

## 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 respond to 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	N/A	N/A	N/A
Program SLO 2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Program SLO 3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Program SLO 4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Program SLO 5	N/A	N/A	N/A

What do these results mean to you?

There appears to be an ongoing problem with mapping of Addiction Studies course level SLOs to Program Level SLOs. This is undoubtedly due to the General Counseling courses having the same course designator. Interpretation of results at this time is not possible.

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

N/A - see above.

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year: 2014-15

Date Completed: 3/31/15

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

N/A - see above.

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

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

Multiple Addiction Studies course assessments have resulted in improved SLO mastery in subsequent quarters. SLO course assessments are on file and document these improvements; no one course stands out.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The SLOs are effective in terms of improving instruction and consequently student mastery on key concepts and skills.

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year: 2014-15Date Completed: 3/31/15

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 problem with course-to-program mapping needs to be further investigated and resolved in the upcoming academic year. This will likely involve submitting course evaluations and designating ADD as the TOPIC code and then completing the mapping to the program level.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2012-13?  
Continue regularly scheduled SLO assessments and study results as they emerge.

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 Yes

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

The Addiction Studies program shows stability and a bit of growth in enrollment, and this trend is expected to continue with the advent of online courses.

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

We are piloting the offering of Addiction Studies courses online for the first time.

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

More Addiction Studies courses will be offered online in an effort to increase student access in California and beyond. Students requiring schedule flexibility will benefit from additional distance education 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 respond to 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?

Unable to answer this question due to the lack of data.

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

Despite the fact that we are lacking data from the 2013-14 academic year, there has been other forms of Program SLO assessment from which to evaluate the Art Department's success in student learning. Through student evaluations, portfolio reviews, faculty evaluations, and on-going informal discussions with faculty, we have a very good idea of how well our students are doing in achieving the seven Program SLOs. We feel that the majority (65%) of our students are achieving "Some Understanding", with a consistent group (25%) achieving "Mastery", and a minority (10%) achieving "No Understanding".

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

- The Art Department obviously needs to do a better job of completing SLO assessments in a timely manner.
- We also need a better system for assisting our adjunct faculty with the same task. With an extremely dynamic, studio-intensive program and an abnormally high faculty workload, we find it hard to complete the SLO assessments for each course in a timely manner.
- With the "no repeatability" law in effect, the Art Dept. has created courses with multiple sections to allow for continued student access. This means that we have more and more courses that require SLO assessments.
- Having said that, the Art Department is a healthy, vital program with a great deal of student success as exemplified by the artwork exhibited in the Art Department's Annual Student Juried Art Exhibition that is as large or larger and is as, if not more, sophisticated than most Community College Art Programs. For the visual arts, the most direct way of assessing student success is through such things as portfolio reviews, evidence of participation in art exhibitions at neighboring schools, and awards/scholarships/recognitions within the greater art community. In these points, our students show signs of a high level of mastery.

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

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

We cannot comment on this due to a lack of data.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

- Without corresponding data, we feel that the overriding comment that stands out in our course assessments is the damaging effects of the new "No Repeatability" rule that was enacted in Summer 2013. This would be the single-most damaging aspect of our program. Student excellence in a performance-based discipline is to a large degree dependent on the practicing of a skill. Without the ability to re-take courses, we have created new curriculum to delve deeper into more specified topics to help students become proficient and well rounded, with time to develop a portfolio that is competitive when transferring to a 4-year program.
- However, we have noticed across the Art Department greater levels of "no understanding". We attribute this to the lack of repeatability as well. Our classrooms more and more are filled with less prepared students. Without the more advanced students who have taken courses previously, there is no model of excellence with which the beginning student can identify. The new students do not have examples of what is possible if enough time is devoted to the craft. There is also less motivation/personal drive and less healthy competition within a classroom environment. Success in a classroom can often depend on classroom dynamics – or, the group pushes the group. Without repeatability, that group dynamic is often compromised.
- In the 2012/13 budget year we received a \$716.00 cut to the Instructional Aide II budget #2412. This translated to less open lab hours for students to complete outside-of-class homework assignments. Students' success is tied to their ability to research and explore the course topics and materials outside of class.
- With the creation of new courses, which was in part due to the repeatability issue, there comes new lab responsibilities, not only to allow for student access, but also to address safety concerns associated with the course tools and materials, and our aging facilities.

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 satisfied with the breadth of our program SLO's. No changes are warranted.

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

We will work harder to complete SLO assessments in a timely manner and ask for help in making this process easier for our adjunct faculty.

Because of the enormous breadth of the Art Program we need help completing our SLO assessments in a timely manner and a better system for assisting adjunct faculty in completing these 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 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 Yes

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Based on the data provided, and other information, describe the current status of your Department/Program.
  - So far, we are surviving the "No Repeatability" rule due to the proactive actions of lead faculty.
  - Lead faculty are building out the curriculum to create more experiences within families.
  - We are losing the battle with aging equipment and facilities to the point where certain processes raise serious issues of safety.
  - We have only temporarily found a solution to the loss of funding for Artstor, a national database of art historical images that is used in every art history and studio art course offered in the Art Department. This needs to be addressed in next year's budget.



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

- Phyllis has again applied and been approved for the Reduced Workload Program, which means that more workload will fall onto Bryan, the staff, and the adjunct faculty.
- Equipment and facility continues to be degraded by usage and time to the point that student learning and safety are being compromised.
- New curriculum for a Ceramics, Printmaking, and Metals sequence which will increase enrollment, but also add to the need for more Instructional Aide hours to cover open lab time.
- Bryan's laptop died. This is a significant event given that faculty teaching studio art courses often use visual presentations as teaching tools in multiple locations on campus.
- Both lead faculty have gone on Professional Development Leave within the past year. As a result, some classes were cancelled.
- Continued phasing out slides to digital images and organization of files shared drive accessible via the internet.
- Created two new Art degrees: Art New Media and the Studio Art Transfer degree, as well as modified the Art certificate to include seven new certificates in concentrated areas of Drawing, Painting, Printmaking, Figure Studies, Ceramics, Sculpture, and Photography.

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

- Phyllis will continue to participate in the Reduced Workload Program.
- With the announcement that our 2-D Art Technician, Mollie Mason, will be leaving at the end of this academic year, we have asked for that position to be reinstated as a full-time position blended with the existing Haldan Gallery Instructional Aide hours for gallery installation, plus 120 hours of extra gallery Inst. Aide hours. We are still awaiting the results of that request.
  - o Without a full-time 2-D Technician position we see the following losses to the Art Program:
    - i. Without a full-time position we will constantly be recruiting and retraining new people because the current positions are no sustainable as a living here in Tahoe.
    - ii. There are times when no one is covering the open lab sessions because of having only one full-time tech. This creates serious safety and security issues.
    - iii. There is an obvious and necessary relationship between the Art Program and the Gallery Program. Having one full-time position that worked in both areas would bring that relationship into a good balance.
    - iv. Without the full-time position, adjunct support has been compromised.
    - v. Art History, an intensive academic course, has lost all technical support.
  - New Degrees place new requirements on offering courses more regularly, for example ART113: 3-D Design is a necessary course for the new transfer Art Degree. This course has historically had low enrollment and often been cancelled. With students seeking the new transfer degree, this course will have to be allowed to run despite low enrollment.

**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 respond to 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>	72.00	18.20	9.80
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	72.00	18.20	9.80
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	68.50	15.00	16.50
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	67.00	0.00	33.00
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			
	69.88	12.85	17.28

What do these results mean to you?

During the department's review of these results for the aggregated Program SLO assessment data, it was determined that the data was skewed by inaccurate feedback on one course.

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

After taking into consideration the skewed data and the limited numbers of assessments available, the department is satisfied with the assessment results.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Due to the skewed data resulting from the inclusion of students who did not complete the course yet were identified as achieving "No Understanding," the "Mastery" and "Some Understanding" percentages should actually be higher.

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year: \_2014-15

Date Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

See #3 above.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

See #7 below.

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 believes that the current Program SLOs are comprehensive and effective toward accomplishing outcomes.

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

As a result of our review, the department is transitioning to a three-year rotation for all department course-level SLO assessments (from the current staggered schedule) in order to more effectively input the data in a timely manner and have more meaningful results for 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 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 **Yes**

---

## 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 responsive to the needs of its students, we are continually seeking ways to improve our program, course offerings, and access to degrees and certificates. We are also currently conducting the department's Comprehensive Program Review (CPR).

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year: \_2014-15

Date Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

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

The Department now offers an online pathway to complete an AS-T degree in Business Administration.



Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year: \_2014-15

Date Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.
  - 1) Create online pathways for students to obtain Certificates of Achievement and Short-Term Departmental Certificates.
  - 2) Provide curriculum updates and modifications to reflect new multiple-degree policy.
  - 3) Create additional Certificates of Achievement and Short-Term Departmental Certificates that create a pathway to obtain an AA degree in Business or an AS-T degree in Business Administration.
  - 4) See #7 above.

**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 respond to 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>	85.6	14.4	0
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	85.6	14.4	0
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	70.0	30.0	0
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

The data indicates that the level of mastery is fine.

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

The results are satisfactory.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The majority of students were able to master the computer concepts and skills in the CAO courses that were assessed.

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

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

CAO 155 had a 70% level of student mastery which is slightly lower than other CAO course assessments.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

CAO 155 Introduction to Database Management is challenging for some students as the course includes database design theory.

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 appropriately measuring both computer software skills and the application of those skills. No changes need to be made.

7. Considering the results of your Program SLOs, what actions are you going to take for AY 2015-16?

Problem-solving will continue to be emphasized in the CAO courses.

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.

Full time faculty member Jackie Lou is on 66 2/3% reduced teaching load.

A new adjunct instructor Jen Vaughn is teaching CAO 165A Introduction to Photo Editing using PhotoShop.

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

The Adobe PhotoShop (CAO 165A), InDesign (CAO 164B), and Illustrator (CAO 166) classes are being taught online for the first time.

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

Full time faculty member Jackie Lou will be on 66 2/3% reduced teaching load in AY 2015-2016.

**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 respond to 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>	44.28	26.76	28.95
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<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>	N/A	N/A	N/A

What do these results mean to you?

It should be noted that the above SLO data is related to the COMPUTER PROGRAMMING program only. Data is sparse due to scheduled assessments in 2013-2014. Only one course (CIS120A) was assessed.

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

N/A - limited data.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Due to limited data, conclusions are not warranted at this point in time. Future assessment results should be monitored carefully and instruction will be adjusted toward the goal of improving instruction.

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

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

N/A. There was only one assessment (CIS120A). Mastery should be monitored moving forward, but it should be noted that CIS120A is an inherently challenging course.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Unable to draw conclusions due to small data set (i.e., one course assessment).

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 probably appropriately measuring the "right" things, but additional assessments and an analysis of patterns are warranted in the future.

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

Continue regularly scheduled SLO assessments and study results as they emerge.

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 Yes

---

## ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

The CIS department consists of three distinct PROGRAMS - Web Development, Programming, Security/Networking. The Web Development program is showing declining enrollments despite offering the courses in an innovated "open access" modality. In other words, students may take the course online or F2F and "float" between the modalities. The Programming area of emphasis is now being instructed completely online and has shown improved student enrollments. The Security/Networking program offered one special topics course this year with limited enrollment success.



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

CIS underwent the Program Vitality Assessment (PVA) process in 2013-2014. A number of recommendations were made and are on file in the Instruction Office. A primary recommendation was to put the Programming courses (i.e., CIS120A/B/C) online. Video game design courses were added online.

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

We will continue to offer Programming courses (as described above) online. The adjunct instructor is adding a Python programming course to the rotation next year. The full-time faculty member in Web Development will transition to the Physical Education department and the existing courses will be taught by instructors online.

**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 respond to 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>	100		
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

Not much.

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

Satisfied.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Inconclusive.

**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.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

None.

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?

100 degrees. None.

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 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 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.

Successful creation of Geography AA-T and C-ID for courses offered in the degree. ETS degree creation could help increase student interest in these courses.

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

ETS degree creation could help increase student interest in these courses.

Loss of adjunct in department. Will need to rehire.

**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 respond to 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	3	3
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	100		
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	90	5	5
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

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 a students grades and degree of effort. 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?

None.

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?

None.

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 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 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.

Successful creation of Geology AS-T and C-ID for courses offered in the degree should increase student interest in these courses.

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

Might have a course in the ISP and this could affect salary allocations.

**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 respond to 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>	94.50		
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	77.6		
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	87.97		
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

We are happy with these results. Rounding of figures was inaccurate on SLO3, but we are maintaining consistency with what we received from the research department.

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

We are extremely satisfied with results for Program SLOs 1 and 3, and generally satisfied with SLO 2. Our numbers have improved from the previous APR.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The Bio Department is successfully fulfilling Student Learning Objectives at the program level, and improving our scores.



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

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

We feel that the % of students achieving mastery for the course Botany, Bio 201, under program SLO 2 could be higher.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The bio department will target Bio 201 and work to improve the number of students reaching mastery in Program SLO 2.

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 the 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 the upcoming 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 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 Yes

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

Anecdotally, our Bio Department enrollments in 2014-15 have dropped; figures have not been provided to us on the numbers of FTE drop. We feel this reflects the dropping enrollments college-wide at LTCC. We are concerned about this, and would like the college to focus efforts on increasing face to face student enrollment.

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

We obtained the Perry display cabinets and completed another diorama in the Science Gallery. We have completed the A&P display of the whole human body with a 3-D Man and accompanying key. We are STILL soliciting bodies for this display, not you, Virginia, but is anybody else reading this?

We still, however, would like to convert the pillar in the gallery into a model of the tree ecosystem.

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

A&P faculty (the FABULOUS Beachy Orr) is retiring. This fall we will submit an application to Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee to rehire this position. This program can NOT be run with adjuncts if we plan to maintain the quality, integrity, and FTES produced by the A&P program. This will maintain the excellent pre-nursing program instituted by the Board of Trustees about 16 years ago.

Nearby nursing schools value the excellent quality of the students who have completed the 3-quarter A&P sequence at LTCC.

We also require a change in the job description and classification for Kathy Strain. We feel exceptionally strongly that her position should be converted to a blended faculty position, so that she can not only fulfill lab manager duties, but also take a more active role in teaching. This will become vitally important as the new ETS program begins in the fall quarter.

We mentioned in our AUP that we need budget planning and readiness for replacement of aging major lab equipment (ie refrigerators and autoclave), as well as a ventilation system in the lab to improve air quality, odor control and health of students and instructors. The benefits of this system would greatly influence the environment in the Science Gallery where students gather to study individually and as groups for hours each day.

## 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 respond to 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>	68.00*	29.00*	3.00*
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	64.00*	26.00*	10.00*
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	30.00*	61.00*	9.00*
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

\*\*This data has been used two years in a row. The incorrect data was used for the 2012/2013 Annual Program Review. The majority of students showed mastery or some understanding of the material as outlined in the SLO statements.

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?

Students are showing a reasonable level of success.

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

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

No, the program SLO's have been satisfied with at least 90% of the students showing a mastery or some understanding of the material.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Student success is reasonable and attainable.



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 current SLOs are measurable and 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?

No actions will be taken. I am satisfied with the 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 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 Yes

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

Adjunct faculty has taught 100% of the workload for the 2013/2014 academic year. For the 2013/2014 academic year, the adjuncts have taught the equivalent of 1.79 FTEF.

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

The chemistry department lost its full time instructor and has used adjunct faculty to teach 100% of the load. The college created a full-time temporary position for one employee who has managed the administrative duties and taught labs to meet the requirements of the temporary position.

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

The chemistry department has begun the hiring process to retain a full time instructor for the 2015/2016 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 respond to 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>	95.00	5.00	0
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	87.50	10.00	2.50
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

Clearly most students in the classes assessed this year achieve mastery or some understanding of the material.

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

I am satisfied with the results associated with the program SLO.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

These positive results are not surprising from students who have passed several prerequisite courses and are working to transfer to a four year university.

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

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

No particular course assessment stands out. Results are typical and very positive.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

These positive results are not surprising from students who have passed several prerequisite courses and who plan to transfer to a four year college.

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 SLO's were agreed upon by the entire science division. Some are less meaningful for Physics, while some are useful.

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

Some modifications are being made to the courses assessed here to bring them into compliance with C-ID but no additional changes are necessary based on 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 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 Yes



ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

The department has maintained a steady number of FTES, although the Astronomy course (PHS 111) is not included in the data provided to the department. With Astronomy included, the department would show an increase in the FTES served by the department and an increase in the number of courses offered. The success rate for students in the department is excellent - consistently greater than 90%. Nearly 100% of students taking these courses transfer to a 4 year institution. The greatest need for the department is an increased budget to provide more laboratory equipment.

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

All courses in the physics curriculum have been modified to comply with C-ID descriptors. These modifications have been approved by the curriculum committee.

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

We will offer the new Survey of Concepts in Chemistry and Physics course (PHS 102) which is included in the new elementary education degree.

**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 respond to 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>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<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?  
Satisfied that I didn't have to do assessments this year.
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 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 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.

Successful implementation of PHS 117 (Oceanography + Lab).

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

The new lab course could require additional funds (i.e. for supplies) to support the program in the longterm.

**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 respond to 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>	95.64	4.36	0.00
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	97.33	2.67	0.00
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	95.00	3.00	0.00
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	95.71	4.29	0.00
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	96.31	3.69	0.00

What do these results mean to you?

These results tell me that the majority of students are achieving mastery of the Program Level SLO's.

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

Overall, I am satisfied with the results associated with each Program SLO. I mean, I would love to have 100% of students achieving "Mastery" of all SLO's, but that is probably unrealistic! After further reflection on the % of students achieving "No Understanding", I found that they all came from the same course (ECE 126). This makes me wonder if SLO's are being assessed correctly. This class is taught by an adjunct online instructor who lives out of the area. It may be that she needs more support in her assessment process or in her instruction.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

I believe that the majority of students are achieving "Mastery" of course content and SLO's, but as I stated above, most of the "No Understanding" came from the same class. I need to take a look at the most recent assessment of this class to figure out why. It could be that students not even completing the assessment were included in the statistics.

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

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

ECE 126 stands out particularly because it is the only course that shows any numbers in the "No Understanding" column. This course is (and was) being taught online, by an out of the area adjunct. It may be that she included students who did not complete assignments in her assessments, or it may be that she needs support in her teaching methodologies and/or course content. It may also be related to the SLO itself, but it bears looking in to.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

My conclusions about this particular class (ECE 126) is that I need to do some research into why the assessments show such a high number of "No Understanding". Other than this particular course, I am extremely satisfied with assessment data. The majority of students are demonstrating "mastery" on all course level SLO's.



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 that the Program SLO's are measuring the "Right" things. ECE courses are aligned with the rest of California in terms of course content, objectives, and SLO's.

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

To continue as we are for the most part. I will be addressing the course that seems to be assessing lower than the rest of the classes.

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 Yes

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

The ECE department continues to be a successful program in terms of student retention and student success. Distance Education numbers have increased while face-to-face enrollments have decreased. I am not sure as to why this is happening, except that DE courses seem to meet the working student's need for flexibility. Additionally, success rates for DE courses are higher than those for F2F courses. I believe this is because retention rates in DE is higher than in F2F. Overall enrollment seems to have dipped a little bit (down 4.66 FTES) from 11-12 to 12-13, but I think this probably mirrors the college's overall enrollment. Demographically speaking, the ECE program has shown improvement in terms of serving underrepresented students.

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

Significant changes this past academic year include:

- \*Submission and approval of the AS-T in ECE by the Chancellor's office
- \*Submission and approval and alignment of the lower division 8 courses by the California Alignment Project
- \*Reclassification of faculty member to 1.0 with .50 re-assignment time to direct child development center
- \*Hiring of an additional adjunct to teach online courses

Department/Program: ECE Academic Year: 2014-15

Date Completed: 2014-15

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

I don't expect any significant changes to the ECE program 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 respond to 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>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<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>	N/A	N/A	N/A

What do these results mean to you?

The two economics courses being taught are not considered a "program" at this time. Both ECO 101 and ECO 102 have course-level SLOs.

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

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 Yes

Have all program-level SLOs been identified and submitted to the SLO Committee? Y or N No

Have all course-level SLOs been mapped to program-level SLOs? Y or N No

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N No

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

The Economics "program" had an increase in Annual FTES of 6.33 from academic year 2012-13 to 2013-14.

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

The significant increase in FTES from 2012-13 to 2013-14 was due to offering both ECO 101: Principles of Macroeconomics and ECO 102: Principles of Microeconomics online. Both courses are now scheduled once per year face-to-face and three times per year online.

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

Determine the viability of an online degree in Economics.

**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 respond to 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>	31.24	40.94	27.82
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	92.00	8.00	0.00
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	56.00	32.00	12.00
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	74.00	20.00	6.00
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	35.92	41.51	22.51
<b>Program SLO 6</b>	26.00	40.40	33.00

What do these results mean to you?

The numbers indicate an inconsistency in how SLOs are evaluated. If we take them at face value, then there's been a significant and serious plunge in student outcomes #s 1, 3, 5, and 6. It was noted last year that the reporting of English 101 and 103, our core transfer level courses, was not included. However, their absence was assumed to be driving the "mastery" levels down. This year, with those courses included, the "mastery" level is actually considerably lower.

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

SLO1 represents a radical shift downward from the previous year, although if we combine "mastery" with "some understanding," the breakdown is more palatable: 72.18 to 27.82. It would be good to see much higher numbers under "mastery" at a higher level. SLO6 jumps out as well with a relatively low "mastery" level, but this, as noted last year, is the SLO centered on grammar and correctness, and is the one most difficult for students to "master." But the numbers are also strange coming out of English 101 where one course reported 28.00 mastery and another reported 65.00 mastery. It seems as if the same measures of "mastery" could not have been applied, although it is true that some classes are uncharacteristically strong while others can be uncharacteristically weak. I don't think there's any reason to be dissatisfied with the set of numbers for each SLO.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

If we believe the numbers are accurate and meaningful, the decline in SLOs #1, 3, 5, and 6 would be cause for concern. However, as long as SLO assessments from course to course remain independently judged, and various instructors use very different measures of "mastery" and "no understanding," then the numbers are predictably "all over the place." If one uses grading in select categories as the criteria for judgment, one instructor might consider only "A" work mastery and "B-C-D" some understanding, and F the only category for "no understanding." Others may consider D-F reserved for "no understanding." Where we see aberrations of "mastery," other instructors may consider any passing grade (A-B-C) as equaling "mastery." With academic freedom and no set standards "carved in stone," fluctuations we're seeing may be normal. We'll only be able to draw conclusions about this as we go on and gather more and more years of results. Having said that, if we do take the numbers at face value, then SLO one is disastrously weak. The others do not set off any alarms because of aggregate numbers of "mastery" and "some understanding" weighted against the "no understanding" category.



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

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

One of the 101's stands out in its "lack of credibility" high scores. SLO1 shows a mastery of 83, SLO2 100, SLO 3 83, SLO 4 83 and 100, SLO5 83, and SLO6 65. These numbers are such an aberration that, in my view, the assessment standard for "mastery" was set far too low.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

I agree with what was entered last year in this category and will repeat part of it: "It suggests that we need to keep working closely with our faculty, including adjunct faculty to make the assessment process accurate and useful."

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're measuring the "right" things. We just need to improve our methods of measuring those concepts.

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

The high level of variance in the numbers may indicate that we need a more formal process for assessing the SLOs. Full-time faculty need to give adjunct faculty better direction on the SLO assessment process. We also need to define what we as a department mean when we use terms such as "mastery," "some understanding," and "no understanding." The overall results will fail to tell us anything useful if we don't standardize the way we look at these course 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 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 Yes

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

The main change we have seen in the department over the past year is yet another loss of a full-time faculty position (a total of three from our peak of six). We continue to review the performance of our adjunct faculty, especially newer members, in the interest of consistency and quality. We are, also in terms of faculty, continuing to try to manage the scheduling of one full-time faculty member going to reduced load, and the anticipated sabbatical of one of our two full-time faculty during one quarter next year.

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

We are continuing the program we began last year of participating in the CAP (California Acceleration Project) community in practice at the state-wide conferences and instituting changes in our basic skills English coursework. This year we sent three faculty (one full-time, two part-time—Suzanne Roberts, Julie Ewing, and Lisa Berry) to the initial conference, and Julie and Lisa participated in the second conference as well.

The concepts and practices of acceleration continue to inform textbook choices, assignments, and methodology for English 152. While not all acceleration models are equally successful or applicable in every class, we have incorporated changes especially following principles of backward design and high-level critical thinking readings. Students appreciate having more thought-provoking materials and when asked to think more carefully and with more sophistication most students are able to produce more thoughtful writing than they had anticipated. In addition, instructors are excited about having new texts and assignments and the more provocative class discussions that ensue. The old “skill and drill” still has its place, but the accelerated model shows us that our students can do more when properly prepared to do more.

Also this year, Julie Ewing took on the role of acceleration coordinator, and she has presented on the philosophy and benefits of acceleration to new adjuncts. She also assists instructors in adopting acceleration practices into the classroom, as well as continues to attend CAP conferences and return with the latest ideas. One of these ideas concerns changing placement policies to enable students to place directly into transfer-level courses. If this model were to be instituted, it would entail substantially changing our assessment and placement system. However, the results from those colleges who have broadened access to transfer-level courses are positive and significant.

The Incarcerated Student Program will be introduced in our department this spring. Suzanne Roberts and Michael O'Laughlin will be offering correspondence courses to incarcerated students. This program is, at present, in the construction stage, but the instructors are enthusiastic about the advent of the program.

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

In the next year (2015-16), we hope to create and offer a 101-Plus section for students who have placed into 152, but who feel ready to pursue transfer-level coursework given additional help. This class would be structured similarly to a standard 101 course, but include accelerated learning methods. It would only be open to students who had tested into 152, and it would include a support class co-requisite. It is too early to have significant, reliable data on retention and pass rates for our accelerated 152 sections, but we hope to collect that next year. In addition, we will continue to scrutinize and re-work our 191 support class in order that it best meet the needs of the students. One possibility may be making this class a requirement.

Julie Ewing will continue to collect information from CAP on the state level and keep us informed of new acceleration strategies as we do not currently have plans to send another faculty team to the CAP conferences. Although the initial results are promising, students enjoy the accelerated approach, and instructors are excited about how acceleration creates a more engaged classroom, the final proof of the program will be with measured by student pass rates.

We are developing the position of an Acceleration Coordinator to ensure the success and consistency of our training and teaching efforts. We will also need help from the college in covering our instructional needs, as we will have two faculty going on sabbatical next year. We would like a full-time position, even if on a temporary basis.

As mentioned in the previous section, the Incarcerated Student Program will be implemented next 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 respond to 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		
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	N/A		
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	N/A		
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	N/A		
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	N/A		

What do these results mean to you?

N/A

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

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.

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

This year we implemented the curricular changes as a result of the comprehensive evaluation and assessment of the program. We are now offering courses in ESL Pronunciation, ESL Computers and an Advanced level.

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

We will update the Citizenship class and the GED class in English and Spanish. We are looking into the creation of curriculum to supplement credit courses in Culinary, Childcare, Healthcare and Hospitality. We will continue working on the ESL certificate and create a procedure to drop students who do not attend. We are exploring collaborative opportunities within the community to expand ESL classes.

**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 respond to 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?

The program will begin Fall 2015. We have no SLO data.

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

The program will begin Fall 2015. We have no SLO data.



3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The program will begin Fall 2015. We have no SLO data.

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

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

The program will begin Fall 2015. We have no SLO data.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The program will begin Fall 2015. We have no SLO data.

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 will begin Fall 2015. We have no SLO data.

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

The program will begin Fall 2015. We have no SLO data.

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 ETS program will begin Fall 2015. We are hoping for enthusiastic community involvement for the program.

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

N/A

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

During the past year, Kathy Strain and Sue Kloss developed and submitted to the Chancellor's Office for approval a brand new Environmental Technology and Sustainability AA degree and certificate program. Ideally, these programs will be available for students either summer or fall quarter 2015 pending approval by the Chancellor's Office. As the ETS major and certificate programs begin and progress, the programs will need a lot more attention by a director and/or faculty member for

**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 respond to 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?

I don't believe there were any GSE SLO assessments last year.

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?

We need to run more GSE classes and conduct more SLO assessments.

**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?

In general the Program SLOs are a good fit. No changes are currently planned.

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

In conjunction with the new ETS program I have trying out a couple new instructors and hopefully filling a few more courses.

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 -

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.

GSE continues to struggle to fill classes.

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

The development of the new ETS program and the Sustainability concentration within that program are potentially significant developments for GSE.

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

The new ETS program has the potential to increase enrollment in GSE courses. The recruitment of new instructors and increased promotion of ETS/GSE classes is important to the success of this new 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>	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?

There is no new assessment data for 2012-2013. This chart reflects the data from the previous assessments.

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

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?

Develop an aggressive assessment schedule.

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 status of this program is strong and somewhat consistent. After a decline in FTES for historic highs in 2010-2011 (28.19), 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 leveled off at about 21 FTES.

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

There were not any significant changes, but with the addition of two new adjuncts we expect to experience an enrollment bump.

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

Of all adjunct-only programs, this program garners the fewest FTES through distance education. We plan the fewest FTES through distance education. We plan on increasing our distance education offerings in Speech next year.

**ANNUAL UNIT PLAN(AUP) - WORKSHEET**

In the Table below, describe the "Actions" that your department plans to take during the 2014-15 academic year. These actions should be in response to the outcomes of your *Annual Program Review Update* and/or align with one or more of your *Program Review Goals, Objectives and/or Recommendations*. Further, each planned action must connect to one or more of the *Goals & Objectives* in the College's Strategic Plan. Lastly, all actions that require additional resources must contain a description and cost estimate. Once all actions and any corresponding resource needs have been identified, each action must be ranked in priority order by the department.

Strategic Goal / Objective	Program Review Goal / Objective	Action I.D.	Action(s)	Outcome(s)	Resource I.D. IT = Technology HR = Human Rec. FC = Facilities OT = Other	Budget Impact	Type OTO On-Going	Priority (i.e. $n$ of $\sum n$ )
	N/A	N/A	No action items identified by full-time faculty member	N/A		\$0 (fund to baseline budget for 2014-2015)		1/3
								2/3
								3/3

**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 respond to 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>	67.64	26.07	7.07
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	67.64	26.07	7.07
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	67.64	26.07	7.07
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	67.64	26.07	7.07
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

Majority of students meeting SLO's, yet too many not.

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

Dissatisfied. Too many students not reaching level of SLO's.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

I must seek out new methods to approaching each SLO in order to ensure student achievement.

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

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

All, levels of mastery are too low. Overall, not satisfactory.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?



Student for various reasons are not achieving the levels necessary to leave course meeting SLO's

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?

SLO's were too general. I have already advanced changes through curriculum for upcoming academic year.

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

Specific changes have been made to SLO's which will guide student success.

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 Yes

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

The History department continues to offer a wide array of courses, while seeking to expand.

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

Course have met C-ID and SLO changes.

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

Expansion of DE 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 respond to 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>	67.40%	21.80%	10.80%
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	73.00%	27.00%	0.00%
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	72.00%	14.00%	14.00%
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	72.00%	14.00%	14.00%
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	72.25%	17.25%	10.50%
<b>Program SLO 6</b>	72.25%	17.25%	10.50%

What do these results mean to you?

No courses were due for assessment in 2013-14.

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

The results are from past assessments. They need to be updated during the next assessment cycle.

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

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 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 Yes

---

#### 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.

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

There has been a significant decline in FTES with a 28% loss. In 2012-13, all program offerings were online.

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

We are promoting some 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 respond to 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
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	96.14	3.86	0
<b>Program SLO 3</b>			
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

Instructors at ISSI are providing the necessary instruction for student success.

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

Highly satisfied.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

ISSI students are achieving mastery in the areas of communicating in Spanish and demonstrating understanding of cultures of different Spanish speaking countries throughout the 11 levels of the program. Instructors are providing the appropriate input, instruction and practice for student success.

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

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

SLO assessment data indicated a high level of mastery at each level.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The results indicate that the curriculum and instruction is effective and that students are mastering curriculum presented.

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 are measuring the appropriate instructional components as indicated on the course outline and curriculum of grammar, communication and cultural awareness. No changes are anticipated.

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

Based on program SLOs, no significant action will be taken. Based on instructor input and student evaluations of the program, curriculum will be reviewed and enhanced at designated levels/courses.

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 Yes

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

Based on the material provided including annual student surveys and student evaluations (196 evaluation responses), students are achieving mastery at a rate of 96.4%. Students indicated overwhelmingly that they agree or strongly agree that the program met their expectations (over 90%).



Department/Program: ISSI Academic Year: 2014-15

Date Completed: 3/9/15

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

The most significant change was the change of date. ISSI was moved one week earlier. Because of that the enrollment of ISSI increased by approximately 100 students. Students indicated satisfaction with the earlier date. Enrollment of educators increased by 15%.

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

For ISSI 2015, we will begin providing ISSI cultural materials on-line. The ISSI binder of handout materials will be significantly smaller. Some handouts will be provided in-class. As a result, the materials fee will drop from \$85 to \$65 (pending board approval). This change has been a request by students for several years to save natural materials. The Community Education Sunday courses will not be offered in 2015. The enrollment has been very low the past 2 years. The Kids Spanish Camp was highly successful and will continued to be offered.

**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 respond to 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>	36	42	22
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	36	42	22
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	36	42	22
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

That we averaged SLO values across multiple sections of multiple courses

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

Yes

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The results are as expected.

**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 results are about as expected

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 seem to be measuring the right things.

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

No action called for based on the outcome of assessing 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 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 Yes

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

The department is functioning well and instructing students well.

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.

None

**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 respond to 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>	NA	NA	NA
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	63.33	28.33	8.33
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	80.00	17.00	3.00
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	90.80	9.20	0.00
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

An meaningful interpretation of these data with regard to the Music Department as a whole may be difficult as the data appears to only be reflecting two courses.

2. Are you satisfied/dissatisfied with the assessment results associated with each Program SLO?  
I would like to see the percentage of mastery higher in Program SLO 2.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

A proper conclusion may not be, in fact, possible with these data for the reason described in #1 above. Having said that, the percentages for SLOs 3 and 4 are in line with previous years.

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

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

The assessment for MUS101 SLOs 1 and 2 have brought down the overall average percentages.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

To arrive at meaningful conclusions is difficult when the overall data is only reflecting two courses.

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 currently satisfied with the Program SLOs and do not anticipate making any changes.

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

For AY 2014-2015 (please disregard typo in the question), I plan to discuss the MUS101 class with the adjunct instructor who teaches it, to see if any changes should be made. He had indicated in Tracdat that he was satisfied with the 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 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 Yes

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

Music Department FTES rose from 49.60 to 60.21 in 2013-2014 which is probably a result of the addition of Recording classes and an additional section of MUS103. However, in Fall 2014 there were a significant number of course cancellations and an adjunct who did not teach due to health reasons, so it is anticipated that FTES for the current year will most likely drop.

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

There have not been any significant changes besides the challenges with enrollment mentioned above. With the SB70 grant we were able to have an adjunct instructor take the instructor training for the 200 level Pro Tools classes.

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

We are looking at scheduling strategies to stabilize enrollment. In addition we are planning to add the next level of Pro Tools classes. This will involve coordination with South Tahoe High School who has already indicated a willingness to purchase some additional equipment needed for the classes.

**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 respond to 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>	F-NA; H-33; T-NA	F-NA; H-67; T-NA	
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	F-NA; H-67; T-67	F-NA; H-33; T-33	
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	F-NA; H-50; T-NA	F-NA; H-50; T-NA	
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

We have three different programs within the department: (PEF) Physical Education - Fitness; (PEH) Physical Education-Health, and (PET) Physical Education Theory. In the past, we also had a designator titled PED which was for the Fitness Education Center. The curriculum attached to that area is not under Physical Education Fitness. The first glaring note is that PEF (F) is missing data completely and PET (T) is missing data in two of the SLO areas. After some research, the mapping of the course SLO to the departmental SLO is missing. Assessments were done in most likely each of these areas, but after the last curriculum cycle where the every class in our department was re-written and re-numbered, the mapping was not completed and therefore, no specific data is given. Corrections will be taken in this area to map appropriately. In the PET (T) SLO #1 and #3 it appears were not mapped to the course SLO, therefore, no data available here. However, it should be. Corrections will be made. In the data we do have, PET has improved in the Mastery area from 52% to 67%. No assessments may have been done in this area last year, because the data shows no % from the previous academic year.

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

PEH -- I would like the 33% to be higher in the mastery area.

PET - No assessments appeared to be done the last academic year according to the data.

PEF - Since it appears the mapping was not accomplished, we are not satisfied. As a reminder, this area probably has an incredible number of classes and very diverse. In looking back at previous data, the Mastery level was between 81.72-95.88%. We tend to have high Mastery rates and I would not expect it to be much different.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Due to state requirements, all PEF curriculum was re-written and re-numbered. It appears the department failed to map the Course SLO's to Departmental SLO's. Therefore, no data was able to be produced. However, assessments were done last year, and there does not appear to be any gross "outlyer" otherwise Rex, Walter, and myself would probably have noted it. If there happened to be a % within the No understanding area, it is usually due to a student who decided to not complete the course, but did not withdraw prior to the official date and probably received a fail or a student was registered as a credit/no-credit option and received a no-credit.



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

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

There does not appear to be any course assessment that stands out.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

We obviously need to map the SLO's. This will be critical to so that we will be able to have appropriate data for analysis and reporting. However, over the years, the department in all its areas has been consistent in its percentage numbers with no specific "oulyers". If there were, I am sure the instructors noticed and made adjustments. I am also confident that all instructors would prefer as high a percentage of students to be in the Mastery level.

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?

After analyzing the Program level SLO's for the Fitness, Health and Theory categories, I believe we are measuring the "right" things and will not be making any changes at the present time. Maybe next year after the mapping is corrected, we will revisit the SLO's.

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

Following areas for action: (1) map the existing course SLO's to the appropriate Program SLO's; (2) re-work the 2 year template for course assessment due dates; (3) work towards a 90-100% of course required assessments for the year and hopefully within the appropriate quarter.

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

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.

The PEH department consists of the following curriculum areas: (PEF) Physical Education Fitness, (PEH) Physical Education Health, and (PET) Physical Education Theory. We presently have two full-time instructors, one classified assistant, and approximately \_\_\_\_\_ adjunct instructors in the department (also includes the FEC). A side note: one of those instructors is a full-time instructor, but is receiving load in our area. The management of the department is as follows: Tim is the Department Chair with certain designated duties and Walter is the Director of the Fitness Education Center with its defined duties. Marla is the assistant to supports all are as of the department. Please note the following summary information:

(1) Fitness Education Center:

FTES -  
 Enrollment -  
 Success -  
 Summary Note:

(2) Physical Education Fitness:

FTES - 122.70, which is down from two years ago of 132; note - this is the 3rd highest generating FTES on campus

Enrollment -  
 Success - 82%. This has remained steady since 2010.

Summary: Under this designator are classes in G3, Dance Studio, Gym, and Outside Venues. We have noticed a decline in student enrollment numbers in fitness classes. Because of this, we have had to cancel classes. When looking back at facility usage data with respect to class offerings and times, we have significantly cut our offerings or classes being canceled. We believe most of this is due to state repeatability rules. However, we are taking a look at scheduling with respect to time blocks, sequencing within or out of families, times classes are being offered, what kind of classes should we offer. It is a puzzle that is not easily answerable.

(3) Physical Education Theory

FTES - 4.0. The numbers are back up from two years ago at 3.48.

Enrollment -  
 Success - 60.8%. We usually average between 71-77% over the years. This is a noticeable difference. I am unsure of the reason, but can imagine that more students did not drop or withdraw from class and they were given an F.

Summary Note: Most of the classes offered here are within the Personal Trainer Certification. Despite, the FTES data saying we are remaining stable, we have noticed an enrollment decline in the classes.

(4) Physical Education Health

FTES - 13.34. There has been a steady decline since 2010 (20.98). The classes here are not affected by repeatability. Therefore, why such a decrease? The high enrollment numbers in this area are probably due to the Nutrition and Personal Health and Wellness classes. We have noticed an enrollment decline in Nutrition over the years. Also, the number of course offerings may have been reduced.

Enrollment -  
 Success - 75.8%. This has remained steady around this number since 2010.

Summary Note: We will need to look at the scheduling of our Health classes. We have added an on-line Nutrition class which has had good numbers and may plan to offer face-to-face and more on-line classes within the same quarter. We also may plan on offering our GE Personal Health and Wellness class on-line. Many community colleges have had high FTES and Success rates with teaching this class on-line.

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

- We used to have a curriculum area designated as PED which was associated with the Fitness Education Center. With the re-writing of curriculum, those specific courses now have a PEF designator.
- The Fitness Education Center, is a specific dedicated space that we have tracked separately over the years. The courses associated with this space have had their designator changed to PEF. Therefore, the PED designator and associated SLO and FTES etc will need to be teased out for any reporting reasons from PEF.
- Rexanne Ring retired from the college. The duties that she was associated with are now being taken over by Tim. These duties include the curriculum, adjunct instructors, scheduling and facilities that are housed in G3 and the Dance studio. In the past, we defined this as the "movement exercise" area as apposed to the gym, outside venues, or Fitness Education Center.
- We added an additional Fit For Llife (Older Adult Wellness) class to meet community demand and the associated health and wellness that comes with that.
- Facility maintenance and set up has been drastically reduced and changed. The college/PEH department is now providing for set-up and take-down for the older adult wellness classes which has budgetary implications. As a side-note, this is also supporting safety for the students and liability for college.
- The department used to have a designated maintenance person. As a part of their job description, many maintenance issues could be fixed or resolved. We are now having to utilize our budget to accomplish these tasks (eg, soccer goal setup/take down, balls pumped up, exercise equipment wheels fixed, etc).
- Exercise equipment, as we have noted in the past, are getting old and breaking down more frequently. At present, we have used up our repair budget and it is only February. A major consideration with respect to budgetary repair will need to be made for next year.
- The department significantly launched its Kinesiology Transfer degree. The two new classes in this degree are Kinesiology and First Aid CPR. The Kinesiology class was offered the winter quarter and we anticipate 17 students completing the class. The First Aid CPR class is being offered in this spring.
- The department is now offering (Health area) the Nutrition class on-line. It is being run this winter quarter and we presently have \_\_\_\_\_ registered. We are also offering a face-to-face Nutrition class this winter, but those numbers are down. We are unsure if the on-line has taken away the face-to-face student registration and will need to look at that. -
- We are thinking about adding our GE class titled Health and Personal Wellness as a on-line option. The rationale is that this specific class is being taught on-line at other community colleges, and we could generate significant FTES due to its GE nature.
- The Personal Training Certification class registration numbers have seen a decline over the years. The hope is that with the Kinesiology Transfer degree and the adding of athletics to the college, an increase in student enrollment will improve.
- With the addition of athletics (soccer), the scheduling of the gym for PEF classes and off-season Athletic training classes has been a challenge. At present, the classes are working out okay, however, continual evaluation will be needed. In the scheduling mix, we also conduct sport club activities. This year only the Badminton Club was affected. Their "normal" time was bumped in the winter and spring quarters to accommodate soccer training. Future scheduling may have an affect on other sport club activities.

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

- Gym Renovation Project: this coming summer the gym will be renovated. The department is in communication with M&O and architects with respect to their needs and wants. The final project is still being developed, so are unable to give complete specifics. However, it appears the gym floor will be either re-done or just re-finished, new bleachers, new scoreboards, new striping and coloring, new wall "pads", sound system, cages on structures for safety, electrical boxes, etc.
- Repair Budget: With our exercise equipment (FEC, Gym, Older Adult, and G3) aging, it appears the funds are not enough to fix and maintain this equipment are not enough. It is recommended that we increase the budget amount.
- New Equipment: If you look at our AUP, the FEC, Gym, and G3 need equipment upgrades. We usually get one or two pieces a year, but that is becoming inadequate. In that document, you will note the equipment needed for each area.
- With the budgetary and equipment needs of the department noted, would leasing equipment be an option? This has been looked at in the past for the FEC, but appeared not to be a viable option. Times have changed and does today offer a better financial option? The theory behind the option is if we are spending \$10,000 dollars a year on maintenance/repairs and \$10-15,000 on new equipment/year, would spending \$2000 on maintenance and \$10,000/year on a lease that would get us say 10 brand new cardiovascular equipment with all the new technology be a viable option?
- Tim will be on sabbatical the spring quarter of 2016. Past practices is that the department will need to have a designated individual who will take over those duties for that quarter.
- I would like to re-work the budget line items and place the funds in the appropriate category. Example: we have the CES group that provides quarterly maintenance on our equipment. Should we place this amount within Contracted Services or Maintenance Agreement.

**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 respond to 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>	X		
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	X		
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	X		
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	X		
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	X		

What do these results mean to you?

Good mastery of program SLOs.

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

Yes.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Both programs are in good shape in terms of enrollments, productivity, and student mastery.

Department/Program: ANT/SOC Academic Year: 2014-15

Date Completed: 2/26/15

**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?

Programs 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?

SLOs, in a conceptual sense, do not measure the "right" things. The assessment movement is fundamentally flawed and all efforts at measuring student learning in the senses that we do are corrupt and only further the bureaucratic orientations of higher learning. Some day, we will measure the "right" things when we actually approach education in a humanistic and "practice of freedom" sense. The changes I suggest are thus all global in nature.

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

I will continue to monitor the status of programs and student learning. This will be undertaken in a proactive and conceptual sense. I think the form should read 2014-2015, not 2012-2013.

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

Have all program-level SLOs been mapped to Institutional level SLOs (i.e., the Core Competencies)? Y or N No

---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

Both programs are in good shape.

Department/Program: ANT/SOC Academic Year: 2014-15

Date Completed: 2/26/15

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

A few new courses have been offered, including a new special topics.

Department/Program: ANT/SOC Academic Year: 2014-15

Date Completed: 2/26/15

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

None are anticipated.

**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>92.29</b>	<b>6.43</b>	<b>1.29</b>
<b>Program SLO 2</b>			
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	<b>93.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	<b>94.00</b>	<b>5.33</b>	<b>0.67</b>

2. What do these results mean to you?

As in AY 2013-2014 students are consistently demonstrating a high degree of mastery of the Program SLOs for the Psychology Department, higher than the previous academic year. I can not compare the previous years data for slo 2 to the current data due to a possible error in tracdat.

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 and continually improving.

**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 2014-15?

Given the substantial size of the Distance Education (DE) component of the Psychology Department, I will continue to 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? 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 Psychology Department has grown significantly over the past five years, almost grown in FTES from 48 in 2007-08 to 82 in 2011-12 but has currently dropped slightly to 72 in 2012-2013 and a further drop to 66 in 2013-2014 (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 four 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). Yet due to a recent retirement the psychology department no longer supports the additional .25 FTE of a full-time faculty member from Physical Education who taught Human Sexuality (PSY 106).

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

We expect to be short on our usual teaching faculty in fall and winter 2015-16 AY due to another retirement and a sick leave.

**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 respond to 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?

Students are meeting SLO requirements.

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

Satisfied. New courses have been offered and students have been meeting expectations.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

I need to incorporate various methods to lift the 25% not meeting SLO's.

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

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

All, students have been doing well in ascertaining a good understanding of SLO's.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?



The need to address the 25% not meeting expectations.

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?

SLO's are very general and need to be updated to provide more specific goals.

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

Make changes to SLO's to provide specific historical periodization.

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 Yes

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

Current status is good. Ethnic Studies course are being offered for the very first time at LTCC and have been successfully enrolled.

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

Increase course offering in Ethnic Studies.

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

Build additional special topics along with offering current 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 respond to 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?

Results are taken from professor assessment, overall students achieving.

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

Satisfied with student engagement and articulation of SLO's. Students are engaging course materials and gaining understanding of principles of American government and history.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Although majority of students are meeting course SLO's, we still have 25% who are not. This tells me I must adapt my pedagogical approach to lift the latter.

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

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

"Developing an open-mindedness to various social, historical, political, and psychological perspectives and opinions, as well as a tolerance for ambiguity." Through course materials and lectures, I believe most students have become more tolerant for the various differences in American society.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The majority of students are engaging course materials and meeting SLO's.

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 year I have made changes to SLO's to better meet the periodization of American political development.

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

Beyond adapting pedagogy to meet 100% student SLO's, I have also made changes above.

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 Yes

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

I have expanded course offerings in Political Science to include Political Theory, Comparative Politics and International Relations.

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

I will be submitting (spring 2015) proposal for A.A. degree in Political Science.

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

Expansion of 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 respond to 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>	96.25	3.75	0
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	95.22	4.78	0
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	99.00	1.0	0
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

The results show that our students are doing very well and that teaching methods are effective.

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

Very satisfied.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The high success rates suggest that teaching methods in the Theatre Arts Department are very effective.

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

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

All courses assessed show high levels of success. Again, this suggests that teaching methods are very affective.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The instruction in the department is effective in current teaching methods and practices.

# Theatre Arts

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year: \_2014-15

Date Completed: 3/18/2015

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 happy with the Program SLOs and do not anticipate making any changes.

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

Continue with current effective teaching methodologies, as well as continuing to look for ways to improve.

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 Yes

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

1. Status of Items From Last Unit Plan: None of the requests from last year's APR that required funding have been accomplished.

2. According to course assessments, the department continues to see high levels of achievement for program and course SLOs. This student success certainly points to effective teaching throughout the course offerings.

3. We continue to offer high-quality and compelling productions of plays and musicals. In 2014/2015, we offered a drama, a fantasy play to appeal to children/families and adults alike, and the musical, "Man of La Mancha" especially to commemorate the 40th Anniversary of LTCC. The Theatre Department continues to draw appreciative audiences throughout the year, and we are arguably the most visible department on campus, bringing over 1,000 people to the campus each year for our shows.

Based on ticket sales, public response, and community involvement and recognition, the department continues to prove itself as a vital component of LTCC and the Tahoe community.

Budget cuts are making it increasingly difficult to produce two plays and a musical. Despite the fact that we bring in plenty of box office revenue to offset our production costs, my budget continues to get cut. Also, as I have started the past two school years only to find that my budget had been drastically cut, it has become increasingly difficult to plan any kind of a season. I have had to beg for money to produce the shows I had planned. It would be helpful to leave for the summer knowing the budget that I will have for the next year, so that I can plan a season accordingly.

These budget cuts are not only affecting production and department expenses, but funding for costumer hours. This also impacts what shows we can do, which further limits what experiences I can offer our students.

Box Office revenue has continued to increase overall since the arrival of the current Director of Theatre:

2008/2009	\$11,818.00	(1 year prior to arrival of new Director of Theatre)
2009/20010	\$14,440.75	
2010/2011	\$26,702.00	
2011/2012	\$18,321.00*	
2012/2013	\$22,530.00*	asterisks:Bookstore selling tickets, receives % of sales
2013/2014	\$17,524.00*	

4. The entire campus has seen a significant fall in enrollment over the past year. This, of course, also had an impact on the Theatre Department. The VP of Instruction took a hardline approach for class minimums, which was recently raised to 15, so a few theatre courses that had 8 or 9 students registered were not allowed to go.

Repeatability limits, loss of community members in this area, higher tuition fees and the loss of the Good Neighbor policy with Nevada all have a direct impact on overall campus enrollment and has definitely impacted the Theatre Department.



## Theatre Arts

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year: \_2014-15

Date Completed: 3/18/2015

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

I continued to develop new courses to be offered. Beginning Musical Theatre Techniques was offered for the first time; new curriculum was written for Acting for the Camera.

As mentioned above, budget for productions continues to be an issue.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected in the upcoming academic year.
  1. The department is now undergoing the Program Vitality Assessment process. This has just begun, so there is nothing to report.
  2. It is hoped that the new Incarcerated Student Program will provide opportunity for the Theatre Department to be involved and thereby increase enrollment, as well as expand our mission in service to this group of people.
  3. I plan to increase film studies offerings, beginning fall 2015 with a new course, Film Appreciation.
  4. I would like to partner with the DMA program in the Film Production area. I am hoping to get Administration's assistance in bringing the two departments together to develop courses for both filmmaking and acting students. There is a lot of potential in developing this natural collaboration.
  5. The VAPA degree will be undergoing renovation.
  6. We will continue to monitor the impact of repeatability on our department.
  7. Budget cuts will have an impact.

**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 respond to 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	20	2
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	78	20	2
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	78	20	2
<b>Program SLO 4</b>	78	20	2
<b>Program SLO 5</b>	78	20	2

What do these results mean to you?

Most students are acquiring some level of understanding/mastery of the WLD SLOs. (These numbers are based upon previous academic years)

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

I am somewhat satisfied with the results associated with the SLOs. Most of our

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

The average program SLOs indicate a high level of student Mastery/Understanding.

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

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

All the results are N/A.

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?

The WLD SLOs are appropriate for our course offerings.

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

We are continuing our current best practices.

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 Yes

---

#### ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

As of AY 2013-2014, Wilderness Education was the 14th largest department by FTES at LTCC (34.57 FTES). Four students graduated with A.A.'s in Wilderness Education in 2014. During AY 2013-2014 WLD awarded 70 industry recognized American Institute for Avalanche Research and Education (AIARE) certificates.

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

During 2013-2014 Wilderness Education formalized the Search and Rescue Area of Concentration and began offering courses in this area. Initial student interest has been strong and student feedback has been positive.

3. Please briefly explain any significant changes expected 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 respond to 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>	89.17	10.83	0
<b>Program SLO 2</b>	87	12.9	0
<b>Program SLO 3</b>	85	15	0
<b>Program SLO 4</b>			
<b>Program SLO 5</b>			

What do these results mean to you?

We are offering quality instruction to our students.

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

We are satisfied due to the fact that we once again have strong communication within the department and work with our adjuncts to improve student learning. Our rates continue to improve.

3. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

Our WL courses are appropriately assessed and we communicate well with our adjuncts. Every winter quarter we have a department meeting to discuss improvement and closing the loop. We also take a serious look at our DE offerings and continue to improve DE instruction while sharing ideas with our adjuncts who teach online.

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

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

No. We continue to follow our department vision. All results are positive.

5. What conclusions do you draw from these results?

We focus on teaching strategies and learning. Our results reflect that. We are satisfied.

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 base our measurements on the guidelines of language proficiency and mapping our courses to the Program SLOS which reflect the language acquisition levels.

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

We will continue to offer an annual department meeting that reinforces these successful actions. We are satisfied and no new actions are needed.

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 Yes



---

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW

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

Our DE course offerings are growing with our face-to-face FTES continues to decline.

We will continue to enhance our DE offerings.

Our success rate continues to be steady.

We continue to award AA degrees and certificates in Spanish.

As enrollment allows we offer a variety of languages and try to vary which courses are offered and when.

Department/Program: WL Academic Year: 2014-15

Date Completed: 2/12/15

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

We ran a very successful summer study abroad program in Guatemala.  
Our instructional supply budget has still not be funded for our department.

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

Our DE courses continue to grow. We will offer an intermediate Spanish online year of courses for the first time. And some of our SPA online courses will be taught by adjunct instructors. And the Elementary French courses will also be offered online next year. The need for DE support continues to be paramount. Both training and funding for online software and subscriptions is highly needed to augment our DE program. Students will be able to obtain an AA degree in Spanish completely online with the addition of the Intermediate Spanish courses being offered online next year.