**Section I – Accomplishments and Status of 2013 Program Review Report**

1. Last Year’s Initiatives

*Instructions: Answer the following questions:*

Provide a brief status of initiatives created last year that did not require funding. Include an explanation of what changes occurred. Sociology

1. Initiative: Continued collaboration among faculty

Initiative ID: SOC1301

Link to Data: Variation in grading and success rates in individual courses show need for faculty to discuss course content/delivery/use of extra credit etc.

Expected Benefits: Normalize student experience within core sociology courses

Goal: Meet as a department at least 3 times per semester

Performance Indicator: more consistent grading and success reports

Timeline: 2014-2015

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Ranking: H

Status of Initiative: Met conditionally. Not all Sociology Faculty participated in collaboration.

1. Initiative: SOC1302

Initiative ID: Increase AA-T completion

Link to Data: degree completion

Expected Benefits: Students will be more likely to transfer to a 4 year university if they obtain a degree.

Goal: Increase AA-T by 10%

Performance Indicator: completion of degrees

Timeline: 2014-2015

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Ranking: H

Status of Initiative: Met. 77 degrees have been issued since Sociology became a degree for transfer in 2013.

1. Initiative: SOC1303

Initiative ID: Offer all core Sociology courses in on-line modality as well as on ground

Link to Data: greater retention rates

Expected Benefits: Better access for students

Goal: Sociological analysis will be offered on-line

Performance Indicator:

Timeline: Fall 2014

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Ranking: M

Status of Initiative: Not Met. Sociological Analysis has not yet been offered online.

1. Initiative: SOC1304

Initiative ID: Maintain Sociology Club

Link to Data: Student participation in campus activities is correlated to student success.

Expected Benefits: Greater awareness of sociology program

Goal: Sociology Club will meet regularly during fall and spring semesters

Performance Indicator: regular scheduling

Timeline: Spring 2014

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Ranking: H

Status of Initiative: Met. The sociology Club became active in fall 2014.

Human Services

1. Initiative: HMSV1302

Initiative ID: Create new advisory board

Link to Data: none

Expected Benefits: Better serve student transfer and employment needs

Goal: Create new advisory board with broader scope of community leaders/service provider and college departments (i.e. child development)

Performance Indicator: meeting of committee

Timeline: Fall 2014

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Ranking: H

Status of Initiative: Not met. We did not have adequate staffing to create a new advisory board.

* Provide a brief status of initiatives created last year that required funding. For those that were funded, what changes occurred (i.e. in student learning) as a result of the initiatives/funding.

1. Initiative: HMSV1301

Initiative ID: More frequent class offerings

Link to Data: success and retention data would be more complete

Expected Benefits: Students would be able to complete certificates and degree faster

Goal: Offer 2 HMSV class each semester

Performance Indicator: schedule

Timeline: Spring 2014

Funding Resource Category: Staffing Funds

Ranking: H

Status of Initiative: Not met. We did not have adequate staffing to offer the variety and frequency needed for the HMSV Program.

FOR BOTH SOC AND HMSV

1. Initiative: SOC1305 & HMSV1303

Initiative ID: Increase DE support

Link to Data: See DE program Review

Expected Benefits: increase success for students taking on-line instruction

Goal: Increase DE faculty by 1

Performance Indicator: hiring of DE staff

Timeline: Fall 2014

Funding Resource Category: Staffing Funds

Ranking: H

Status of Initiative: Met. An instructional technologist was hired prior to the fall 2014 semester.

1. Initiative: SOC1306 & HMSV1304

Initiative ID: Create funding for professional development

Link to Data: SEE PD Program Review

Expected Benefits: increase instructor skills (pedagogical, technology, etc.) The ultimate benefit would be great student success and retention.

Goal: Create line item budget category for PD

Performance Indicator: $ allotted to PD annually

Timeline: Fall 2014

Funding Resource Category: Facilities Funds

Ranking H

Status of Initiative: Met. The professional development has been expanded with various grant monies.

1. Updates/accomplishments pertaining to any of the Student Success or Operating Goals from last year’s report.

Goal: To maintain student success and retention at or above the college average. Met.

Goal: To hire an additional faculty member to run the Human Service Program. Sociology/Human Services was ranked 3rd by the staffing committee for 2015/16.

**Section II - Description**

1. **Description of Program/Department**

**Sociology** is the scientific study of human behavior in groups and the social forces that influence that behavior. The Sociology program offers a diverse curriculum in an effort to provide students with the tools necessary to comprehend their social world, using sociological theory and methodology to focus on the building blocks of the social structure and culture. The program includes courses that explore how social institutions play integral roles in our society, how class, race, ethnicity, and gender interact with these fundamental social institutions, the inequalities that exist in society, the importance of norms and values, the deviations therein, and the origins of social problems, their potential solutions, and the challenge to the status quo. Upon completion of a sociology course, the student will have a greater understanding of her/his part in the social world, enhancing interpersonal relationships and relationships to the social structure. A student graduating with an Associate of Arts in Sociology may transfer to a four‐year institution to complete a Bachelor's Degree. Because of the broad scope of subject matter, sociology is excellent preparation for a wide range of career paths, including teaching, journalism, law, business, communications, non‐profit management, corrections/law enforcement, and employment in the human services fields.

**Program Purpose**: Students graduating from the Sociology program will be able to demonstrate comprehension of the major sociological theories and relevant concepts, the scientific method, the variety and appropriateness of sociological research designs and the application and interpretation of findings from such research. Additionally students will be able to critically evaluate and apply theoretical concepts to specific cultural phenomenon past and present.

**PROGRAM LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:**

1. Demonstrate comprehension of the major sociological theories and relevant concepts.
2. Demonstrate comprehension of the scientific method, the variety and appropriateness of research designs and the application and interpretation of the findings.
3. Critically evaluate and apply theoretical concepts to specific cultural phenomenon past and present.

**Human Services** is a course of study for those interested in employment in such diverse settings as group homes and halfway houses; correctional, developmental disability agencies, and community mental health centers; family, child, and youth service agencies and programs concerned with alcoholism, drug abuse, family violence, homelessness, aging or other social issues. The primary focus of the human service worker is to assist individual and communities to function as effectively as possible in the major domains of living as case managers, advocates, grant writers, youth workers, volunteer coordinators, human resource specialists, fundraisers, trainers, para‐educators or advocacy. The Human Services AA and certificate programs are structured around interrelated components including: theoretical foundations/intervention strategies; client population/cultural diversity; research /evaluation; and skill development/field experience. Successful completion of appropriate coursework will enable students to either further their education, seek employment in a variety of social service organizations or both.

**Program Purpose: The Human Services program is designed to assist students in their conceptual understanding of system concepts, theories and techniques that are foundational to the practice of human/social services. Gain an understanding of assessment methods, treatment planning and case management. Also, to develop an understanding of recovery oriented behavior health services.**

**PROGRAM LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:**

1. Conceptual understanding of system concepts, theories and techniques that are foundational to the practice of human/social services.
2. Demonstrate understanding of assessment methods, treatment planning and case management.
3. Demonstrate understanding of recovery oriented behavior health services.

**Degrees/Certificates**

Both program’s courses are designed to articulate to UC and CSU for transfer students.

There are now Associates of Arts Sociology and Associates of Arts Human Services degree. Additionally, there are four proficiency awards in Human Services.

1. **Program/Department Significant Events (Strengths and Successes), and Accomplishments**

The Sociology/Human Service Program has been prioritized to add a new faculty position beginning the fall 2015. This position will enable the Human Service Program to expand and meet its goals from previous initiatives.

1. **2013-2014 Estimated Costs/Gainful Employment – for Certificates of Achievement ONLY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Cost** |  | **Cost** |  | **Cost** |  | **Cost** |
| Enrollment Fees | \*46 per unit unclassunitx121212 | Enrollment Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| Books/  Supplies | Approx.  $65 per course | Books/  Supplies |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $1169-1215 \* | Total |  | Total |  | Total |  |

1. **Criteria Used for Admission**

No pre-requisites

.

1. **College Vision**

Ventura College will be a beacon of learning—a source of inspiration and guidance—for our students and community.

1. **College Mission**

At Ventura College, we transform students’ lives, develop human potential, create an informed citizenry, and serve as the educational and cultural heart of our community. Placing students at the center of their learning experience, we serve a highly diverse student body by providing innovative instruction and student support, focusing on associate degree and certificate completion, transfer, workforce preparation, and basic skills. We are committed to the sustainable continuous improvement of our college and its services.

1. **College Guiding Principles**

Guiding Principles: At Ventura College we believe that students come first and all else follows.  We strive to create a campus environment that fosters collaboration, communication, and mutual respect.  We are committed to these Guiding Principles in all that we do:

* Embrace the strength of diversity
* Listen with intensity and compassion
* Communicate with integrity and patience
* Design student-centered solutions
* Spark self-confidence and a sense of discovery
* Pursue our vision and goals with passion

1. **Organizational Structure**

*Instructions: Fill-in the appropriate information below.*

**College President:** Greg Gillespie

**Executive Vice President:** Patrick Jefferson

**Dean:** Dr. Gwendolyn Lewis-Huddleston

**Department Chair(s)**: Ron Mules

**Faculty/Staff**:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Albert Chen** |
| Classification | Associate Professor |
| Year Hired | 2007 |
| Years of Work‐Related Experience |  |
| Degrees/Credentials | A.A.,B.A., M.A. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Andrea Horigan** |
| Classification | Associate Professor |
| Year Hired | 2011 |
| Years of Work‐Related Experience |  |
| Degrees/Credentials | B.A., M.A. Online Teaching & Learning Certificate |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Lauri Moore** |
| Classification | Professor |
| Year Hired | 1996 |
| Years of Work‐Related Experience |  |
| Degrees/Credentials | A.A.,B.A., M.A. |

**Section III – Data and Analysis**

1. **SLO Data**

Completion of the Student Learning Outcomes provided Sociology/Human Service faculty to collaborate on assignments used for assessment. While SLOs were met in most cases, we were able to re-evaluate not only our course objectives but our rubrics used for assessments. This collaboration enabled us to see where we were excelling in some areas and where improvement was needed in others.

For Human Services, the 5 year rotational plan made it apparent that to assess each course in a timely manner more Humans Service courses needed to be offered each semester.

For both Sociology and Humans Services, the SLO process allows us to continue to re-evaluate course objectives, assessment and improvement of student learning. Initiatives created based on SLO results are centered on student success.

1. **Performance Data**
2. **Retention – Program and Course**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below. Retention refers to the number/percentage of students completing the class.*

Sociology: retention rates exceeds that of the college: (3yrSoc 90%, College 83%), (FY14 Soc 90%, College 85%)

FY14 Retention Rate by ethnicity ranged from 85% to 97%. In FY14, 60% of our students self-identified as Hispanic with a retention rate of 90%. Those that self-identified as ‘other’ had the lowest retention rate at 85% while ‘Filipino’ retention rate was 97%.

Human Services: 3yr retention rates exceed that of the college (HMSV 87%, College 86%), (FY14 HMSV 90%, College 85%)

FY14 Retention Rate by ethnicity was fairly even. Forty eight percent (48%) of the human service students self-identified as Hispanic with a retention rate of 87%. Students that self-identified as white (41%) had a retention rate of 93%.

1. **Success – Program and Course**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below. Success refers to the number/percentage of students who pass the class with a grade of C or better or a “pass.”*

Sociology: Success rates exceed that of the college (3ys Soc 73%, College 71%), (FY14 Soc 79%, College 72%) We will explore options to bring success rates up to or above our SLO goal of 75%. A better indicator might be to compare success rates of social science courses.

FY14 Success Rate by ethnicity ranged from 70% to 90%. In FY14, 60% of our students self-identified as Hispanic with a success rate of 78%. Those that self-identified as ‘other’ had the lowest success rate at 70% while ‘Filipino’ success rate was 90%.

Human Services: 3yr success equal to or above that of the college (HMSV 71%, College 86715), (FY14 HMSV 79%, College 72%)

Success rates for Human Service students may indicate a need for further evaluation: self-identified Hispanic students had a success rate of 74% compared to 86% for those self-identified as white.

1. **Program Completion – for “Programs” with Degrees/Certificates Only**

4 Year Total for Sociology: Degrees **77**

(Note: Sociology has been a degree for transfer only since FY13)

4 Year Total for Human Services: Certificates **8**

4 Year Total for Human Services: Degrees **13**

(The addition of a new faculty member to teach these courses and monitor the program will ideally increase these numbers.)

1. **Operating Data**
2. **Demographics - Program and Course**

This year’s data did not aggregate sex and age by subject (only by individual courses), however both Sociology and Human Services continues serve females approximately 2 to 1 males.

The primary age category of Sociology students in the 20 to 24 range.

The majority Human Services students are in the 25 to 49 age range. The Human Service student population is much more varied by age with many ’re-entry” students. Human Service courses have been historically offered in the afternoon from 4-7pm to accommodate working adults. A possible initiative is to offer these courses during traditional student hours (8-2pm) which may provide more exposure to the younger student.

1. **Budget**

X Program members have reviewed the budget data.

X No comments or requests to make about the budget.

1. **Productivity – Program and Course**

The average productivity of the 22 sections of Sociology offered in Spring 2014 was 690, exceeding the district goal of 650 for large classes.

The average productivity of the 3 sections of Human Services offered in Spring 2014 was 570, exceeding the district goal of 525 for 35 student class sizes.

1. **Resources**
2. **Faculty**

Sociology:

Sociology has 3 full time instructors.

The 3yr average FTEF has been influenced by 2 fulltime faculty member taking sabbatical leaves in 2013 and 2014.

Human Services:

Human Services is taught by 1 fulltime instructor as an overload, currently

1 course is offered each semester. There is a need to offer additional courses (of the cycle rotation) per semester. This will either require an additional section of Sociology to be taught by part time faculty.

1. **Classified Staff**

N/A

1. **Inventory**

N/A

1. **Facilities or other Resource Requests**

MAC 201 and 202 have not yet been upgraded to fully smart classrooms. Both need document cameras and functional teacher/computer desks.

1. **Combined Initiatives**

N/A

1. **Other Program/Department Data**

N/A

**Section IIIb – Other Program Goals and Initiatives**

1. **Other Program Goals**

N/A

**Section IV – Program Vitality\* (Academic Senate Approved Self-Evaluation)**

*\*Service Areas – Skip this section.*

* What is your score?

Sociology: 25

Human Services: 22

* What does that score mean to you?

Both programs are vibrant.

**Section V – Findings and Initiatives**

1. **Findings**

* Finding #1 – Student success rates for Sociology are below retention rates. Sociology faculty need to continually assess and improve upon the student learning experience.

This finding aligns with the VC Educational Master Plan Goal #1 and VC Educational Master Goal #2. Aligns with District Strategic Goal 1.

* Finding #2 – Student success rates for Human Services are below retention rates. Sociology/Human Service faculty need to continually assess and improve upon the student learning experience.

This finding aligns with the VC Educational Master Plan Goal #1 and VC Educational Master Goal #2. Aligns with District Strategic Goal 1.

Findings → Link to VC Educational Master Plan Goal(s) → Link to District Strategic Goal(s)

Prior year initiatives carried forward:

**Initiative Title: Continued collaboration among faculty**

**Initiative ID:** **SOC1301**

**Links to Finding: Links to Finding #1: Variation in grading and success rates in individual courses show need for faculty to discuss course content/delivery/use of extra credit etc.**

**Initiative Finding Link**: SOCF1501

**Initiative Action:** **Meet as a department at least 3 times per semester all p/t and f/t faculty at least once a semester and all f/t faculty 3 times.**

Timeline: 2015-2016

**Expected Benefits**: **Normalize student experience within core sociology courses and student learning outcomes.**

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Estimated Cost: none

Ranking: M

**Initiative Title: Offer all core Sociology courses in on-line modality as well as on ground**

**Initiative ID:** SOC1303

**Links to Finding: Links to Finding #1: 1 Increase student success. Providing greater accessibility through distant education courses will increase student retention and success.**

**Initiative Finding Link**: SOCF1501

**Initiative Action:** Create and offer Sociological Analysis for online modality.

Timeline: Fall 2015

**Expected Benefits**: Provide greater accessibility and higher degree completion rates.

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Estimated Cost: none

Ranking: M

**Initiative Title: New Advisory Board**

**Initiative ID:** HMSV1303

**Links to Finding: Link to Finding #2**

**Initiative Finding Link**: HMSVF1502

**Initiative Action:** Organize advisory board consisting of Ventura County Human Service Providers

Timeline: 2015-16

**Expected Benefits**: Provide skill and job/internship base for Human Service students.

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Estimated Cost: none

Ranking: **M**

**Initiative Title: Complete Smart Room Updates to MAC 201 &202**

**Initiative ID:** SOC1304 & HMSV1304

**Links to Finding: Link to Finding #1**

**Initiative Finding Link**: SOCF1501 & HMSVF1502

**Initiative Action:** Install document cameras and working computer desks

Timeline: Fall 2015

**Expected Benefits**:

Funding Resource Category: Facilities Funds

Estimated Cost:

Ranking: **H**

**New Initiatives:**

**Initiative Title: Faculty Workroom in LRC**

**Initiative ID:** SOC1501

**Links to Finding: Links to Finding #1**

**Initiative Finding Link**: SOCF1501

**Initiative Action:** Create a workspace for faulty to collaborate. (Our previous workspace was turned into cubicles primarily being used by student workers.)

Timeline: 2015-16

**Expected Benefits**: Faculty can work together sharing ideas.

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Estimated Cost: none

Ranking: **M**

**Initiative Title: Student Scantrons**

**Initiative ID:** SOC1502

**Links to Finding: Links to Findings #1.**

**Initiative Finding Link**: SOCF1501

**Initiative Action:** Purchase 1000 Scantrons annually

Timeline: 2015

**Expected Benefits**: Students can complete survey method activities in timely manner.

Funding Resource Category: Supply Funds

Estimated Cost: $500

Ranking: **M**

**Initiative Title: Field Trip Funds**

**Initiative ID:** SOC1503 & HMSV 1501

**Links to Finding: Link to Findings #1 and Findings #2**

**Initiative Finding Link**: SOCF1501 & HMSVF1502

**Initiative Action**: Provide $ for Field Trips, Transportation and Field Work Observations.

Timeline: 2015-16

Expected Benefits: Increase student success with experiential learning.

Funding Resource Category: Grant Funds

Estimated Cost: $2000

Ranking: **M**

**Section VI – Process Assessment**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below.*

1. **How have the changes in the program review process this year worked for your area?**

I am not convinced that this should be labeled a ‘mini’ review.

1. **How would you improve the program review process based on this experience?**

Data could be disaggregated by program PRIOR to being given to faculty to streamline the process.

1. **Appeals**

**VII – Submission Verification**

**Program/Department: Sociology & Human Services**

**Preparer: Andrea Horigan,**

**Dates met (include email discussions): 1/30/15, 2/8/15**

**List of Faculty who participated in the program Review Process:**

Andrea Horigan & Lauri Moore

**Preparer Verification:**

X I verify that this program document was completed in accordance with the program review process.

**Dean Verification:**

☐ I verify that I have reviewed this program review document and find it complete. *The dean may also provide comments (optional):*

**Program Review Process Map**

Appendix A

**I . Status report and accomplishments from prior year**

**o**

**III(a). Data**

1. **Review**
2. **Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **A. SLO’s** | 1. **B. Success** | 1. **C. Operating** | 1. **D. Resources** | 1. **E. Other** |
|  | * **Retention** | * **Demographic** | * **Faculty** | **Data** |
|  | * **Success** | * **Budget** | * **Classified Staff** |  |
|  | * **Completion** | * **Enrollment/Productivity** | * **Inventory** |  |
|  |  |  | * **Facilities or other Resource Requests** |  |
|  |  |  | * **Combined Initiatives** |  |

**II. Description**

**III(b). Other program goals and initiatives**

**(Innovations, regulations, legislation, new technology, industry standards, professional development, or advisory committee recommendations, etc.)**

**IV. Program vitality-(Academic Senate rubric)**

**VII. Verification of review**

**VI. Process assessment**

**V. Summary of initiatives and requests**

**Minority reports if any**

Appendix B

Program Review Resource Initiatives Guidelines

**WHAT TO LEAVE OUT**

*The purpose of this document is to clarify what kinds of resource requests should NOT be included in the Program Review Document as initiatives.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The table below summarizes the types of resources that DO NOT need to be included in the Department Plans. The “Who to Contact” column lists who to contact when the resources or services are needed. | | |
| **Excluded Items** | **Who to Contact** | **Explanation** |
| Safety Issues, including but not limited to broken chairs or desks, etc. that can be resolved through the normal process. | Dean, M&O or Appropriate Office | All safety issues should be immediately reported to the Dean, M&O, or appropriate department. |
| EAC Accommodations that can be resolved through the normal process. | DSPS and Dean | Any accommodation should have the guidance of the DSPS office. |
| Routine M&O maintenance & repair  (light fixtures not working, holes in walls, locks, cleaning, broken desks or chairs, etc.) that can be resolved through the normal process. | M&O or Division Office | Complete an email request to [vcmaintenance@vcccd.edu](mailto:vcmaintenance@vcccd.edu) or notify your division office so they can handle for you. |
| Cyclical Maintenance  (painting, flooring, carpet shampooed, windows, etc.) that can be resolved through the normal process. | M&O or Division Office | Complete an email request to [vcmaintenance@vcccd.edu](mailto:vcmaintenance@vcccd.edu) or notify your division office so they can handle for you. |
| Classroom technology equipment repairs (projector light bulb out, video screen not working, computer not working, existing software updates) that can be resolved through the normal process. | Campus Technology Center or Division Office | Complete an email request to [vchelpdesk@vcccd.edu](mailto:vchelpdesk@vcccd.edu) or notify your division office so they can handle for you. |
| Section Offerings/  Change of classrooms | Dean/Department Chair | Dean will take requests through the enrollment management process. |
| Substitutes | Dean | Dean will process in accordance with existing guidelines. |
| Conferences, Meetings, Individual Training | Professional Development Committee | Requests should first be addressed by the PDC and only go through program review if costs cannot be covered. |

Program Review Resource Initiatives Guidelines

**WHAT TO LEAVE IN**

*The purpose of this document is to clarify what kinds of resource requests should be included in the Program Review Document as initiative.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty and Staff from each department will meet as a division to prioritize initiatives resulting from the Program Review process. The initiatives will then go to each respective governance groups such as Staffing Priorities, Technology Committee, Budget Resource Council, etc., for further prioritization. Administrative Council and the Executive Team will develop the final prioritized list and distribute for implementation. | | |
| **Included Items** | **Committee Group** | **Explanation** |
| Replacement of classroom furniture | Facilities Oversight Group | Only when it is an entire classroom/lab/office at a time or a safety or disability issue that has not been resolve through the normal process. |
| Upgrade and/or replacement of computer and other technological equipment | Technology Committee | These items will go on to a list for replacement or upgrade per the technology plan. |
| New Equipment/Furniture/ classroom items (i.e. microscope, etc.) | Budget Resource Council | These items must be approved included in a plan to improve student learning and/or services. |
| Buildings/Office Space  (new renovation, modernization) | Division Dean | The division dean will work with Administrative Council and the Fog Committee to pursue the projects. |
| New Software | Technology Committee | These items must be approved included in a plan to improve student learning and/or services. |
| New Faculty Positions | Faculty Staffing Priorities | Requests for new positions will compiled on a list and sent to the FSP committee. |
| New Classified Positions/or increase in percentage of existing positions. | Classified Staffing Priorities | Requests for classified positions will compiled on a list and sent to the CSP committee. |
| New Programs/certificates | Curriculum Committee | These program/certificates must be approved by the curriculum committee. |
| Training and Professional Development above normal | Professional Development/ Budget Resource Council | These are items over and above what the PDC can provide. |
| Expansion/Conversion to Distance Learning | Dean of Distance Learning and Distance Learning Committee | Requests will be compiled and sent to the committee process for discussion. |
| Service Agreements | Budget Resource Council | Requests must include justification. |
| Instructional Materials and Office Supplies/ Advertising/Student Workers/Printing/Duplicating | Budget Resource Council/Dean | These items must include a compelling reason and be above what the normal budget will allow. |

Appendix C

Rubric for Instructional Program Vitality-Academic (non-CTE)

The purpose of this rubric is to aid a program in thoughtful, meaningful and reflective self-evaluation. This rubric is also a defensible and objective way at looking at program viability and efficacy. This rubric should not be used as the mechanism to justify funding requests or for resource allocation. Lastly, a low score on this rubric does not preclude a program from requesting documented and necessary resource requests in other parts of this program review document.

**Academic programs:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Point Value** | **Element** | **Score** |
| **Up to 6** | **Enrollment demand** [[1]](#footnote-1) | SOC/HMSV |
|  | A “6” would be the ability to fill 100% of sections prior to the start of the semester. |  |
|  | A “5” would be the ability to fill 95% or greater of class sections prior to the start of the semester for the past two terms. | 5 |
|  | A “4” would be the ability to fill 90% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms. |  |
|  | A “3” would be the ability to fill 85% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms. | 3 |
|  | A “2” would be the ability to fill 80% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms. |  |
|  | A “1” would be the ability to fill 75% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms. |  |
|  | A “0” would be the ability to fill less than 75% of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Sufficient capital / human resources to maintain the program, as defined by:** |  |
| **Up to 3** | **Ability to find qualified instructors** |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that no classes have been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors. | 3 |
|  | A “2” would indicate that rarely but occasionally have classes been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors. | 2 |
|  | A “1” would indicate that a significant number of sections in the past year have been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors. |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that classes are not even scheduled due to the inability to find qualified instructors. |  |
| **Up to 3** | **Financial resources, equipment, space** |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that the program is fully supported with regards to dedicated class / lab space, supplies and equipment. | 3 3 |
|  | A “2” would indicate that the program is partially supported with regards to dedicated class / lab space, supplies and equipment |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that the program is minimally supported with regards to dedicate class / lab space, supplies and equipment. |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that there is no college support with regards to class / lab space, supplies and equipment. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Up to 4** | **Agreed-upon productivity rate** [[2]](#footnote-2) |  |
|  | A “4” would indicate that a program has met or exceeded its productivity rate. | 4 4 |
|  | A “3” would indicate that a program is at 90% or greater of its productivity rate. |  |
|  | A “2” would indicate that a program is at 80% or greater of its productivity rate. |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that a program is at 70% or greater of its productivity rate. |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that a program is at less than 70% of its productivity rate. |  |
|  | | |
| **Up to 4** | **Course completion rate** [[3]](#footnote-3) |  |
|  | A “4” would indicate that the program’s course completion rate is greater than 5 percentage points or greater than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” | 4 4 |
|  | A “3” would indicate the program’s course completion rate is equal to or greater than the most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “2” would indicate that a program’s course completion rate is up to 2 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that a program’s course completion rate is up to 5 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that a program’s course completion rate is greater than 5 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Up to 3** | **Success rate** [[4]](#footnote-4) |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that the sum of the program’s course success rates for the past academic year is greater than the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” | 3 3 |
|  | A “2” would indicate that the sum of the program’s success rates for the past academic year is within 4 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that the sum of the program’s success rates for the past academic year is within 8 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that the sum of the program’s success rates for the past academic year is lesser than 8 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Up to 3** | **Ongoing and active participation in SLO assessment process** |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the programs SLO mapping document found in TracDat have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year. | 3 3 |
|  | A “2” would indicate that 95% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program’s SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year. |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that 90% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program’s SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year. |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate than less than 90% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program’s SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year. |  |

In no more than two to three sentences, supply a narrative explanation, rationale or justification for the score you provided, especially for programs with a score of less than 22:

Score interpretation, academic programs:

**22-26** Program is current and vibrant with no further action recommended

**18-21** Recommendation to attempt to strengthen program

**Below 18** Recommendation to consider discontinuation of the program

**Appendix D**

**Rubric for Instructional Program Vitality-CTE**

The purpose of this rubric is to aid a program in thoughtful, meaningful and reflective self-evaluation. This rubric is also a defensible and objective way at looking at program viability and efficacy. This rubric should not be used as the mechanism to justify funding requests or for resource allocation. Lastly, a low score on this rubric does not preclude a program from requesting documented and necessary resource requests in other parts of this program review document.

**CTE programs:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Point Value** | **Element** | **Score** |
| **Up to 6** | **Enrollment demand / Fill rate** [[5]](#footnote-5) |  |
|  | A “6” would be the ability to fill 100% of sections prior to the start of the semester. |  |
|  | A “5” would be the ability to fill 95% or greater of class sections prior to the start of the semester for the past two terms. |  |
|  | A “4” would be the ability to fill 90% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms. |  |
|  | A “3” would be the ability to fill 85% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms. |  |
|  | A “2” would be the ability to fill 80% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms. |  |
|  | A “1” would be the ability to fill 75% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms. |  |
|  | A “0” would be the ability to fill less than 75% of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Sufficient capital / human resources to maintain the program, as defined by:** |  |
| **Up to 3** | **Ability to find qualified instructors** |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that no classes have been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors. |  |
|  | A “2” would indicate that rarely but occasionally have classes been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors. |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that a significant number of sections in the past year have been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors. |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that classes are not even scheduled due to the inability to find qualified instructors. |  |
| **Up to 3** | **Financial resources, equipment, space** |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that the program is fully supported with regards to dedicated class / lab space, supplies and equipment. |  |
|  | A “2” would indicate that the program is partially supported with regards to dedicated class / lab space, supplies and equipment |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that the program is minimally supported with regards to dedicate class / lab space, supplies and equipment. |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that there is no college support with regards to class / lab space, supplies and equipment. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Up to 4** | **Agreed-upon productivity rate** [[6]](#footnote-6) |  |
|  | A “4” would indicate that a program has met or exceeded its productivity rate. |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that a program is at 90% or greater of its productivity rate. |  |
|  | A “2” would indicate that a program is at 80% or greater of its productivity rate. |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that a program is at 70% or greater of its productivity rate. |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that a program is at less than 70% of its productivity rate. |  |
|  | | |
| **Up to 3** | **Program Completion** |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that the program has granted 25 or greater combined degrees, certificates and proficiency awards over the past four academic years. |  |
|  | A “2” would indicate that the program has granted 20-24 combined degrees, certificates and proficiency awards over the past four academic years. |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that the program has granted 15-19 combined degrees, certificates and proficiency awards over the past four academic years. |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that the program has granted fewer than 14 combined degrees, certificates and proficiency awards over the past four academic years. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Up to 3** | **Employment Outlook for Students/Job Market Relevance** |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that the employment outlook for students in the program is greater than the projected county-wide employment average for the next three years and/or “leavers” of the program make more money in their jobs based on taking courses at the college (with or without having completed a degree) than had they not taken courses at the college. |  |
|  | A “2” would indicate the employment outlook for students in the program is about average with the projected county-wide employment average for the next three years. |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that the employment outlook for students in the program is less than the projected county-wide employment average for the next three years. |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that the employment outlook for students in the program is significantly less than the projected county-wide employment average for the next three years. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Up to 3** | **Success rate** [[7]](#footnote-7) |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that the sum of the program’s course success rates for the past academic year is greater than the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “2” would indicate that the sum of the program’s success rates for the past academic year is within 4 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that the sum of the program’s success rates for the past academic year is within 8 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that the sum of the program’s success rates for the past academic year is lesser than 8 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Up to 4** | **Course completion rate** [[8]](#footnote-8) |  |
|  | A “4” would indicate that the program’s course completion rate is greater than 5 percentage points or greater than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate the program’s course completion rate is equal to or greater than the most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “2” would indicate that a program’s course completion rate is up to 2 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that a program’s course completion rate is up to 5 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate that a program’s course completion rate is greater than 5 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual “VC Institutional Effectiveness Report.” |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Up to 3** | **Ongoing and active participation in SLO assessment process** |  |
|  | A “3” would indicate that all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the programs SLO mapping document found in TracDat have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year. |  |
|  | A “2” would indicate that 95% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program’s SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year. |  |
|  | A “1” would indicate that 90% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program’s SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year. |  |
|  | A “0” would indicate than less than 90% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program’s SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year. |  |

In no more than two to three sentences, supply a narrative explanation, rationale or justification for the score you provided, especially for programs with a score of less than 22:

Score interpretation, academic programs:

**27-32** Program is current and vibrant with no further action recommended

**22-26** Recommendation to attempt to strengthen program

Below **22** Recommendation to consider discontinuation of the program

**APPEAL FORM**

Appendix-E

The program review appeals process is available to any faculty, staff, or administrator who feels strongly that the prioritization of initiatives (i.e. initiatives that were not ranked high but should have been, initiatives that were ranked high but should not have been), the decision to support or not support program discontinuance, or the process followed by the division should be reviewed by the College Planning Council.

Appeal submitted by: (name and program) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

Category for appeal: \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty

\_\_\_\_\_ Personnel – Other

\_\_\_\_\_ Equipment- Computer

\_\_\_\_\_ Equipment – Other

\_\_\_\_\_ Facilities

\_\_\_\_\_ Operating Budget

\_\_\_\_\_ Program Discontinuance

\_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please specify)

Briefly explain the process that was used to prioritize the initiative(s) being appealed:

Briefly explain the rationale for asking that the prioritization of an initiative/resource request be changed:

**Appeals will be heard by the College Planning Council. You will be notified of your time to present.**

1. Enrollment demand is determined by the ability to fill classes. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Productivity rate is defined as **WSCH/FTEF** as determined by the program faculty at the college. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. As defined by the RP Group, the course completion rate is the “percentage of students who do not withdraw from class and who receive a valid grade.” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. As defined by the RP Group, the success rate is “the percentage of students who receive a passing/satisfactory grade” notation of A, B, C, P, IB, or IC. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Enrollment demand is determined by the ability to fill classes. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Productivity rate is defined as **WSCH/FTEF** as determined by the program faculty at the college. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. As defined by the RP Group, the success rate is “the percentage of students who receive a passing/satisfactory grade” notation of A, B, C, P, IB, or IC. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. As defined by the RP Group, the course completion rate is the “percentage of students who do not withdraw from class and who receive a valid grade.” [↑](#footnote-ref-8)