

CYPRESS COLLEGE

**Instructional Program Review
2019–2020 Annual Report**



Revision Date: April 2020
Prepared on behalf of the Instructional Program Review
Committee by
Bryan Seiling, Nicole Ledesma, and David Halahmy

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
COVID-19 Disruption.....	3
Purpose of Program Review.....	3
Process Overview	4
Mission Statement	4
Program Review Handbook, Forms, & Evidence Location.....	4
A General Note about Evidence.....	5
Program Review Committee Representatives and Terms	5
Meetings with Program Representatives.....	6
Overview of Findings.....	6
<i>Program Completion: Certificates and Degrees</i>	6
<i>Distance Education</i>	6
<i>Online v. Web-Enhanced</i>	7
<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>	9
<i>Remaining recommendations that are in progress of being addressed</i>	9
Specialized Instructional Program Reviews	9
<i>Specialized Instructional Program Related Commendations</i>	9
<i>Specialized Instructional Program Related Recommendations</i>	10
<i>Specialized Instructional Program Related Budget/Resource Needs</i>	10
Program Related Commendations and Recommendations.....	10
IPRC Resolution in Support of the THEATER.....	10
Global Commendations	11
Global Recommendations.....	11
<i>On-Going Recommendations</i>	11
<i>New Recommendations</i>	11
Budget and Resource Allocations.....	12
<i>On-Going Needs</i>	12
<i>Newly Identified Needs</i>	12
Looking Forward	13
Appendix A: Timeline for the 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Cycle.....	14
Appendix B: Rotation Schedule (New 4-Year Cycle Effective Fall 2016).....	15
Appendix C: Specialized Instructional Programs Presenting Reviews	16
Appendix D: Specialized Instructional Program Review Form (Blank)	17
Appendix E: IPRC Resolution in Support of the THEATER	23
Appendix F: Instructional Program Review Committee Summaries.....	25
Appendix G: Specialized Instructional Program Review Summaries	57

Introduction

In 2016 Cypress College moved 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 fourth year of the new four-year cycle. Each department under review submitted a Departmental Planning and Program Review Self-Study. For reference, the schedule for the new four-year cycle is included in the appendices along with a list of CTE TOP-Coded programs.

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 department/program. For the past several years, there have been discussions as to how to better tie our instructional program review efforts to our larger College budgeting processes. 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.

Continuing the process started last year, the IPRC provided Summaries to the programs/departments under review assigning each a Compliance Status to be used in the College budgeting processes. The Summaries will be used by the Planning and Budget Committee to help inform the campus processes for One-Time Funding, Faculty Prioritization, and other budget and resource requests. This process will be explained in more detail later in the report.

This year the committee began reviewing Specialized Instructional Programs. These are programs that combine tailored instruction, counseling, and student services to support specific student groups. Historically, these programs have not had a “home” or institutionalized process for regular review, and the IPRC was determined to be the logical and appropriate place to conduct them. In addition, it is hoped that the IPRC’s review of the hybrid approach of these programs may inform the larger Guided Pathways efforts across campus. In order to undertake an effective review, the IPRC created a new Specialized Instructional Review Form and Summaries. The process and forms are detailed later in the report and in the Appendix.

Covid-19 Disruption

In response to the Covid-19 pandemic, the campus was forced to close and transition all face-to-face classes to remote modes of instruction. At the time of writing this report, the campus is closed and the work of the IPRC is being done remotely. It is clear that some of the Recommendations and Budget/Resource Requests addressed in this report now will have a heightened need, and it is expected that the impact of the current crisis will be reflected in the Program Review Cycle for years to come. Through all of the turmoil, the departments and programs across campus have been focused on meeting the needs of their students and helping them adjust to remote instruction while maintaining the academic rigor of their courses. All of the departments and programs must be congratulated and recognized for putting in the great effort in meeting this Herculean task.

Purpose of Program Review

The Department Planning and Instructional 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 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 an Instructional Program Review Summary to each program highlighting the main points of the program review and discussion. The results of all of the summary reports and conversations are summarized in IPRC Annual Report. That report is distributed to the entire campus, the North Orange County Community College District, and the Board of Trustees. Copies of the IPRC's Annual Reports can be found on the "J-drive" and on the Program Review webpage on the College website.

Beginning in Spring 2019, a Compliance Status was added to the Instructional Program Review Summaries. The status reflected the degree of compliance with the expectations of Instructional Program Review and was tied to a department or program's ability to apply for and access regular sources of College funding. The main purpose of the revision was to comply with an Accreditation recommendation to demonstrate a more direct tie between the review of our instructional programs and the larger College planning and budget processes.

Throughout 2019-20, the IPRC specifically focused on tying the Instructional Program Review Form and IPRC Summaries to the campus One-Time Funding process. The goal was to ensure that the review process captured the necessary/desired data needed to better address the funding requests while allowing departments and programs to expand on how that data supports their requests. To this end, the forms used in the review process are being revised to better collect data to be used to inform campus planning and budget decisions. These revisions will be completed by the end of the Spring 2020 semester, so they may be used by the departments and programs underdoing review in Fall 2020. Similar work remains to more concretely tie Instructional Program Review to faculty prioritization and other planning and budget decisions. This will be a focus of the committee's work in the coming year.

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 2020 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 Instructional 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	Peter Molnar (1 st : 2019-2022)	pmolnar@cypresscollege.edu
CTE	Stepahnie Rosati (3 rd : 2017-2020)	srosati@cypresscollege.edu
Counseling	Ernesto Heredia (2 nd : 2018-2021)	eheredia@cypresscollege.edu
Fine Arts	Maha Afra (2 nd : 2018-2021)	mafra@cypresscollege.edu
Health Science	Nancy Corrales (3 rd : 2017-2020)	ncorales@cypresscollege.edu
Language Arts	Sarah Jones (1 st : 2019-2022)	sjones@cypresscollege.edu
Library	Joyce Peacock (1 st : 2019-2022)	jpeacock@cypresscollege.edu
Kinesiology	Margaret Mohr (3 rd : 2017-2020)	mmohr@cypresscollege.edu
SEM	Sujata Chiplunkar (1 st : 2019-2022)	schiplunkar@cypresscollege.edu
Social Science	David Halahmy (3 rd : 2017-2020)	dhalahmy@cypresscollege.edu
Administrative		
Dean	Eldon Young	eyoung@cypresscollege.edu
IRP	Eileen Haddad	ehaddad@cypresscollege.edu
IRP	Kristina Oganessian	koganessian@cypresscollege.edu
Chair	Bryan Seiling	bseiling@cypresscollege.edu
Co-Chair	David Halahmy	dhalahmy@cypresscollege.edu
Student Services Liaison	Celeste Phelps	cphelps@cypresscollege.edu
Visiting Members		
Accreditation Faculty Chair	Liana Koeppel	lkoepfel@cypresscollege.edu
SLO Coordinator	Nicole Ledesma	nledesma@cypresscollege.edu

The committee agreed to add the SLO Coordinator and Accreditation Faculty Chair as voting members of the committee for the year. The two were previously resource members that did not have a vote. The committee, after consultation with the Academic Senate, will discuss making this change permanent and will amend the Bylaws and other documents as needed. In addition, the committee added a liaison from the Student Services Program Review Committee as a resource member. This is designed to aid in our Guided Pathways efforts and help with reviews of Specialized Instructional Programs. There has also been discussion about having a member of the Instructional Program Review Committee sit as a liaison on the Student Services Program Review Committee.

The committee will also be selecting a new Co-Chair to handle the responsibilities outlined in the IPRC Chair job description. The position is being recruited through the Academic Senate and will be in place by the end of Spring 2020. The committee will also need to prepare for a transition to a new Chair over the course of the

coming year.

Meetings with Instructional Program Representatives

After reviewing the written program reviews, the committee met face-to-face with the following program representatives in Fall 2019. All meetings were all held on Mondays in CCCPLX, room 405:

November 4

Communication Studies
Counseling
Economics

Liana Koeppel
Kelly Carter
Parwinder Sindhu

November 18

Chemistry
Dance
Math
Psychology

Torri Draganov
Maha Afra
Cindy Shrout and David Nusbaum
Brandy Young and Randy Martinez

November 25

Art
Kinesiology
Political Science
Sociology

Molly Schulp
Margaret Mohr
Gloria Badal
Regina Rhymes

Overview of Findings

As per practice, Institutional Research and Planning provided faculty with prepopulated data to help them evaluate their programs and improve student learning. This is the third year the data included distance education success rates, transfer data, labor market wage and employment data, and student equity information in the form of disaggregated student achievement data. The added statistics have allowed departments/programs to more meaningfully analyze where they are successful and where they need improvement. Previous concerns about the accuracy of this information remain. In particular, transfer data and labor market data do not match what some faculty believe to be true anecdotally. It will be important for this data to be more accurate when the CTE programs go through their 2-year cycle next year.

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) continues to do substantial work 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 is at today. While work still remains, the campus is in far better shape regarding distance education than it was in the past. The work of the DEAC and DE Team 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 gap between the success rates of traditional and on-line classes has decreased over the past several years. 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 on-line and typical lecture classes. One reason programs point to for the success of hybrid courses is the face-to-face orientation session at the beginning the beginning g of the semester. But the new definitions of "on-line" and "hybrid"

classes make having a face-to-face orientation for on-line courses problematic at best. As such, The IPRC encourages programs to create on-line orientations for their students taking classes on-line.

Distance Education will continue to be a chief focus for the College 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 addressed many of the issues central to the QFE, but the campus needs to address some of the deficiencies in the support provided DE. There continues to be a need for more classified and expert support to aid in the full implementation of the Distance Education Plan. The DEAC is currently working on updating the plan, and the IPRC fully supports the committee's goals, vision, and needed resources outlined in it.

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. Departments, programs, and clubs have created shells to better communicate with members, promote their work, and create a sense of community. Canvas also provides an excellent means of communicating with students allowing for the distribution of important information, announcements, and surveys.

The widespread use of Canvas across campus has also allowed faculty to communicate with counselors and other support services across campus to better serve our students. Providing a format for real-time communication between classroom instruction and student services provides in-term help to students that may prevent them from failing or dropping the class and having to retake it. Canvas has also allowed specific committees and workgroups to have a place to share information and coordinate their activities.

Distance Education Training

The DEAC has increased the training and support being offered. New opportunities for training have been provided that never existed before. 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 offered in the open lab has been a valuable resource for instructors needing specific guidance.

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. There is still a need for more BASICS training, particularly for adjunct faculty. The perception of this need may result from a lack of faculty knowing all of their training options, so some further outreach to faculty to inform them of these options may be warranted.
2. 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.
3. There needs to be greater training on remediation of accessibility. The campus acquired the Ally software, which helps identify bad files and provides instruction for remediation, and there needs to be specific training on how to use the tool. Untrained users may open the college to lawsuits from students suing for ADA violations.
4. 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

While the DEAC and the DE team have done a tremendous job improving distance education on the campus, they also remain understaffed and continue to lack needed resources. The duties, responsibilities, and scope of work of the DEAC and DE team have increased dramatically, while the technical, classified, and expert support agreed to by administration in 2015 has yet to be established.

The need for funding and support was exposed by the recent Covid-19 crisis. As we transitioned our classes from face-to-face to remote formats, the DE Team was stretched to the breaking point. Without the great work of the team going above and beyond once again, the campus would not have been able to make the transition as "smoothly" as it did. But we must provide the long-promised support. The IPRC strongly urges the college to make good on its promise of support. The campus cannot continue to

unduly burden the DE team. Current revisions being made to the DE Plan underscore the need for support and propose ways to bring that about. It should be a priority of the College to address these needs by supporting the new DE Plan.

Student Equity and Disaggregation

The programs were provided with disaggregated student demographics data. 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)

CSLO Table

Area	Courses Assessed		Successful Assessments	
	# Offered	% Assessed	# Assessed	% Successful
Art	38	81.6%	6,708	93.1%
Chemistry	9	100.0%	7,780	77.1%
Communication Studies	9	88.9%	7,437	86.0%
Counseling	14	92.9%	3,509	89.1%
Dance	27	92.6%	1,500	94.7%
Economics	3	100.0%	1,564	80.4%
Mathematics	20	100.0%	16,602	72.3%
Political Science	7	42.9%	2,066	76.4%
Kinesiology	70	97.1%	14,575	95.3%
Psychology	13	84.6%	10,899	83.7%
Sociology	8	75.0%	3,118	84.4%
Total	218	90.4%	75,758	83.9%

Note. Percentages refer to the percentages of all enrolled students who met or exceeded the standard for a particular SLO in all department level courses since Fall 2017.

ISLO Table

ISLO I	Exceeded Standard		Met Standard		Did not Meet Standard		Total Assessed	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
A. Breadth of Knowledge, Competencies, & Skills								
1. Humanities & the Arts	6,939	50.7%	5,395	39.4%	1,359	9.9%	13,693	100.0%
2. STEM	8,438	39.4%	7,305	34.1%	5,688	26.5%	21,431	100.0%
3. Social Sciences	8,865	47.3%	7,060	37.7%	2,803	15.0%	18,728	100.0%
4. Kinesiology/Athletics	9,437	86.0%	904	8.2%	633	5.8%	10,974	100.0%
B. Communication								
1. Reading	25,171	59.8%	11,110	26.4%	5,796	13.8%	42,077	100.0%
2. Writing	19,972	61.1%	8,435	25.8%	4,284	13.1%	32,691	100.0%
3. Communicating	26,089	63.1%	10,455	25.3%	4,805	11.6%	41,349	100.0%
4. Presenting	17,002	71.0%	4,839	20.2%	2,089	8.7%	23,930	100.0%
C. Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency								
1. Analysis	28,572	58.1%	13,223	26.9%	7,392	15.0%	49,187	100.0%
2. Computation	15,824	57.8%	6,253	22.8%	5,291	19.3%	27,368	100.0%
3. Research	19,387	64.4%	7,159	23.8%	3,575	11.9%	30,121	100.0%
4. Problem-solving	34,367	59.1%	14,824	25.5%	8,943	15.4%	58,134	100.0%
5. Technology	17,857	71.0%	5,363	21.3%	1,944	7.7%	25,164	100.0%
D. Personal, Academic, & Professional Development								

1. Personal Responsibility	22,343	65.5%	8,547	25.1%	3,218	9.4%	34,108	100.0%
2. Global Citizenship	18,110	71.2%	5,374	21.1%	1,968	7.7%	25,452	100.0%

Note. The above table includes all PSLOs mapped to ISLOs for programs that participated

Completed SLO Reporting Recommendations from previous years:

Since the eLumen system was recently adopted, various instructional packets and instructional videos have been created and the SLO Coordinators have also set up training workshops to train faculty on how to complete their CSLO assessments in eLumen. Also, a training stipend was given to adjunct faculty who learned the eLumen system and completed their assessments in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018. Due to the adoption of the new system, many recommendations from previous years have been addressed:

- Instead of courses being assessed every four years, courses are now being assessed every semester.
- Standardized PSLOs have been created and the SLO Coordinators have been meeting with the department chairs to help them complete the CSLO to PSLO mapping process in eLumen
- An updated SLO Manual has been created and posted on the SLO webpage that contains instructions of how to assess CSLOs in eLumen, how to complete the CSLO to PSLO mapping process in eLumen, how to run various reports in eLumen, etc.
- CSLO Status Reports that show the percentage of courses that are assessed for each division and department are created by IRP every semester and can be found on the SLO webpage

Remaining recommendations that are in progress of being addressed:

While there has been a great deal accomplished in the past year, there are some issues that have not been fully addressed:

- A system needs to be implemented that will ensure that the CSLOs listed on the faculty syllabi are accurate and match the CSLOs that are listed on the Course Outline of Record (COR) in CurricUNET.
- The SLO Coordinators will need to make sure that all of the departments have completed the CSLO to PSLO mapping process.
- A system that can connect our Curriculum system and our SLO system is very much needed. Every semester, there are errors in the CSLOs in eLumen, which needs to be checked and fixed manually by the SLO Coordinators. Also, when there are any revisions to CSLOs or new CSLOs that have been created, these also have to be individually entered into eLumen.

Specialized Instructional Program Reviews

In Spring 2019, the campus decided that the IPRC would begin reviewing Specialized Instructional Programs. These “hybrid programs” are programs that have been identified as offering a unique combination of instruction and student support services, but for which there had been no previous institutionalized process for review. The IPRC created a Specialized Instructional Program Review Form and reviewed the first of these programs in Spring 2020. The remaining programs will be reviewed in Spring 2021 with all programs then being placed on a 4-year spring review cycle.

Each of the programs submitted program reviews that covered the required topics and detailed plans for achieving their stated actions and goals. The IPRC’s created a Summary Form to provide a written evaluation of each program and the summaries were provided to each presenter for any modifications or updates. The final reviews and the committee summaries are posted in the Department Planning and Instructional Program Review folder on the “J” Drive. The new Specialized Instructional Program Review Form and the final versions of the committee evaluations for each program are also included as appendices to this report.

As with other Instructional Program Reviews, the IPRC creates a list of “global” commendations, recommendations, and supported budget/resource needs that reflect common issues shared by Specialized Instructional Programs across campus.

Specialized Instructional Program Related Commendations:

1. Each of the programs provided examples for combining instruction, counseling, and student services in ways that offer examples for other departments and programs across campus to use in their Guided Pathways efforts.
2. Each of the programs have been successful in increasing the numbers of students they are able to serve. This ability to scale their services and approach should be studied by the campus to see where and how such services can be scaled to the rest of the campus.
3. Each of the programs provides numerous opportunities for their members outside of the

classroom. Whether it be conferences, seminars, service-learning, or an assortment of other activities, the programs provide a “total college” experience that is not just bound to classroom instruction. These opportunities are another way in which these programs create a sense of community among their members.

4. Each of the programs have exhibited high success rates among their students.

Specialized Instructional Program Related Recommendations:

1. The programs are encouraged to develop SSLOs to better track their impact and success. The IPRC would like to see significant progress in this area by the next review cycle.
2. The programs are encouraged to update their budget and resource needs to reflect the growth of the program and the increased costs of material, supplies, and conferences. This includes the need for laptops to assist with instruction. This budget should prioritize resources based on program needs and distinguish whether the expenses are new, on-going, or needed for program growth.
3. The programs are also encouraged in their efforts to find a specific space on campus for students of their programs to interact academically and socially. If space is going to be campus budget item, any additional costs should be detailed in the program's budget.

Specialized Instructional Program Related Budget/Resource Needs:

1. Each of the programs expressed a need for a dedicated space tailored to their specific needs. Having a place for students to interact academically and socially helps promote a sense of community among students of the program. Sometimes these spaces need to be closer to the classrooms, some of them need to be closer to faculty office and other services; therefore, these spaces should be based on the needs of the individual programs. These spaces should be considered as the campus updates its facilities plans.
2. Each of the programs demonstrated that their current budgets were inadequate for their needs to fully service their students. After the programs establish updated budgets, the base budgets of these programs should be increased to reflect the current scope and growth of their work.

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 IPRC's written evaluation and Summary of each program was provided to each presenter for any modifications or updates. The final self-studies and the committee summaries are posted in the Department Planning and Instructional Program Review folder on the “J” Drive. The final versions of the committee summaries for each program are also included as appendices to this report.

IPRC Resolution in Support of the Theater

This semester the IPRC, once again, saw departments in the Fine Arts Division identify significant issues with the Campus Theater stemming from the fact that timely and adequate maintenance, repairs, and upgrades have not been made. Similar concerns have been raised in previous reviews of other departments over the past several years. While the Fine Arts building is scheduled for remodel in the upcoming, state-approved renovation plans, the Campus Theater is not currently part of those plans. The costs of these repairs/renovations also exceed the typical one-time funding allocations and constitute maintenance, upgrade, sustainability, and safety concerns for both students and staff, and there are currently no plans to address the identified problems.

This is not just an issue that impacts one division. The Campus Theater is not just a classroom in Fine Arts. It is used by numerous groups across campus for classroom space, a community exhibition hall, a campus meeting area, student and community performances, our Opening Day Events, and other ceremonies. Yet, the departments of the Fine Arts Division have had to cover some of the upkeep of the theater out of their own department budgets.

It is in this context that the IPRC decided to draft a resolution in support of funding upgrades and maintenance of the Campus Theater. This is not something the committee has ever done before, nor is it something it wishes to become standard procedure. But it is wholly appropriate and necessary at the current time. There is a large fund of one-time money currently being held at the District of which the campus will receive a portion. While the IPRC and the PBC have made great strides in tying our Instructional Program Review to the College one-time funding process, there is no formal process for our campus reviews to be used in District funding. It is hoped that this resolution will serve as a means of adding our program reviews to those discussions. The resolution was taken to the Academic Senate for its support and approval. The Senate approved the Resolution

by unanimous vote in its regular open meeting on April 23, 2020. A copy of the resolution is contained in the Appendix.

Global Commendations

1. All of the departments and programs that presented this cycle exhibited extensive Guided Pathways work. Whether it be increasing dual enrollment courses, working more closely with embedded counselors, changing and developing new curriculum, or a host of other innovations, the departments and programs of the College have made concerted efforts to clarify and streamline the academic paths of our students.
2. The departments and programs under review demonstrated great innovation in meeting the needs of students. In particular, the IPRC wishes to highlight the work of the Math Department in creating eDLAs. The early indications are that they are overwhelmingly successful in helping the campus and students adjust to the implementation of AB 705.
3. Of particular note, the departments and programs under review are dedicated to their students outside of the classroom. The curriculum and classroom instruction are first rate, but there is a commitment on the campus to fostering student engagement in a wide range of activities and opportunities outside of the classroom. Whether it's seminars, conferences, college visits, research opportunities, or service learning and social outreach experience, the departments and programs embrace the "total college" experience for their students.

Global Recommendations:

Based on a thorough review of all of the departments and programs that present to the committee, a list of Global Recommendations is created that reflect common issues shared across campus. The recommendations are broken down into two categories. The first is Ongoing Recommendations which remain from previous IPRC Annual Reports. The second are New Recommendations which have come from the reviews this cycle.

Ongoing Recommendations:

Below are Global Recommendations made in previous IPRC Annual Reports, but which have not yet been sufficiently addressed. It is hoped that these items will not remain on this list for multiple reports.

1. The funding and support for the DE Team remains wholly inadequate. The role and responsibilities of the team have expanded greatly over the past five years; yet, their support and funding has not kept up with the pace. The recent COVID-19 crisis further highlighted how overextended the DE Team has become. The IPRC strongly urges the College to meet the needs of the DE Team as outlined in their DE Plan.
2. All programs are encouraged to continue to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining/updating equipment and addressing recurring budgetary needs. This should include a revision of supply budgets to meet the current needs for and costs of supplies. This budget should also prioritize resources based on program needs and distinguish whether the expenses are new, on-going, or needed for program growth.
3. The IPRC continues to need more clarification as to the priority of the budget needs listed by the programs in their reviews. The individual Program Summaries and the IPRC Annual Report need to more directly reflect what the programs find to be their most important budget needs. This will also allow the IPRC to better advocate for the needs of programs throughout the College budgeting process.
4. Released time continues to be an issue for several programs. Increasingly, faculty are being asked to take on more non-classroom duties, and there needs to be a reexamination of the released time received as compensation. A more standardized and scheduled process for reviewing reassigned time across campus should be developed. Reassigned time needs to be increased and decreased based on the changing needs of programs and positions.

New Recommendations:

The following Global Recommendations come from the comprehensive review of the all of the programs that presented to the committee this past fall. Any recommendations that are not fully addressed over the next year will roll over to the Global Recommendations: Ongoing section of next year's IPRC Annual Report.

1. To meet Accreditation recommendations, Instructional Program Review has been more concretely tied to the larger campus planning and budget processes. Revisions to the College One-Time Funding forms and process have more closely tied the Instructional Program Reviews to campus planning. But there still is work needed to tie Faculty Prioritization and other College budgeting processes to program review. To this end, the IPRC is working on revising the form used in review to more completely and accurately capture the data points needed to influence College planning and budget decisions.
2. The theater provides challenges unique to the College. It is a hybrid of classroom space, community exhibition hall, and campus meeting area, among other things. The College has demonstrated a lack of understanding these challenges and has, thus, not provided adequate and regular funding for the

maintenance and improvement of the theater. Unfortunately, this has been a longstanding problem, and we have been told repeatedly that things will be taken care of with the remodel of the Fine Arts building remodel. But the theater remodel is not going to be covered by the anticipated state-funded Fine Arts building remodel. There needs to be a larger campus discussion about the unique nature of the theater that includes the appropriate stakeholders and experts, properly funding and maintaining it, and placing it on a regular maintenance and upgrade schedule, the cost of which should not disproportionately fall on the programs that use the theater for classroom purposes. As we move forward in revising our College budgets, a specific theater budget, separate from the programs, should be a major focus. The IPRC passed a Resolution supporting funding repairs and upgrades being made to the Campus Theater through the use of funds currently in pool of District One-Time funding. A copy of the Resolution is contained in the Appendix.

3. In the updated Adjunct Instructor Evaluation form, Student Learning Outcomes assessment data is now listed as one of the clerical requirements. Because of this new language, adjuncts should now be expected to assess at least one CSLO for each of their classes through eLumen every semester.
4. There needs to be greater institutional support for research being performed by students in programs across campus. There is a great need for technology, including laptop computers and database subscriptions, to support research. An important step would be for Cypress College to establish an Institutional Review Board (IRB). When a campus does not have an IRB, it is not ethical for the students to conduct research, since they cannot request approval from the IRB. Also, any research that is done by faculty or students at Cypress College cannot be published or shared at a professional conference because we lack an IRB.
5. The faculty need laptops to use for their instruction. Many of their courses incorporate the use of technology so it is important that the faculty are able to show the students how that technology works during lecture and for research purposes. In the past, faculty have used their own money to purchase computers and software. It is hoped that this out-of-pocket cost will be replaced by technology support from the campus.

Budget Requests and Resource Allocations:

In an effort to comply with accreditation recommendations, beginning in Spring 2019, the IPRC began reviewing the budget requests of the departments and programs. The committee includes support for specific budget and resource requests in the Summary forms each program now includes with all requests. The following budget requests and resource allocations are shared by multiple programs and departments of the College and have the full support of the IPRC. They are broken down into two categories. The first is Ongoing Budget Requests which are carried over from previous Annual Reports. It is hoped that items on this list will not remain from year to year. The second is New Budget Requests that came from programs under review this past fall.

Ongoing Budget Request:

1. 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.
2. Several programs continue to demonstrate clear needs for new full-time faculty. Even after the recent hires in Spring 2019 and 2020, retirements and outside accreditation requirements will continue to place some programs under a strain.
3. 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. There needs to be a regular review of the reassigned time across campus and adjustments made up and down where appropriate.

New Budget Requests:

1. While adjunct faculty are now contractually obligated to enter SLO data, they are still not required to participate in the analysis, review, writing, or revision of SLOs. To address the continuing need for adjunct faculty to fully participate in SLOs, the IPRC recommends that adjunct faculty receive a stipend for all SLO work not covered by their contract.
2. The committee supports the need for laptop computers in faculty offices, in classrooms, and for student use. This should be a consideration in the technology replacement process across campus.
3. The committee supports the increase of department/program budgets to reflect the increase of the cost of

goods, materials, and other resources needed to effectively support student needs. The current budgets do not reflect the basic costs of running the program and leaving it with no funding to promote innovation or growth. This requires the departments and programs to revise and prioritize their budgets accordingly.

Looking Forward

The programs up for the full review in Fall 2020 are identified in the attachment. In November 2020, 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 instructional program review process to the larger planning and budgeting processes of the College.

The committee will also be conducting the Two-Year Review for the CTE programs. These reviews will not require the programs to present these reviews in person.

A new Co-Chair will be seated and take on the meeting and administrative duties of the Chair per the IPRC Chair job description.

In the Fall of 2020, 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 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 Spring of 2021, the committee will finish reviewing the Specialized Instructional Programs, after which, all of the programs will be placed on specific 4-year review cycles.

Appendix A: Timeline for the 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Cycle

- ✓ May 2020: Email the deans with the next programs required to submit reports by October 15.
- ✓ Summer 2020: IR sends the prepopulated self-study forms and SLO summary reports to the deans by Opening Day in August.
- ✓ August 2020: Send deadline reminder email to all deans.
- ✓ September 2020: Committee plans to meet twice during the month.
- ✓ October 10, 2020: Faculty submit their self-studies to their deans for comments and signature.
- ✓ October 25, 2020: Faculty submit their final self-study reports to the IPRC Chair.
- ✓ November 2020: Presentations every Monday from 3-5 (four 15-minute presentations per week).
- ✓ December 2020: Program Review Summaries will be sent to all of the programs under review.
- ✓ February 2021: Committee meets to review results and feedback from summaries.
- ✓ February/March 2021: Committee meets to review Specialized Instructional Programs (date to be determined).
- ✓ March 2021: 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 2021: 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 (13 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 (12 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 Specialized Instructional Program Reviews

The following Specialized Instructional Programs presented their reviews in Spring 2020:

- Honors/Service Learning
- Puente
- SEM

The following Specialized Instructional Programs will present their reviews in Spring 2021:

- Distance Education
- Dual Enrollment (Moved from Spring 2020 due to COVID-19 crisis.)
- Legacy (Moved from Spring 2020 due to COVID-19 crisis.)
- Teacher Preparation
- Travel Abroad

In response to each department's self-study and face-to-face dialogue with the committee, a draft summary evaluation, including commendations, recommendations, and budget/resource needs, was provided to the program representative. Participants reviewed the feedback with an invitation to make changes if needed. The final summaries are included at the end of the report and will be posted on the Instructional Program Review website.

Appendix D: Specialized Instructional Program Review Form

Cypress College
Specialized Instructional Program Review Form

Specialized Instructional Programs are programs that have identified themselves as offering a unique combination of instructional and student support services.

Program: _____ Coordinators: _____

Names of those participating in the report:

Date: _____

Program Mission:

Mission statements broadly describe the overall purpose of an organization. As a specialized instructional program, please identify your mission statement below or note if your mission statement has changed since the last review cycle. Describe how your mission statement supports the college's mission statement.

Core Measures:

The following key parameters are used to measure success of the program. Whenever relevant, parameters are identified that measure college-wide performance with program performance (for example, a program may choose Transfer Rate of their program students and compare it with overall College Transfer Rate). Please respond to the relevant core measures presented below as well as on the following pages. Please comment on how the data in the tables below and other factors describe the program's effectiveness as a whole.

Overall Measures 4 Year Trend Analysis - Fall

Overall Measures of Effectiveness	Fall ## Cohort (n = #)			
Unduplicated students				
Enrollments				
Success Rates				
Persistence from semester 1 to 2				

Overall Measures 4 Year Trend Analysis - Spring

Overall Measures of Effectiveness	Spring ## Cohort (n = #)			
Unduplicated students				
Enrollments				
Success Rates				
Persistence from semester 1 to 2				

Response to 4-year trend analysis:

Success Rate Analyses

Course	Fall #1	Fall #2	Fall #3	Fall #4	Overall	Comparison
	Cohort Success % (n = #)	Comparison Success % (n = #)				
Course #1	% (n = #)					
Course #2	% (n = #)					
Course #3	% (n = #)					
Course #4	% (n = #)					
College	% (n = #)					

*Note. Cypress College’s ACCJC institution-set standard for successful course completion is 72.1%.

Course	Spring #1	Spring #2	Spring #3	Spring #4	Overall	Comparison
	Cohort Success % (n = #)	Comparison Success % (n = #)				
Course #1	% (n = #)					
Course #2	% (n = #)					
Course #3	% (n = #)					
Course #4	% (n = #)					
College	% (n = #)					

*Note. Cypress College’s ACCJC institution-set standard for successful course completion is 72.1%.

Response to success rate analysis:

Equity Data

Equity Group	# Enrolled	# Successful	Success Rate	Disproportionate Impact
Gender				
Female				
Male				
Unknown				
<i>80% of Reference Group ()</i>				
Age				
19 or less				
20-24				
25-39				
40+				
<i>80% of Reference Group ()</i>				
Ethnicity				
Am. Indian				
Asian or PI				

Equity Group	# Enrolled	# Successful	Success Rate	Disproportionate Impact
Black				
Hispanic				
White				
Unreported				
<i>80% of Reference Group ()</i>				
Disability Status				
No				
Yes				
<i>80% of Reference Group ()</i>				
Veteran Status				
No				
Yes				
<i>80% of Reference Group ()</i>				
Foster Youth Status				
No				
Yes				
<i>80% of Reference Group ()</i>				
Financial Aid Status				
No				
Yes				
<i>80% of Reference Group (non-Recipient)</i>				
TOTAL				

*Note. Sample size too small to assess disproportionate impact

Note. Cypress College's ACCJC institution-set standard for successful course completion is 72.1%. Disproportionate impact is calculated by comparing the highest performing meaningful sub-group (greater than 30 students) with all other sub-groups in each area. Any group performing at less than 80% the rate of the highest performing group is considered to be disproportionately impacted based on EEOC guidelines.

Response to equity analysis:

Awards					Overall
####-##	####-##	####-##	####-##	####-##	
Associate in Arts - Transfer					
Associate in Arts - Transfer Total					
Certificate 6 to 18 units					
Certificate 6 to 18 units Total					
Total Awards					

Response to awards analysis:

Transfer Rates

Number of degree recipients	####-##	####-##	####-##	####-##	Total
	#	#	#	#	#
Did not transfer, no longer enrolled					
Enrolled at Cypress College					
Enrolled at other 2-yr college					
Transferred to 4-yr, no longer enrolled					
Transferred to 4-yr, still enrolled					
Received bachelor's degree					
Received bachelors, seeking graduate degree					
Received master's degree					
Number Transferred	#	#	#	#	#
% Transferred	%	%	%	%	%

Note. Cypress College's ACCJC institution-set standard for the number of transfers is 916 per year. Transfer rates are calculated from submitting the cohorts of students to the National Student Clearinghouse and represent the ratio of students who either enrolled at a 4-year college or received a bachelor degree over the amount of unduplicated degree recipients, excluding those in which NSC could not match.

Response to transfer analysis:

Any other comments about the data presented in this section:

Identification of Needed Resources and Budget Implications:

Provide trend information regarding the allocated budget / actual expenditures for the past several years of the program. Note any special circumstances below the table. The information in this chart will be used in the following two sections. Please mention reassigned time allocated towards the program. If any resource is shared, mention the proportion allocated to the program, for example, if an administrative assistant works 20% for the program, please clarify it.

	20##-##	20##-##	20##-##	20##-##
Allocated				
Actual Expenditures				

List the needed resources and specify a dollar amount for each request. Additionally, please note if the request is for program maintenance or improvement and note if the request is one-time or an ongoing need (if ongoing, please specify how often). Please also include the approximate number of students impacted by each request.

Rank	Request Name	Amount	Maintenance or Improvement	One-Time or Ongoing	# Students Impacted
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					

Review Previous Goals and Objectives

Please describe if the goals and objectives identified in the previous review were met or not. Please provide explanations if the goals were not met. The information in the tables above, or other information, may be used as evidence.

I. Goal:

Narrative: Strengths and challenges.

Please base this section on the two charts above, in addition to program-specific evidence.

Strengths: Use this section to briefly reflect upon major accomplishments of the program. The narrative should discuss the implications related to the core measures and compare program performance parameters with overall college parameters (whenever possible).

Challenges: Please provide any insight into significant challenges or obstacles that may have curtailed the success of the program. Identify the types of changes necessary for improvement.

Long-range Plan and Objectives

In the following section, identify general goals and specific, measurable objectives your area plans to achieve within the next three years. Programs should identify 3-5 goals, with at least one goal per year. Goals set for next year that require fiscal resources must also be submitted as a Budget Request and Action Plan (separate form). Identify if the goal is aligned with any of the following plans (provide details):

Educational Master Plan, Student Services Plan, Matriculation Plan, Distance Education Plan, Student Equity Plan, Technology Plan, Basic Skills Plan

I. Goal:

1. Objective:

1.1. Person(s) responsible:

1.2. Timeframe:

1.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate "NA"):

2. Objective:

2.1. Person(s) responsible:

2.2. Timeframe:

2.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate "NA"):

II. Goal:

Supports plan

1. Objective:

1.1. Person(s) responsible:

1.2. Timeframe:

1.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate "NA"):

2. Objective:

- 2.1. Person(s) responsible:
- 2.2. Timeframe:
- 2.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate "NA"):

Use the above outline format to add additional goals or objectives as necessary.

Review by Dean(s)

MISSION OF THE PROGRAM:

1. Do you agree with the program's evaluation of that their mission statement supports the college's mission statement? Why or why not?

TREND DATA/PROGRAM TRENDS:

2. Do you agree with the program's evaluation of the core measures? Why or why not? Did the program miss any important information from the tables?
3. Do you agree with the program's evaluation of their success rates for both on campus and online/hybrid instruction? Did the program miss any important information from the table?
4. Do you agree with the program's effectiveness as a whole? Why or why not? Did the program miss any important information?

PROGRAM GOALS:

5. Do you agree with the program's evaluation of meeting their past goals met? Why or why not?
6. Based on the information provided in this report, do the program's goals for the next three years to improve learning outcomes for all their students make sense?

IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDED RESOURCES AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:

7. Based on the information in this report, are the funding requests reasonable and have the potential to positively impact student learning?

Name of Reviewing Dean:

Reminder: If fiscal resources are needed for next year's goals, submit a separate **Budget Request and Action Plan** for budget unit review.

Appendix E: IPRC Resolution in Support of the Theater

Instructional Program Review Committee Academic Senate Resolution Proposal

As a result of the campus Instructional Program Review (IPR) process, Fine Arts Division departments have identified several resource allocation needs to address issues with the Campus Theater. The resources required to meet the needs are in the millions of dollars and would likely utilize the majority of the College's annual One-time Funding allocation thus restricting the campus' ability to fund other department's requests.

While these discussions were occurring in IPR, the Senate was apprised of significant *District* one-time funding monies available. The Senate was encouraged to think about projects that would need this type of major funding. As such, the IPR Committee thought that this was the type of project that would be ideally suited to meet the identified needs of the Campus Theater and should be a project that the faculty should support collectively to show our commitment to this campus request. The IPR Committee drafted the resolution below for Senate approval so that President Schilling would be able to advocate for the *District* one-time funding request with full faculty support.

Academic Senate Resolution Proposal

Whereas, the Cypress College Campus Theater is used by numerous groups across campus for classroom space, community exhibition hall, campus meeting area, performances, Opening Day and other ceremonies, and

Whereas, several Fine Arts Division departments have identified significant issues with the Campus Theater in past Program Review reports and campus conversations, and the identified upgrades and repairs to the Campus Theater are significant and costly and

Whereas, the Campus Theater is a separate building from the Fine Arts building and thus not included in the upcoming, state-approved renovation plans, and are costs that are expected to exceed typical *College* One-time Funding allocations, and

Whereas, the issues in the Campus Theater constitute maintenance, upgrade, sustainability, and safety concerns for both students and staff, and there are

currently no plans to address the identified problems,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Cypress College Academic Senate urge President Schilling to make the identified Fine Arts Division Campus Theater upgrades a top priority for College and District resource allocation requests.

Be it further resolved that the appropriate Fine Arts Division Theater production team be consulted on said Theater renovation plans.

Approved by Cypress College Academic Senate, April 23, 2020

Appendix F: 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 2019 (11 programs)

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

Appendix G: Instructional Program Review Summaries



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Art

Presenter: Molly Schulp

Date: 11/25/19

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 Art Department presented a well-written and comprehensive review that reflected the collaborative work of the entire program.

Program CSLOs:

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

Courses Assessed: Fall 2018 – 65.7% Spring 2019 – 51.4%

Comments: The Art Department has completed their CSLO mappings. Their assessment rates

are relatively low; however, this is due to the large number of courses that they offer, many of which are taught solely by adjunct faculty. Prior to the new adjunct contract, the adjuncts were not contractually obligated to participate in the assessment of CSLOs making it difficult to gather data. Even with the new contract, the department suggests some sort of compensation for training sessions for data entry and for participation in work related to the development of CSLOS and analysis of CSLO data.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments: The Art Department has completed their PSLO mappings. All of their PSLOs have extremely high success rates. Many of their PSLOs have the same mapping (Reading, Writing, Research, Problem-solving, Technology, Personal Responsibility, and Global Citizenship all have the same mapping and also Communicating, Presenting, and Analysis all have the same mapping). To have more meaningful results, it is suggested that they revisit these mappings to make them distinct.

Commendations:

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

1. The program has three different Associate degrees and has experienced a 400% increase in their ADTs over the last four years. They are planning three new certificates: Comprehensive Gallery, Ceramics, and Illustration. Any new course that are written or resources that are needed are substantiated by the needs of the ADTs.
2. The program has an extensive list of course offerings while maintaining excellent fill rates and student success rates.
3. The program has worked to make themselves more efficient. They have been thoughtful in balancing their higher seat count lecture classes with their lower seat count studio classes.
4. The hiring of an Art Historian has boosted the department. This is a practice other programs should be encouraged to follow.
5. The department runs the campus gallery and has greatly expanded the number of exhibitions.
6. The department has collaborated with the embedded counselors in the division. Their practice of inviting counselors into their classes to schedule appointments and present information has proved quite successful and should be considered a model for other programs on campus to follow.
7. The department establishes deep ties to their students as is exhibited by program's ability to track those students once they leave the program. Since 2014-15, 43 of their students are currently enrolled in a 4-year institution, and 20 others have received their bachelor's degree.
8. The department has no appreciable achievement gap.
9. The department has control of its own website allowing it to better promote itself.

Recommendations:

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

1. The department needs to prioritize and better define its budget and resource requests to help the IPRC advocate for its needs. For example, they list "equipment" needs totaling \$100,000. These should be broken down into specific pieces of equipment. The department should also begin the process of creating/revising their on-going budget. Many of the full-

time faculty members have paid out of pocket for instructional tools such as projectors, laptops, and online platforms such as studyt.com for their students to access video lessons and assignments. These items should be line items in their departmental budget.

2. Related to point #1 above, the department, along with other Fine Arts programs, should work with campus administration and various departments to get the theatre maintenance budget put on the campus/maintenance budget. They departments in Fine Arts should not bear the burden of a theater used by the entire campus.
3. The department needs to work on CSLOs and PSLOs. They must improve the percentage of courses assessed by their next review cycle or risk having their Compliance Status lowered. The program should make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. While there is still some contractual ambiguity on the responsibility of adjunct faculty to participate in the process, the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language regarding CSLO data input. But the committee is most concerned that all full-time faculty fully participate. The full-time faculty contract is quite clear that SLO work is part of our required duties. Lack of full-time faculty participation in SLOs will not be tolerated, and failure of faculty to participate may result negatively impact the department's Compliance Status.

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 department has a demonstrated need for more full-time faculty. Their full-time faculty ratio of 36.1% is well below the college average.
2. The reassigned time for the Art Gallery Director should be increased from 20% to 40%.
3. The campus Art Gallery needs to be upgraded. Those improvements should be part of a larger Campus Theater budget.
4. The department should get funding for the study.com tool.
5. The department has demonstrated a need for paid training sessions on CSLOs and PSLOs for their adjunct faculty. New adjunct faculty are hired each semester, and their needs to be a means for training them on this work. The department's idea of a paid workshop for the adjuncts who teach Art 100 would be a good idea.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Chemistry

Presenter: Torri Draganov

Date: 11/18/19

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 Chemistry Department presented a thorough review that reflects a first-class program committed to student success.

Program CSLOs:

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

Courses Assessed: Fall 2018 – 100% Spring – 85.7%

1. **Comments:** The Chemistry department has been doing an excellent job of assessing their CSLOs each semester. When their assessment rate is not 100%, it is because only one course is not being assessed, which is a course that is being taught solely by adjunct. To

remedy this, they will assign one of the new full-time faculty that they are hiring to this course so that there will be a full-time faculty teaching each course in their department. In addition, after analyzing their CSLO data and identifying specific challenging concepts, one faculty member created their own original lab manual and lab activities which incorporated extra practice for those challenging concepts in hopes to increase their CSLO success rates.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments: The department has completed their mapping of their CSLOs to their PSLOs. The success rates of their PSLOs are a bit lower when compared to other departments on campus but are similar to the success rates of departments in their Division. The department did an excellent job of mapping their CSLOs to PSLOs, since each of the mappings are distinct. Because of this, they are able to analyze how their students are doing for each PSLO and can identify which ones are most challenging for the students and find ways to better these success rates.

Commendations:

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

1. The department has strong enrollment, with a fill-rate over 100% for most semesters.
2. In an effort to promote student success, the department has a full-time instructor for each of the courses offered. This provides a point person specialist/resource for each course that adjunct faculty and students can go to for assistance if needed.
3. Chemistry does extensive outreach with elementary schools to excite kids about science. In addition, they participate in National Chemistry Week by offering hands-on activities to the public at the Santa Ana Zoo.
4. The department has increased their course offerings and has adjusted the types of chemistry classes to account for a high volume of allied health students.
5. The department's success rates are higher than the college average.
6. Starting in 2016-2017, the program launched their AS-T degree. The number of AS-Ts awarded has been steadily increasing, with 9 AS-Ts being awarded in 2018-2019.

Recommendations:

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

1. The department needs to prioritize its budget and resource requests to help the IPRC advocate for its needs. The department should also begin the process of creating/revising the on-going budget for the department. In particular, this budget needs to account for the increase cost of chemicals and other supplies as well the replacement costs for materials like beakers and other breakable supplies.
2. The department is encouraged to continue exploring the creation of CHEM 105, which will provide a more flexible GE or entry-level course.
3. The department is encouraged to clarify pathways to increase the declaration of major.
4. The department should seek additional support in counseling, peer support, and SI.
5. The department is asked to work through DSS limitations and create separate test times for these 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 department has demonstrated the need to have their supply budget increased. The materials needed for their labs are absolutely necessary for the success of their students, and their budget has not kept up with the increased cost of existing supplies, let alone the need for new ones as curriculum and student needs evolve. Their department budget needs to be evaluated and increased to accommodate the growing costs of the materials that they need.
2. The department has a demonstrated need for more lab techs.
3. The department does have lab/lecture room limitations. It is hoped that these issues will be resolved with the completion of the new SEM building, but the department will continue to be restricted by the space limitations in the short-term.
4. While the department will be hiring 2 new full-time faculty members for Fall 2020, there will still be a need a more full-time faculty to balance retirements and allow for growth in the department.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Communication Studies

Presenter: Liana Koeppel

Date: 11/04/19

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 Communication Studies department presented a thoughtful review that reflected a well-organized and successful program. The IPRC supports and wants to underscore the department's need to reinforce its identity as the "Communication Studies" Department and not simply the "Communications" Department. The misuse of these titles creates confusion on multiple levels because of the Journalism/Communications Department, as well as the confusion between a Comm. Studies AA-T, Journalism AA-T, and those students that want to major in Communications at CSUF and CSULB.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2018 – 100%

Spring 2019 – 71.4%

Comments: The department has been exceptional in its work with CSLOs and PSLOs. They strive for full department SLO meetings and have revised their CSLOs to keep them relevant and meaningful. They have been particularly adept at getting adjunct faculty to participate in collection and entry of CSLO data. The department is encouraged to continue its work with CSLOs, but it is also asked to make sure their efforts to involve adjunct do not violate the adjunct contract.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments: The department has completed their mappings of their CSLOs to their PSLOs with high success rates in each of their PSLOs. Some of their PSLOs have the same mappings (Reading and Communicating have the same mapping and Research and Technology have the same mapping). In order for the data to be more meaningful, it is suggested that the department revisit their mappings to make each mapping distinct.

Commendations:

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

1. The department has been quite innovative in creating the “Communication +” certificates. These certificates are designed to promote achievement in the communication skills necessary for success in a variety of fields and are a great way to tie into other campus offerings.
2. They have worked hard at increasing the number of students able to enroll in COMM 100 with increased staff and Communication Studies certificates pairings.
3. In an effort to meet the multiple requests for a completely online degree and to support the College's goals, the Department has agreed to offer a “Mediated Oral Communication” course that will fulfill the CSU GE Breadth Area A1 requirement.
4. The program has solid student success rates for on campus courses. The curriculum and Communication Studies AA-T contribute to student success in both transferring to four-year institutions and obtaining both AA and BA degrees.
5. The Forensics Team has been quite successful and has met their needs for growth by adding a co-director.

Recommendations:

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

1. The department needs to prioritize its budget and resource needs and have discussions with the division dean about creating/revising an on-going departmental budget. The IPRC supports that budget having an increase of funding for the needs of the Forensics Team.
2. The department has a demonstrated need for full-time faculty. Their full-time faculty ratio is low, and they anticipate adding a full-time faculty member to meet the needs of a growing program. But this department does have two full-time faculty on reassigned time. Is there an expected date for the reassigned time to end?
3. The department is encouraged to continue its work on reducing the achievement gap.
4. In an effort to underscore the need to identify the program as the Communication Studies Department, the committee suggests referring to the certificates as “Communication Studies Certificates” rather than “Communications 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 department has a demonstrated need to increase its on-going funding to pay for speech debate competition expenses. Like many programs on campus, the Speech and Debate Team budget has not seen a budget allocation increase in 20 years and relies primarily on fundraising efforts.
2. The department has a demonstrated need for funding to compensate adjunct faculty for CSLO work.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Counseling
Presenter: Kelly Carter
Date: 11/04/19

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 Counseling Department presented a thorough review that reflects the first-rate work done across the campus by the program.

Program CSLOs:

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

Courses Assessed: Fall 2018 – 87.5% Spring 2019 – 84.6%

Comments: Despite the large number of courses offered and the number of adjunct faculty in their department, Counseling has consistently done an excellent job of assessing their courses. The Counseling faculty are in frequent communication with the SLO Coordinator to request

Faculty Participation Reports to ensure that their faculty, both full-time and adjunct, are completing their assessments.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments: The department has completed their mappings of their CSLOs to their PSLOs, with success rates that are amongst the highest on campus. Their mapping for three of their PSLOs, Reading, Research, and Personal Responsibility, are all the same. In order for the data to be more meaningful, it is suggested that the department revisit their mappings to make each mapping distinct.

Commendations:

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

1. The department should be commended for its growth. In order to meet the demand of Pledge and Dual Enrollment students, they have been able to offer 16 additional class sections while maintaining strong enrollment. COUN 140C also increased its units from .5 to 1.0
2. The program has undertaken an extensive review of the success rates of its courses. For example, they reviewed COUN 151 and found that the number of students receiving “W”s was impacting success rates. They are working to address the issue through more individualized student outreach.
3. The Counseling faculty recognizes the need to offer counseling and student development courses through Distance Education (both online and hybrid). They are also exploring ways to notify students of the expectations of courses before they get to class.
4. The department works together in collaborative way. Their Program Review reflected the work of the entire department. Their all department retreat is one example of team building in the department.
5. They have made improvement in addressing the achievement gap of African American students and are working with the Anthropology Department to address the gap with native American students.

Recommendations:

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

1. The department needs to prioritize its budget and resource requests to help the IPRC advocate for its needs. The department should also begin the process of creating/revising the on-going budget for the department.
2. The department should continue to work on clarifying the confusion students are expressing as to what it means to take a “hybrid” class.
3. The department should continue working with the Anthropology department address the achievement gap with the Native American student population.
4. The department is encouraged to continue to explore the creation of a drop-down menu in WebStar to help track the reasons students drop classes.
5. The IPRC requests the department include DSS information, including a list of resources and services, be sent to students enrolled in on-line courses prior to the beginning of the semester.

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 department needs more distance education training for faculty in order to be able to increase their on-line course offerings.
2. The program has a need for MBTI/Strong Certification for 15 counselors. This expense should be factored into a comprehensive departmental budget.
3. The program has a demonstrated need for OnCourse Training of 6 counselors. This expense should be factored into a comprehensive departmental budget.
4. The program has a need for counselors to expand the services and courses they offer. They have gained some counselors as a result of new hires and the receipt of the Title V grant related to Guided Pathways, but they will still have faculty needs to meet the growing demand for their courses.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Dance
Presenter: Maha Afra
Date: 11/18/19

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 Dance Department provided a thorough and thoughtful review. Their presentation was attended by students who were showing their support for the program. The department has expressed a concern that they are not recognized as an important academic program and this may be having a negative impact on the program and student success.

Program CSLOs:

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

Courses Assessed: Fall 2018 – 45% Spring 2019 – 41.7%

Comments: Compared to other departments on campus, Dance has very low assessment rates,

which is attributed to a large number of their courses being taught solely by adjuncts. During the two semesters where adjuncts were given an eLumen training stipend, their assessment rates were some of the highest on campus, 91.3% for Fall 2017 and 100.0% for Spring 2018. However, the lack of compensation for adjunct faculty to complete CSLO work beyond simple data entry will continue to make it difficult for the department to consistently assess their CSLOs.

Program PSLOs:

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

Comments: The department has completed their mapping of their CSLOs to their PSLOs. Their success rates are on track with that of other departments on campus. The mappings for several of their PSLOs are the same e.g. Humanities & the Arts, Communicating, Presenting, Analysis, Problem-Solving, Personal Responsibility, and Global Citizenship all have the same mapping. In order for the data to be more meaningful, the mappings for each PSLO should be distinct.

Commendations:

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

1. The Dance Department has a high profile on campus and participates in numerous campus-wide events. They have participated in 20 events since the beginning of Spring 2019 alone. Their focus on cultural diversity and inclusion is on full display in each of these events. The department has also developed a strong outreach approach with the high schools and the broader community.
2. The department has an extremely high success rate of 94.7% since Fall 2017 with little to no exhibited achievement gap.
3. Students in Dance are engaged and in full support of the program. The department has created a positive atmosphere for the students that provides support, follow through, and a commitment to addressing the food, clothing, and housing insecurities of their students. This was illustrated by the students who came to the committee meeting to help present the department's program review. The effort the department puts into tracking their students once they leave the program is also quite commendable. There is a commitment to the students well after they leave Cypress College.
4. The department is working towards creating a CTE certificate.
5. The department created an adaptive dance course.

Recommendations:

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

1. The department is encouraged to implement new curriculum that can remedy the issue with repeatability. Dance, along with other departments in Fine Arts, is struggling with the fact that courses are no longer repeatable. The switch to non-repeatable courses is essentially derailing the effectiveness and success of the program. Because of this, their students are no longer able to refine the dance skills needed and are now being pushed into the next level without being prepared. The department is encouraged to make curricular changes in their technique classes to offset the repeatability issue. Creating new courses such as Dance 105A, Dance 105B, Dance 105C etc., may help ensure that students are learning the skills needed to be competitive in their field and have the opportunities necessary at auditions.
2. The department, along with other Fine Arts programs, should work with campus

administration and various departments to get the theatre maintenance budget put on the campus/maintenance budget.

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 department has many unique resource needs. Budgeting needs for the theater needs to be a bigger campus conversation, due to the many campus activities that take place there. There has been a perceived lack of support, transparency, and communication regarding the funding and maintenance of the theater.
2. The department, and division as a whole, has a demonstrated need for a special marketing person. While dance events are marketed extensively across campus, there needs to be a more concerted effort to market to the community at large. Increasing the attendance of events could help with their budgeting needs. Such a position is common for other Fine Arts programs across the state, and even exists at our sister campus in the District. Not having such a person at Cypress puts Dance, and all of our other Fine Arts programs, at a decided disadvantage.
3. The department has a demonstrated need for full-time faculty. In Fall 2018, the department only full-time faculty ratio was 40.5%, which is 11.2% below the college ratio.
4. The IPRC also supports the department's request for a full-time Office Manager. Currently, they are being served by a manager at only 80%.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Economics
Presenter: Parwinder Sindhu
Date: 11/04/19

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: Economics submitted a thorough and thoughtful review. It 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 2018 – 100% Spring 2019 – 100%

Comments: Every semester since Fall 2017, the Economics department has had an assessment rate of 100.0% and has had consistently high success rates in each of the CSLOs.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments: The department has completed their mappings of their CSLOs to their PSLOs, however, the mappings for each of their PSLOs are identical. Although the Economics faculty have discussed this with the SLO Coordinator, it is still suggested that the department revisit their mappings to make each mapping distinct.

Commendations:

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

1. The department has made positive efforts to address the achievement gap among their African America students. They have been thoughtful in the development of new curriculum like the "Survey of Economics" and "International Economics" for the Legacy Program cohorts.
2. The department is seeing success with the newly launched AA-T and has plans for adding new courses to make their degree more robust.
3. The department has been successful in improving the success rates of their students. While the updating and improvement of classroom methodologies has contributed to this success, the program's strong use of tutors rather has been particularly important. The one-on-one tutoring of students in the program by other students in the program also encourages student involvement and leadership.

Recommendations:

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

1. The program is encouraged to continue its work in addressing the achievement gap.
2. The department is also encouraged to continue its work in addressing the lower success rates of their on-line courses. In particular, the classification of "hybrid" classes may be contributing to low enrollment, and they have decided to deliver their courses 100% online beginning spring 2020.
3. To address the need for additional tutors, the IPRC also recommends the Economics Department look into Smart Thinking (online tutoring) as an additional resource to assist with student success.
4. The program should continue to the next steps of mapping their program.
5. The department needs to prioritize their budget requests and include them in the chart on the form. There also needs to be broader discussions with the Division Dean regarding an on-going departmental budget.

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. They department has identified the need for more Economics tutors and training as a means to improve student success and retention.
2. The department has a demonstrated need for professional development and conference funding that would be on-going in nature.
3. The department has a need for laptops for both instructor and student use.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Kinesiology and Athletics

Presenter: Margaret Mohr

Date: 11/25/19

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:

Kinesiology and Athletics presented a program review that reflects the excellent work of the program.

Program CSLOs:

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

Courses Assessed: Fall 2018 – 97.9% Spring 2019 – 92.2%

Comments:

The department has extremely high assessment rates.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Kinesiology department has completed their mapping of CSLOs to PSLOs, with distinct mappings for each PSLO. The success rates for each of their PSLOs are extremely high.

Commendations:

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

1. The program review was a cooperative effort of the whole department. They filled out an anonymous questionnaire and then met to discuss the answers. The collaboration resulted in a revision of the department's mission statement.
2. The program is one of the few that have had a substantive budget meeting with their Division Dean. In this regard, the department should be seen as a model for other programs across campus to follow.
3. The department has comparatively high student success rates and exhibits no appreciable achievement gap. Institutional Research and Planning conducted a study that showcased the success of their student athletes from 2014-15 to 2018-19. It found that student athletes had a higher success rate (78% vs. 71%) and a higher persistence rate (72% vs. 55%) when compared to other students overall. They also were 2.4 times more likely to earn an award and 1.5 times more likely to transfer.
4. The program has improved the efficiency and cost of the Fitness Lab by ending the open lab concept.
5. All of the coaches are very invested in the success of their student athletes, requiring some type of weekly study hall hour. They have also improved student engagement through the creation of the Kinesiology Club.
6. The program offers four different Associate degrees and has awarded 190 degrees since 2014.
7. The department has done extensive work in support of the Guided Pathways efforts on campus. They have recently added a Public Health Science pathway, received state approval for a Community Health Worker certificate, and added a new course, KIN 297 Kinesiology Internship Seminar, which will help students learn in a real world setting and directly from professionals.
8. Despite the large number of courses offered, many of which are taught by adjuncts, the Kinesiology department has had consistently high assessment rates, at over a 90% each semester.

Recommendations:

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

1. The department needs to prioritize its budget and resource requests to help the IPRC advocate for its needs. The department should continue the process of creating/revising the on-going budget for the department. Supplies required to run the programs should be part of the on-going department budget, thereby ending their traditional reliance on one-time and emergency funding for those items.
2. The program is encouraged to work on their fill rates. Although the fill rates of their courses have increased slightly, the rates are still somewhat low and typically in the 70% range.

3. While there is crossover in the budget and resource needs for Kinesiology and for Athletics, the department should consider a separate budget for the specific needs of the Kinesiology program.

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 numerous demonstrated supply and resource needs. Many are part of the on-going costs of running the program, and the department's budget needs to reflect this.
2. The department has a need for more classroom space that can also house some of the expensive equipment needed to run the program. While the department is aware of the restrictions of space utilization, the needs of the department continue and, if unmet, will hamper the department's ability to grow to meet student need.
3. The department shows a demonstrated need for their playing fields and gym facilities to be upgraded and improved.
4. Like others across campus, the department needs more resources dedicated to marketing their programs and career pathways.
5. The department has a need for full-time faculty. Their full-time faculty ratio is somewhat low at 43.5%, and it is expected to drop even further since they are anticipating at least two retirements in the next three years.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Mathematics

Presenter: David Nussbaum and Cindy Shrout

Date: 11/18/19

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 Math Department presented a well-organized, thoughtful review that reflects a first-rate department committed to student success.

Program CSLOs:

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

Courses Assessed: Fall 2018 – 94.4% Spring 2019 – 100%

Comments: The Mathematics department has been doing an excellent job in assessing their courses each semester. Although the department has a large number of adjuncts teaching their courses, the adjuncts still continue to assess their CSLOs. They also have at least one full-time

faculty member teaching each course, which also helps in their high assessment rate.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments: The department has completed their mapping of their CSLOs to their PSLOs. The success rates of their PSLOs are a bit lower when compared to other departments on campus but are similar to the success rates of departments in their Division. The mappings for two of their PSLOs, Problem Solving and Computation, are the same. In order for the data to be more meaningful, the mappings for each PSLO should be distinct.

Commendations:

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

1. The department has been able save their students over \$200,000 each semester through their use of Open Educational Resource materials across their courses. Currently, their Math 40 is using OER for both the textbook and the online homework, making it completely free for these students. In Fall 2020, they will have OER ready for their Math 141 course and they are currently working on adopting an OER textbook and creating an OER online homework set for their Math 120 course. This makes the department a leader in OER across campus and offers an example for other departments to consider following.
2. The Mathematics program implemented a graphing calculator rental program through the LLRC. Hundreds of students are able to opt out of buying a graphing calculator (which costs over \$100) and borrow a graphing calculator from the LLRC for the entire semester.
3. The department has revised course curriculum to meet the needs of AB 705. Their paired courses have proven to be popular among students and are expected to have a positive impact on student success and retention.
4. The department has very strong enrollment, with fill rates of over 100% in the fall and 90% in the spring.
5. The department has increased the number of Mathematics AS-Ts awarded. In 2015-2016, 7 Mathematics AS-Ts were awarded, and in 2018-2019, there were 34.
6. The department has created over 70 Electronic Directed Learning Activities (e-DLAs). Each e-DLA has instructional videos created by various full-time faculty members followed by problems the students most solve based on the instructional video. Early data suggests they have been extremely successful in promoting student success, particularly in the developmental courses.
7. The Math department's dedication to assisting their students shows with their creation of many e-DLAs, the faculty assistance in the Math Learning Center, the added co-requisite math classes, the creation of MATH 21, and the creation of the OER textbook.
8. The adjunct support [Box.com](#) page is a great way to maintain consistency of pedagogy.

Recommendations:

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

1. The department needs to prioritize its budget and resource requests to help the IPRC advocate for its needs. The department should also begin the process of creating/revising

the on-going budget for the department. The technology needs for creating eDLAs should be a part of that budget.

2. The department is encouraged to continue creating eDLAs to help student success. The committee supports the expansion of eDLAs in all courses the department sees fit.

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 needs up-to-date instructional technology to not only use during lecture, but also to help them with the creation of instructional videos and eDLAs. The type of programs needed to teach the math courses and create the eDLAs needs to be updated approximately every 3 years. As software/programs are updated, the computer technology needs to be able to run the program. Due to the success of the eDLAs, the committee sees this funding as a high priority.
2. The department has a demonstrated need full-time faculty. Their full-time faculty ratio is only 35.9%. While they have been hiring full-time faculty in the past several years, their ratio is still 15.8% below the college ratio.
3. The program also needs more funding to create more OER materials for Math 120 and to start creating the OER materials for their other courses as well.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Political Science

Presenter: Gloria Badal

Date: 11/25/19

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 Political Science Department presented a thoughtful review that reflects its great work across campus. However, the IPRC found a significant issue regarding the assessment of CSLOs and PSLOs. (See Recommendation #2 for below). This issue needs to be addressed by the next review cycle. The committee will provide instructions for how the department can address the issue in a future email.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2018 – 66.7% Spring 2019 – 50.0%

Comments: The Political Science Department has low assessment rates. While they have experienced the same issue with compelling adjunct faculty to assess CSLOs, there is a full-

time faculty member who teaches each of their courses. By contract, all full-time faculty are required to participate in the assessment of CSLOs, and any full-time faculty member who teaches a course should be able to assess its CSLOs. That way, even if the adjuncts do not assess their CSLO, the course will still be counted as assessed. This issue will need to be addressed for the department to change their Compliance Status.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Political Science Department has completed their mapping of CSLOs to PSLOs, with distinct mappings for each PSLO. The success rates for each of their PSLOs are very high.

Commendations:

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

1. The department maintains good fill rates with no appreciable achievement gap.
2. Since 2014, the department has awarded 65 AA-Ts. Currently 22 of their students are enrolled in a 4-year institution, 18 of them have already received a bachelor's degree. The department is reviewing their AA-T requirements to help clarify student pathways.
3. In collaboration with Ethnic Studies and the Puente Program, the department is developing curriculum in Latin American politics and issues concerning our LatinX populations.

Recommendations:

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

1. The department needs to prioritize and better define its budget and resource requests to help the IPRC advocate for its needs. The department should also begin the process of creating/revising the on-going budget for the department.
2. The department needs to work on CSLOs. They must improve the percentage of courses assessed by their next review cycle or risk having their Compliance Status lowered. The program should make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. While there is still some contractual ambiguity on the responsibilities of adjunct faculty, the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language regarding CSLO data input. But the committee is most concerned with the participation of full-time faculty. The full-time faculty contract is quite clear that SLO work is part of our required duties. As such, lack of full-time faculty participation in CSLOs will not be tolerated, and failure of faculty to participate may negatively impact the department's Compliance Status.
3. The curriculum being developed for Latin American politics should appear in the Curriculum section of the review form.

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 department has a need for conference funding and journal subscriptions that should be part of an on-going departmental budget.
2. The department has a need for a full-time faculty member.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Psychology

Presenter: Brandy Young and Randy Martinez

Date: 11/18/19

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 Psychology Department presented a well-written and comprehensive review that reflected the collaborative work of the entire program.

Program CSLOs:

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

Courses Assessed: Fall 2018 – 92.3% Spring 2019 – 91.7%

Comments: The Psychology department does an excellent job of assessing their CSLOs every semester and has developed standardized assessments. The only course that has historically not been assessed is a course that is taught solely by adjunct. While the new adjunct contract provides for data entry, the department feels that some sort of stipend for the adjunct faculty to assess and develop their CSLOs every semester is more than appropriate.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments: The department has completed their mapping of their CSLOs to their PSLOs. Their success rates are on track with that of other departments on campus. The mappings for several of their PSLOs are the same e.g. Social Sciences, Reading, Writing, Communicating, Analysis, Research, and Problem Solving all have the same mapping and also Computation and Technology have the same mapping. In order for the data to be more meaningful, the mappings for each PSLO should be distinct.

Commendations:

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

1. Psychology is the 3rd largest major on campus, and the department has fantastic AA-T numbers. In 2018-19 they awarded 141 AA-Ts.
2. The department is engaging their students and encouraging student involvement with the Psychology Club, the Psi Beta Honor Society, and research conferences. This is a big part of their inclusive program that moves their students from introduction, to research and conferences, to their next step in education.
3. The Psychology program has a very high transfer rate of 88.3% since 2014-15 with three students having already received their Master's degree.
4. The textbooks and courses have been consistent and streamlined within the department, and technology has been a key factor with student retention and engagement.
5. The department has a large number of on-line courses and is a premier department on campus in this regard. They have various hybrid formats to meet the needs of students and particular course material.

Recommendations:

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

1. The department needs to prioritize its budget and resource requests to help the IPRC advocate for its needs. The department should also begin the process of creating/revising the on-going budget for the department.
2. The department should send a seat count change for "Research Methods" through curriculum with justifications for the change.
3. The department is encouraged to continue pursuing SPSS funding for a student lab.
4. The department is encouraged to continue working with the Legacy and Puente programs to address the achievement gap for African American 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 department has a demonstrated need for conference funding to be included in their on-going department budget.
2. The department has a crucial need for full-time faculty. In Fall 2018, their full-time faculty

ratio was only 41.0%, which is 10.7% below the college ratio. The department lost a potential new faculty hire with their desired specialty focus due to the salary and benefits package offered by District not being competitive with other districts. As a result, this has the potential to negatively affect the running of the department and the momentum of student success and completion or transfer.

3. The department has a demonstrated need to streamline the on-line teaching training requirements for adjunct faculty. There should be an equivalency process in our on-line training that makes it easier to verify an adjunct's ability to teach online, especially if they have taught at other institutions using Canvas.
4. The department needs greater institutional support for research. They have a great need for technology, including laptop computers, to support research in a formal department would like Cypress College to establish an Institutional Review Board (IRB). When a campus does not have an IRB, it is not ethical for the students to conduct research, since they cannot request approval from the IRB. Also, any research that is done by faculty or students at Cypress College cannot be published or shared at a professional conference because we lack an IRB.
5. The faculty need laptops for them to use for their instruction. Many of their courses incorporate the use of technology so it is important that the faculty are able to show the students how that technology works during lecture and for research purposes. In the past, faculty have used their own money to purchase computers and software. It is hoped that this out-of-pocket cost will be replaced by technology support from the campus.
6. They are in need of annual licenses of SPSS, which is a statistical software that is used in analyzing data. This funding should be part of their department's on-going operational budget.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Sociology
Presenter: Regina Rhymes
Date: 11/25/19

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 Sociology Department presented a well-written review that reflects the excellent work of the program. However, the IPRC did find a significant issue with CSLOs that resulted in the department receiving the status of Compliant – Needs Improvement. (See Recommendation #3 below). This issue needs to be addressed by the next review cycle. The committee will provide instructions for how the department can address the issue in a future email.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed: Fall 2018 – 60.0% Spring 2019 – 62.5%

Comments: Although their assessments rates have doubled since Fall 2017, the numbers are still relatively low. While they have experienced the common issue with compelling adjunct faculty to assess CSLOs, there is a full-time faculty member able to make the assessments. By contract, all full-time are required to participate in the assessment of CSLOs, and it is strongly encouraged that any full-time faculty members assess their CSLOs so that the course can be counted as assessed. The IPRC supports the department's recent revision of their CSLOs and corresponding assessments, and it is expected that these changes and greater faculty participation will improve the percentage of courses assessed by the next review cycle.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Sociology department has completed their CSLO to PSLO mappings and have high success rates in each of their PSLOs. Mappings for two of their PSLOs are identical, Reading and Communicating. It is suggested that they revisit these two mappings to make the mappings distinct.

Commendations:

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

1. The department has increased its course offerings to meet the needs of students. They offer courses at a variety of days and times and through different modes of instruction. They also rotate their offerings to facilitate the completion of their AA-Ts.
2. Since 2014-15, the Sociology department has awarded 212 AA-Ts, which is a very high number.
3. Preparing their students to transfer and succeed at the next level is a primary focus of the department. The Sociology Club, participation in campus events like Connect to Cypress, Commit to Cypress, and Charger Fridays, and mentoring in the Puente and Legacy programs are all designed to prepare their students for future success. In particular, the department has been instrumental in fostering student interest in teaching in higher education by partnering with CSUF Sociology Graduate Division. Through CSUF College Symposium, their students have received academic support and tutoring. These efforts have paid off. Currently, 61 of their students are enrolled in a 4-year institution, and 62 others have received a bachelor's degree since the last review cycle.
4. To assist students in their success, they have embedded counselors and peer tutors in some of their classes to assist with basic skills. This is a best practice the campus should try to replicate and scale to other classes in other departments.
5. The department has a very high success rate for their online classes (73.2%), which is much higher than the Division and College averages. They have taken active steps to improve the quality of their on-line delivery, particularly in their hybrid courses. They have increased student engagement prior to and throughout the semester and have offered greater technical support through Canvas and publisher materials. Their use of video conferencing in these courses has been particularly popular among students.
6. The department has a strong partnership with the Legacy Program. To address the department's disproportionate impact for Black/African American students, they incorporated some of their classes into the Legacy curriculum. They are also creating a GE transferable course in race relations. Partnering with Legacy has also allowed the department to provide additional support to special need populations such as student athletes, African Americans, and first-generation college students.

7. The department's "Meet the Professor" events are a good example of its commitment to student outreach.

Recommendations:

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

1. The department needs to prioritize and better define its budget and resource requests to help the IPRC advocate for its needs. The department should also begin the process of creating/revising the on-going budget for the department.
2. The department should work with other departments like Psychology to create an Institutional research Board on campus.
3. The department needs to work on CSLOs and PSLOs. They must improve the percentage of courses assessed by their next review cycle or risk having their Compliance Status lowered. The program should make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. While there is still some contractual ambiguity on the responsibility of adjunct faculty to participate in the process, the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language regarding CSLO data input. But the committee is most concerned that all full-time faculty fully participate. The full-time faculty contract is quite clear that SLO work is part of our required duties. Lack of full-time faculty participation in CSLOs will not be tolerated, and failure of faculty to participate may negatively impact the department's Compliance Status.
4. The department is encouraged to explore adding Sociology 292: Introduction to Criminology to the list of courses for the Administration of Justice degree.
5. The department is encouraged to find ways of scaling the use of embedded peer tutors to other courses in other departments as a part of the campus-wide Guided Pathways efforts.

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 department has a demonstrated need for laptop computers and access codes for textbook support.
2. The department has a need for conference funding to be a part of its on-going budget.

Appendix G: Specialized Instructional Program Review Summaries



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Honors

Presenter: Penny Gabourie and Stephanie Tran

Date: March 09, 2020

Special Instructional Program Review Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) 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 Specialized Instructional Program Review Form submitted by the program. The highlights of that 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 Specialized 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 Special 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 Honors Program presented a well-written review that demonstrated its commitment to student success.

Program SSLOs:

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

SSLOs Assessed: None

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through review in Spring 2019.

Commendations:

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

1. The program has high student success rates and has been able to double the number of students in the program over the past year.
2. The program's organization is somewhat unique. It is not a traditional cohort as there is fluid entry, exit, and course work. But they do offer specific instruction and class size, tailored counseling, and service-learning components that allow the students to interact in ways normally only seen in traditional cohort models. This approach may also provide examples for other departments/programs to use in their Guided Pathways efforts.

Recommendations:

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

1. Honors is encouraged to develop SSLOs to better track the impact/success of the program. The IPRC would like to see significant progress in this area by the next review cycle.
2. The program is encouraged to update its budget and resource needs to reflect the growth of the program and the increased costs of material, supplies, and conferences. This budget should prioritize resources based on program needs and distinguish whether the expenses are new, on-going, or needed for program growth.
3. The program is encouraged in their effort to find a specific space for students of the program to interact academically and socially. If space is going to be campus budget item, any additional costs should be detailed in the program's budget.
4. The IPRC supports Honors courses remaining stand-alone courses rather than being stacked, but the committee encourages the program to find ways to address the lower fill rates of the courses.

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, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, SSLO outcomes, and awards, transfers, and equity data, to support their request.

1. The budget of the program needs to be increased. The current allotment of \$3,100 was set years ago and has not kept up with increased cost, nor is it adequate at meeting the needs of the program.
2. The Honors Program needs their own space on campus for their students to gather for school and social needs.
3. The program demonstrated the need for their students to receive priority registration. This has proven to be an effective feature of other successful Specialized Instructional Programs, and the IPRC strongly supports this request.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Puente

Presenter: Dr. Therese Mosqueda-Ponce and Ashton Politanoff

Date: March 02, 2020

Special Instructional Program Review Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) 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 Specialized Instructional Program Review Form submitted by the program. The highlights of that 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 Specialized 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 Special 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 Puente Program presented a thorough report that underscored how it has become a model for Specialized Instructional Programs on campus.

Program SSLOs:

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

SSLOs Assessed: None

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through review in Spring 2019.

Commendations:

The Instructional Program Review Committee finds the following work of the program to be

noteworthy and commendable:

1. The Puente Program has paved the way for other Specialized Instructional Programs that have followed. From its early struggles to gain support on campus to its present position as a campus institution promoting student success, their history is an example of their motto: "Si se puede!"
2. The Puente Program has demonstrated a strong commitment to student success. Their retention, graduation, and transfer rates are strong and have exceeded expectations. In addition, the program has adapted well to the implementation of AB 705. They have eliminated ENGL 060C as the entry level course and adjusted their curriculum with the inclusion of ENGL 104C. The program is to be commended for adjusting to this sea change.
3. The program provides excellent professional development and state/regional training for its counselors and instructors.
4. There are 2 PAL tutors in each Puente English class to ensure student success. This peer mentoring is something that may be scaled across campus.
5. The program is not just limited to the Hispanic/Latino population, and students from every race are members of the program.
6. Puente does an excellent job tracking their students after they leave Cypress. This reflects the commitment the program makes to its students who see the program like a family.

Recommendations:

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

1. The program is encouraged to develop SSLOs to better track their impact and success. The IPRC would like to see significant progress in this area by the next review cycle.
2. The program is encouraged to update its budget and resource needs to reflect the growth of the program and the increased costs of material, supplies, and conferences. This includes the need for laptops to assist with instruction. This budget should prioritize resources based on program needs and distinguish whether the expenses are new, on-going, or needed for program growth.
3. The program is encouraged in their effort to expand to a second cohort of students, and it should detail the budgetary needs for additional release time or additional faculty.
4. The program is also encouraged in their effort to find a specific space for students of the program to interact academically and socially. If space is going to be campus budget item, any additional costs should be detailed in the program's budget.

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, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, SSLO outcomes, and awards, transfers, and equity data, to support their request.

1. The Puente Program has been fighting for, and needs, their own space on campus for the students in the cohort can gather for school and social needs. The success of the program is driven by the overall shared experiences of the cohort - collective engagement through the trips they attend, the authors of the books they read in class. This will foster greater student success and cohesiveness.
2. The program has a demonstrated need for laptop computers for their students, counselors, and instructors.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: STEM²

Presenter: Yanet Garica and Richard Fee

Date: March 09, 2020

Special Instructional Program Review Summary

The goal of the Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) 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 Specialized Instructional Program Review Form submitted by the program. The highlights of that 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 Specialized 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 Special 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: STEM is one of our most successful Specialized Instructional Programs and has proved successful in scaling their services to increasingly larger numbers of students.

Program SSLOs:

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

SSLOs Assessed: None

Comments: Not applicable for programs going through review in Spring 2019.

Commendations:

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

1. STEM² has been incredibly successful increasing the numbers of students they are able to service. The scaling of their program may provide clues as to how the campus may scale that support and services to other departments and programs across campus.
2. The program has developed a pathway from recruitment through transfer that may also provide a model for other departments/programs to follow in their Guided Pathways efforts. Priority registration has been essential to these efforts, but the program's development of a mobile app for students to use to register for workshops, set counseling appointments, and access other support services.
3. STEM² has excellent transfer rates and have no demonstratable achievement gap.
4. The program has experienced tremendous growth. Beginning in 2012 with a grant through CSF, the program serviced 30 students; today, the program services over 500. Their ability to offer their wrap around services to an increasingly larger number of students provides clues as to how to scale these types of services across other departments/programs on the campus.
5. The program offers extensive opportunities for students outside of the classroom. Students attend conferences and are afforded summer research opportunities with Cal Poly Pomona, CSULB, CSUF, and UCSD. In particular, 12 students were chosen to participate in UCSD/NASA research project.

Recommendations:

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

1. The program is encouraged to develop SSLOs to better track their impact and success. The IPRC would like to see significant progress in this area by the next review cycle.
2. The program is encouraged to update its budget and resource needs to reflect the growth of the program and the increased costs of material, supplies, and conferences. This budget should prioritize resources based on program needs and distinguish whether the expenses are new, on-going, or needed for program growth.
3. The program is encouraged in their effort to find a specific space for students of the program to interact academically and socially. If space is going to be campus budget item, any additional costs should be detailed in the program's budget.

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, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, SSLO outcomes, and awards, transfers, and equity data, to support their request.

1. Part of the success of the STEM² program is the availability of various sources of restricted funds, grants, and other revenue streams tailored to STEM². The IPRC supports the efforts of the program to seek out alternate forms of funding.
2. The program has a demonstrated need for a permanent Special Projects Director plus additional Administrative and Classified support.
3. While STEM² has its own dedicated space on campus, the program expressed feeling a disconnect from faculty since moving to their new space in the Fine Arts building. The STEM² space needs to be where the STEM² faculty are, not necessarily where the classrooms are. The IPRC supports the program's need to find a new space on campus to house the program.