

CYPRESS COLLEGE

Instructional Program Review 2018–2019 Annual Report



Revision Date: March 15, 2019
Prepared on behalf of the instructional Program Review
Committee by
Bryan Seiling, Christie Diep, and David Halahmy

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Purpose of Program Review	3
Process Overview	3
Mission Statement	4
Program Review Handbook, Forms, & Evidence Location	4
A General Note about Evidence	4
Program Review Committee Representatives and Terms	5
Meetings with Program Representatives	5
Overview of Findings	6
<i>Program Completion: Certificates and Degrees</i>	6
<i>Distance Education</i>	6
<i>On Line v. Web-Enhanced</i>	6
<i>Distance Education Training</i>	7
<i>Distance Education support and Funding</i>	7
<i>Student Equity and Disaggregation</i>	8
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs, PLOs, and ILOs)	8
<i>Completed SLO Reporting Recommendations from previous years</i>	8
<i>Remaining recommendations that are in progress of being addressed</i>	9
Program Related Commendations and Recommendations	9
CTE Two-Year Summary Recommendations	9
Global Commendations	9
Global Recommendations	10
Budget and Resource Allocations	10
Looking Forward	11
Appendix A: Timeline for the 2018-2019 Program Review Cycle	12
Appendix B: Rotation Schedule (New 4-Year Cycle Effective Fall 2016)	13
Appendix C: Programs Presenting CTE Two-Year Summaries	14
Appendix D: Program Review Committee Summaries	15

Introduction

Starting in Spring 2019, the Program Review Committee added the word “Instructional” to the beginning of its title. The change was made to distinguish the review of instructional programs from those of student services and administrative services programs. The Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) will continue to be governed by all of the state, district, and college rules, regulations, and guidelines covering “Program Review.”

In response to a recommendation in the 2016 Program Review Evaluation Survey, IPRC recommended that Cypress College move to a four-year cycle that aligns the full CTE program reviews with the CTE “short form” reports required every two years in even-numbered years. This year marks the third year of the new four-year cycle. Each department submitted a Departmental Planning and Program Review Self-Study (“long form”). The remaining half of the CTE programs transitioning to the new four-year review cycle submitted their short CTE Reports, along with a complete (full) review this past fall. Under the new four-year rotation, only general education or non-CTE programs are reviewed in odd-numbered years. For reference, the schedule for the new four-year cycle is included in the appendices along with a list of CTE TOP-Coded programs.

The scope of the instructional program review was also expanded last year to include additional data to assist faculty in evaluating distance education, transfers, labor market information, and student equity. The faculty evaluations of this new data provided some unexpected and interesting analyses identified later in this report.

In addition, the instructional program review process has been updated this year to include a more robust review of resource and budget needs identified by each program. For the past several years, there have been discussions as to how to better tie our instructional program review efforts to our larger campus budgeting process. These efforts took on increased importance due to our Accreditation Report from ACCJC asking us to show a better connection between our program review and planning processes and our budgeting processes. Changes were made to the scope of the work of the committee, the responsibilities and duties of the IPRC Chair, and the summaries and forms issued by the committee all in effort to show this connection.

In particular, the Summaries provided by the IPRC to the programs/departments under review have been updated also to further underscore this connection. Each program will now receive one of three Compliance Statuses to be used in the campus budgeting processes. These categories are explained further in this report.

Purpose of Program Review

The Instructional Department Planning and Program Review process supports the Cypress College and North Orange County Community College District strategic and educational master plans, technology assessments, staff development, and related efforts aimed at assuring quality educational programs, student achievement, and learning. Decision-making processes, including those affecting budgets, resource allocation, hiring of full-time faculty, and competitive internal grant opportunities rely on the program review process and corresponding reports as a basis for evaluating resource requests. The review process incorporates the systematic, ongoing evaluation of programs using data on student success, diversity, basic skills, distance education, achievement, curriculum, labor market results, and student learning outcomes to assure currency, relevancy, and innovation. The faculty program reviews, dean reviews, interdisciplinary dialogue, and Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) assessments contribute to the evidence-based evaluation of programs, which are summarized in an annual report to foster institutional effectiveness, appropriate resource allocation, and ongoing improvements in student success.

Process Overview

Instructional Program Review is included in the Academic Senate’s “Ten Plus One” responsibilities (as articulated in Title 5, Section 53200), and as such, the Instructional Program Review Committee works under the purview of the Academic Senate to review instructional programs and make recommendations to promote student learning and success. The IPRC is comprised of a faculty representative from each division, a counselor, a dean, and two institutional researchers. Faculty representatives are elected at the division level and serve three-year terms. The IPRC

chairperson serves a three-year term, and is elected by the Academic Senate with input from the IPRC members. Prior service on the IPRC is required to serve as chair. The IPRC Chair responsibilities are included in the appendix of the *Department Planning and Program Review Handbook*.

To assist program faculty due for review, Institutional Research and Planning provides each department chair with a program review form that includes prepopulated data and performance metrics. Program faculty then meet to review the data and prepare their written program review. The reviews are next given to the appropriate dean for further input and comment. The completed review is then given to the IPRC members for review and comment. The IPRC invites the department chair or program representative(s) to meet with the committee to share highlights about the program review, including accomplishments, challenges, resource needs, and strategies for improving student learning. In this face-to-face dialogue, the IPRC shares both informal and formal commendations and recommendations with the program representatives. The IPRC Chair then provides a Program Review Summary to each program highlighting the main points of the program review and discussion. The results of all of the reports and conversations are summarized in an annual report. These reports are distributed to the entire campus, the North Orange County Community College District, and the Board of Trustees. Copies of the Instructional Program Review Committee's Annual Reports can be found on the "J-drive" and on the Program Review webpage.

Beginning in Spring 2019, the Instructional Program Review Summaries added a Compliance section to the form. Every program now receives one of three compliance statuses. The first status is "In Compliance." The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. The second status is "Compliance – Needs Improvement." The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. The third status is "Not In Compliance." The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Special Program Review or Program Discontinuance.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Cypress College Department Planning and Instructional Program Review Committee is to promote quality instructional programs by facilitating a positive, open, and collaborative exchange of ideas with faculty to evaluate data, resolve challenges, inform resource allocations, verify currency, and provide suggestions for useful practices that will contribute to improved institutional effectiveness and student success.

Instructional Program Review Handbook, Forms, & Evidence Location

A new *Department Planning and Instructional Program Review Handbook* provides faculty and administrators with instructions, sample forms, and resources for the instructional program review process. The committee will update the *Handbook* in the Fall of 2019 to reflect the revisions that were made to the review process. Of particular focus for the committee will be establishing the specific criteria and vote threshold for assigning each Compliance Status and clarifying the process used to rank the resource and budget requests of the programs. The *Handbook* can be found on the Cypress College Program Review webpage. Faculty will also find copies of previous self-studies and CTE reports on the "J-drive" in the Program Review folder.

A General Note about Evidence

Occasionally, faculty disagree about the meaning of evidence, data, and research used in evaluating student learning. The IPRC welcomes dialog that may lead to a collective understanding of evidence. Therefore, the instructions to faculty acknowledge that they are being asked to comment on statistical data with the understanding that a range of variables may be present and that causal assumptions may not be statistically valid. Faculty are encouraged to view program review as an

opportunity to evaluate data, exchange ideas about trends, comment on noteworthy accomplishments, and identify areas of need where the program would benefit from assistance or resources. Committee members make informal comments and recommendations during the course of the presentations in the spirit of helping faculty consider approaches that other programs have identified as useful. The IPRC remains committed to improving the accuracy of data and facilitating a positive, open, and collaborative dialogue.

Instructional Program Review Committee Representatives and Terms

Division Faculty	Representative (Term)	Email
Business/CIS	Alireza Moady (2 nd : 2017-2020)	amoady@cypresscollege.edu
CTE	Stephanie Rosati (1 st : 2017-2020)	srosati@cypresscollege.edu
Counseling	Ernesto Heredia (1 st : 2018-2021)	eheredia@cypresscollege.edu
Fine Arts	Maha Afra (1 st : 2015-2018)	mafra@cypresscollege.edu
Health Science	Nancy Corrales (1 st : 2017-2020)	ncorales@cypresscollege.edu
Language Arts	Christie Diep (1 st : 2017-2020)	cdiep@cypresscollege.edu
Library	Billy Pashaie (1 st : 2017-2020)	wpashaie@cypresscollege.edu
Kinesiology	Margaret Mohr (2 nd : 2017-2020)	mmohr@cypresscollege.edu
SEM	Sheila Nguyen (1 st : 2017-2020)	snguyen@cypresscollege.edu
Social Science	David Halahmy (2 nd : 2017-2020)	dhalahmy@cypresscollege.edu
Administrative		
Dean	Kathleen Reiland	kreiland@cypresscollege.edu
Institutional Res.	Phil Dykstra	pdykstra@cypresscollege.edu
Institutional Res.	Kristina Oganessian	koganesian@cypresscollege.edu
Chair	David Halahmy	dhalahmy@cypresscollege.edu
Visiting Members		
Accreditation	Liana Koeppel	lkoeppel@cypresscollege.edu
Academic Senate	Bryan Seiling	bseiling@cypresscollege.edu
SLO Committee	Nicole Ledesma	nledesma@cypresscollege.edu

The chair of the committee from the previous year continued in that capacity this year as the committee worked to update the job description for the IPRC Chair. The new description has been approved and a call will be placed by the Academic Senate President to find a chair for a three-year term. The *Department Planning and Instructional Program Review Handbook* will be updated to reflect the newly revised IPRC Chair qualifications and duties.

Meetings with Instructional Program Representatives

After reviewing the written program reviews, the committee met face-to-face with the following program representatives in the fall of 2018. All meetings were all held on Mondays in CCCPLX, room 406 or 407:

November 5

Hotel, Restaurant, and Culinary Arts
Management and Marketing
Nursing

Stephanie Rosatti
Kathleen Troy
Sally McNay and Michael Puttman

November 19

Auto Collision Repair
Automotive Technology
Dental Assisting
Radiologic Tech/Diagnostic Medical

Larry Ramos
Marty Orozco
Elizabeth Pacheco
Lynn Mitts

November 26

Court Reporting
Geography/GIS
Psychiatric Technology

Carolee Freer
Armando Mendoza
Jaime Ramos

December 3

Mortuary Science

Jolena Grande

Overview of Findings

Each year for the past six years, Institutional Research and Planning has provided faculty with prepopulated data to help them evaluate their programs and improve student learning. This year the volume of data was notably increased to provide distance education success rates, transfer data, labor market wage and employment data, and student equity information in the form of disaggregated student achievement data. Generally, the added statistics were well received, but in several cases, faculty were not convinced that all of the data accurately represented their students or programs. In particular, faculty felt the transfer data (from the National Student Clearinghouse) and labor market data (from the Launchboard) did not match what they knew to be true anecdotally. Faculty supplemented this information with data from the BLS and O*Net. Institutional Research is working with the agencies that supply these data to assure its accuracy.

Program Completion: Certificates and Degrees

With the implementation of SB 440 and SB 1440, the number of Associate Degree for Transfer has greatly improved the transfer and completion rates for several of the programs included in this year's cycle. In addition, the movement to expand dual enrollment opportunities for high school students has created opportunities for these same programs to build their enrolments into the near future.

Distance Education

The Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) should be commended for the substantial work done in reshaping and establishing shared governance support for distance education on the campus. For years, distance education at the college lacked sufficient guidance, support, and training, and it was a monumental task to get it to the place it is at today. While there is still work to do, the campus is in far better shape regarding distance education than it was just three years ago. The work of the committee has driven this success and has been an excellent example of the collaboration of classified, faculty, and administration at Cypress College.

Across the campus, distance education success rates are consistently higher than the state average, and the success gap between the success rates of traditional and on-line classes has steadily decreased over time. Yet, on-line classes do remain less successful than face-to-face classes, and several programs reported that hybrid classes are often more successful than typical lecture classes. With the change in the definition of online classes, previously identified online classes that only met the first and last day are now categorized as "hybrid" classes beginning with the Fall 2016 schedule. It will be worthwhile to continue tracking these predominately online classes separately because they may negatively skew the more successful hybrid course data by reflecting lower success rates for this new category of hybrid classes.

Distance Education will continue to be a chief focus for the campus for growth in courses and FTES. To support this, the college chose DE as a topic of a Quality Focus Essay (QFE) for accreditation. The DEAC has already addressed some of the issues central to the QFE, but the campus as a whole will need to address some of the deficiencies in the support provided DE. There is a need for more classified and expert support to aid in the full implementation of the Distance Education Plan.

Online v. Web-Enhanced

Beginning in the Fall of 2018, every class, regardless of mode of instruction, received a Canvas shell to allow instructors to give access to online handouts, assignments, and grades. Such online resources help keep students informed as to their progress in the course, allow for greater faculty/student interaction, and promote student success. Most high school students (and their parents) already have online access to their classes, but a large percentage of our students did not. We wanted to give our students the same resource. There is a lot of work that still remains to support all the possibilities of using these Canvas shells.

The widespread use of Canvas across campus can also be an essential part of an early alert system. The committee supports expanding the use of Canvas shells as a tool for faculty to communicate with other support services across campus to better serve our students. Providing a format for real-time communication between classroom instruction and student services can provide in-term help to students that may prevent them from failing or dropping the class and having to take it over. In this way, Canvas can be an effective tool in promoting guided pathways.

Because the DE team, with the support of the DEAC, oversaw the original transition of the campus from Blackboard to Canvas for online instruction, it was given responsibility for training and overseeing its use in face-to-face instruction as well. There needs to be campus discussions as to whether this training should be the responsibility of DE or some other entity. It may be proper for the DEAC and the DE team to lead this, but as currently structured, the two entities are not equipped to effectively and efficiently handle Canvas training and ongoing support for both online and face-to-face classes.

Distance Education Training

A previous complaint from faculty was that there was not enough training and support for DE. In response, the DEAC made a concerted effort to remove roadblocks and obstructions leading to more training and support being offered over the past two years than in the previous decade. New opportunities for training have been provided that never existed before. These include:

1. The time for online training was shortened from 8 weeks to 5 weeks. This sped up the process, but the DEAC expressed some concern with the quality of courses and materials being generated by faculty who completed the abbreviated version of the training. This point will need to be studied more fully, and, as such, there are no plans to further shorten the training time.
2. The committee has created separate training resources for online instruction and web-enhanced instruction. There are fundamental differences in online and traditional pedagogy that are not covered in web-enhanced training. The ability to foster effective exchange in an online environment is not just a function of technical ability, and the different trainings are designed to address that fact.
3. "Canvas for Beginners" and the web-enhancing Blue Print module were created to help faculty become "web-enhanced" and able to use Canvas more effectively in their face-to-face classes.
4. Support sites, self-enrolling workshops, and dozens of instructional videos have been developed to provide faculty with access to training materials on their own time. In addition, one-on-one support is offered in the open lab.

While there have been great advances, there is still work left to do. It is recommended that the DEAC continue to work with department coordinators and other faculty to address the following:

1. Increase outreach to faculty to inform them of new training options. There's a belief that many faculty, particularly adjunct, are unaware of the new training and support that is available. There may be a need to establish a more clear understanding of expectations with regard to training.
2. Expand current training opportunities and support services. DEAC has made great strides in this regard, but the demand remains high.
3. There is still a need for more BASICS training. This is the result of a high demand for training, particularly among adjunct faculty, and that the Distance Education team has been stretched thin by being the de facto lead in the adoption of Canvas as the LMS for all classes, not just those on-line. There need to be flexible training options that fit within faculty schedules.
4. Explore the option of developing a prepared online or hybrid "Master Course" that other instructors may be trained to teach. Such a course could be ideal for the OEI course exchange.
5. There needs to be greater training on remediation of accessibility. While this is arguably an instructional obligation, the burden for educating everyone has fallen to the DE team. The campus acquired the Ally software, which helps identify bad files and provides instruction for remediation. However, faculty, classified, and administrators may not be aware of it, let alone know how to use it. This is an area where the DEAC needs additional guidance and support. It is also a place that an instructional designer could really support DE and the entire campus. Across the country, there are examples of students suing colleges for ADA violations. As more untrained users open their course sites, it become very precarious for the college. The committee sees the urgency in needing to address this issue.
6. The expanded use of Canvas in all classes has created a need for training specifically focused on face-to-face instruction. Some of this can be accomplished through FLEX Day activities, but there is also a need for a more comprehensive and ongoing training process/manual.

Distance Education Support and Funding

The DEAC and the DE team has done a tremendous job improving distance education on the campus, but they have been stretched to the limit in doing so. In 2016, the Academic Senate revised the job description, duties and responsibilities of the Distance Education Coordinator to focus more on pedagogy and less on design and system administration. The technical side was to be taken over by administration, which pledged to supply the necessary classified and expert support. Since that revision, the support that was agreed to has yet to be established, while the duties, responsibilities, and scope of work of the DEAC have increased dramatically. The IPRC strongly asks the college to make good on its promise of support. To begin the process, the DEAC is advised to create a list of needed support and resources to be presented to the administration through the regular budget processes.

Student Equity and Disaggregation

Again, this year, programs were provided with disaggregated student demographics for their programs. Previously it was noted that veterans, disabled students, students over age 50, and students not receiving financial aid tended to demonstrate the highest success rates (close to 80% or higher) across disciplines. Notably, students under the age of 24, Asian, Black, and Hispanic students appear to need additional mentoring and tutoring. To assist students, many programs identified strategies to address these gaps including more hands-on instruction, “flipping” more instruction, mentors, and scaffolding assignments by breaking larger assignments into smaller sections with more examples.

Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs)

In Fall 2017, the College adopted eLumen as its data management system for SLO assessments. As part of the regular Program Review cycle, departments review their CSLOs to determine assessment effectiveness and make modifications as appropriate. Faculty then identify how CSLOs link to their department’s PSLOs in order to evaluate program strengths and areas needing improvement.

The 2018-19 IPR cycle represents the first time that College Outcomes Assessment data (COA) was pre-populated into the IPRC form from eLumen by the Institutional Research and planning office. As a result, departments did not need to attach a separate report with CSLO data.

Department participation in outcomes assessment increased from 71% in 2014-15 to 100% for programs being evaluated within the 2018-19 cycle. The table below indicates each department that went through program review in Fall 2018 alongside summary information on courses assessed, students assessed, and SLO success rates since Fall 2017.

Area	Courses Assessed		Successful Students	
	# Offered	% Assessed	# Assessed	% Successful
Automotive Collision Repair	15	80.0%	362	95.9%
Automotive Technology	16	100.0%	890	89.7%
Court Reporting	40	100.0%	1,323	92.5%
Dental Assisting	12	100.0%	256	99.2%
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	8	100.0%	270	95.9%
Geography	10	100.0%	1,365	86.9%
Hotel, Restaurant & Culinary Arts	20	100.0%	1,398	86.9%
Management	6	83.3%	2,428	96.6%
Marketing	2	100.0%	242	96.7%
Mortuary Science (Baccalaureate)	6	100.0%	78	100.0%
Nursing	15	93.3%	1,710	97.0%
Psychiatric Technology	8	100.0%	711	97.9%
Radiologic Technology	16	100.0%	1,932	93.7%
TOTAL	174	97.1%	12,965	93.4%

Note. Percentages refer to the percentages of all enrolled students who met or exceeded the standard for a particular SLO all department level courses.

Once courses/programs have been properly mapped to the ISLOs, higher level PSLO data will be included alongside CSLO success rates. Disaggregated data will also be considered to support student equity.

Completed SLO Reporting Recommendations from previous years:

Many of the recommendations identified in previous annual reports have been addressed, including the following:

- Institutional Research and the SLO Data Coordinator are working to implement eLumen as the centralized repository of CSLO and PSLO data.
- We are manually correlating the courses assessed with the courses offered in Banner to ascertain that all courses are being assessed within specified timeframes.
- Need the ability to disaggregate subpopulations of students to support student equity.
- To address these remaining issues, the Accreditation Steering Committee decided to include a Quality Focused Essay (QFE) with the Cypress College Accreditation Self-Study that explains the current challenges and provides an action plan.

Remaining recommendations that are in progress of being addressed:

- Mapping of CSLOs to PSLOs to ISLOs is still in progress.
- With new data from eLumen, faculty are re-assessing the evaluative effectiveness of their CSLOs.
- There is still a challenge in making changes to the Course Outline of Record due to the inability of CurricUNET and eLumen to share information.
- Departments are reassessing their PSLO language, which will then need to be included in the College Catalog.

Instructional Program Related Commendations and Recommendations

All programs submitted program reviews that covered the required topics, and they provided detailed plans for achieving their stated actions and goals. The Instructional Program Review Committee's written evaluation of each program was provided to each presenter for any modifications or updates. The final self-studies and the committee evaluations are posted in the Department Planning and Instructional Program Review folder on the "J" Drive. The final versions of the committee evaluations for each program are also included as appendices to this report.

CTE Two-Year Summary Recommendations

Cypress College reviews each department every four years (long-form), but each CTE TOP-coded program also completes a two-year (short-form) review in the even numbered years. Institutional Research and Planning provided all CTE programs with labor market wage and employment data, student equity disaggregation, and certificate and degree updates to assist faculty in assessing their programs. The committee received 21 CTE Reports (see Appendix C) and there were several common themes including:

1. Labor market data shows a strong demand in all of the CTE programs. Many demonstrated great wage gains for their graduates, with 8 earning either a Silver or Bronze Star for wage gains from the CCCC. This not only benefits students, but with wage gains being part of the new Student-Focused Funding Formula, it will benefit the campus as a whole.
2. The programs are looking to clarify students' pathways to earning certificates and degrees. There is also considerable working taking place with stacking certificates and notifying students that they are eligible for certificates.
3. There is a great need for new faculty with specific expertise to help grow each of the programs.
4. There is a need for increased funding for all of the programs. Many of the programs have a high cost of instruction and are overly reliant on grants and one-time funding requests.
5. A key area in need of reform is the supply budgets for the programs. The supply budgets have not been revised for 15 years, but in the meantime, the cost for supplies and materials has increased substantially.
6. One means of addressing the high costs of these CTE programs is through increasing grant revenue. A campus grant writer would help in that area.

Global Commendations

1. Several of our CTE programs received recognition from the California Community College Chancellor's Office for their excellence in wage gains for their graduates. Two programs received a Silver Star for wage gains: Psychiatric Technology and Ultrasound. 5 other programs earned a Bronze Star: Auto Collision Repair, Automotive Technology, Dental Assisting, Hotel, Restaurant, and Culinary Arts, and Radiology. The Radiological Technology/Medical Diagnostic Department receives special recognition for having two different programs earn stars. Collectively, this recognition underscores how Cypress is a premier community college.
2. CTE counselors are working to inform students who may not be aware that they qualify for certificates.

This provides a benefit to our students on their way to a degree while also allowing the college to capture greater funding under the new Student Centered Funding Formula. Similarly, several programs are working to create stackable certificates students may earn on their way to completing an Associate's Degree or ADT. Again, this provides a benefit to both the students and the campus.

3. All of the programs under review have begun work on clarifying academic pathways for students across campus. This has taken many forms, but one area of note has been the expansion of Dual Enrollment opportunities offered by various programs.
4. The programs have all been keeping up with SLO work, and many have commented that eLumen has made the process much easier. The SLO Committee should also be commended for helping create a better campus culture regarding SLOs.

Global Recommendations

1. The scope of Instructional Program Review continues to evolve, and the committee strongly recommends that the link between instructional program review and the campus planning and budget process be strengthened. Beginning Fall 2019, the Instructional Program Review Chair will sit as a voting member of the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC). The chair will act as the voice of the IPRC and will be an active participant in the Faculty Prioritization process. While these changes are a good first step, the IPRC needs to be more fully involved in the prioritization process, perhaps by providing a committee ranking before the process moves on to PBC.
2. Technology exists that could help automate program review, facilitate better communication between faculty and students, improve SLO assessments with seamless integration into learning management systems, provide early alerts, increase enrollment/retention with online advertising/resources, and much more. It is unrealistic for instructors on temporary assignment to stay abreast of all of the advancements in educational technology and to understand the integration ramifications to other systems. It is essential that Cypress College work with the District to provide technological coordination for systems (like eLumen), to identify system improvements that could mitigate the amount of manual reconciliation of data, to provide students with access to their assignments and grades, and to optimize our educational technology resources to enhance institutional and student success.
3. Many of the programs under review expressed the need for help finding and writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer for the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.
4. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests. Too often, the One-Time Funding process is used to meet recurring program needs that should be part of the overall budgeted cost running the program.
5. The committee would like more clarification as to the priority of the budget needs listed by the programs in their reviews. There are many justifiable requests, but there is not funding for them all. In this case, what are the chief budget priorities? Beginning in Fall 2019, the IPRC will provide a ranking of the budget requests for the summaries and Annual Report. Having the programs provide insight into what they find to be their most important budget needs would greatly aid both the committee in its budget rankings and the IPRC Chair in advocating for program needs in campus budget discussions.
6. Several programs expressed a need for more released time to cover the non-classrooms duties they are increasingly being asked to perform.
7. A key area in need of reform is the supply budgets for the programs. The supply budgets for all programs needs to be revised. Over the past 15 years, the cost of materials and supplies has increased substantially while the supply budgets have remained the same.
8. There continues to be an issue with adjunct compensation for SLOs. Until there is language in the adjunct contract regarding the issue, the committee recommends that adjunct faculty continue to receive the stipend provided them last year for participating in the reporting of SLOs.
9. Several CTE programs believed the job market data they were being given is way off. In some instances, the average salaries in the data are less than half of those they know their graduates are receiving. Cleaning up this data may have budgeting consequences.

Budget Requests and Resource Allocations

1. Several programs have clear needs for new full-time faculty. Whether due to retirements or outside accreditation requirements, some programs will be placed under a strain. Some of these faculty hires are taking place in Spring 2019, but there are others that will need to be filled in the very near future. The IPRC will play a larger role in the prioritization of those faculty hires going forward. With the help of input from the programs, the committee will rank the faculty requests of the programs going through review.
2. To address the continuing need for adjunct faculty to participate in SLOs, the committee recommends

that adjunct faculty continue to receive the stipend provided them last year.

3. Many programs expressed a need for more comprehensive DE training for all faculty, but especially for their adjunct faculty. The committee strongly urges the creation of DE Training Program specific to Cypress College with a regular and consistent schedule of training. In the absence of such on-campus training, the committee strongly believes the college should pay the fee for the on-line At One training for both full-time and part-time faculty.
4. Many programs have other needs for materials and upgrades that are all justified. There needs to be a more precise prioritization of these requests in the likely event there is not enough money to fund everything.
5. The committee supports the various programs requesting an increase in reassigned time. A common complaint from programs was that the work they were being asked to do outside of the classroom in support of their programs has increased without a corresponding increase in the reassigned time received as compensation.

Looking Forward

The programs up for the full review in 2019 are identified in the attachment. In November 2019, the I P R C will begin the face-to-face meetings with those programs. A focus of the committee will be working further to tie the program review process to the larger campus planning and budgeting processes. In collaboration with the programs, the committee will create a ranking of the resource needs of the instructional programs across campus in an effort to better inform campus planning and budget discussions and decisions.

In the Fall of 2019, the committee will revise the bylaws and handbook for the committee to reflect the changes made to the review process. In particular, the committee will need to establish more specific criteria for each new Compliance Status, as well as the voting threshold needed to assign a program their Compliance Status.

It will be necessary to update the Instructional Program Review long form to reflect the need to assess PLO's as well listing improvements made as a result of the SLO process.

It will also be necessary for the committee to create a separate Instructional Program Review Form for the Mortuary Science Baccalaureate degree. This is tied to our accreditation report and will be a particularly point of emphasis for the committee.

In the first meetings of Fall 2019, the committee will finish creating a review process and form for the following unique instructional programs: Puente, Legacy, Honors/Service Learning, Teacher Preparation, STEM, Distance Education, and Dual Enrollment. All of these programs will undergo review in Spring 2020, after which, they will be placed on specific 3-year review cycles.

The committee also looks forward to the IPRC Chair joining a larger "Committee of Chairs" to help coordinate the work of the various committees on campus.

Appendix A: Timeline for the 2018-2019 Program Review Cycle

- ✓ May 2019: Email the deans with the next programs required to submit reports by October 15.
- ✓ Summer 2019: IR sends the prepopulated self-study forms and SLO summary reports to the deans by Opening Day in August.
- ✓ August 2019: Send deadline reminder email to all deans.
- ✓ September 2019: Committee plans to meet twice during the month.
- ✓ October 10, 2019: Faculty submit their self-studies to their deans for comments and signature.
- ✓ October 25, 2019: Faculty submit their final self-study reports to the program review chair.
- ✓ November 2019: Presentations every Monday from 3-5 (four 15 minute presentations per week).
- ✓ December 2019: Program Review Summaries will be sent to all of the programs under review.
- ✓ February 2020: Committee meets to review results and feedback from summaries.
- ✓ February 2020: Committee meets to review Unique Programs (date to be determined).
- ✓ March 2020: Prepare final report for submission to the Academic Senate and VPI. Note: If the Program Review Chair's position is due to be replaced, forward a copy of the job description (found in the Program Review Handbook on the website) to the current Academic President; ask that a call for applicants be put out. Review the applicants with the committee and collaborate with the Academic Senate president to select a new chair.
- ✓ April 2020: Present the annual report to the Academic Senate, PBC, and PAC. Replace termed out committee members who have served for three-years. Add the annual report to the Program Review website and post the self-studies on the "J-drive."

Appendix B: Rotation Schedule (New 4-Year Cycle Effective Fall 2016)

CYCLE #1: Fall 2016, 2020, 2024 (12 programs)

Accounting
Administration of Justice (New to PR)
Air Conditioning & Refrigeration
Aviation & Travel Careers
CIS
Dental Hygiene
Health Information Technology
Human Services
Journalism
Media Arts Design
Mortuary Science
Photography
Theater Arts

CYCLE #2: Fall 2017, 2021, 2025 (11 programs)

Anthropology
Biology
ESL
English
English/Reading
Ethnic Studies
Foreign Language
History
Library (New to PR)
Music
Philosophy & Religious Studies
Physical Science

CYCLE #3: Fall 2018, 2022, 2026 (12 programs)

Auto Collision Repair
Auto Technology
Court Reporting
Culinary Arts
Dental Assisting
Geography/GIS
Management/Marketing
Mortuary Science Baccalaureate Degree (NEW Program)
Nursing
Psychiatric Technology
Radiologic Technology/Medical
Diagnostics

CYCLE #4: Fall 2019, 2023, 2027 (11 programs)

Art
Chemistry
Communication Studies
Counseling
Dance
Economics
Mathematics
Political Science
Kinesiology
Psychology
Sociology

Appendix C: Programs Presenting CTE Two-Year Reports

The following CTE programs presented Two-Year Reports:

- Accounting
- Administration of Justice (New to PR)
- Air Conditioning & Refrigeration
- Aviation & Travel Careers
- Computer Information Systems
- Court Reporting
- Dental Assisting
- Dental Hygiene
- Geography/GIS
- Health Information Technology
- Hotel, Restaurant, and Culinary Arts
- Human Services
- Management/Marketing
- Media Arts Design
- Mortuary Science
- Mortuary Science Baccalaureate Degree (NEW Program)
- Nursing
- Photography
- Psychiatric Technology
- Radiologic Technology
- Theater Arts

Appendix D: Instructional Program Review Summaries

In response to each department's self-study and face-to-face dialogue with the committee, a draft summary evaluation, including commendations and recommendations, was provided to the program representative. Participants reviewed the feedback with an invitation to make changes if needed. The final summaries are included in the following pages and will be posted on the Program Review website:

CYCLE #3: Fall 2018 (11 programs)

Auto Collision Repair

Auto Technology

Court Reporting

Hotel, Restaurant, and Culinary Arts

Dental Assisting

Geography/GIS

Marketing and Management

Mortuary Science Baccalaureate Degree (New Program)

Nursing

Psychiatric Technology

Radiologic Technology/Medical Diagnostics



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Auto Collision Repair

Presenter: Larry Ramos

Date: November 19, 2018

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

 X **In Compliance** – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

 Compliance – Needs Improvement – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

Auto Collision Repair is to be commended for its overall exceptional program.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes X No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 96.4% Spring 2018: 94.6%

Comments: Full-time faculty will work with adjunct faculty to achieve 100%.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ____ No ____ Other ___X___

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the Auto Collision Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. Auto Collision earned a Bronze Star for wage gains from the CCCCCO.
2. Auto Collision students are highly sought after by employers looking for the various certifications offered by the program.
3. CTE counselors are working with students who qualify for certificates that aren't aware they are eligible. The program is also looking at stacking certificates for pathway progression.
4. The program is actively seeking students for dual enrollment including faculty and counselor outreach events.

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the Auto Collision Program in the work of its action plan:

1. The program should apply for Strong Workforce funding and other grants to improve the ventilation, lighting, and flooring in the work area.
2. In the process of updating your core courses to transfer level to coincide with Rio Hondo's automotive baccalaureate, explore the possibility of developing an AST.
3. The committee would like more clarification as to the priority of the budget needs listed in the review. There are many justifiable requests, but in the absence of funding them all, what are the chief budget priorities?
4. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests.
5. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The Instructional Program Review Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

1. There is a need to improve the facilities of the program. The ventilation, lighting, and flooring in the work area all need to be updated. There may be safety issues here and the committee strongly supports their receiving funding to address these issues.
2. The program has many other needs for materials and upgrades that are all justified. There needs to be a more precise prioritization of these requests in the likely event there's not enough money to fund everything.



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Automotive Technology

Presenter: Marty Orozco

Date: November 19, 2018

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

 X **In Compliance** – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

 Compliance – Needs Improvement – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

Automotive Technology is a premier CTE program in the state and nation.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes X No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 100% Spring 2018: 85%

Comments: Courses listed are on a strategic rotation and not offered every semester.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ____ No ____ Other _____

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the Automotive Technology Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The Automotive Technology Program received a Bronze Star for wage gains from the CCCCCO, was rated 4th in the nation by Schools.com, and is a nationally recognized participant in the Toyota T-Ten Program.
2. The program has established multiple partnerships with industry leaders such as TESLA, Subaru, Toyota, and others that have strongly supported the effectiveness of the program. Students have been able to obtain scholarships and donations and have made connections with the industry and community resulting in students gaining employment upon completion of the program.
3. The associations with Toyota and Subaru have led to the program being NATEF certified.
4. The program has worked to clarify pathways for student by supporting the creation of CTE English. The program is also working to expand its dual enrollment offerings and has been able to offer those students uniforms tools for competitions.
5. Automotive Technology has improved the student success rate over the past couple of years.

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the Automotive Technology Program in the work of its action plan:

1. Pursue additional supports from the school so that programs, like Toyota, have an equitable relationship centered around their funding which assists the program in funding for professional development, modernized equipment, and other budget/resource needs.
2. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests.
3. The program needs to explore using Strong Workforce funding for professional development, conferences, and accreditation fees.
4. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.
5. The committee would like more clarification as to the priority of the budget needs listed in the review. There are many justifiable requests, but in the absence of funding them all, what are the chief budget priorities?
6. The program should continue exploring why AT110, AT105, AT106 and AT107 have a lower success rate than their other courses.
7. Some Formatting issues: Revise past action plans (#15) to include the Goals that went with the associated objectives. Insert goal on p. 15

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPR Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

1. Automotive Technology Program is growing and additional space is required to manage the effectiveness of the work currently being done, let alone accommodate further growth.

They currently have 8 lifts, but they could actually use 30. The program is being held back from advancing or introducing new technologies as a result. Additional lab space that will accommodate not current vehicle needs, but also the types of needs for future vehicles (ie hydrogen, electric).

2. The program also has great need for additional faculty. The program currently has 2 T-Ten faculty, and it could add two instructors in that area alone to meet current and future demand.
3. The program has many other needs for materials and upgrades that are all justified. Every car is a computer today, and the program needs the equipment to keep up with industry standards. There needs to be a more precise prioritization of these requests in the likely event there's not enough money to fund everything.



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Court Reporting

Presenter: Carolee Freer

Date: November 26, 2019

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

In Compliance – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

Compliance – Needs Improvement – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

The Court Reporting Program submitted a thorough review; however, the committee has some concerns it would like the program to address. In particular, the committee would like greater clarification regarding Recommendations #1 through #5 below.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 100% Spring 2018: 97%

Comments:**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ____ No ____ Other _____

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the Court Recording Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. Court Reporting is one of only four programs locally offering this course of study.
2. The program has a high pass rate on California Certified Reporters examination
3. Students who complete certificates are immediately placed into the field with salaries starting at \$90,000/year.
4. The program implemented strategies to improve both on campus and online/hybrid courses.

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the Court Reporting Program in the work of its action plan:

1. The program is encouraged to continue marketing the program to increase the number of students enrolled. These efforts should highlight the success rate of the program and the starting annual salary.
2. The committee suggests meeting with the Division Dean to discuss the best possible ways to promote the program and leverage resources. Strong Workforce funding may be available to help with these marketing efforts.
3. The committee would like program to further explain its need for a full-time faculty member, particularly its importance for the program. The committee also suggests the program collaborate with other programs/departments within their division to improve the ranking of their request in the Faculty Prioritization process.
4. The committee suggests revising curriculum to allow for speed-building courses to be done through non-credit.
5. During the oral presentation, it was stated that the technology of Court Reporting is changing. The committee would like clarification as to how the program plans to meet those changes. It was unclear from the presentation.
6. The committee suggests the program add a new goal as to how it will address the disproportionate impact to Hispanic students and those aged 20+.
7. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests.
8. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The Instructional Program Review Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

1. The committee strongly supports the program receiving funding to continue its marketing efforts.



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Dental Assisting

Presenter: Elizabeth Pacheco

Date: November 19, 2018

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

 X **In Compliance** – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

 Compliance – Needs Improvement – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

Dental Assisting is to be commended for its exceptional program.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes X No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 100% Spring 2018: 100%

Comments:

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ____ No ____ Other _____

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the Dental Assisting Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The Dental Assisting Program received a Bronze Star for wage gains from the CCCCCO.
2. The program is actively working towards bringing more men into the profession through advertisements, the incorporation of technology, and the having more male centered presentations.
3. Dental Assisting is a strong program with high student retention and success rates.
4. The Occupational Certificate will aid student pathways and add to campus funds.

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the Dental Assisting Program in the work of its action plan:

1. The program has several budget/resource needs. The committee is looking for more guidance from the program as to how these needs should be prioritized.
2. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests. The Sterilization Area needs to be addressed at a cost of \$200,000. This expense can be worked into the budget as an on-going cost.
3. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.
4. Is there a reason for not having a hybrid offering for students?
5. Some Formatting issues: update p. 15 with additional requests and list additional personal costs to #18

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The Instructional Program Review Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

1. Due to pending retirements, the program will need F/T faculty to meet requirements of accreditation.
2. The Sterilization Area needs to be updated or it risks not passing certification.
3. The program has provided a strong case for increasing its supply budget from \$1600 to \$3000. Students are not allowed to pay for these essential items. To meet the need, the committee recommends revisiting the distribution of the old breakdown of lottery and vending machine funds
4. The program has also made a compelling case to increase the reassigned time for program coordinator from 4 units to 7 units.
5. The program has many other needs for materials and upgrades that are all justified. There needs to be a more precise prioritization of these requests in the likely event there's not enough money to fund everything.
6. The program is also requesting additional Administration faculty – from 10 month to 11 month.



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Geography/GIS – Geographic Information Systems

Presenter: Armando Mendoza

Date: November 26, 2018

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

 X **In Compliance** – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

 Compliance – Needs Improvement – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

Geography/GIS is to be commended for its exceptional program.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes X No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 100% Spring 2018: 100%

Comments:

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ____ No ____ Other _____

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the Geography/GIS Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The program increased the number of degrees and certificates it offers. This has been in large part the result of hiring Eric Bladh, a new faculty member who has enhanced the Geographic Information Services program through classes focusing on the use of drone technology.
2. The program has done a good job promoting geography on and off campus. The drone technology has been an effective marketing tool during on-campus events.
3. The program has a completion rate above the target of 72.1% set forth by ACCJC.
4. The program has helped clarify student pathways by implementing SI is in Geography courses to further assist basic skills student needs.

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the Geography/GIS Program in the work of its action plan:

1. The program should request lower seat count for the GIS courses.
2. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests.
3. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.
4. Some Formatting issues: Add two program goals, one to market and grow the program and another to request more release time.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The Instructional Program Review Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

4. The program expressed a need for more comprehensive DE training for all faculty, but especially the adjunct. The committee strongly urges the creation of DE Training Program specific to Cypress College. While that program is being created, the committee strongly believes the college should pay the fee for the on-line At One training.
5. The committee supports the program's request for GIS software and a digital media presentation projector.
6. The program expressed a need for more comprehensive DE training for all faculty, but especially the adjunct. The committee strongly urges the creation of DE Training Program specific to Cypress College. While that program is being created, the committee strongly believes the college should pay the fee for the on-line At One training.



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Hotel, Restaurant, & Culinary Arts (HRC)

Presenter: Stephanie Rosati

Date: 11/5/18

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

 X **In Compliance** – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

 Compliance – Needs Improvement – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

HRC is a premier program for the college. The committee supports the program returning to the Cypress campus.

Program CSLOs:

Was the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes X No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 100% Spring 2018: 100%

Comments:

HRC 120 C has been restructured to a 2 unit course, with both hybrid and online formats, in order to facilitate success and retention. HRC 136 C was identified as having lower success

rates in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018, which prompted a switch to a hybrid format in order to provide greater flexibility for students and improve success and retention rates.

Program PSLOs:

Was the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ____ No ____ Other ___X___

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the HRC Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The HRC program was awarded a Bronze Star by the CCCCO and was ranked #2 in the nation by Schools.com for Best Colleges for Culinary Arts Degree Program for 2018.
2. The program continues to be a campus leader in certificates and degrees: 205 awarded in 2017-2018; 122 awarded in 2016-2017; 161 awarded in 2015-2016.
3. Over a five-year period, HRC has increased section offerings by 45% and increased enrollment by 23%. In addition, student success rates are consistently higher than the campus average (in the 80% percentile) owing to focused efforts in faculty advising, early intervention, referrals to campus support services, and onsite counseling.
4. The program is finalizing work on Associate in Science degrees for transfer in Nutrition and Dietetics and in Hospitality Management.
5. HRC faculty are also working to create two dual enrollment courses with local high schools.
6. Program faculty have 100% participation on campus and/or district level committees.

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the HRC Program in the work of its action plan:

1. HRC 231 C and 232 C success rates are significantly lower than other courses possibly because of a switch to a later time offering. Consider moving the classes to earlier in the day as student fatigue might be having a negative impact.
2. Complete a budget analysis for relocating the program back to the Cypress College Campus. The program has made a compelling case that returning to Cypress would be beneficial to their students. A chief concern of the committee is the unfair burden HRC students face in being forced to travel back and forth between campuses to complete their GE coursework. To help clarify the pathway for students, it may be worthwhile to relocate the program.
3. The program could better explain how it will educate faculty on resources and student success strategies relevant for target populations as is mentioned on page 9 of their Department Planning and Program review Form.
4. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests.
5. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The Instructional Program Review Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited

to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

1. The committee supports the program's request for an additional full-time faculty member to support increasing degree and certificate offerings.

2. The program needs an Instructional Aide for the HRC lab in order to facilitate student support and success.

3. The program will need funding to maintain aging facilities and equipment in order to support quality instruction. A comprehensive list of items needing to be addressed is being compiled.

4. The committee supports the relocating the HRC Program back to the Cypress College campus. Current space at the Anaheim campus will soon be at capacity, which will limit future growth. In addition, student and faculty resources are limited at the Anaheim campus. This is a long-term plan with the actual cost still to be determined.



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Management & Marketing

Presenter: Kathleen Troy

Date: November 5, 2018

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

 X **In Compliance** – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

 Compliance – Needs Improvement – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

Management and Marketing is to be commended for its exceptional program.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes X No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 100% Spring 2018: 100%

Comments:

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the Management and Marketing Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. In an effort to better promote student pathways, the program is beginning to revise its certificate programs. They currently have a large number of degrees, but not certificates. Their advisory committee has stated that a 4-year degree is demanded in this profession, but the need for certificates is there.
2. The program is actively involved in dual enrollment and is looking to expand its offerings and involve students as early as freshman year of high school.
3. Both in-class and online/hybrid instruction courses have high success and retention rates

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the Management and Marketing Program in the work of its action plan:

1. In the process of revising their certificate program, the committee strongly urges the committee to create stackable certificates that may be earned on the path to a degree.
2. The program has strong numbers in hybrid/online instruction and may want to consider adding more course offerings with that format of instruction.
3. The committee would like greater clarification and detail as to the types of technology the department has incorporated into its courses.
4. With the money being allocated for SWP marketing, would it be plausible to use students to help with marketing and outreach?
5. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests.
6. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.
7. Some Formatting issues: Add request for F/T faculty on page 19, and consider creating a goal of increasing the number of marketing certificates.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The Instructional Program Review Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

1. The committee agrees that the program has provided detail to support their need for additional full-time faculty.
2. The program expressed a need for more comprehensive DE training for all faculty, but especially the adjunct. The committee strongly urges the creation of DE Training Program specific to Cypress College. While that program is being created, the committee strongly believes the college should pay the fee for the on-line At One training.
3. The committee supports the program's request to fund the Entrepreneurship Program and "Shark Tank" event.



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Health Science – Mortuary Science

Presenter: Jolena Grande

Date: December 3, 2018

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

 In Compliance – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

 X **Compliance – Needs Improvement** – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

Mortuary Science has put in an incredible amount of hard work in creating the Baccalaureate Program. There's concern support for the program at many levels has not met expectations. In particular, the committee is interested in having the program address Recommendations #1 and #2 below.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes X No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 100% Spring 2018: 100%

Comments: SLO's have been included but due to a small sample size, certain data are not available. Significant and more robust data will become available as more students enroll and complete the program.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ____ No ____ Other ____

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the Mortuary Science Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. This past spring, the program granted the first 4 Baccalaureate Degrees in the history of Cypress College.
2. The program is designed for working practitioners in the field with far more online and hybrid instruction than on-campus instruction to meet their students' work schedules.
3. The program now includes professional certification and state licensure as cemetery and crematory managers.
4. The success rates of the program are at or above the Division and college average.

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the Mortuary Science Program in the work of its action plan:

1. The committee seeks greater clarification as to whether it should consider the Mortuary Science program as a whole when conducting its review. There is also concern that issues with the BA program may inadvertently have a negative impact on the AA program in Mortuary Science. As such, it may be best to consider having a separate program review form and process for the BA program.
2. The need for a new instructor dedicated to the BA program seems to stem from the desire of current faculty to focus more on the AA program. The committee would like more clarification on the impact of this dilemma. Is there enough current support in Mortuary Science for both a BA and AA program?
3. The program is encouraged to increase assistance in helping students enroll themselves in coursework, conduct business activities online, and quickly obtain answers to their suggestions and/or concerns.
4. The program should pursue Strong Workforce funding to help restructure/revise the Baccalaureate Program.
5. Are there marketing or outreach remedies that may help address what seems to be low enrollment and a low WSCH of 103.5? Are there new types of collaboration with industry partners and alumni that might be employed to strengthen the program?
6. The committee suggests changing the IGETC entrance requirement into an exit requirement. With other programs on the campus specializing in helping students meet the IGETC requirements, the current policy may be unnecessarily restrictive and harming the program overall.
7. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests.
8. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The Instructional Program Review Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

1. The program has a demonstrated need for additional faculty. There was an initial state, district, and campus commitment to support Mortuary Science in the creation of the BA program, but there is concern that commitment is not being met. The lack of a dedicated instructor for the BA program could place the program in jeopardy. New faculty would also support dual enrollment opportunities.
2. The committee supports the program's request for a full-time Admin II.
3. The need for a Marketing/Outreach Coordinator is well documented. This would help advertising and outreach to increase enrollment.



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Nursing

Presenter: Sally McNay and Michael Puttman

Date: November 5, 2018

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

 X **In Compliance** – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

 Compliance – Needs Improvement – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

The Nursing Program is exceptional and a key part of making Cypress College a premier community college.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes X No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 96.1% Spring 2018: 97.6%

Comments: Lead faculty for two courses retired before completing the SLO assessments.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ___ No ___ Other _____

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the Nursing Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The Nursing Program has awarded over 400 AS degrees over the past 5 years.
2. Utilization of grant funding to provide mentoring and math supports to students, A Registered Nurse is designated for mentoring and tutoring students with test-taking, study, and communications challenges
3. Curriculum changes have been implemented which have improved student success and critical thinking. Students report that curriculum is easier to follow, objectives are defined more clearly, and is more consistent
4. The program consistently reaches a 100%+ fill rate while maintaining success rates above district and college averages, and exhibiting no significant achievement gaps.

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the Nursing Program in the work of its action plan:

1. The program should make requests at the first of the year to re-bid Strong Workforce for funding of updated equipment, simulators, service agreements, and other needs.
2. The program should make a request to renovate the old SEM building for the purposes of creating new classrooms and computer labs for the nursing program.
3. The program should explore different methods to better track students, including the use of technology. Currently, students are tracked by a paper/pencil method.
4. Additional mentoring is needed for students to address the stresses/rigors of the program.
5. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests.
6. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.
7. Some Formatting issues: Clarify Goal #4 – clarify you are referring to re-entry students

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The Instructional Program Review Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

1. The program has a demonstrated need for new full-time faculty to assist in the clinical setting. There have been 6 full-time faculty retirements since 2014, 3 of them, including 1 Director, in the last year alone. Nursing is struggling with not being able to offer enough clinical opportunities for students and with the lengthy paperwork involved.
2. The program needs clerical support to address a “lack of administrative support” cited in accrediting reports.



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Psychiatric Technology

Presenter: Jaime Ramos

Date: November 26, 2018

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

 X **In Compliance** – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

 Compliance – Needs Improvement – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

Psychiatric Technology presented a thorough review, and the program should be commended for its exceptional work. The committee notes that the program stated that the use of Canvas has been positive for both students and faculty.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes X No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 57% Spring 2018: 100%

Comments:

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ____ No ____ Other _____

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the Psychiatric Technology Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. Psychiatric Technology earned a Silver Star for wage gains from the CCCCCO. Graduates have seen a 203% increase in earnings. Many new graduates are also trained for supervisory positions soon after employment.
2. The program has an amazing 100% employment rate for graduates. Local employers contact the program to recruit new graduates who are very marketable upon completion of program.
3. The program reached 100% enrollment for the past 3 semesters.
4. The program has an over 90% completion rate contributing to the closure of the achievement gap. They have a cohort of 24 students, and faculty devote a lot of time with students in their clinical setting to catch any issues early on and offer supports as appropriate.
5. The program has been able to expand and increase marketing efforts, largely due to the hiring of Cassandra Rodriguez. The Psych. Tech. Club has been started and will assist in promotion of the program.

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the Psychiatric Technology Program in the work of its action plan:

1. Apply for Strong Workforce to funding to assist with accreditation/certification fees
2. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests.
3. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The Instructional Program Review Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

1. The committee supports the program's request for new full-time faculty positions. Due to retirements, full-time faculty has decreased from 5 to 2.
2. The committee supports accreditation/certification fees being paid by Strong Workforce funds when possible.



Instructional Program Review Committee

Evaluation

Program: Radiologic Technology/Diagnostic Medical

Presenter: Lynn Mitts

Date: November 19, 2018

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee is to help faculty accentuate the most positive aspects of their programs, meet instructional requirements, communicate challenges, share useful practices, and substantiate the need for resources to continue supporting student success.

Program Compliance Status:

The Program Compliance Status is based on a thorough review of the Department Planning and Program Review form submitted by the program. The highlights of the report are included in this summary. A program has the right to appeal their status to the IPR Committee.

 X **In Compliance** – The program review adequately covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals. Having met all of the requirements of Instructional Program Review, the program may apply for all available funding. (See comments below.)

 Compliance – Needs Improvement – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to comply with the requirements of Instructional Program Review and will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may apply for early review at any time before the next review cycle to update their compliance status. If the program fails to improve its compliance status in the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See comments below.)

General Comments:

Radiologic Technology/Diagnostic Medical provided a thorough review and should be commended for its fine work. The DMS program will be extended from 16 to 21 months and will require an AA degree beginning Fall 2019.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes X No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2017: 100% Spring 2018: 100%

Comments:

The program enters SLO data via eLumen and is quite satisfied with the process.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ____ No ____ Other _____

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through Program Review in Fall 2018.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the Radiologic Technology/Diagnostic Medical Program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The Department had two programs receive awards from the CCCCCO. Ultrasound received a Silver Star and Radiology received a Bronze Star.
2. Employment rate of 100% in 2017. There is demand for the program.
3. Increase WSCH/FTEF from 1.5 to 2.5 times
4. Student success after graduation is high Success after graduation is high according to employer surveys, benchmarks for National Exam pass rates, retention rates, graduate satisfaction, employment rates, etc.
5. Once pass the RADT 142 and 146 (pre-reqs) the numbers for the success are high and retention is very strong.
6. Students passing national certification exams on 1st attempt (RADT 100%; DMS 100%)

Recommendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee makes the following recommendations to aid the Radiologic Technology/Diagnostic Medical Program in the work of its action plan:

1. Will need to replace soon to be retired F/T Faculty member in near future (update annual cost to reflect true salaries which is more than \$70000)
2. Please include small comment as to whether or not past goals were met with elaboration
3. The program should continue to find solutions for students withdrawing from RADT 142 and 146. These classes have lower success rates than other courses in the program due to the competitive nature of the program. If students are not earning "A"s in these courses, they withdraw to protect their GPAs.
4. All programs are encouraged to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining and updating equipment, and addressing recurring budgetary needs normally met through One-Time Funding requests.
5. The department, like many others, needs help writing grants. Faculty spend large amounts of time searching for grants and completing their applications. Having a grant writer on the campus would help ease this burden and allow faculty to focus on instruction.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The Instructional Program Review Committee supports the program in the resource and budget needs identified below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request.

1. The committee supports the program's request for a new full-time faculty member. The department ratio is low and losing an instructor or Program Director may put the program in jeopardy.
2. The program has made a strong case for reinstatement of the Perkins funds.
3. The 2nd radiology room will need to be replaced, as Phillips will not support it past Dec 2019.