLO is one that is linked to every course in the ECE dept. Overall, I am satisfied with the results. The "not mastered" results were from a specific student not completing the final or doing the required oral presentation.*
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
*The most obvious conclusion is that more ECE classes need to be assessed to get a clearer picture of the ECE program. In terms of this specific class, I believe it is important that the instructor follow through with students to ensure completion of assignments.*

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?  
*EC 109 standout because it is the only course that has been assessed.*

Department/Program:  Division: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year (AY):

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
*In order to be able to answer these questions fully and to get a more accurate picture of the ECE dept., more SLO assessments need to be completed.*
  
6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?  
*Again, it is hard to say, given the fact that only one class has been assessed. I need to complete more assessments to be able to definitively say.*
  
7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?  
*Complete SLO assessments as scheduled in order to get a more complete picture of the ECE department.*
  
8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:  
Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee?   
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee?   
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs?   
Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)?

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.  
*The Early Childhood Education Dept continues to be a very robust CTE program, showing strong enrollments, high course completion & success rates in both face-to-face & distance education (93.0% & 82.1% respectively). ECE students earn more certificates 0020 & degrees than any other CTE program. Certificates are awarded more often than degrees (likely because of the MAT & ENG requirements). The most likely reason being that ECE Certificates lead straight to employment. This dept is the 21<sup>st</sup> largest instructional program at LTCC (35.318 FTES) & currently operates with a .50 faculty presence. A substantial portion of the ECE Dept FTES is generated through distance education (50.1%). Currently, the ECE dept is behind in assessing SLO's so it is difficult to ascertain if the SLO's are measuring the “right” things. There is a plan in place to get caught up on the scheduled assessments by the end of Fall Quarter 2012.*
  
2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.  
*The most significant change in the dept over the past year is the creation of a very clear pathway allowing students to compete an ECE certificate in 1 year. This course pathway reflects the growing evidence that students want to get in, get their units, & get out to work. This required re-writing curriculum & changing the degree & certificate requirements to reflect this pathway. The catalog was updated to reflect these changes.  
Additionally, a long time adjunct instructor within the dept resigned unexpectedly. This necessitated the recruitment & hiring of a new adjunct instructor-preferably one who was certified to teach online. Fortunately this process was successful & a new adjunct will begin teaching for LTCC in the Winter quarter.*

Department/Program:  Division: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year (AY):

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

- Submission of the AAT in ECE to the Chancellor's office. It should be noted that it was the **consensus of the Advisory Committee was to support parallel programs – both an A>A. Degree and an A.A.T. Degree.**
- Increase in number of certificates awarded
- Expand .50 faculty to 1.0 to reflect the duties of the position
- Complete SLO assessments that are due in a timely manner so as to address student success and the appropriateness of program and course SLO's.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

---

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

No data has been gathered. The courses will be assessed this year as they get offered.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

N/A

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

N/A

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

N/A

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

N/A

Department/Program: EDU Division: Humanities Academic Year (AY): 12/13

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

N/A

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

N/A

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

This program can be a little confusing since it covers a wide range of topics covered and of student abilities. EDU 110 & 110M are courses offered to provide tutoring methodologies & support for subject tutors in the TLC and Math center. EDU 500 is a course offered to provide course or subject tutoring for all students. EDU 551 is a course offered to prepare both ESL and native speakers to pass the General Education Development Test.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

No significant changes

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

The most significant change will be in addressing the assessment needs in this program.



## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

### PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	50.59	33.91	15.36
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	65.86	25.43	9.07
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	58.20	32.20	9.80
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	58.86	27.57	13.79
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	50.74	34.89	14.44
<b>Program SLO 6</b>	47.55	30.91	21.55

What do these results mean to you?

SLO 1, SLO 5, and SLO 6 have the lowest percentages of “Mastery.” These SLOs are “Recognize, understand, and apply the rhetorical strategies of argumentation”; “Analyze and evaluate creative and argumentative writing through the application of the principles of complex critical analysis”; and “Demonstrate mastery of Standard English grammar and mechanics.” These skills are difficult to master, so it is not surprising that these two have the lowest percentages in terms of “Mastery” and the highest percentages of students showing “No Understanding.” Also, one 101 class reported 64% of students showing no mastery in SLO 6, and one 101 reported 79% of students showing no mastery in program SLO 1 and SLO 5, both are hard to believe, but this skews the data.

In looking at the individual course, it is no surprise that 100% of students in English 102, 202, 209, and 221 showed “Mastery” or “Some Understanding” in many of the SLOs, whereas English 101 and 156 were the lowest.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

We are satisfied with the performance of SLO 2,3, and 4. And as stated above, some of the outliers in SLOs 1, 5 and 6 make this data unreliable. Either a couple of classes are truly not meeting the course and program-level SLOs or there are instructors who do not understand how to assess these SLOs. Also,

Department/Program: English Division: Humanities Academic Year (AY):  
12/13

English 101 (our first transfer-level English course) and our foundational skills classes contribute to the low numbers in our program SLOs; these students cannot yet master any of these Program SLOs.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

We need department training, especially for our adjuncts. 70% of our courses are being taught by adjuncts, many of them have had little or no training in SLO assessment. Also, we need to take into account that many of our course offerings are in the foundational skills, and the students in those classes are not going to master grammar or some of the higher level thinking skills in our program SLOs. We may need to discuss if we need SLOs for basic skills English and English since none of our basic skills students are going to be able to master any of these SLOs until they reach English 101 and beyond. None of the 151s or 152s provided SLO assessments, and that will inevitably lower the numbers of students mastering the program SLOs.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

As stated above, the 200-level English courses show high Mastery and the 101s are much lower, which is to be expected. Also, one of the 101s reported very high numbers of students achieving "No Understanding," which has skewed the data.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Our English students are able to meet the program SLOs by the time they reach 200-level classes.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

We may want to consider program SLOs for foundational skills versus transfer-level courses.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

Seek compensation for adjunct training.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N Yes  
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N Yes  
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N Yes

Department/Program: \_\_English\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_Humanities\_\_\_\_ Academic Year (AY):  
\_\_12/13\_\_\_\_

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N  
Yes

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

Because we have not refilled two positions, and Jan Smith has taken over the TLC, we are at about 30% fulltime instruction and 70% adjunct instruction, which is out of compliance. This is hurting our students, especially our most at-risk students in our foundational skills courses. We are unable to meet their needs because we are a department running on primarily adjunct faculty, and though we have many wonderful adjuncts, they are not compensated to participate at the same level, so they are not as available, nor are they as current in our field, as full-time instructors.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

As mentioned earlier, Jan Smith is directing the TLC, so she is only carrying half a fulltime load. Because she teaches primarily foundational skills classes, these types of courses (English 151R, English 151W, and 152) have taken a definite hit. There is a staggering difference in the pass rates between foundational courses taught by full-time instructors versus those taught by adjuncts.

We have also been offering fewer literature courses which makes it difficult for our English majors to take the classes they need for transfer and graduation.

We have made some improvements, including holding adjunct office hours in the TLC, adding the lab component in 151W, implementing a mentor program for foundational skills instructors, and hiring two LTCC alumni to teach in our department.

We also developed and presented a college-wide writing rubric at convocation in 2012, which is being adopted by some of the instructors outside of the English department.

Department/Program: English Division: Humanities Academic Year (AY):  
12/13

We are also working the ESL department in the creation of a high-level noncredit ESL course, which will hopefully feed our English 151 courses and contribute to the cultural diversity on our campus. We are also continuing to teach ESL-sheltered 151W, which has increased the ESL numbers in our courses.

We have also offered creative writing courses on a more regular basis, generating interest and excitement in writing. We have continued the Writers' Series, and have begun to partner with Bona Fide Books to bring poets and writers from across the United States. We now draw 75 or more students and community members to each event, making LTCC a vibrant cultural center. We are also using a student intern to help edit the Kokanee, providing valuable editing experience.

We have also created an English Facebook page where we post upcoming events and course offerings.

And finally, the available Professional Development Funds has allowed our faculty to attend important conferences in our field, such as The Association of Writers and Writing Programs, The Western Literature Association, and the American Literature Association conferences.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

Two of our faculty, Suzanne Roberts and Jan Smith, will be taking sabbatical, which means we will have to rely even more heavily on adjunct faculty to teach both foundational and transfer-level courses.

We are still hoping to look into holding a "Big Read" at LTCC, and if we can raise the money, bring the author to campus as part of the Writers' Series.

We also hope to continue to encourage writing across the curriculum at the college.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	67%	6%	27%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	92%	7%	1%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

I am fairly satisfied with SLO #1; however I would like to decrease the percentage of students who have no understanding of the program requirements. I am very satisfied with SLO #2, as 99% demonstrated Mastery or Some Understanding of the educational plan requirement by having a complete or partial educational plan.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Overall, students in the EOPS program are aware of the requirements of the program and demonstrate this understanding by completing educational plans, counselor contacts, and progress reports.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

N/A

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year (AY): \_\_\_\_\_

N/A

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

The SLOs for this program are measuring the ‘right’ things. For now, I will continue with these two measurements.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

The entire Student Services Division is looking at combining the planning process into one large program plan. We will begin looking at this process and building a structure this year. Specific to EOPS, we will do more follow-up with students and utilize communication functions in Colleague to notify students of program requirements and send out reminders to students.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N N/A

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N N/A

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

There was no packet provided by the OIRP for this program; therefore, minimal data was available. However, the Student Experience Survey conducted in the fall 2010 did show that nearly 97% of students agreed or strongly agreed that support services (including EOP&S) were adequate and supported their development, learning, and success as a student.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

The programs are running with an interim counselor as the more experienced EOPS/CARE counselor/coordinator is acting as the Interim Dean. This Interim Dean has maintained EOPS/CARE Director duties and has conducted training for the interim counselor on program requirements and services for EOPS/CARE students.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

The program is aiming to serve at least 100 students during the 2012-13 year, and will maintain current levels of direct support services to students. The program SLOs are scheduled to be assessed during the 2012-13 academic year. In addition, these programs will become part of a larger annual program review process encompassing most areas within Student Services.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

\*SLO data for 2011-2012 was not available (no courses scheduled for assessment).

1. **What do these results mean to you?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. **Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW****1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The Environmental Science program at LTCC peaked in 2007-2008 (2.65 FTES and 34 enrollments) and then showed a bit of decline over the next three academic years. Enrollments are now picking up and 1.96 FTES were garnered in 2011-2012. Completion rates have fluctuated over the past five years (range: 66.7% - 93.8%). Approximately 73% of students successfully completed courses in 2011-2012. This is on par with the average campus-wide completion rate of 74.5%.

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

The possibility of creating an EVS certificate or degree was explored in 2011-2012. Implementation of this idea is challenging due to the fact that the program is instructed entirely by an adjunct instructor (Kathy Strain). In the absence of a full-time faculty member or department chair to oversee the program, it is



unlikely that an EVS degree or certificate will be developed unless there are financial resources committed to the project.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

See comments under #2. Additionally, there is some interest in possibly splitting EVS101 into two separate courses. The curriculum is viewed as being too comprehensive in nature; 22 chapters are covered in 12 weeks. It may be possible to have one course cover ecosystem dynamics and the second course cover human impacts. As mentioned previously, financial resources would be required to implement this curricular enhancement.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	81.00	19.00	0.00
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	77.90	20.20	1.90
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	94.57	5.43	0.00
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	75.64	20.43	3.93
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	90.29	9.71	0.00
<b>Program SLO 6</b>	89.11	9.44	1.44

\*SLO data for 2011-2012 was not available (no courses scheduled for assessment); a review of 2010-2011 data is provided here.

1. **What do these results mean to you?**

SLO program mastery is extremely strong in the Fire Science program. Individual course SLO assessments support this observation. FIR instructors have taken the SLO assessment process seriously and have made improvements to instruction based on the assessments.

2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**

Extremely satisfied.

3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

Despite exceptional performance across the board, there is an opportunity for further improvement on SLO#2 (emergency management and safety) as well as SLO#4 (causes and stages of fire development).

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.****4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**

The Fire Academy assessments (FIR170A/B/C) indicate that student mastery on SLOs is “all over the map.” Given the entry-level nature of these courses, this is not surprising. Improvement is noted as the courses progress through the academic year, however. This demonstrates the sequential nature of the curriculum.

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

The FIR program is demonstrating strong performance in terms of course and program-level SLO mastery.

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

Program and course SLOs are adequate at this time.

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

Fire Science is a CTE program instructed completely by adjuncts. These adjuncts are professionals working in full-time/demanding careers. To the extent feasible, all FIR adjuncts will be highly encouraged to attend faculty flex activities and apply for professional development funds toward the goal of improving instruction. A full-time faculty presence is desperately needed in this program in order to provide leadership to the adjuncts and instructional aides.

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW****1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The Fire Science program at LTCC is extremely “healthy” in terms of FTES generation and enrollments. The FTES and enrollment data reported for 2010-2011 is incorrect. The “Fact Book” indicates 85.101 FTES were generated in 2010-2011. The error has been reported to the OIRP. Course completions are exceptionally strong at 92.3% for the year. Fire Science is one of the most prolific programs on campus in terms of degree and certificate completions.

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

A Fire Officer degree and certificate were created and approved in 2011-2012. Individual Fire Officer courses launched this fall with limited success. According to experts in the field, the economy has significantly impacted the ability of agencies to free up personnel to attend courses. While the fees associated with the courses are extremely reasonable, the overtime and other expenses associated with sponsoring an employee’s attendance is proving to be cost prohibitive at this time. When the State Fire Marshal finalizes approval for hybrid delivery of these courses, we may see enrollments improve.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

It is apparent that this enormous CTE program is in need of a full-time faculty or director presence. A faculty hiring proposal was recently submitted to address the dire staffing issue.

Distance education may become a reality for the program in 2012-2013.

The program will be extended in 2012-2013 with the creation of a certificate in Search & Rescue.

Planning has begun for a Public Safety Center of Excellence. While funding and logistics behind the facility are tenuous (at best), such a project would prove extremely valuable in terms of supporting and enhancing the Fire Science program at LTCC.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?
5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

As of AY 2011-12, Wilderness Education had FTES of 2.8 and enrollment of 43. This program should have the ability to grow, but it has struggled to fill classes. The relative absence of construction courses at LTCC results in a challenge marketing green tech GSE courses. The GSE Coordinator is continuing to build alliances with the South Tahoe Environmental Education Coalition and is serving on the 2013 South Tahoe Earth Day Committee.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

GSE has never had a formal Program Review.

The LTCC Demonstration Garden continues to be a valuable teaching resource for GSE courses.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

Past discussion of an Environmental Studies AA degree which would likely feature GSE courses appears to have been dropped. This potentially removes a home for GSE classes and a structure that would help/encourage students to take GSE courses.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	84.25%	15.75%	
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	81.33%	18.67%	
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	82.33%	17.67%	
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	76.33%	23.67%	
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?

While I'm very pleased with the percentages of students achieving Mastery or Some Understanding, I'm a little suspect of no students being assessed at a "No Understanding" level.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

I believe that these results should be assessed for authenticity.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

The consistency of the percentages leads me to believe that there wasn't much effort put into the process.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

I'm not sure of the validity of the numbers.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

The most significant change will be in the actual assessment process and the review of the results since the full-time instructor in this area has retired.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

Work with the adjuncts who are teaching in this area to ensure authenticity..

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

The History Department is consistent, averaging 32.3318 FTES per year for the past 5 years.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

The most significant change is the retirement of the full-time instructor in this area.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

The most significant change is that all of the courses in this department will now be taught and assessed by adjuncts..



**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

---

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	38%	51%	11%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	50.25%	38.25%	11.5%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	41.33%	53.67%	5%
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	41.33%	53.67%	5%
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	41.33%	53.67%	5%
<b>Program SLO 6</b>	41.33%	53.67%	5%
<b>Program SLO 7</b>	53%	30.5%	16.50%

What do these results mean to you?

The results indicate a legitimate assessment.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

The results show a level of legitimacy.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

It will be interesting to compare the online to the face-to-face results.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

The course assessments also reveal a consistency in the numbers.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

I believe the instruction/instructors are responsible for the consistent learning experience.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

We are establishing baselines for this program.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

There are no specific actions that will be taken.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

This is another completely adjunct department with 91% of the FTES generated through online course offerings.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

The one instructor who taught these courses face-to-face is no longer teaching for us, so this has virtually become a completely online program.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

This is a program with growth potential that we want to develop.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	74%	26%	
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	74%	26%	
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	N/A	N/A	
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	74%	26%	
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

These results demonstrate that all students either achieved mastery or some understanding of the Program Learning Outcomes.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?

I am very satisfied with the results.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The program has been very consistent bringing in an average of 10.6878FTES over the past 5 years.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

The data supports that this program continues to be vital.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

This program continues to meet the needs of our students.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

This is the first year of having and using such data, so I consider this as establishing a baseline for future analysis.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

My future actions will be to monitor any substantial or significant changes in the program.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

The current status of the Communications Program is strong and consistent. Enrollment trends have stayed consistent with the main variable being the number of sections offered.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

There has been a significant increase in the online offerings. In 2010-11, online instruction accounted for 90.7% of the program's FTES.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

Department/Program: COM Division: HUMANITIES Academic Year (AY): 2012

Careful and focused evaluation of the online learning experience will begin this year. The average successful completion rate for online offerings for the past 5 years was 58.36% compared to the face-to-face average of 68.8%.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	58.5%	30%	11.5%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	59.5%	22%	18.5%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	67%	26%	7%
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	78%	17%	5%
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

The results seem to be within an acceptable range.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

These results seem to be consistent.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Well-trained adjuncts are conducting authentic assessment of the learning outcomes.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

What stands out the most is the absence of a course from this process, SPE104.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

This is a very consistent program.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

Once again, to establish a baseline for future consideration.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

Find an instructor for SPE104.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

This is a very important and consistent program. The actual enrollment are consistent, and this is one program that isn't built upon online learning.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

Much of the consistency can be attributed to the fact that we have the same instructor teaching 2 sections of the course each quarter.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

The most significant change will be made if we can find an instructor for SPE104.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	67.4%	21.8%	10.8%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	73%	27%	
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	72%	14%	14%
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	72%	14%	14%
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	72.25%	17.25%	10.5%
<b>Program SLO 6</b>	72.25%	17.25%	10.5%

What do these results mean to you?

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

The results for each Program Learning Outcome demonstrates a strong focus on student learning.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

I believe the assessment is authentic.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

There seems to e a consistency within all of the courses being assessed.



5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

My major conclusion is that learning is occurring and that the assessments were appropriate.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

The only Program level Learning Outcome that seems to be inappropriate is SLO#7, one that can't assessed.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

It will be my recommendation to delete Program SLO#7..

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

As another adjunct-only department, the major method of delivery is online. Since 2009-10, over 90% of the courses are offered online. I would like to see more face-to-face courses in this area.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

This is another of those programs with very little change.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

I have a goal of bringing more balance into the program by adding additional face- to face course offerings.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

That little to no assessment is taking place.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

There were no course assessment linked to Program Learning Outcomes.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
  
6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?
  
7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?
  
8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:  
  
Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.  
  
Once again, this in an adjunct-only department.
  
2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.
  
3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.  
  
Courses will be assessed.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	96.14	3.86	0.00
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	96.14	3.86	0.00

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

*We are very satisfied with the assessment results.*

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

*Overall students are achieving mastery in the areas of communicating in Spanish and demonstrating understanding of cultures of different Spanish speaking cultures throughout the 11 levels of Spanish.*

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

*Low Superior SPA124 stands out at 85% for Program SLO 1 and 2 and for SPA123B and 123D (High Advanced and Advance) at 90% as they are slightly lower than other course results. Although 85% and 90% are a high rate of % of students achieving mastery, it is still worth re-visiting to determine if this is significant.*

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

*The % of students achieving mastery is very high in the 11 courses. Instructors are preparing students for mastery at the appropriate levels as demonstrated on assessments. These results are indicating success in meeting Program SLOs.*

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

*The Program SLOs are appropriate for this program. No changes are anticipated.*

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?  
*We will review all results and assessments. We will consider especially any areas that are consistently low in students achieving mastery and will review course outlines, materials, assessments and results.*

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Yes**

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Yes**

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? **Yes**

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? **Yes**

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

*ISSI continues to be a successful program meeting program objectives and Student Learning Outcomes. ISSI usually fills to capacity and students are waiting to register for classes. Class sizes are near maximum. However, for ISSI 2012, the program did not fill. Based on information from students and staff, ISSI plans to participate in additional marketing and to provide more support for student registration in order to increase enrollment. Registration for the August 2012 ISSI was difficult for many students due to technology changes.*

*As per Annual Program Review/Unit Plan 2012-13, new cultural break-out sessions and min-courses were provided, new materials for break-out sessions were provided, more courses addressing difficult grammar issues and conversation were provided, new funding sources for donations were explored and provided. Based on data, the one major change in ISSI population was an increase in returnees to 48%. Usually the returnee rate is 30%-35%.*

*Students continue to highly value the organization, instructor knowledge, variety of instructional strategies, variety of topics and the LTCC support and services. The conversation groups with native Spanish speakers and evening events (lecture by Dr. John Rosenberg and Difficult Trip) are very highly rated as exceptional activities.*

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.
- *Since the last program review, we have seen an additional increase in returnees attending ISSI. Returning students have requested additional topics in Spanish language and culture.*
  - *Community Education classes were added on Sunday. These were successful and will continue.*
  - *A Weekend ISSI program was provided in October 2012 though Community Education.*
  - *The population of older students continues to remain high.*
  - *The % of students from out of the area continues to remain very high.*

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.
- Marketing (to increase ISSI enrollment as per administrative request): Additional and more efficient marketing. We will be working closely with the Peter Bostic, Director of College Advancement and Community Engagement to seek new ideas (social media, etc).
  - Continue to add/change Break-out sessions and Mini-courses.
  - Community Education: Continue and expand Sunday pre-institute classes.
  - Consider offering another Weekend Spanish Institute through Community Education.
  - Work with Peter Bostic to seek sponsors and community support for funding of ISSI components.
  - Review course level materials and improve and enhance current materials.
  - The ISSI date, August 12-16, 2013 is later than usual. Many students who are employed in education (25-35% of ISSI students) might not be able to attend at this late date because schools have started and/or staff has to return. This could significantly impact the ISSI enrollment for ISSI 2013.
  - Explore additional assistance for registration.

**Student Learning Outcomes:****PED: (Fitness Education Center-Walter)**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:  
(Program SLO 1,2,3 etc and Mastery, Some Understanding, No Understanding)
  - SLO 2 100% mastery
  - SLO 5 95% mastery 5% some understanding
  
2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?
  - Yes, satisfied.
  
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
  - We need a bigger sample.
  
4. Review Assessment Data for each SLO:
  - a. Does any assessment stand out? Why?
    - o No
  - b. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
    - o Students seem to be achieving mastery at a high rate but more data is needed.
  - c. To what degree are your Program SLO's measuring the "right" things. Describe any changes you want to make this year (if any).
    - o This is occurring. No changes are desired at this point.
  - d. Considering the results of your Program SLO's, what actions are you going to take for 2012-13?
    - o Get a bigger sample.

**PEF: (Physical Education Fitness-Tim)**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:  
(Program SLO 1,2,3 etc and Mastery, Some Understanding, No Understanding)

In writing up a summary statement, we need to realize that 32 classes were assessed. Each class may or may not have one or more of the SLOs attached to it. The value will be that we can see a trend. At the Mastery level, we averaged an 81.72%-95.88% on all SLOs. This is basically telling us we have a high mastery level of all classes. On the other, end our 'no understanding' was very small being no percent to 3.56%
  
2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?

We are very satisfied with the results.
  
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

We can conclude that among the 31 classes, of which we have multiple instructors teaching, our department is doing a good job in meeting the outcomes of the class at a very high level.
  
4. Review Assessment Data for each SLO:

- a. Does any assessment stand out? Why?
- b. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
- c. To what degree are your Program SLO's measuring the "right" things. Describe any changes you want to make this year (if any).
- d. Considering the results of your Program SLO's, what actions are you going to take for 2012-13?

With such a multitude of classes and a large number of different teachers teaching the classes, this becomes difficult to make a summary statement. The data is beneficial specifically to the course and teacher. Each full-time faculty in that area will look at the classes they teach and/or adjuncts they "manage" and provide feedback from the SLO data. However, based upon the percentage outcomes mentioned, we are meeting the outcomes at a high level and are measuring the appropriate things. I don't think any real changes need to be made. However, we will take a look at the Department SLO outcomes and course specific SLO outcomes and if any wording needs to be change, we will make that happen. Since our area deals with activity, some of us may add an additional MASLO for which is not represented in the "college summary" document. We will note if this needs to be addressed or not.

**PET: (Physical Education Theory- Tim)**

No assessments were done this year.

**PEH: (Physical Education Health- Rex)**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:  
(Program SLO 1,2,3 etc and Mastery, Some Understanding, No Understanding)
  - 90%
2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?
  - satisfied
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
  - SLOs are functioning as they should
4. Review Assessment Data for each SLO:
  - a. Does any assessment stand out? Why?
    - o no
  - b. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
    - o SLOs are fine as they are
  - c. To what degree are your Program SLO's measuring the "right" things. Describe any changes you want to make this year (if any)
    - o No changes
  - d. Considering the results of your Program SLO's, what actions are you going to take for 2012-13?
    - o none

**Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

- Course-level SLOs identified and submitted to the SLO Committee: Y
- Program-level SLOs identified and submitted to the SLO Committee: Y
- Course-level SLOs mapped to program-level SLOs: Y
- Program-level SLOs mapped to Institutional level SLOs: Y  
(core competencies?)



## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW:

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the **current status of your Department/Program.**

- The PEH department is broken down into 4 separate areas; PED, PEF, PET, PEH. The following summarizes data for that specific area. (reference from 2010-11 last year to this year)

(a) PED (Fitness Center):

- FTES: 51.9 to 55.8 (increase by 4), yet down from 2007-09 which was around 92
- Enrollment: 1628 to 1331 from (decrease by 297), big decrease since 2007-09 by around 1000 students
- Success: 73.2% to 68.8% (decrease by 4.4%), yet above 2007-09 which was around 62%
- Summary:

(b) PEF (Fitness):

- FTES: 128 to 132.3 (increase by 4 FTES), down from 2007-09 by close to 20
- Enrollment: 2477 to 2539 (increase by 62 students), down from 2007-09 by around 500+ students
- Success: basically same as last year at around 79%, but up from 2007-10 which averaged 73%
- Summary: FTES is basically the same as last year, but down overall over the years due to a decrease in course offerings due to pressure from the state. Enrollment is actually up so this would signify a little more efficiency in effect. Success rates have remained constant, but has gone up these last couple of years.

(c) PET (Theory):

- FTES: 4.04 to 3.48 (drop by .50), but up from 2007-09
- Enrollment: 77 to 63 (drop by 14 students), but up by 20-40 students (2007-09)
- Success: 65.3 to 74.6% (increase close to 10%), and additional up 10% from 2007-09
- Summary: There is not much of a change in FTES, with a little drop in overall students this last year. This may cycle differently each year, primarily in that the Theory classes are offered in our certification classes and the interest may not be as great that year. Our success rate is up by almost 10%, so that is significant.

(d) PEH (Health):

- FTES: 16.9 to 18.3 (increase by 2.6), up from 2007-09 by over 6
- Enrollment: 210 to 232 (increase by 22 students), up from 2007-09 by around 80 students
- Success: basically same as last year around 66%, but a drop by 2-3% from 2007-09
- Summary: We are remaining stable with respect to enrollment and are up a little. No significant changes needed at this time.

2. Please explain any **significant changes in the Department/Program** over the past year?

The following were issues we wanted addressed:

- Heating/cooling system of the PE building – there was some major work done with the cooling tower over the year and it appears that the cooling/heating system may be functioning more efficiently. Thank you to Craig in his support in this area.

-Windows in the 4 corners of the gymnasium – a bid was put out and received back. No action has taken place. There is some concern that with air coming in from the top and getting circulated, will it reach lower into the floor of the gym and get the necessary desired effect. More discussion will need to take place here.

-Budgetary needs for equipment – The college has provided \$10,000 for new equipment as per last years annual program review. We are greatly indebted to the support offered here for our programs.

-Collaboration with the high school in sports medicine talks – no talks have been generated in this area. Tim has spoken with Evonne Larson a couple of times to let her know that when talks do take place to make sure we are at the table.

-Significant changes that did take place were that more classes were cut from our schedule due to collegiate needs to cut budgetary expenses.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant **changes expected** in the **upcoming academic year**.**

- The major change is that the department has to map courses into families to meet state requirements. Along with that task, most courses may need to be revised in their curriculum content, numbering system, unit value, etc.
- The department is also supposed to go through its 5 year Program Review plan. We will be assessing and completing this task in the spring.
- We need to continue the discussion for the addition of window “vents” in the gym to assist us in the cooling effect during the shoulder season
- Additional monies were given to the department to meet last years’ annual program review. Unfortunately, a treadmill has broken down in the FEC for which repairs can not be done. A good portion of this money will be spent on replacing that. This means we will not be able to purchase all the needed equipment on our list, since the majority of the additional monies will be used to replace the treadmill.
- Additional monies for equipment:
  - o \$2500 - EFX machine in the adult wellness class if we don’t purchase it this year
  - o \$5000 for replacement of spin bikes – machines are getting old and the newer machines have new technologies that would support new training techniques and teaching modalities.
  - o \$5000 - Elyptical trainer (FEC)

**Student Learning Outcomes:****PED: (Fitness Education Center-Walter)**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:  
(Program SLO 1,2,3 etc and Mastery, Some Understanding, No Understanding)
  - SLO 2 100% mastery
  - SLO 5 95% mastery 5% some understanding
  
2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?
  - Yes, satisfied.
  
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
  - We need a bigger sample.
  
4. Review Assessment Data for each SLO:
  - a. Does any assessment stand out? Why?
    - o No
  - b. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
    - o Students seem to be achieving mastery at a high rate but more data is needed.
  - c. To what degree are your Program SLO's measuring the "right" things. Describe any changes you want to make this year (if any).
    - o This is occurring. No changes are desired at this point.
  - d. Considering the results of your Program SLO's, what actions are you going to take for 2012-13?
    - o Get a bigger sample.

**PEF: (Physical Education Fitness-Tim)**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:  
(Program SLO 1,2,3 etc and Mastery, Some Understanding, No Understanding)

In writing up a summary statement, we need to realize that 32 classes were assessed. Each class may or may not have one or more of the SLOs attached to it. The value will be that we can see a trend. At the Mastery level, we averaged an 81.72%-95.88% on all SLOs. This is basically telling us we have a high mastery level of all classes. On the other, end our 'no understanding' was very small being no percent to 3.56%
  
2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?

We are very satisfied with the results.
  
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

We can conclude that among the 31 classes, of which we have multiple instructors teaching, our department is doing a good job in meeting the outcomes of the class at a very high level.
  
4. Review Assessment Data for each SLO:

- a. Does any assessment stand out? Why?
- b. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
- c. To what degree are your Program SLO's measuring the "right" things. Describe any changes you want to make this year (if any).
- d. Considering the results of your Program SLO's, what actions are you going to take for 2012-13?

With such a multitude of classes and a large number of different teachers teaching the classes, this becomes difficult to make a summary statement. The data is beneficial specifically to the course and teacher. Each full-time faculty in that area will look at the classes they teach and/or adjuncts they "manage" and provide feedback from the SLO data. However, based upon the percentage outcomes mentioned, we are meeting the outcomes at a high level and are measuring the appropriate things. I don't think any real changes need to be made. However, we will take a look at the Department SLO outcomes and course specific SLO outcomes and if any wording needs to be change, we will make that happen. Since our area deals with activity, some of us may add an additional MASLO for which is not represented in the "college summary" document. We will note if this needs to be addressed or not.

**PET: (Physical Education Theory- Tim)**

No assessments were done this year.

**PEH: (Physical Education Health- Rex)**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:  
(Program SLO 1,2,3 etc and Mastery, Some Understanding, No Understanding)
  - 90%
2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?
  - satisfied
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
  - SLOs are functioning as they should
4. Review Assessment Data for each SLO:
  - a. Does any assessment stand out? Why?
    - o no
  - b. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
    - o SLOs are fine as they are
  - c. To what degree are your Program SLO's measuring the "right" things. Describe any changes you want to make this year (if any)
    - o No changes
  - d. Considering the results of your Program SLO's, what actions are you going to take for 2012-13?
    - o none

**Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

- Course-level SLOs identified and submitted to the SLO Committee: Y
- Program-level SLOs identified and submitted to the SLO Committee: Y
- Course-level SLOs mapped to program-level SLOs: Y
- Program-level SLOs mapped to Institutional level SLOs: Y  
(core competencies?)

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW:

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the **current status of your Department/Program**.

- The PEH department is broken down into 4 separate areas; PED, PEF, PET, PEH. The following summarizes data for that specific area. (reference from 2010-11 last year to this year)

(a) PED (Fitness Center):

- FTES: 51.9 to 55.8 (increase by 4), yet down from 2007-09 which was around 92
- Enrollment: 1628 to 1331 from (decrease by 297), big decrease since 2007-09 by around 1000 students
- Success: 73.2% to 68.8% (decrease by 4.4%), yet above 2007-09 which was around 62%
- Summary:

(b) PEF (Fitness):

- FTES: 128 to 132.3 (increase by 4 FTES), down from 2007-09 by close to 20
- Enrollment: 2477 to 2539 (increase by 62 students), down from 2007-09 by around 500+ students
- Success: basically same as last year at around 79%, but up from 2007-10 which averaged 73%
- Summary: FTES is basically the same as last year, but down overall over the years due to a decrease in course offerings due to pressure from the state. Enrollment is actually up so this would signify a little more efficiency in effect. Success rates have remained constant, but has gone up these last couple of years.

(c) PET (Theory):

- FTES: 4.04 to 3.48 (drop by .50), but up from 2007-09
- Enrollment: 77 to 63 (drop by 14 students), but up by 20-40 students (2007-09)
- Success: 65.3 to 74.6% (increase close to 10%), and additional up 10% from 2007-09
- Summary: There is not much of a change in FTES, with a little drop in overall students this last year. This may cycle differently each year, primarily in that the Theory classes are offered in our certification classes and the interest may not be as great that year. Our success rate is up by almost 10%, so that is significant.

(d) PEH (Health):

- FTES: 16.9 to 18.3 (increase by 2.6), up from 2007-09 by over 6
- Enrollment: 210 to 232 (increase by 22 students), up from 2007-09 by around 80 students
- Success: basically same as last year around 66%, but a drop by 2-3% from 2007-09
- Summary: We are remaining stable with respect to enrollment and are up a little. No significant changes needed at this time.

2. Please explain any **significant changes in the Department/Program** over the past year?

The following were issues we wanted addressed:

- Heating/cooling system of the PE building – there was some major work done with the cooling tower over the year and it appears that the cooling/heating system may be functioning more efficiently. Thank you to Craig in his support in this area.

-Windows in the 4 corners of the gymnasium – a bid was put out and received back. No action has taken place. There is some concern that with air coming in from the top and getting circulated, will it reach lower into the floor of the gym and get the necessary desired effect. More discussion will need to take place here.

-Budgetary needs for equipment – The college has provided \$10,000 for new equipment as per last years annual program review. We are greatly indebted to the support offered here for our programs.

-Collaboration with the high school in sports medicine talks – no talks have been generated in this area. Tim has spoken with Evonne Larson a couple of times to let her know that when talks do take place to make sure we are at the table.

-Significant changes that did take place were that more classes were cut from our schedule due to collegiate needs to cut budgetary expenses.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant **changes expected** in the **upcoming academic year**.**

- The major change is that the department has to map courses into families to meet state requirements. Along with that task, most courses may need to be revised in their curriculum content, numbering system, unit value, etc.
- The department is also supposed to go through its 5 year Program Review plan. We will be assessing and completing this task in the spring.
- We need to continue the discussion for the addition of window “vents” in the gym to assist us in the cooling effect during the shoulder season
- Additional monies were given to the department to meet last years’ annual program review. Unfortunately, a treadmill has broken down in the FEC for which repairs can not be done. A good portion of this money will be spent on replacing that. This means we will not be able to purchase all the needed equipment on our list, since the majority of the additional monies will be used to replace the treadmill.
- Additional monies for equipment:
  - o \$2500 - EFX machine in the adult wellness class if we don’t purchase it this year
  - o \$5000 for replacement of spin bikes – machines are getting old and the newer machines have new technologies that would support new training techniques and teaching modalities.
  - o \$5000 - Elyptical trainer (FEC)

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

\*SLO data for 2011-2012 was not available (no courses scheduled for assessment).

1. **What do these results mean to you?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)
  
2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)
  
3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. **Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**  
N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW****1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The Physical Therapy Aide program is relatively new to LTCC and consists of two courses and the associated data is part of the “Allied Health” data package. When these courses are combined with two courses from the PE department, students are awarded a short-term department certificate. To date, enrollments in these courses are strong. The first course in the sequence (HEA119A) typically begins with 28-30 students. The program has a base in anatomy and physiology and is therefore inherently rigorous. The program was piloted in 2011-2012 and approximately 60% of the students completed the first course. This resulted in a rather small cohort continuing on to the second course. These continuing students showed greater academic preparedness and approximately 80% of them successfully completed the second course.



**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

None. The program was piloted in 2011-2012.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

2012-2013 represents the second offering of the PT Aide program. The instructor is increasing the enrollment limit to allow for the inevitable attrition that will occur when students experience the extreme academic rigor of this CTE program.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE - WORKSHEET**

**1. Based on the data provided and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The online student survey conducted in October 2010, in which 473 students participated, indicates 82% of students who used the TLC agree that there are enough tutors to meet their needs and 97% agree that the TLC supported their development and success. (Standard II, Self Study) Currently, our usage is up in the Writing Center and the Math Success Center from the previous fall, and I hope to continue that trend.

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program since the last Program Review.**

Many changes! As of this fall, we no longer are the primary assessment center (we still administer the paper geometry test) with the D-Wing lab taken over those responsibilities. However, we are now the site of nearly all DRC testing. This has shifted our room usage as well, replacing the assessment space with a quiet testing area. In addition, the TLC is now used by Non-Credit ESL for its program Monday through Thursday after 6 PM. The Writing Center is now offering a by appointment option for students, as well as taking over the duties of online DE tutoring previously done by Diane Lewis. This training, in conjunction with CCC Confer, began the third week of the quarter and is ongoing. We also re-configured our space which resulted in a change in how and when students log in; we gained a spacious more casual study/computer area and downsized our group study rooms to one. The Library has a number of study rooms to accommodate those who need them. We also have more subject-area tutoring taking place in the TLC, and we are currently experimenting with by appointment study groups in math. Having English 151 Writing Improvement classes meet in the TLC has also been a positive step in increasing awareness of our tutoring and other resources among new and Basic Skills students.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

I hope we will see continued growth in usage throughout the entire TLC. I plan to involve faculty more in our tutoring by scheduling study group tutoring sessions coinciding with specific coursework and classes. We have also begun to see faculty meeting in the TLC (the Senate has had meetings here, for one). I believe that encouraging faculty use will result in increased student use.

**4. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)**

- Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Yes
- Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Yes
- Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Yes

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	n/a		
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	n/a		
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	n/a		
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

1. What do these results mean to you? Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

The library lists 3 SLO's, but #2 is under the domain of the ENG department's assessments for ENG 103 students.

**SLO #1** (increase of Ebsco usage by 5% each year) was not attained in part because we were asked to submit our stats (and APR) 2 weeks earlier than we normally gather data and also because overall student enrollment was down about 9% this quarter. Library usage was flat during Fall Quarter, but it had increased 22% in Winter and over 4% in Spring. It declined in Summer, however. I am satisfied with the data given the decline in enrollment and steady increase in online classes which tend to have less in person and online library site traffic.

**SLO#3** concerns student satisfaction surveys. I launched a trial program of in-depth research appointments in Fall Quarter which by all accounts was very successful and rewarding for students and faculty librarians alike. The survey submitted to Tracdat to was a HIS 113 sample. We will be expanding the research by appointment program this coming year and have streamlined the communication process with instructors by creating a sticker called "library reference check" to document that a student received research assistance at the reference desk. The goal of these appointments was not simply to assist students with particular assignments, but rather to teach academic research skills. The survey documents that 100% respondents expressed/stated:

1. *increased comfort levels with LTCC Library subscription databases*
2. *they would return for research assistance in future.*

2. What conclusions do you draw from these results? Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

My conclusion from SLO#3 is that we will expand this research appointment outreach. I got input from a student focus group on how to promote the appointment program in class visits. Teaching academic research skills is our core mission here in the library. We will be far busier than ever and therefore need to let go of other lower priority tasks, like college podcasts.

<<< Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.

Library has no course assessments: N/A

3. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?
4. What conclusions do you draw from these results? >>>
5. **To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

I don't find Program SLO's useful to my continuous feedback and improvement process. I do collect a lot of data that **is relevant** to my department that doesn't fit into this format or questionnaire.

6. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? N/A

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? N/A

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Not sure where “the map” is located. Library's SLO is connected to Core Competency #4, information literacy.

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW**

**Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

Our department has been downsized this past year, reducing hours of operation from 57 to 49, a 14% reduction from prior FY. Additionally, the department reduced adjunct, clerk, and library technician II staff. The staffing reduction is significant and the workload is higher in most areas. Approximately 1.25% FTE staff were lost as of December 2012, 52 hours of staffing per week, while library hours of operation were reduced only 8. We are looking for efficiencies in tasks we performed when fully staffed. For example, we have cut our periodicals dramatically and no longer catalog or barcode them. What we call our "patron count", the number of folks passing through our doors, was almost as high as last year, which documents that workload didn't decrease despite a 14% reduction in hours of operation and roughly 30% reduction in staff --- not including the media tech change of department. Last year the library had a total staff of 5 FTE, now reduced to 3.5. Furthermore, this is the first year that the library was not awarded a student worker (to shelve books, recycle newspapers, water plants and other menial tasks).

**Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

We are in the midst of a technology migration to new software in order to reduce dependency on the IT department and its servers and also lower technology costs in future. This migration involves extra technical work and weekly training, and then, after we go live, data clean up and new areas of instruction to our users. It also involves opportunity for workflow efficiencies as the cloud-based beta product WMS improves. We are an "early adopter" and therefore get a price break for being on the cutting edge. Our technology (PC's, networked printers) is well past its prime and requires extra troubleshooting and patience. We are hoping for new PC's and public printers in 2013. Having a PC prioritization system that other college libraries have (e.g., Tracdat) would help us uphold our mission to put students first, prioritize their PC access over the non-students. Additionally, it would take the danger out of closing the library, because it disperses patron anger away from library staff. It would be a significant upgrade to get the log in/and automated log out system I have requested for 5 years in a row.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	50%	32%	18%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	50%	32%	18%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	50%	32%	18%
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

*It looks like each department SLO has the same set of course SLO's mapping to it. Need department SLO's that draw from different sets of SLOs.*

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

*I am not sure how accurate they are-Why are the percentages identical for all three SLOs? The mastery/some understanding/no understanding is 50%, 32%, 18% for each SLO. (This is because of the mapping SLO sets being the same.)*

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

*There needs to be department SLOs for not only the basic skills classes but also for some of the other transfer level classes. MAT 187, 152A, 152B, MAT 102, MAT 103A, 103B map to no department SLO's; department SLO's 2 and 3 should apply to these classes.*

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

*It looks like there is more variability within the SLO's for any given course than there is between the courses.*

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

*The analysis of SLO's is incomplete-need more unique department SLOs that draw from a bigger set of math classes.*

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

*Only partially measuring the right things two recommended changes:*

- 1. More program SLOs for basic skills classes*
- 2. More "unique" department SLOs*

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13? *Come up with a revised set of program SLOs to assess the performance of basic skills students.*

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N Yes  
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N Yes  
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N No-basic skills courses missing  
Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Not sure

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

*Overall successful completion up 3.8% from previous year. Distance ed. successful completion is up from 47.5% to 64%. Overall enrollment has stayed consistent.*

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

*Percent of distance ed. FTE's has continued to increase and has been significantly higher in 2011-12 than previous years.*

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

*Available adjuncts have changed. Need to deal with the short-handedness. More workshops for teaching skills math and/or training of math adjuncts are expected.*

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

- 1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:**

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	69.50	9.50	21.00
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	93.43	0.00	6.57
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	95.63	0.00	4.38

- 2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**

*I am not satisfied with the results for Program SLO 1. I am very satisfied with the results for Program SLOs 3 and 4.*

- 3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

*I am a little surprised that none of the classes assessed was mapped to Program SLO 2. That is something I intend to look into this year. Also some work needs to be done to address the success level for Program SLO 1.*

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

- 4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**

*Yes, the assessment for MUS 104B. Only 50% achieved mastery under Program SLO 1.*

- 5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

*It explains the overall dissatisfaction with Program SLO 1.*

- 6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

*I am satisfied that the Program SLOs themselves are appropriate for the Music program and currently do not plan to make any changes to them this year.*



**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

*I plan to determine if the high percentage of students "achieving no understanding" for the SLOs in MUS 104B that map to Program SLO 1 is an outlier. If it is, then I will wait to compare the assessment with a future assessment for that class. As mentioned above, I also plan to examine the mapping for Music course SLOs to Program SLO 2.*

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Yes**

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Yes**

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? **Yes**

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? **Yes**

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW**

**1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

*Based on recommendations from a previous PDL report, and after a year-long series of meetings with the high school to develop curriculum pathways, LTCC approved and began moving forward with the creation of a Commercial Music Degree and Certificate, Pro Tools certification, and a Music/Audio component for the Art New Media Degree. This has included a complete remodel of the F125 classroom as a multi-purpose piano and Digital Media lab. The program maintains healthy enrollment. After being asked last year to increase program FTES by 10%, Music was able to actually grow by 7.4%. Face to Face Successful Completion Rates remained steady and the DE rate actually increased by 1%. However the Overall rate dropped slightly but is still at 85.7%.*

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

*In addition to the changes mentioned in item 1, Music has been undergoing many curricular changes due to new State regulations regarding repeatability of classes. The effect of these changes on enrollment has yet to be determined.*

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

*The Department is looking at expanding the Pro Tools offerings to include the 200 level of certification. In the 2011-12 Review the possibility of an A.A. in Musical Theatre was being discussed. This is still being examined.*

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
<b>Program SLO 6</b>			

\*SLO data for 2011-2012 was not available (no courses scheduled for assessment).

1. **What do these results mean to you?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

2. **Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

3. **What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. **Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?**

N/A (no assessments in 2011-2012)

**8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:**

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? YES

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? YES

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? YES

---

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW****1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The Phlebotomy program consists of two courses and the associated data is part of the “Allied Health” data package. Enrollment in the courses is capped at 18 due to mandated student : instructor ratios and the availability of clinical placements at Barton’s laboratory. The course is offered once or twice a year based on certification cycles and Barton’s ability to accommodate students when they are ready to do their blood draws. This program typically “sells out” during the first day of open registration. Despite its extreme academic rigor, approximately 90%+ of the students who begin the program finish it with a grade of “B” or better. Successful completion allows students to take the national certification exam to become a Certified Phlebotomy Technician I. The most recent statistics available indicate that 96% our students pass this exam and are therefore eligible for employment as CPTs.

In summary, the Phlebotomy program is healthy and stable. Students are being properly prepared for employment as CPT 1s.

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.**

This CTE program requires recertification every two years. Of all the CTE programs at LTCC, it has the “heaviest” administrative and coordination needs. It takes a minimum of six months for the CTE program technician and phlebotomy instructor to properly prepare the certification package. That work began summer 2012 and will be completed in late January 2013. The courses cannot be offered again until the program is officially recertified (expected in March 2013). Accordingly, a spring-summer 2013 offering is planned.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

Recertification (and the associated workload issues for the department) is currently underway. The process will begin again later in 2013-2014 to ensure compliance by March 2015.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

That little to no assessment is taking place.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

There were no course assessment linked to Program Learning Outcomes.

Department/Program: REL Division: HUMANITIES Academic Year (AY): 2012

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?
  
6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?
  
7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?
  
8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:  
  
Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.  
  
Once again, this in an adjunct-only department.
  
2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.
  
3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.  
  
Courses will be assessed.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	78.6%	21.4%	
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	81.2%	18.8%	
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	86.9%	13.1%	
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

*Original MASLO's were not developed with this rubric, however future MASLO's will reflect it.*

What do these results mean to you?  
*A large percentage of students successfully demonstrated desired outcomes.*

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?  
*Yes.*
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
*Students achieved the desired outcomes.*

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?  
*SLO #1 and SLO #2 are no longer measurable due to the discontinuance of the career + educational website we had been using for 13 years. (DISCOVER)*
5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
*Need to identify a new tool to capture the same information. We've been told a new version of DISCOVER will be piloted after Jan. 2013.*

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

*I believe the SLO’s are measuring the “right” things. We just need to identify a new tool or resource to replace DISCOVER.*

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

*I have volunteered to serve as a pilot testing site for the new DISCOVER Program. I will also continue to look for other resources.*

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee?

Y

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee?

Y

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)?

Y

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

*1) COU 108, Career + Life Planning, has been added to catalog and general education patterns.  
2) Other services continue as before = workshops, counseling, class presentations, career fair.*

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

*Major significant change is the discontinuance of DISCOVER – an educational + career planning website that was widely used for assessment and occupational information.*

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

*DISCOVER is piloting a new product after January 2013. I have been asked to serve as a testing site and I agreed to.*



**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	37%	27%	36%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	73%	20%	7%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

These results show that the students are familiar with counseling services and know how to access them, but matriculants are often not able to identify their educational goal using the tools of an educational plan and the projected schedule.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

While we are satisfied with the percentages, it is obvious that SLO #1 clearly shows that students need to master the use of ed plans and projected schedules.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Counseling sessions need to identify the students' goals and develop ed plans that make their educational experience more relevant. Students need to learn how to access the projected schedule in preparation for developing their ed plan.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

NA

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

NA (Counseling is not an academic instructional department.)

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

Ed plans are vital, as is the ability to correctly identify services. This includes students’ understanding of the purpose of ed plans in their educational experience.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

With the pending legislation of the SSTF, ed plans will be required for all students. Counseling sessions will include an ed plan for each student and will be updated as appropriate.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

We have three fulltime counselors and one interim counselor who are assigned program responsibilities, and one fulltime DRC counselor, as well as one part-time counselor who works 12-13 hours per week. We also have one interim fulltime Dean of Students. We also have complete front office staff, a vibrant student ambassador program, and robust Financial Aid Department.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

The department has been impacted by the infusion of three TRiO grants into the interim Dean’s responsibilities. With turnover and new hires for TRiO, this has added to the workload for our Dean and staff. The department has been heavily impacted by the conversion to the new ERP, which has required several hours of training and ongoing development.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

Course repeatability will definitely affect our department. The Datatel conversion will continue to affect our department, also. The initiation of the SSTF will impact our department in a myriad of ways that we don’t even recognize yet. Hiring a new Dean will affect our department’s personnel status.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	Insufficient data	Insufficient data	Insufficient data
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	99+	0	<1
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

SLO 1 needs to be replaced, since it is obsolete. The federal government eliminated the student loan program in which LTCC participated effective 7/1/10; student loans are not currently offered to LTCC students.

SLO 2 results was intended to be based on data extracted from files received from the processing center of returning students' federal financial aid applications; each file contains any number of individual student records. Also, results were expected to extract data for students who filed by March 2<sup>nd</sup> versus those who filed after March 2<sup>nd</sup>. Our expectation when this SLO was developed was that IT and/or Institutional Research staff would be able to extract data from PowerFAIDS, our financial aid software at the time. With the implementation of Datatel/Colleague, we are hopeful that this data may be more available, since this SLO remains one we would like to use. However, we will continue to rely on staff in other departments to extract such data from the system.

SLO 3 should be replaced, since it is virtually obsolete. At the time it was developed, the FAFSA application was available in both paper and online formats, and a significant number of LTCC students preferred the paper format. This is no longer the case. We have only 1 or 2 students annually, out of thousands, who choose to submit a paper FAFSA.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

Dissatisfied, as noted above.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

We need to develop another SLO that is more pertinent to the Financial Aid Program; and for SLO 2, we need the ability to extract accurate data that exists in Colleague.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

N/A

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

N/A

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

#1 and #3 should be eliminated. We need a second SLO that reflects a current focus of the Financial Aid Program.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

Implement a new Program SLO that reflects our desire to increase the percentage of financial aid applicants and recipients of Latino ethnicity.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? N/A

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? N/A

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

Through Spring 2012, the Financial Aid Program continued to experience significant growth, in terms of Pell recipient numbers as well as Board of Governors Fee Waiver recipient numbers. In 2010-11, LTCC awarded

753 students Federal Pell Grant and 1,807 students the Board of Governors Fee Waiver. In 2011-12, 864 students received Federal Pell Grant and 1,025 received a BOGFW.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

Our staff continued to learn more about Colleague, and how financial aid information can be accessed and processed in the new system. Cross-training--for front office staff funded by the categorical programs (EOP&S, CARE, and CalWORKs) and financial aid—continued and increased.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

Staff will continue to develop understanding of Colleague, as well as understanding of interface between financial aid and the categorical programs. Changes in duties of the 28-hour/week Financial Aid Office Assistant are expected, in order to better spread the responsibilities to be handled during the busy periods of registration. Scholarships will be publicized beginning in January, instead of April, with the intention of increasing the number of students who are aware of such opportunities, as well as the number of applications submitted for various scholarships.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
Program SLO 1	X		
Program SLO 2	X		
Program SLO 3	X		
Program SLO 4	X		
Program SLO 5	X		

What do these results mean to you?

Successful course completions have averaged 75.4% in Anthropology and 71.3% in Sociology. These indicate a good level of mastery of program-level SLOs.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?

Based on classroom observations, office-hour conversations, and assessment of course information, the programs are on track in terms of program-level SLOs.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Both programs are in good shape in terms of enrollments and successful student completions. Areas of improvement should always be considered and implemented.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

I would like to look at creating an alternative mapping of Program and Course SLOs over the next year. It will be necessary to assess whether the current mapping is an accurate reflection of student success in the programs.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

I will focus on creating an alternative mapping of Program and Course SLOs over the next year.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Y** or **N**

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Y** or **N**

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? **Y** or **N**

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? **Y** or **N**

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

The programs in Anthropology and Sociology are strong. Enrollments in Anthropology for 2011-12 were 29.664 FTES and in Sociology for 2011-12 were 23.523 FTES. These are strong enrollments that are produced through 1.0 FTEF and a very conservative budget. These are two of the most cost-effective programs at Lake Tahoe Community College.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

There is one new course being piloted, SOC 111—Sociology of Popular Culture.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

It is still a challenge to find qualified adjunct instructors in Anthropology and Sociology.



**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?
5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?
  
7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?
  
8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:  
  
Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N  
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N  
Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.  
  
No courses have been offered in this program since 2009-2010.
  
2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.
  
  
3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.  
  
We are looking for an instructor to teach these courses. Hopefully, we'll be able to begin offering the Ethnic Studies sequence.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	75.5%	23%	1.5%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	75.5%	23%	1.5%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	75.5%	23%	1.5%
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	75.5%	23%	1.5%
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

It is always suspect when all data points are the same.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

I am not satisfied as they seem to support that the assessment process was not authentic.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

There needs to be some work/contact with the new adjuncts in this department to conduct valid assessments of learning.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

The focus of this department has been POL101, and it is the only course recently assessed.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

That there was little thought given to the process as the numbers seem to be simply alternating.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

The SLO’s are fine and encompass the desired outcomes; the process needs to be better defined and instituted.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

Focus on training the new adjuncts to perform authentic assessments.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

This program is currently in flux as we move from 1 full-time instructor who always taught POL101, to a number of adjuncts who will be teaching it.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

The retirement of the full-time instructor in this area is the most significant change.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

All Political Science courses will be taught by adjuncts, some of whom are very new to teaching. There needs to be significant training of the adjunct so they might become fully involved in the assessment process.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

---

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	79.29	17.38	3.33
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	73.33	25.00	1.67
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	80.29	18.29	1.43
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	85.36	12.27	2.36

2. What do these results mean to you?

As in AY 2012-2013 students are consistently demonstrating a high degree of mastery of the Program SLOs for the Psychology Department. Due to a mapping error in TracDat for Program SLO1 in AY 2012-2013 I can not compare the current data to the previous year for that particular slo.

3. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

I am very satisfied with the results of the Program SLO assessments.

4. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Similar to last year, I conclude that instruction is of the highest quality in the Psychology Department, and that effective learning is taking place.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

5. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

There were no major outliers at the course SLO level that were cause for concern. Across multiple adjuncts, sections, and MASLOs, there are consistent findings of high levels of learning, demonstrated by the high percentages of 'mastery' of course SLOs.

6. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

I conclude that instruction is of the highest quality in the Psychology Department, and that effective learning is taking place.

7. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

There are no changes planned to either course or program SLOs this year.

8. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

Given the substantial size of the Distance Education (DE) component of the Psychology Department, I will focus on comparing course SLO results for DE vs. face-to-face courses, and to continue to promote professional development for online instructors in order to ensure that the same level of learning is taking place in the online environment.

9. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

The Psychology Department has grown significantly over the past five years, almost doubling in FTES from 48 in 2007-08 to 82 in 2011-12 but has currently dropped slightly to 72 in 2012-2013 ( A trend across campus). The Department has consistent scheduling of courses, dedicated adjuncts, and effective coordination led by the full-time faculty member, as reflected by the strength of the growth. Most of that growth can be attributed to FTES generated in distance education (DE). Online courses are seen as an essential component of the Department, allowing student to access to classes, and maintaining a sustainable level of FTES and enrollments.

Because of the size of DE, student success in online courses is a continued focus. A persistent gap of 4% in DE compared to face-to-face bears monitoring, but has not widened or narrowed significantly in the last three years. Efforts will continue to promote student success and learning across all modalities.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

In the past academic year, the Department has seen continued growth, and has surpassed the 50% threshold for FTES generated through DE approaching nearly 58%. At the same time, the department has continued to support an additional .41 FTE of a full-time faculty member from the Disability Resource Center (DRC), and continuous to support .25 FTE of a full-time faculty member from Physical Education who teaches Human Sexuality (PSY 106). This presents a challenge for scheduling and maintaining a pool of qualified adjuncts, as FT loads have to be addressed regardless of sections that may cancel. This is currently not an issue, but could develop into one.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

Department/Program: Psychology Division: Humanities and Social Sciences Academic Year (AY): 2012-13

An expectant retirement may impact the psychology department. There will also be a full-time instructor on sabbatical, Fall 2014.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>			
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

Currently, there are no established SLO's for matriculation.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

N/A

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Student Support Services plans to combine matriculation, counseling, transfer services, career services, distance education, and EOPS/CARE into one program review for the 2013-14 year. We will create comprehensive SLOs that over-arch all services.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

N/A



5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

N/A

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

N/A

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

N/A

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

The matriculation program’s philosophy and mission at LTCC has remained the same since the last program review on file (July, 2009).

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

The introduction of a new ERP and registration system has impacted the logistics of the matriculation process. Staff and students have had to learn a new system, which has, at times, been frustrating. However, all components of assessment, orientation and educational planning have remained.

Department/Program: Matriculation Division: Student Services Academic Year (AY): 2012-13

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

The SSTF may impact the logistics of implementing the matriculation process by requiring more focused educational plans of all students.

The position of interim dean, and how that may or may not change next year, is bound to influence the productivity and implementation of services, including matriculation.

Revised  
10/12/12

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT

RECEIVED  
OCT 12 2012  
INSTRUCTION OFFICE

Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.

- 1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
Program SLO 1	64.67%	35.33%	
Program SLO 2	68.50%	31.50%	
Program SLO 3	N/A	N/A	
Program SLO 4			
Program SLO 5			

What do these results mean to you?

Only one Theatre course was assessed in Spring 2012, so on the one hand, this is not necessarily a thorough overview of the program. However, I do believe that these are pretty typical results based on previous classes assessed. The majority of students do well in class.

The percentages that represent "Some Understanding" and "No Understanding" result, based on my experience, from students who do only some of the assignments or no assignments at all, or students who stop coming to class and don't drop. Therefore, I feel the categories "Some Understanding" and, especially, "No Understanding" are not valuable categories, as they do not give a realistic or complete picture of what is actually happening. Those headings imply that students are doing the work, just not grasping the material, and that is not what is really happening in the classroom. There should be some way of indicating those students who do not do the work or who stop showing up to class.

- 2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?

Satisfied, based on the students who completed the class and did the course work.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The teaching in this department is effective and the majority of students do the work and do well. There is a small percentage who don't do the assignments, or do only some assignments, or who stop coming to class and don't drop. As stated above, I believe the category headings for assessments do not reflect what is really happening in the classroom and should be modified.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

No. Only one course was assessed, but I think the results are pretty standard (see comments above).

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

See comments above

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the "right" things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

Program SLOs #1 and #2 are solid; I am not happy with #3 – while I require my face to face students to attend our department production and write a critique, I can't be sure other classes will be able to require the same thing. Last year I had to quickly reduce the 11 Program SLOs for this department down to 3. I am not sure we need a 3<sup>rd</sup> Program SLO. I will find that out. Either way, I will delete the current #3 and just stay with two, or replace it with something else.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

Replace Program SLO #3 or delete it altogether.

Continue to be available to my adjuncts for support.

Try to intervene earlier with students who aren't doing the work; I have already counseled my adjuncts to do the same.

Continue to establish clear expectations.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Y** or **N**

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **Y** or **N**

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? **Y** or **N**

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? **Y** or **N**

It is my understanding that we can do this mapping as we assess courses.

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

### 1. Based on the data provided and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

- The department has seen substantial growth in program size over the past five years. However, we have lost credit of FTES due to the course enrollment structure for the musical. Enrollment that should have been reflected in the Theatre Department was lost to the Music and Dance departments. Beginning 2012/13, this has changed. All enrollment for the musical will come to the Theatre Department, and the Music Director and Choreographer positions will be paid via stipend. Distance Education provides about 1/3 of department enrollment and FTES. While there has been a fluctuation in enrollment (as is typical at this school), the department has seen significant growth in registration for online classes.

- An assessment of the 2007 Program Review Final Recommendations shows that many of the goals were achieved by the end of the 2010/11 academic year. Some of the goals were not achieved. The major reason for this is that the department has been in transition for the past three years. The former Director of Theatre resigned at the end of the 2007/08 school year, and was replaced for a year by an interim full-time faculty person. This caused a period of instability with a lack of continuity. The new Director of Theatre came on board for the 2009/10 academic year and has worked to achieve the bulk of the listed goals. Due to the transition, some goals are still ongoing, but many have been accomplished. Budget cuts and lack of funding are directly responsible for the department being unable to achieve those goals tied to funding.

- Based on ticket sales, public response, and community involvement and recognition, the department continues to produce successful, quality stage productions on a limited budget, as well as creating community outreach opportunities (for 2011/12 I organized a highly successful event to commemorate the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of 9/11, with a play reading, events to honor the victims and heroes, as well as establish a memorial in the Demonstration Garden. This event included the participation of a number of community members and organizations and was very successful). This department continues to show itself as a vital component of LTCC and the community.

- The department has consistently produced quality productions, as well as special events connected to productions, over the past three years with limited funding. However, this is something that needs to be addressed. To offer *large-cast* productions, as well as producing a *musical* every year (prior to 2009/10, musicals were offered only sporadically), requires additional funding that the department currently does not have. Additionally, we are unable to do "period" plays because of the cost inherent in providing period costumes. This has a direct negative impact on the instruction of Theatre students, as we are not able to expose them to the wide spectrum of dramatic genres because these plays are "too expensive" for us to produce. Providing increased production values contributes to the overall quality of stage productions and can result in great audience attendance. Increased audiences provide increased revenue for the college, as well as community outreach and increased visibility for the college. Therefore, the department needs to be able to increase the production values for each show (costumes, sets, etc.), as well as have the funding to offer musicals that cost more to license in order to continue to offer quality productions that will draw more audiences. In addition, the more vibrant the Theatre Department is, the more the potential exists to draw increasing numbers of theatre students from the local high school. The funds for this request could come from a percentage of the unanticipated revenue generated by Theatre Department ticket sales. (*Strategic Issue #3, Goal #6, Objective 6.1: Increase the presence and visibility of the college in the community through higher level participation and sponsorship in community events, organizations and projects AND Strategic Issue #4, Goal 9, Objective 9.2: Maintain healthy, vibrant, and resilient physical spaces and systems*).

- While increasing course offerings would improve enrollment and offer more variety and training to students, finding qualified adjuncts to teach face to face courses has proven extremely difficult in this isolated area.

- There is opportunity to increase enrollment as well as interest in the department with the creation of a Dramatic Writing emphasis, as well as a Musical Theatre emphasis. *(Strategic Issue #2, Goal 5, Objective 5.1: Offer programs and courses at the right times, in the right sequences, and through the most effective modalities to facilitate student's timely completion of their educational and professional goals.)*

- There is opportunity to develop several more courses to be offered online. In the winter quarter of this school year, we will be offering THE101 Introduction to Theatre online. In the spring, we will be offering THE 115 Introduction to Playwrighting online, as I currently don't have someone to teach it face to face again. With strong marketing, hopefully these courses will fill. *(Strategic Issue #2, Goal 5, Objective 5.1: Offer programs and courses at the right times, in the right sequences, and through the most effective modalities to facilitate student's timely completion of their educational and professional goals.)*

- There is a need to upgrade our existing theatre lighting equipment, per the long-term plan established when the theatre was built. The lighting instruments purchased with the original building purchase were not current (for 1995) technology due to contract arrangements the architects had with a vendor (Colortran) who only manufactured previous generation equipment. Part of the Theatre Department's strategic plan was to upgrade to current generation instruments which allow use of many ancillary components which are not compatible with our current instruments. This was a long-term strategy to purchase a few each year to gradually replace our current instruments, with a goal of a complete upgrade of approximately 60 instruments, as well as purchase modules for the moving lights, Gobo rotators, and slide projections inserts. Eight were purchased in the first installment, then the funding was cut and never returned to our budget. Now it is 17 years later, and we have not been able to upgrade our instruments. This has a direct impact on Theatre Department training and productions, as well as for other campus or outside groups that use the facility. Now that the high school theatre has a new facility with state of the art equipment, we should be focusing on improving our equipment so that high school students are not taking a step backward when they come here. *(Strategic Issue #4, Goal 9, Objective 9.1: Establish a robust technology infrastructure and support that reflects proactively the evolving needs of students, faculty and staff, AND Strategic Issue #4, Goal 9, Objective 9.2: Maintain healthy, vibrant, and resilient physical spaces and systems).*

- There is a need to purchase a CAD software program for the Theatre Technician to use for set and lighting design for both in-class and stage productions needs. This software will provide the ability to significantly improve the set design process by providing the designer with the tools to create fully developed 3-dimensional, full color renderings for set design. This will help in the communication process with the director and the actors, as well as provide the TD with professional development skills in learning and utilizing the software program. Students will also have the opportunity to learn the program and apply set design principles to the development of in-class assignments as well as assisting in design plans for stage productions. Now that the high school theatre has a new facility with state of the art equipment, we should be focusing on improving our resources so that high school students are not taking a step backward when they come here. *(Strategic Issue #2, Goal 5, Objective 5.1: Offer programs and courses at the right times, in the right sequences, and through the most effective modalities to facilitate student's timely completion of their educational and professional goals AND Strategic Issue #10, Goal 10, Objective 10. 1: Develop the professional skills, abilities and talents of faculty, staff and administrators on a continual basis).*

- There is a need to construct sound-proof doors between the scene shop and the theatre. This was supposed to have been done when the theatre was built, but the money ran out. As the noise level in the shop is disruptive to classes and rehearsals, set and prop building cannot be done when the theatre is in use. Building doors to provide sound proofing will allow more efficient use of time for set building. In order to cut costs, building and installing the sound doors would be done in-house by the Theatre Technician and Maintenance. The estimate (per the Theatre Technician) is approximately \$2,000.00. (*Strategic Issue #4, Goal 9, Objective 9.2: Maintain healthy, vibrant, and resilient physical spaces and systems*).

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program since the last Program Review.**

- I am continuing to develop new courses. We offered the new THE 115 Introduction to Playwriting in the spring 2012. While we didn't get as many students as I had hoped, the class was very successful. I plan to continue promoting this class, whether we need to offer it online or not.

- I have established an annual Theatre Department fundraiser.

- I began developing a core of Improvisation performers and we had several performances. I will continue to develop this area of the Theatre Department.

- Primarily due to budget cuts, the department has not been offering technical theatre classes for the past several years. While some of these classes have a history of not making, some did, so this impacts our enrollment. The current thought is that, with the development of the union for classified staff, the theatre technician will no longer be able to teach these classes when they can be offered again. Finding a suitable adjunct to teach these courses will be difficult in this isolated area. This situation does need to be addressed, as we should be offering at least the sound class once a year.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

- I (the Director of Theatre) have agreed to accept less units for directing and producing productions in order to make the production classes less "costly" and to be able to teach additional classes, which will result in more FTES. The units have gone from 10 units to 6 units for the production.

- The operating budget for the department has been reduced by \$2,300, which has a negative impact on what we can provide for sets, costumes, lights, etc. for our productions. It also may limit us as to what shows we can do, especially musicals, as some shows are more expensive to license than others. For example, the licensing for "Rent," our spring musical this year, is more expensive than most musicals.

- The budget for hiring costumers has also been reduced. This will have a negative impact on the amount of hours we can give to a costumer to do a show, especially as we have to split the hours between 3 productions. The fall show this year will not have a costumer and the Director of Theatre will have to do it (on top of losing units for producing and directing the production and having to teach more classes). This will also have an impact on what shows we can do (in addition to the limitations we already must take into consideration when choosing shows), as shows with significant costume demands are already a challenge – with reduced hours to hire costumers, it will now be even more difficult to try to do shows that have any kind of costume demands (number of costumes needed, period costumes of any kind, having to make any costumes). This will force us to have to do more contemporary plays as we can use contemporary dress for costumes, but these plays have generally only 4 or so characters in them, which then lowers our enrollment for the production class. This also restricts the genres of plays I can expose my students to. It is a vicious cycle – I have to keep enrollment up, but the only shows we can afford to do are shows that only have a few characters. It will continue to be a challenge to select a season that works within our limitations.

- Due to budget cuts, I no longer have money to hire a house manager for the productions. In addition to all of the above, I will now have to house manage and sell concessions, as well. We may be able to use crew members, but we can't always count on that – depending on the needs of the show and the number of crew people needed backstage.
- The elimination of the Graphics Design position by the end of the fall quarter of this year has the potential to have a large negative impact on this department. We rely on this position to create posters, fliers, programs, and tickets for our productions. While I have been told that Ginger will be contracted to do some things for the school and not others, I don't know at this point what those things are. I don't know if the needs of the Theatre Department will be covered for the winter and spring. If they are not, I don't have the skills, the computer program, or the time to design posters. There is no money in my budget to hire an outside vendor to do this. Posters are a necessary and effective means of publicizing our productions. I am hoping I will be told of the decisions **soon** so that I can make plans.
- The box office will now be handled by the bookstore. I will still have a lot to do with this, but they will handle the selling of the tickets.
- We are poised to begin to have online ticket sales this year, which will make purchasing tickets for our productions in advance much easier for our patrons.
- The department is getting involved with the Kennedy Center American College Theatre Festival this year. ACTF is a national theatre festival/competition for colleges and universities. The regional competitions culminate in the final Irene Ryan Awards competition in Washington, D.C. We have entered our fall production as an associate entry, which means we will have a respondent attend our production and two students will be nominated to compete in the regional festival in February 2013, which will be held at American River College. I am planning to enter our production of "Rent" in the spring, as well. It costs the department \$225.00 to register a production, but the experience for the students and the visibility for the department and the college will be worth it.
- I am teaching acting classes for children and teenagers through the LTCC Community Education department. This is great outreach and recruitment for our department.



**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE - WORKSHEET**

**1. Based on the data provided and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.**

The online student survey conducted in October 2010, in which 473 students participated, indicates 82% of students who used the TLC agree that there are enough tutors to meet their needs and 97% agree that the TLC supported their development and success. (Standard II, Self Study) Currently, our usage is up in the Writing Center and the Math Success Center from the previous fall, and I hope to continue that trend.

**2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program since the last Program Review.**

Many changes! As of this fall, we no longer are the primary assessment center (we still administer the paper geometry test) with the D-Wing lab taken over those responsibilities. However, we are now the site of nearly all DRC testing. This has shifted our room usage as well, replacing the assessment space with a quiet testing area. In addition, the TLC is now used by Non-Credit ESL for its program Monday through Thursday after 6 PM. The Writing Center is now offering a by appointment option for students, as well as taking over the duties of online DE tutoring previously done by Diane Lewis. This training, in conjunction with CCC Confer, began the third week of the quarter and is ongoing. We also re-configured our space which resulted in a change in how and when students log in; we gained a spacious more casual study/computer area and downsized our group study rooms to one. The Library has a number of study rooms to accommodate those who need them. We also have more subject-area tutoring taking place in the TLC, and we are currently experimenting with by appointment study groups in math. Having English 151 Writing Improvement classes meet in the TLC has also been a positive step in increasing awareness of our tutoring and other resources among new and Basic Skills students.

**3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.**

I hope we will see continued growth in usage throughout the entire TLC. I plan to involve faculty more in our tutoring by scheduling study group tutoring sessions coinciding with specific coursework and classes. We have also begun to see faculty meeting in the TLC (the Senate has had meetings here, for one). I believe that encouraging faculty use will result in increased student use.

**4. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)**

- Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Yes
- Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Yes
- Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Yes

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	67%	26%	7%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

*2/3's of the students surveyed had a clean understanding of the transfer SLO.*

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?  
*Although 2/3's (66%) is good, there is clearly room for improvement.*
3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
*In general, students are getting the necessary information to follow their transfer path.*

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?  
*Yes – the difference in response between “recognizing” and “choosing” appropriate 90 transfer units and transfer patterns did not vary enough to continue measuring both levels of understanding. Future, surveys, should-only include the question that identifies the student’s ability to choose relevant information vs. “recognize” relevant information.*
5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

- Eliminate what was stated in #5

- Broaden the GPA question because GPA for school + major can vary – from year to year

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2013-14?  
*Increase students’ knowledge and skills in transfer planning.*

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee?  Y

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee?  Y

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)?  Y

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

*With my 178 day contract coupled with my avg of 21 paper days/year, ½ per transfer + ½ for articulation (about 84 hrs for each), there is very minimal time to address transfer issues, for 12-13, probably significantly more time is being put toward articulation/curriculum issues, which leaves very little time for transfer activities.*

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

*We lost a seasoned 19 hr/work counselor who helped me significantly with transfer issues. We also lost very experienced full time counselor to acting dean position.*

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

*If we expand our registration time as planned, there will be even less time to coordinate our programs.*

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

---

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	94%	5%	
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	79%	19%	1%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	78%	18%	3%
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	75%	22%	3%
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	79%	18%	3%

What do these results mean to you?

WLD instructors think students are mastering the SLOs at a fairly high level.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

I am satisfied with the assessment results with each Program SLO.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Program SLO 1 seems to be most effectively taught/learned by students.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why?

One of the WLD 104 courses resulted in consistently low mastery percentages (WLD 126A was close as well).

Department/Program: WLD Division: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year (AY): 2012-13

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Not sure but it might have been a rough class or the instructor was in a critical mood when submitting their SLOs. In general it is interest to examine how different instructors assessed the SLOs for their class.

6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?

I think the Program SLOs are measuring the “right” things to the extent that this is possible.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?

I am planning to continue monitoring WLD Program SLOs.

8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:

Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee?  Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee?  Y or N

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs?  Y or N

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)?  Y or N

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.

As of AY 2011-12, Wilderness Education had FTES of 35.5 and enrollment of 856. During AY 2011-2012 WLD awarded 167 industry recognized American Institute for Avalanche Research and Education (AIARE) certificates. This represents an increase in the number of AIARE certificates despite an impressively low snow winter that required the rescheduling of the entire first month of winter quarter WLD classes.

WLD continues to implement the risk management plan. The Wilderness Education Coordinator is examining the development of a Search and Rescue certificate.

Student interest continues to be strong for WLD courses.

Recruitment of qualified WLD instructors is a challenge and potentially threatens to limit the number of courses the program is able to offer.

2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.

Changes in MQ requirements for WLD have made it easier to hire qualified instructors. Important purchases of critical equipment (avi beacons, rescue gear) have been made (but a sustainable source for refreshing similar equipment still needs to be identified).

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.

Department/Program: WLD Division: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year (AY): 2012-13

WLD is continuing to develop and implement the risk management plan but there is need for increased participation in this process from other areas of LTCC.

Due to ongoing uncertainty over access to LTBMU lands it is again the Coordinator's recommendation that additional resources be devoted to pursuing access in neighboring forest service lands (Eldorado National Forest, and Humbolt-Toiyabe National Forest). Eldorado National Forest has indicated at least a willingness to discuss this.

WLD 104 was modified so that students receive a LNT Trainer certificate. This will require that instructors are LNT Master Trainers and it will likely be necessary to host a training for our instructors.

**ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR) - WORKSHEET**

**Instructions:** Evaluate the Annual Program Review (APR) packet provided by the OIRP that includes your Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) assessments and answer the following questions. Remember, no single piece of information is meant to be used in isolation. Each piece of information may generate a process of inquiry that will lead to the incorporation of other information to form a complete picture, or even the desire for more information that is not currently provided.

**PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO) ASSESSMENT**

**Review the aggregated Program SLO assessment data.**

1. What was the average percentage of students who achieved:

	<u>Mastery</u>	<u>Some Understanding</u>	<u>No Understanding</u>
<b>Program SLO 1</b>	79.35	17.76	2.88
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	62.03	31.79	6.14
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	76.70	20.70	2.6
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

It means that we are assessing and that are students are learning. We looked at the individual assessment forms submitted by our adjuncts to see why students were in the no understanding column. It turned out that instructors were including the students who were absent the day of the assessment.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment **results** associated with each Program SLO?

Yes!

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

We are communicating well with our department and our instructors are assessing often.

**Now review the Course SLO assessment data provided for each Program SLO.**

4. Does any particular course assessment stand out? Why? No, we are all on track.

Department/Program: \_WL\_\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_HUM\_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year (AY): \_\_2012-13\_\_\_\_\_

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?  
We would like funding to pay our adjuncts to attend our annual meeting where we discuss SLOs.
  
6. To what degree are your Program SLOs measuring the “right” things? Describe the changes, if any, you want to make to them this year?  
We are doing a good job of measuring the components of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and cultural content in our classes and adjusting as necessary. No major changes are required. We will keep doing the great job as always.
  
7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?  
We will continue the discussions at our annual department meeting.
  
8. Status of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your department/program:  
  
Have all course-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **YES**  
Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? **YES**  
Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? **YES**  
Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? **YES**

#### Annual Program Review

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.  
FRE: enrollment decrease a bit.  
Completion rates overall look good.  
SNL: healthy FTES enrollments are strong and good completion rates  
SPA: Distance Ed, more overall FTES in Spanish, SPA FTE went up 4.2!
  
2. Please explain any significant changes in the Department/Program over the past year.  
Less AA degrees and certificates were awarded.
  
3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.  
Fulltime instructor (Pierce) will be out fall quarter on maternity leave. We notice a decrease in enrollment and retention when the fulltime instructors are not in the classroom.