

**CYPRESS COLLEGE**

**Instructional Program Review  
2020–2021 Annual Report**

---



Draft Date: March 2021  
Prepared on behalf of the Instructional Program Review Committee by  
Bryan Seiling and Jennifer Coopman

## Table of Contents (Active Links)

INTRODUCTION .....	4
COVID-19 DISRUPTION.....	4
DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION .....	5
PURPOSE OF PROGRAM REVIEW .....	5
PROCESS OVERVIEW .....	6
MISSION STATEMENT .....	6
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK, FORMS, & EVIDENCE LOCATION .....	6
A GENERAL NOTE ABOUT EVIDENCE .....	7
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES AND TERMS .....	7
MEETINGS WITH INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REPRESENTATIVES.....	8
OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS .....	8
Program Completion: Certificates and Degrees.....	8
Distance Education .....	8
Online v. Web-Enhanced.....	9
Distance Education Training.....	9
Distance Education Support and Funding.....	10
Student Equity and Disaggregation.....	10
Completed SLO Reporting Recommendations from previous years: .....	11
Remaining recommendations that are in progress of being addressed: .....	12
CTE TWO-YEAR REPORTS (SHORT FORM).....	12
SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM (SIP) REVIEWS .....	13
Specialized Instructional Program Related Commendations:.....	13
Specialized Instructional Program Related Recommendations: .....	13
Specialized Instructional Program Related Budget/Resource Needs:.....	14
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM RELATED COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	14
GLOBAL COMMENDATIONS:.....	14
GLOBAL RECOMMENDATIONS:.....	15
Ongoing Recommendations:.....	15
New Recommendations:.....	15
BUDGET REQUESTS AND RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS: .....	16
Ongoing Budget Needs and Requests: .....	16
A Special Note about the Campus Theater: .....	17
Newly Identified Budget Needs and Requests:.....	17
LOOKING FORWARD.....	18
APPENDIX A: TIMELINE FOR THE 2021-2022 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW CYCLE.....	19
APPENDIX B: DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION QUESTIONS .....	20
APPENDIX C: ROTATION SCHEDULE (NEW 4-YEAR CYCLE EFFECTIVE FALL 2016).....	21
APPENDIX D: PROGRAMS PRESENTING CTE TWO-YEAR REPORTS (SHORT-FORMS) .....	22
APPENDIX E: SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM BEING REVIEWED .....	23
APPENDIX F: SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW FORM.....	24
APPENDIX G: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARIES .....	30
Program: Accounting.....	31
Program: Administration of Justice .....	34
Program: Air Conditioning and Refrigeration .....	37
Program: Aviation and Travel Careers .....	40
Program: Computer Information Services .....	44
Program: Dental Hygiene.....	47
Program: Health Information Technology.....	50
Program: Human Services.....	53
Program: Journalism.....	56
Program: Media Arts Design.....	59
Program: Mortuary Science.....	63
Program: Photography .....	67
Program: Theater .....	71
APPENDIX H: SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARIES .....	75
Program: Distance Education.....	76

Program: Dual Enrollment.....	80
Program: English Success Center .....	83
Program: Legacy.....	86
Program: Math Learning Center .....	89
Program: Supplemental Instruction.....	92
Program: Tutoring .....	95

## Introduction

In 2016, Cypress College revised its instructional program review schedule from a 3-year to a 4-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 beginning of a new four-year cycle. For reference, the schedule for the new four-year cycle is included in the [Appendix C](#) of this document along with a list of CTE TOP-Coded programs undergoing review this year in [Appendix D](#).

The change in cycle also brought a revision of the instructional program review process and accompanying forms. The goal was to make the process more meaningful and to tie it more closely to the larger College planning and budget processes. The Departmental Planning and Instructional Program Review Self-Study form each department submits was updated for style, layout, and ease of use. Each department makes an in person (or Zoom) presentation to the committee based on the material in the form and then receives a Review Summary to be attached to any future requests for funding made by the department. To assist in this, the Summary includes a Compliance Status tied to the program’s eligibility for funding and a Budget Resource Table designed to capture information needed to better inform decisions made regarding One-Time Funding, Faculty and Classified Prioritization, and other budget and resource requests.

This year the committee continued reviewing Specialized Instructional Programs. These are programs that combine tailored instruction, counseling, and student services to support specific student groups. Historically, these programs did not have a well-defined review process, and the IPRC was determined to be the appropriate place to conduct them. In order to undertake an effective review and make the process as similar to the other Instructional Program Reviews, the IPRC created both a Specialized Instructional Program Form and a Review Summary. The process and forms are detailed later in the report and in the Appendix.

## Covid-19 Disruption

When the COVID-19 hit with full force in Spring 2020, nobody would have predicted we would still be conducting most of our courses remotely. Like no other recent crisis, the pandemic has stretched the resources of the campus and placed unprecedented burdens on faculty, administration, and staff. There is no doubt that the college will be feeling the effects of the crisis for years to come, and 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 further impact from the pandemic will be reflected in the reviews of the departments and programs in the near future. The college will need to make special consideration for budget and resource requests that help departments and programs mitigate the impact of COVID-19.

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. For meeting this challenge in Spring 2020, the honor of Fulltime Faculty of the Year and Adjunct Faculty of the Year awarded by the Academic Senate went to All fulltime faculty and All parttime faculty, respectively. But the work was only beginning. Many instructors needed to be trained online, synchronous, and asynchronous instruction had to be planned, a remote ecosystem had to be created and scaled to the whole campus, and technology and other resources needed to be provided to students. Faculty from across the campus went above and beyond to ensure that instruction continued at Cypress and students had all the support and services they needed.

Special recognition must be given to those departments and programs whose curriculum forced them to return to on-campus instruction. These programs worked incredibly hard to ensure health and safety standards were being upheld and regulations followed. Some programs, like Automotive Repair, established successful safety protocols that were adopted by other colleges and are now seen as the industry standard. There was some concern expressed as to whether the voices of these programs were always being heard in the planning process and as well as whether they had full administrative support, particularly regarding PPE and other needed supplies. There will surely be reflection as to how the College and District responded to the disruption of COVID, but it is certain that the faculty, staff, and administrators of Cypress College must all be congratulated and recognized for meeting this Herculean task. It was a collective effort that required the dedication, work, and support of all parts of the campus.

## Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

In response to numerous examples of Black Americans being killed by law enforcement and others, the Black Live Matter Movement helped to organize demonstrations and protests for racial justice across the state and nation. In response, Black faculty, administrators, and staff formed the Black Lives Matter Taskforce that called for a sweeping reevaluation of district and college policies and practices and offered numerous recommendations for implementing meaningful and lasting reforms. The recommendations became the focus of an Academic Senate ad hoc committee charged with responding to the recommendations and organizing the advocacy and action needed to implement them. This resulted in a Senate Resolution in the support of the BLM Taskforce recommendations and a call for all faculty committees to revise their policies and procedures using an equity lens.

In this context, the Instructional Program Review Committee committed to making discussions of diversity, equity, and inclusion a centerpiece of the Instructional Program Review process going forward. As a first step, the committee added a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Liaison as a full voting member. They join the SLO, Accreditation, and Student Services Liaisons to create another important lens through which to view our programs. Appropriately, a member of the BLM Taskforce was chosen to serve that role. The committee also revised the questions, forms, and summaries used in the review process to have a greater equity focus.

Central to this was the creation of a set of DEI questions designed to foster a conversation about the work being done by programs to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion across campus and in the surrounding community. The programs participating in review were sent the questions to consider at the beginning of the semester and were asked to have responses ready when they made their presentations to the committee later in the fall. This resulted in robust discussions that not only highlighted the great work already being done on campus, but also revealed so much more work that needs to be done and the impediments, both institutional and attitudinal, that stand in the way. These discussions are reflected in the “Commendations” and “Recommendations” sections of the Program Review Summaries each individual program received this spring. The Summaries also contain a “Budget and Resource” section in which requests for financial and institutional support needed to further work in diversity, equity, and inclusion were given high rankings. The specific questions asked can be found in [Appendix B](#) of this document.

This process will continue going forward, and these revisions are by no means complete. The recent incidents of violence targeting Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders only underscores the need for these efforts to continue. The conversations have been tremendous, but they must also be followed up with actions and a commitment to bring about long-needed reforms to College and District, policies, practices, and personnel. As the college efforts and focus on DEI shift and grow, so will that of Instructional Program Review. New questions will assuredly need to be developed, and the forms and summaries will certainly need to be revised. To ensure this process and focus remains current, the IPRC will conduct a regular spring review of the entire process and accompanying forms. The review was written into the committee’s new meetings bylaws.

## 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 IPRC 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 dean, two institutional researchers, and liaisons for SLOs, Accreditation, and Diversity. 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 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. In Fall 2020, a Budget Table was added to the Identified Budget and Resources Needs section of the IPRC Summary. Each department will be expected to attach their Review Summary to all future resource and budget requests, and the goal was to ensure that the Summaries collected all the necessary and desired data to be used to inform campus planning and budget decisions.

## 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

The *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 updated the *Program Review Handbook* in the Spring of 2021 to reflect the substantial revisions that were made to the review process and forms over the past four years. To help run the committee meetings and better document the review process, Meeting Bylaws were created and added to the Appendix of the handbook. The Bylaws may be updated as needed and such revisions do not need to wait until the scheduled 4-year review of the handbook. The *Department Planning and Instructional Program Review Handbook* can be found on the Cypress College Program Review webpage and in the J-drive. Similarly, faculty will also find copies of previous self-studies and CTE Short Form reports on the "J-drive" in the Instructional 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 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 (2 <sup>nd</sup> : 2019-2022)	pmolnar@cypresscollege.edu
CTE	Stephanie Rosati (2 <sup>nd</sup> : 2021-2024)	srosati@cypresscollege.edu
Counseling	Ernesto Heredia (2 <sup>nd</sup> : 2021-2024)	eheredia@cypresscollege.edu
Fine Arts	Maha Afra (2 <sup>nd</sup> : 2018-2021)	mafra@cypresscollege.edu
Health Science	Nancy Corrales (1 <sup>st</sup> : 2021-2024)	ncorales@cypresscollege.edu
Language Arts	Sarah Jones (2 <sup>nd</sup> : 2019-2022)	sjones@cypresscollege.edu
Library	Joyce Peacock (2 <sup>nd</sup> : 2019-2022)	jpeacock@cypresscollege.edu
Kinesiology	Margaret Mohr (3 <sup>rd</sup> : 2020-2023)	mmohr@cypresscollege.edu
SEM	Sujata Chiplunkar (2 <sup>nd</sup> : 2019-2022)	schiplunkar@cypresscollege.edu
Social Science	David Halahmy (2 <sup>nd</sup> : 2021-2024)	dhalahmy@cypresscollege.edu
<b>Administrative</b>		
Dean	Eldon Young	eyoung@cypresscollege.edu
IRP	Eileen Haddad	ehaddad@cypresscollege.edu
IRP	Kristina Oganessian	koganesian@cypresscollege.edu
Chair	Bryan Seiling	bseiling@cypresscollege.edu
Co-Chair	David Halahmy	dhalahmy@cypresscollege.edu
Student Services Liaison	AnnMarie Ruelas	aruelas@cypresscollege.edu
Accreditation Faculty Chair	Liana Koepfel	lkoepfel@cypresscollege.edu
SLO Coordinator	Jennifer Coopman	jcoopman@cypresscollege.edu
Diversity Liaison	Regina Rhymes	rrhymes@cypresscollege.edu

The committee added a Liaison for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion as a permanent voting member of the committee and selected a member of the Black Lives Matter Taskforce as the first member. A process for selecting this liaison in the future is being created with the plan being that the Academic Senate will be responsible for making the appointment.

The current committee Assistant Chair is resigning before his term is complete, and a replacement was needed to take over his duties by the end of the spring semester. A call was made through the appropriate process, and Maha Afra was appointed by the Academic Senate with unanimous support of the members of the IPRC. Professor Afra will handle the responsibilities of the Assistant Chair as outlined in the IPRC Chair job description for the next year. The current terms of both the Chair and replacement Assistant Chair expire at the end of the Spring 2022 semester. A new call will be needed to fill the vacant positions with the replacement Assistant Chair being given special consideration if they choose to continue in that role or apply to be the Chair.

## Meetings with Instructional Program Representatives

After reviewing the written program reviews, the committee met face-to-face with the following program representatives in Fall 2020. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, all meetings were held remotely via Zoom.

### November 9

Photography  
Theater

Tony Maher  
James Hormel and Donny Jackson

### November 16

Accounting  
Air Conditioning and Refrigeration  
Journalism  
Media Arts Design

Ann Sheridan Solis and Samreen Manjra  
Douglas Sallade  
Michael Coronado  
Katalin Angelov and Ian Holmes

### November 23

Administration of Justice  
Aviation and Travel Careers  
Computer Information Services  
Health Information Technology

Ed Valdez  
Ed Valdez  
Peter Molnar  
Patti Spitler

### November 30

Dental Hygiene  
Human Services  
Mortuary Science

Kendra Velasco  
Virgil Adams, James Tapia, and Gary Zager  
Jolena Grande and Damon de la Cruz

## 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 fourth 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. Departments are being encouraged to work with IRP, the Title V Data Coaches, and others to ensure all the desired data is being collected and the proper metrics are being used to determine program success.

### *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. Others have certainly felt the impact of the COVID-19 restrictions and may have a lingering impact in the immediate future. It is believed that the movement to expand Dual Enrollment opportunities for high school students, increased marketing and social media outreach, and expanded access to support services for all students will help mitigate this impact and create opportunities for these same programs to build their enrolments in the future.

### *Distance Education*

No department or program on campus deserves more praise than Distance Education for meeting the demands of the pandemic. The shift to remote instruction in Spring 2020 could not have been done without the aid of the DE Team. By facilitating the rapid review and approval of curriculum for DE delivery, enhancing course Canvas shells with support services, and training faculty to teach in an online setting, the program led the way and positively impacted every class and student at Cypress College. For this reason and others, the DE Coordinator, Kathleen McAlister, was selected by the Academic Senate to receive the Charger Award for contributions to the College outside of the classroom. The well-deserved honor was a reflection not only of her tireless work but that of the entire Distance Education Team as well.

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 it 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 staff, 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. Historically, online classes regularly have success rates that are double digits lower than face-to-face classes. Recently, this gap has been narrowed to 2-3% with some classes showing no gaps at all. 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 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.

### *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. Canvas has allowed the global integration of student services and counseling and offers the opportunity for self-enrolling Canvas support sites. The program then facilitated, supported, and developed training for LMS integrations such as Turnitin.com, ALLY, Canvas Studio, GoReact, Proctorio, Respondus, Lockdown Browser, Labster, Zoom, Screencast-O-matic. These software integrations provide various essential services and resources for faculty and students. In particular, they are central to accessibility compliance which should be of high concern for the college and district. Currently many of these integrations are being provided by the federal and state funds as well as publishers offering access to products during the pandemic. Both these funds and access cannot be expected to last indefinitely, and the campus needs to prepare for that eventuality to ensure these services are not interrupted.

### *Distance Education Training*

The DEAC has greatly increased the training and support being offered. They increased the frequency and awareness of training, updated the Faculty Handbook and College Website, created “web enhanced training”, and updated faculty certification all with an eye to the Canvas LMS. Also, 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. This helped the program triple the number of active DE-trained/certified faculty from Spring 2020 to Fall 2020.

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. 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.
2. 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.
3. The DEAC is encouraged to address concerns of disciplines such as Math that need more security, particularly regarding testing, in order to offer courses online.

### *Distance Education Support and Funding*

While the DEAC has 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 has not kept up to meet that demand. This is a longstanding problem that was further exposed by the demands placed on the DE because of being forced to remote instruction.

A new DE Plan has been approved, and the IPRC fully supports its goals, vision, and implementation. The IPRC specifically advocates for the restructure of the DE program support model. The scope of the program's work increased from 25% of class offerings to 100% in the past 5 years, but the institutional support in terms of technology and personnel has not increased to meet that workload. The program needs a more defined structure that includes a fulltime DE Project Manager, an increase in reassigned time for the DE Coordinator and potential support, and the required Instructional Designers, ideally three or more, all with well-defined roles. This structure and other budget and resource requests of the DE Plan should be included in an accurate, right-sized budget that is fully supported and well-funded by a campus-level line item. The DE Program is too essential to rely on One-Time Funding or other non-permanent sources of revenue.

The need for funding and support was further 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. 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 and fully funding the new DE Plan.

### *Student Equity and Disaggregation*

Programs continued to be provided with disaggregated student demographic data as well as student characteristic data including gender, ethnicity, age, financial aid status, foster youth status, disability status, and veteran status. Gaps varied based upon the programs examined. Overall, support is needed to strengthen the success rates for African American, American Indian, and Pacific Islander students as well as former foster youth and veteran students.

## **Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs)**

### **CSLO Table**

Fall 2020 Program Review Departments	Courses Assessed		Successful Assessments	
	# Offered	% Assessed	# Assessed	% Successful
Accounting	5	100.0%	4,499	88.1%
Administration of Justice	4	75.0%	494	86.8%
Air Conditioning & Refrigeration	21	100.0%	4,047	91.6%
Energy & Sustainable Technology	2	50.0%	14	85.7%
Media Arts Design	49	89.8%	3,837	90.8%
Aviation & Travel Careers	48	75.0%	2,219	87.2%
CIS	55	100.0%	15,180	85.5%
Dental Hygiene	20	100.0%	2,451	96.5%
Health Information Technology	12	100.0%	1,635	89.4%
Human Services	23	95.7%	6,141	94.7%
Mortuary Science AS	29	95.6%	2,872	95.6%
Photography	18	50.0%	2,071	94.0%
Theater Arts	40	82.5%	1,871	93.2%
<b>Total since Fall 2017</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>90.2%</b>	<b>47,331</b>	<b>92.2%</b>

*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.

## ISLO Table

ISLOs	Exceeded Standard		Met Standard		Did not Meet Standard		Total Assessed	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>A. Breadth of Knowledge, Competencies, &amp; Skills</b>								
Arts, Sciences, and Kinesiology Career Technical Education	2,496	72.9%	593	17.3%	334	9.8%	3,423	100.0%
Business and Computer Information Systems	10,173	66.8%	2,853	18.7%	2,204	14.5%	15,230	100.0%
Career Technical Education	4,429	78.3%	652	11.5%	576	10.2%	5,657	100.0%
Health Sciences	1,084	79.5%	226	16.6%	54	4.0%	1,364	100.0%
Humanities & the Arts	496	72.7%	113	16.6%	73	10.7%	682	100.0%
<b>B. Communication</b>								
1. Reading	14,669	71.5%	3,384	16.5%	2,453	12.0%	20,506	100.0%
2. Writing	7,839	78.7%	1,213	12.2%	908	9.1%	9,960	100.0%
3. Communicating	10,224	79.2%	1,580	12.2%	1,108	8.6%	12,912	100.0%
4. Presenting	8,991	78.3%	1,423	12.4%	1,069	9.3%	11,483	100.0%
<b>C. Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency</b>								
1. Analysis	15,149	76.2%	2,636	13.3%	2,095	10.5%	19,880	100.0%
2. Computation	10,151	79.4%	1,438	11.3%	1,193	9.3%	12,782	100.0%
3. Research	9,154	82.1%	1,082	9.7%	918	8.2%	11,154	100.0%
4. Problem-solving	19,366	75.7%	3,516	13.7%	2,715	10.6%	25,597	100.0%
5. Technology	21,009	74.2%	4,156	14.7%	3,132	11.1%	28,297	100.0%
<b>D. Personal, Academic, &amp; Professional Development</b>								
1. Personal Responsibility	8,490	83.1%	906	8.9%	825	8.1%	10,221	100.0%
2. Global Citizenship	7,635	83.6%	797	8.7%	700	7.7%	9,132	100.0%

### *Completed SLO Reporting Recommendations from previous years:*

Since the eLumen system was adopted, various instructional packets, instructional videos, and training workshops have been created to aid faculty in completing their CSLO assessments. This has increased the CSLO completion rates for departments and allowed many recommendations from previous years to be addressed. For instance:

- Instead of courses being assessed every four years, courses are now being assessed every semester. The expectation is that at least one CSLO will be assessed for every class section taught each semester, and departments and programs are encouraged to assess even more than that.
- Standardized PSLOs have been created and department chairs have been given guidance on how to complete the CSLO to PSLO mapping process in eLumen. As such, all departments are now expected to have this mapping complete by the time they participate in instructional program review. The SLO Committee and IPRC are both committed to guiding them through the process.
- 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, and how to run various reports in eLumen, among other things.
- CSLO Status Reports that show the percentage of courses that are assessed for each division and department are created by Institutional Research and Planning every semester and can be found on the SLO webpage.
- The criteria for CSLO assessments that departments and programs must meet when going through Instructional Program Review was established. Beginning with Fall 2019, the percentage of courses assessed for each semester should be at least 90%. There should be an exception to Spring 2020 due to the transition to completely remote instruction in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. For Spring 2020, the percentage of courses assessed should be at least 70%. For any subsequent semesters with percentages below 90%, the program should write a brief description on the Instructional Program Review Self-Study Form describing the reason for the lower percentage. The exception statement will be considered by the IPRC in assigning the department's Compliance Status.

### *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. This has been an on-going issue, and there have been some positive changes. The SLO Coordinator created a guide to facilitate the process and established the policy of sending out a reminder email to all faculty at the beginning of the fall and spring semesters. But there is still much work to be done, and a committee is being created to address the issue and suggest possible solutions.
- 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.
- A simple and easy-to-use Canvas integration with eLumen would be helpful. The college beta test participants for Canvas NextGen were unable to complete the beta test since there were system connectivity issues syncing eLumen with Canvas. From the Canvas NextGen training that eLumen hosted, the beta test participants also found many issues with the integration and it was much more complicated than anticipated.
- Continued efforts to encourage all faculty to participate in the SLO process is recommended. There has been great growth in the campus culture regarding SLOs over the past several years. Many departments and programs have exceptional CSLO assessment completion rates and have completed the PSLO mapping. However, increased communication and efforts are recommended to encourage more Faculty participation. Fulltime faculty have been required to participate in the SLO process for a few years, and the Adjunct Faculty Contract now states that they are required to participate in the collection and entry of CSLO data. The IPRC and the SLO Committee are committed to offering guidance to any department or program that may need assistance in encouraging adjunct faculty participation in the CSLO process.
- Departments and programs need support from administration to address the recommendation above. This past cycle, 6 of the 13 reviewed departments received the status of “Compliance – Needs Improvement” due to low CSLO assessment completion rates. Most of those programs expressed the need for help with encouraging adjunct faculty participation due to time-constraints because of meeting other program needs. These programs made a few suggestions to help with this issue such as paying a stipend to train new adjunct faculty on the SLO system and process and hiring fulltime faculty to help alleviate the burden that some programs and departments feel. Addressing the issue should be treated as a high priority.

### **CTE Two-Year Reports (Short Form)**

Cypress College reviews each department every four years (long-form), but each CTE TOP-coded program also completes a two-year (short-form) review in the even numbered years. Institutional Research and Planning provided all CTE programs with labor market wage and employment data, student equity disaggregation, and certificate and degree updates to assist faculty in assessing their programs. The IPRC received 16 CTE Reports ([Appendix C](#)) and there were several common themes including:

1. The programs under review all demonstrated a commitment to student success. Whether seeking to attract more qualified applicants, to meet the demands of certification and licensing, or to make graduates more attractive candidates for employment, the programs are working to clarify student pathways to earning certificates, degrees, and higher wages. Students pass national, state, and regional exams at high rates and routinely surpass established benchmarks. Labor market data shows a strong demand for these students reflected in good job placement and living wage increases.
2. All of the CTE programs need to have accurate, detailed budgets that reflect the current costs of running the program. Many of the programs have a high cost of instruction and are overly reliant on grants and one-time funding requests. Without Perkins or CalWorks funding, some of these programs would not be able to exist. Programs are being asked to address this issue in their 4-year review long forms.
3. All of the programs have an identified need for Classified support for themselves and their division. The traditional needs for Classified help remain, but such support is also needed to help with marketing, grants, accreditation, and other needs.
4. The programs need to be more diligent in assessing their CSLOs. This is an area of focus in each of

the programs 4-year long form reviews. It is an important issue that the committee will be tracking more closely in future review cycles.

5. All of the programs expressed the need for marketing and outreach resources to publicize their programs and the job opportunities associated with them. This will also address the competition for students created by a duplication of programs in the area.

## **Specialized Instructional Program (SIP) Reviews**

In Spring 2019, the IPRC began reviewing Specialized Instructional Programs (SIP). These “hybrid programs” offer a unique combination of instruction, counseling, and support services to aid specific student groups in achieving their educational goals. Previously, these programs did not have a well-defined process of review, and it was determined that the IPRC would be responsible for creating that process and conducting those reviews. A Specialized Instructional Program Form ([Appendix F](#)) was created to facilitate an effective review and make the process and documents as similar as possible to the ones used in the Instructional Program Reviews.

Each of the programs submitted reviews that covered the required topics and detailed plans for achieving their stated actions and goals and then made face-to-face presentations of their reports to the committee via Zoom. Each program received a SIP Program Review Summary from the committee with commendations and recommendations to be used by the program in making future budget and resource requests. The individual summaries for the programs can be found as part of [Appendix H](#) of this document. All the documents used in the review process, including the individual program self-studies, are posted in the Department Planning and Instructional Program Review folder on the “J” Drive.

The IPRC is working on placing all the SIPs on a regular 4-year review cycle. The plan is to have the IPRC review at least one SIP each spring. This will require some of the programs to participate in review again before four years, but this will allow the IPRC to institutionalize a regular and substantive review of the SIPs to mirror the reviews of the Instructional Programs in the fall. Once established, the cycle and reviews will become a regular part of the Annual Report.

As with the Instructional Program Reviews, the IPRC creates a list of “global” commendations, recommendations, and supported budget/resource needs that reflect common issues shared by the 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. This has led directly to the programs having very high success rates among their students, often outperforming the same class not affiliated with the program. The College should explore how the services and approach of these programs can be successfully scaled to other departments on campus.
2. 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. Most important, the campus needs to commit to the resources for the programs to continue scaling their programs to include more students.
3. The programs provide 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.

### ***Specialized Instructional Program Related Recommendations:***

1. Each of the programs needs to have accurate, detailed budget that reflect the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the program is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly as it impacts technology and staffing. Related to this, the program needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.

2. All the SIPs need to develop SLOs to track the specific impact of their work and to identify the proper data needed to access them. The unique nature of these programs may not be able to be tracked by the current SSLOs or CSLOs. While these may be of use in reviewing the SIPs, the committee recommends exploring the creation of SLOs specific to the SIPs. To achieve this, the IPRC Chair will arrange a meeting with the SLO Coordinator, Student Services Coordinator, and the Coordinators of the various SIPs to discuss the issue. It may be that a SIP SLO Coordinator needs to be added under the umbrella of the campus SLO structure. This is a conversation for the larger campus community, but all Specialized Instructional Programs will be expected to have specific SLOs or update the committee on this process by their next review cycle.
3. The programs are encouraged to plan to scale their services and approach to increase the number of students they serve. It is hoped that these efforts will result in ways to scale the services and approach beyond the programs to help a larger number of students across campus. One central purpose of the Specialized Instructional Program review process is to find successful practices that can be used by the college.

### ***Specialized Instructional Program Related Budget/Resource Needs:***

1. 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.
2. The programs have expressed a need for increased classified support. This is something all departments and programs have expressed. There has been a cut in classified support over the years, and it has never been fully restored. The scope of work done by the programs on campus has increased dramatically over the past five years, which has exposed the need for classified support even more. The integration of campus personnel and resources at the heart of the SIPs has given these programs an up-close view of the importance of classified support in promotion of student success.

### **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.

### **Global Commendations:**

1. The departments and programs under review demonstrated great innovation in meeting the needs of students. The move to remote instruction required all programs to be flexible and patient in ensuring students successfully made the transition. In particular, the IPRC wishes to highlight the work of all the programs that were able to help students with their technology and resource needs during the pandemic.
2. Of note, the departments and programs under review demonstrated a dedication 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.
3. Several departments have demonstrated significant increases in both student fill rates and student success. This success can be attributed to many things, including the use of blended classrooms, SI, and tutoring to enhance course instruction. In particular, the adoption of department-wide documents, assignments, and homework to create continuity between classes and instructors has been well received by students. This is a practice other department may benefit from as well.
4. There is some terrific and noteworthy work being done to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion across campus and in the community. Various departments arranged conferences, speakers, student performances, and other events that explored specific DEI issues. Particularly significant has been the efforts of all departments and programs under review to revise curriculum, pedagogy, and outreach with an equity lens. As the Photography Department stated, the goal was to make the program a mirror for the students to see themselves and not just a window.

## Global Recommendations:

Based on a thorough review of all 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 is 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. The years in parentheses represented the Annual Report in which the recommendation originally occurred.

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. (2018-2019)
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. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. (2019-2020)
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 reflect more directly 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. (2019-2020)
4. Reassigned 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. (2019-2020)
5. 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 program review process to campus planning. But there still is work needed to tie Faculty Prioritization, Classified Prioritization, and other College budgeting processes to program review. To this end, the IPRC will continue working with PBC to revise the form used in review to more completely and accurately capture the data points needed to better inform College planning and budget decisions. (2019-2020)
6. 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. (2019-2020)
7. 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 can 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. (2019-2020)

### *New Recommendations:*

The following Global Recommendations come from the comprehensive review of all 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. There needs to be a concerted effort on the part of each department and program to encourage their adjunct faculty to participate in the CSLO data collection and entry process. The Adjunct Faculty contract and Adjunct Instructor Evaluation form now require part-time faculty to enter CSLO data and perform other clerical functions related to the SLO process. Because of this new language, adjunct faculty should now be expected to assess at least one CSLO for each of the classes they teach and enter the results through eLumen. The SLO Coordinator has sent emails to all department coordinators with instructions for “completing the loop” and ideas to encourage adjunct faculty participation. The SLO Committee and IPRC are both committed to helping programs receive the guidance and resources they need to meet this obligation. But this is an area of focus for the IPRC and departments risk having their Compliance Status negatively impacted by low CSLO completion rates.
2. Departments are encouraged to work with Institutional Research and Planning, the Title V Data Coaches, and others to ensure they are capturing all relevant metrics of student success in their programs. Students in some programs may be most interested in getting training and certificates that allow them to obtain better paying jobs. As such, the number of transfers and degrees are not an accurate metric of the success of the program. Capturing the success of students who may have “jobbed out” or received a higher living wage because of the program is important considering the state’s new Student-Centered Funding Formula awards funding based on such metrics. But some departments may also be “underreporting success” due to their students transferring with a divisional degree that is not reflected in their program’s overall numbers.
3. Departments and programs on campus impacted by the state-imposed restrictions on course repeatability should work to together to address the issue and organize efforts to petition the state to revise the policy. This is an issue of particular interest to the Business, Fine Arts, and Kinesiology Divisions.
4. Several departments across campus expressed a need for greater marketing and social media outreach to help promote their programs and increase enrollments. Those departments that have increased their marketing have been fruitful in increasing their enrollment. It is expected that other departments would benefit as well. It is necessary to increase the resources dedicated to marketing the departments and programs of the College. The IPRC supports a broad campus discussion about how to combine the various needs for marketing and outreach to get some economy of scale.

### **Budget Requests and Resource Allocations:**

To comply with accreditation recommendations, the IPRC has worked to tie information gathered in program review to the larger college planning and budget processes. The committee reviews the budget and resource requests of each department and program to ensure they are providing the necessary support and data. The committee then sends the programs a Review Summary that includes, among other things, a Budget and Resource Table with a list of items in rank order and comments further explaining the requests.

During the reviews, there were common budget and resource requests shared by multiple programs and departments of the College. They are detailed below, 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. They all have the full support of the IPRC.

#### ***Ongoing Budget Needs and Requests:***

Below are resource and budget needs that were 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. The date in parentheses at the end of item’s description is the year of the Annual Report in which it first appeared.

1. 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 continue to place some programs under a strain. This is a high priority, and it is hoped that the revisions being made in PBC to the Faculty Prioritization process will help better address it. (2018-2019)
2. 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. (2018-2019)
3. 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. (2019-2020)

4. 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. (2019-2020)

### *A Special Note about the Campus 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. While the Campus Theater is certainly regularly used by programs within the Fine Arts Division, it also serves the whole college as a community exhibition hall, a campus meeting area, a stage for student and community performances, a venue for Opening Day events, and many other purposes. Yet, much of the burden for the upkeep of the theater has fallen on the departmental budgets of the programs in Fine Arts. This needs to be a responsibility that is shared by the campus.

This is an issue that has been raised in many ways and in many times in the past. Previous Department Self Studies, Program Review Summaries, and the past three Program Review Annual Reports all state that maintenance and upgrades of the Campus Theater are needed and responsibility for that should fall on the College as a whole. Last spring, the IPRC took an unprecedented step in passing a Resolution, supported by the Academic Senate, urging upgrades to the Campus Theater and creation of maintenance and upgrade schedule going forward. It is time for the College to step up and make this a budget priority. There needs to be adequate and regular funding for the maintenance and improvement of the Campus Theater as part of a specific theater budget committed to providing the college with a first-class theater that is staffed and maintained like one. There is great wasted potential in that building both for the departments and programs that use it and the campus. Investing in developing that potential would increase the College impact in the community, bring in new potential revenue, and, most important, be a great benefit to students and the campus.

An important start in addressing this would be to make repairs and upgrades to the Campus Theater a central focus of requests made for One-Time Funding coming from the District. There is a large fund of one-time money currently being held at the District of which the campus will receive a portion. Some of that money has already been dedicated to certain maintenance of the theater, but it is not enough. While the IPRC and the PBC have made great strides in tying our Instructional Program Reviews to the College one-time funding process, there is no formal process for our campus reviews to be used in District funding. Without this connection, the campus will be forced to rely more on the advocacy of administration to secure such funding.

### *Newly Identified Budget Needs and Requests:*

The following resource and budget needs come from the comprehensive review of all 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 Ongoing Budget Needs and Requests section of next year's IPRC Annual Report.

1. Once departments and programs establish accurate, right-sized budgets detailing the actual cost of their programs, the College needs to commit to funding those budgets and not leaving essential, ongoing resources to the One-Time Funding process. This has been a longstanding issue in the college planning and budget process that the revisions to the Program Review process are designed to address. It is hoped that some requests would not have to be included in the department's future Instructional Program Review resources requests but will be instead funded through their department budgets.
2. Almost every department under review expressed a need for greater classified support to help meet the needs of their programs and the needs of their division as a whole. The IPRC supports the revision of the Classified Prioritization process being done in PBC, particularly the inclusion of the Program Review Summaries to help inform decisions regarding classified support. With so many departments and programs expressing the need, it is essential that the College has a transparent and well-documented process for hiring additional Classified employees.
3. Many departments under review expressed a need for updated technology. As more disciplines become reliant on technology to teach their classes, there will be a greater need to keep that technology to be current. While this applies to every discipline, it is particularly an issue for those

programs that must maintain the industry standard for their professions or risk failing to adequately prepare their students for the workplace. These technology needs and their regular maintenance and upgrades should be part of a department's right-sized budget. As important, these needs should be included in the Technology Master Plan. This is an area with potential of economy of scale.

4. While adjunct faculty are now contractually obligated to enter CSLO data, they are still not required to participate in the analysis, review, writing, or revision of CSLOs. 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. This may be particularly true for new adjunct faculty who will need to be trained on our process and system. Similarly, if requested, departments and programs should be given funds and resources to help build the SLO culture among their adjunct faculty. It has taken time to this point to change the campus culture regarding SLOs, and further time and resources may be needed to complete the task.

## Looking Forward

The programs up for the full review in Fall 2021 are identified in [Appendix C](#). In November 2021, the IPRC will begin meetings with those programs. Since the campus is not scheduled to fully reopen by then and some classes will continue to be taught in the remote format, the plan is to conduct those meetings remotely via Zoom.

Over the course of the year, the committee will continue revising the process and forms to tie them more closely to the larger College planning and budgeting processes. A key focus in this will be educating the broader campus on the changes in the process and their significance to funding and resource requests. Making terms like "Program Review Summary" and "Compliance Status" part of the Cypress College planning and budget lexicon will require a clear, consistent, and repetitive message from all members of the committee to its various constituents and partners.

The committee will also work to expand the dialogue regarding issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion in the review process and across campus. Balancing the many views and opinions will be key, and there must be an effort to ensure that everyone feels their voices have been heard. But the commitment to continue the conversation and convert that dialogue into action that brings lasting change will not be deterred.

Lastly, the IPRC will continue to work closely with the SLO Committee to ensure that all departments and programs are aware of the contractual requirement of adjunct faculty to collect and enter CSLO data. Several departments had the Compliance Status negatively impacted by low CSLO completion rates. Both committees will work to provide guidance and assistance to programs that need help encouraging their adjunct faculty to fulfill this obligation. This is part of the next step in creating a campus culture where SLO assessment is continuous and meaningful.

The committee will also receive regular updates from the SLO Committee and Curriculum Committee to monitor if departments that received the status of "Compliance – Needs Improvement" have done enough work to have their status improved. If evidence of such work is found, the committee will update the status of those programs and issue them a new Summary reflecting the changes.

## Appendix A: Timeline for the 2021-2022 Instructional Program Review Cycle

- ✓ May 2021: Email the deans with the next programs required to submit reports by October 15.
- ✓ Summer 2021: IRP sends the prepopulated self-study forms and SLO summary reports to the deans by Opening Day in August.
- ✓ August 2021: Send deadline reminder email to all deans.
- ✓ September 2021: Committee plans to meet twice during the month.
- ✓ October 11, 2021: Faculty submit their self-studies to their deans for comments and signature.
- ✓ October 25, 2021: Faculty submit their final self-study reports to the IPRC Chair.
- ✓ November 2021: Presentations every Monday from 3-5 (four 15-minute presentations per week).
- ✓ December 2021: Program Review Summaries will be sent to all of the programs under review.
- ✓ February 2022: Committee meets to review results and feedback from summaries.
- ✓ February/March 2022: Committee meets to create Specialized Instructional Program four-year cycle and review programs if necessary.
- ✓ March 2022: Prepare final report for submission to the Academic Senate, PBC, and PAC. 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 2022/May 2022: 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: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Questions

The IPRC is interested in having conversations with departments and programs related to diversity, equity, and inclusion. There are various sections of the program review form that touch on these topics, but, historically, the review process has not fully integrated them into the conversations and reports of the committee. To help correct that, the committee developed the questions below for programs and departments to consider when going through Program Review. The committee is certainly interested in any answer you have to any of the questions, but we are also interested in finding out if there are other questions we should be asking or other data we should be considering. This is all new and a work in progress, and the committee is open to any input or suggestions to help in creating a new framework and lens through which we can view the work promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion by the departments across campus.

### Questions to Consider:

1. Has your department had conversations about implicit bias, micro-aggressions, or other more subtle forms of racism? If so, how have those conversations impacted your department's curriculum, pedagogy, training, and outreach? If not, what is the department's plan moving forward? How can the college help you in these efforts?
2. Discuss specific ways the department is equity minded, and its efforts to ensure culturally relevant curriculum and pedagogy. For example, when your students look at your courses, are they seeing a window or a mirror? How can the college help you in these efforts?
3. How do you include social justice/social equity in your program? How has your program adapted or transformed in the past 5 years to include social equity and social justice to equitize marginalized and underrepresented groups? What has been your greatest success in these efforts? What barriers have you encountered in these efforts?

## Appendix C: 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  
English  
English/Reading  
ESL  
Ethnic Studies  
Foreign Language  
History  
Library (New to PR)  
Music  
Philosophy & Religious Studies  
Physical Science

### **CYCLE #3: Fall 2018, 2022, 2026 (11 programs)**

Auto Collision Repair  
Auto Technology  
Court Reporting  
Dental Assisting  
Geography/GIS  
HRC (Culinary Arts)  
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 D: Programs Presenting CTE Two-Year Reports (Short-Forms)

The following CTE programs presented Two-Year Reports:

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

## Appendix E: Specialized Instructional Program Being Reviewed

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
- English Success Center
- Math Learning Center
- Tutoring
- Supplemental Instruction
- Dual Enrollment (Moved from Spring 2020 due to COVID-19 restrictions.)
- Legacy (Moved from Spring 2020 due to COVID-19 restrictions.)

The Teacher Preparation and Study Abroad programs were removed from the original review schedule. Teacher Preparation is undergoing a reorganization to make a more viable Specialized Instructional Program. It will remain in the review cycle and will be expected to present review materials next time. Study Abroad is currently being run out of Fullerton College, and the IPRC will not review it unless or until it returns to Cypress College.

## Appendix F: 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 = #)	Fall ## Cohort (n = #)	Fall ## Cohort (n = #)	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 = #)	Spring ## Cohort (n = #)	Spring ## Cohort (n = #)	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 %	Cohort Success %	Cohort Success %	Cohort Success %	Cohort Success %	Comparison Success %
Course #1	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)
Course #2	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)
Course #3	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)
Course #4	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)
<b>College</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>

\*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 %	Cohort Success %	Cohort Success %	Cohort Success %	Cohort Success %	Comparison Success %
Course #1	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)
Course #2	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)
Course #3	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)
Course #4	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)	% (n = #)
<b>College</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>	% <b>(n = #)</b>

\*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
<b>Gender</b>				
Female				
Male				
Unknown				
	80% of Reference Group ( )			
<b>Age</b>				
19 or less				
20-24				
25-39				
40+				
	80% of Reference Group ( )			
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Am. Indian				
Asian or PI				

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

\*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:**

<b>Awards</b>					<b>Overall</b>
#####-##	#####-##	#####-##	#####-##	#####-##	
<b>Associate in Arts - Transfer</b>					
<b>Associate in Arts - Transfer Total</b>					
<b>Certificate 6 to 18 units</b>					
<b>Certificate 6 to 18 units Total</b>					
<b>Total Awards</b>					

**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					
<b>Number Transferred</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>
<b>% Transferred</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>

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 G: 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 2020 (13 programs)**

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



**Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation**

*Program: Accounting*

**Presenter:** Ann Sheridan-Solis and Samreen Manjra

**Date:** 11/16/2020

**Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

  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 Accounting Department presented an excellent review that reflected its position as a cornerstone of the transfer program of the Division.

**Program CSLOs:**

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

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 100%	Spring 2018 – 100%
Fall 2018 – 100%	Spring 2019 – 100%
Fall 2019 – 100%	Spring 2020 – 100%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 100%. The Accounting Department is doing a stupendous job of assessing CSLOs with 100% of courses assessed each semester since Fall 2017. The overall CSLO success rate for the department's courses is 88.1%. The department's challenge with CSLO assessment is finding a practical yet efficient way to collect course specific data to assess the CSLOs.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. They have done a great job at mapping and have been able to draw meaningful conclusions. The department came up with a detailed and specific plan to help increase the percentage of students meeting the standard in each of the four PSLO areas.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The department has demonstrated significant increases in both student fill rates and student success. This can be attributed to many things including the adoption of department-wide documents and homework to create continuity between classes and instructors, and their use of blended classrooms, SI, and tutoring to enhance course instruction.
2. There is excellent communication between the full-time and part-time faculty of the department. This has not only contributed to increased success rates but has also helped the department to do so well in the completion of their CSLOs.
3. The department has experienced increased enrollment which they attribute to scheduling classes earlier in the day to better accommodate the demands of their younger students.
4. The department's work with the Legacy Program and the organization of a Student Club are ways in which the department is working to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion on the campus.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
2. The department is encouraged to work with Institutional Research and Planning, the Title V Data Coaches, and others to better track Accounting students who receive the divisional Business Administration AS-T. These students are likely not reflected in the department's current transfer rates.
3. The department is encouraged to make plans to address equity gaps that exist for African Americans, Native Americans, and LatinX students.

**Identified Resource and Budget Needs:**

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the

department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Furniture – chairs/tables on rollers	\$25,000	M	V	O	I	N	700
2	Division/Department Canopy	\$800	M	V	O	I	N	200
3	Accounting Department Tablecloth	\$400	M	D	O	I	N	200

**\*TABLE CODE KEY**

*Amount:* Total \$ amount for request

*Type:* F = Faculty

C = Classified/ Admin.

T = Technology

M = Maintenance

*Need:* D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

*Length:* O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing / On-Going

*Purpose:* CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

*Age:* N = New Request

RR = Repeat / Received

RN = Repeat / Not Received

*Impact:* # of students impacted per year

**BUDGET COMMENTS:**

1. There is a demonstrated need for the department to have chairs and tables on rollers to allow for better instruction and student collaboration. This is seen as a high need.
2. The department needs a canopy and a tablecloth of its own to use at events to better promote the program. In the future, this is something that should be part of a revised, right-sized budget detailing the true expenses of the program.
3. The department included a request for full-time faculty in this review. There is a position that has been placed on hold due to COVID restrictions. It is expected the department will receive that faculty member once those restrictions are ended.



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Administration of Justice*

**Presenter:** Ed Valdez

**Date:** 11/23/2020

### **Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

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

   X    **Compliance – Needs Improvement** – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See **General Comments below and Recommendations #1 and #2.**)

       **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:** This was the first review for Administration of Justice as a stand-alone program, and the review materials affirm the decision to create a separate department. It is a first-rate program with great potential for growth. However, the committee did find two areas of concern that need to be addressed. First, the department's PSLO mapping is incomplete and CSLO completion rate is below 90%. Second, the department has a number of courses with curriculum that is out of compliance and needs to be updated. These issues are detailed further in Recommendations #1 and #2 below. Both of these issues contributed to the department receiving its current Compliance Status. The IPRC understands that some of these issues are the result of the lack of institutional support, and the committee will provide guidance and resources to help the department address these issues. The expectation is that these issues will be resolved by the department's next review if not sooner.

**Program CSLOs:**

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 100%	Spring 2018 – 66.7%
Fall 2018 – 100%	Spring 2019 – 25%
Fall 2019 – 50%	Spring 2020 – 75%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 75%. The lack of full-time faculty in the department is a big factor in not having 100% assessment completion. The overall CSLO success rate for the department's courses is 86.8%.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The department has not completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The program has experienced great growth. This is all the more noteworthy in that the program relies solely on adjunct faculty to teach the courses.
2. The program places diversity, equity, and inclusion at the center of its curriculum and pedagogy.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to be more diligent in assessing their CSLOs and need to complete the mapping of their PSLOs. The committee recognizes that a lack of full-time faculty forces some departments to rely on adjunct faculty to teach many classes, and in the past, this placed limitations on the department's ability to collect and assess CSLO data. But the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language specifically regarding CSLO data input, and the department should make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. The program's Compliance Status is being impacted by the low CSLO completion rate and the fact that PSLO mapping incomplete. The percentage of courses assessed must increase to above 90% by their next review cycle, or the department risks having their Compliance Status lowered further.
2. The department has a number of courses with curriculum that is out of compliance and in need of updating. Despite the efforts of the Curriculum Committee to remind the department of the issue, the curriculum is not updated. This is a serious issue that potentially jeopardizes courses within the department. The department must update this curriculum by the next review or risk further negative impact to their Compliance Status.
3. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
4. The department is encouraged to continue developing new courses in order to help grow the program and increase student pathways.
5. The department is encouraged to explore cross-listing classes with Ethnic Studies,

Human Services, and Sociology to expand its focus on diversity, equity and inclusion. The department should work to reduce equity gaps that exist for Native American, Latinx, Pacific Islander, and White students.

**Identified Resource and Budget Needs:**

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Fulltime faculty member	\$100K	F	V	C	CN	N	400
2	Tutors, mentors, professional experts	\$25K	?	D	C	M	N	400
3	Classified and administrative support	\$25K	C	V	C	I	N	400

**\*TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

Need: D = Department

Length: O = One-Time Need

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

Age: N = New Request

Impact: # of students impacted

C = Classified/ Admin.

V = Division

C = Continuing/ On-Going

M = Prog. Maintenance

RR = Repeat/Received

T = Technology/Equipment

C = Campus

I = Prog. Improvement

RN = Repeat/Not Received

M = Maintenance

G = Prog. Growth

**Budget Comments:**

1. The program has a demonstrated need for a full-time faculty member. The original focus of the program was on TSA and the aviation side, but the discipline has expanded to include prisons, police, detectives, and other aspects of criminal justice. For the program to be a success and continue to grow, a full-time faculty member is needed to create robust and meaningful curriculum to fully develop the program. The hire would help address the issues for which the program is receiving its current Compliance Status. In addition, a new faculty member in this department would allow the current coordinator, who is also the coordinator of another department, to focus on only one department. For these reasons, the IPRC sees this as a high priority hire.
2. The department has a demonstrated need for clerical support, tutors, mentors, and professional experts; however, these are currently being funded through the Perkins' Grant. The department does need a contingency plan in case that funding is no longer available. This is also example of why the department needs an accurate, right-sized department budget.



**Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation**

*Program: Air Conditioning and Refrigeration*

**Presenter:** Doug Sallade

**Date:** 11/16/2020

**Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the IRPC 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 IPRC.

  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:** Air Conditioning and Refrigeration presented a well-written and comprehensive review that reflected a program committed to student success.

**Program CSLOs:**

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

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 100%	Spring 2018 – 100%
Fall 2018 – 100%	Spring 2019 – 100%
Fall 2019: 100%	Spring 2020: 88.9%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 100%. The Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Department is doing an excellent job of assessing CSLOs with 100% of courses assessed almost every semester since Fall 2017.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The Air Conditioning and Refrigeration department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The department did an excellent job at mapping and was able to draw meaningful conclusions. There is a high success rate for meeting the standard in the area of Communication and also in the area of Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency. It was noted that the department plans to further improve success rates by offering more resources such as mentoring and tutoring.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The program experienced an increase in enrollment due to marketing and social media outreach. The dean and counselors in the division have worked hard in this regard and should receive special recognition. It's a practice that other divisions should consider.
2. The department has been quite successful in awarding certificates.
3. The department's creation of a Direct Digital Control Program shows its recognition of a changing job market and the need for new student pathways. This is also seen in the department's decision to suspend and not deactivate the Energy and Sustainable Technology Program, which needs some revision to remain a viable program and student pathway.
4. The department has shown a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus and in the community. There is strong LatinX population in the program, and the department is committed to being a magnet for women seeking to enter the field. They also have a strong partnership with FITE and seek to offer a pathway for our formerly incarcerated students.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
2. The department is encouraged to work on ways to better capture their success. Students in the program are interested in getting training and certificates that allow them to obtain better paying jobs. As such, the number of transfers and degrees are not always an accurate metric of their success. Similarly, the state's new Student-Centered Funding Formula makes it even more important to capture the success of students who may be "jobbing out."
3. The program is encouraged to continue its outreach to the local high schools. This is a good way to market the discipline and field. The program is also encouraged to continue the development of the AC/R Survival Skills Workshops.

4. The department is encouraged to create a plan for addressing equity gaps for African American, American Indian, LatinX, Two or more races, and Pacific Islander students.
5. The IPRC supports the department's need to have the maintenance and power issues identified in their review included in the campus Facilities Master Plan. The department is encouraged to work with other departments and divisions on campus with similar maintenance issues to help in this effort.
6. The department is encouraged to explore working with other departments across campus like Engineering, who may have similar pathways for students.

### Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Reconnect 460V power for lab	\$2,000	M	V	0	CN	N	120
2	Boiler to heat lab	?	M	V	0	CN	RN	240
3	Fulltime faculty member	\$150K	F	D	C	M	N	1200
4	Movable separation wall	\$5,000	M	D	O	I	N	120
5	Replace lab sink	\$7,000	M	D	O	M	N	120
6	Rearrange media cart (TE3-111)	\$2,000	T	D	O	I	N	120

#### \*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/ Admin.

T = Technology

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/ On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

### BUDGET COMMENTS:

1. The department has a pressing and urgent need to have 460V Power reconnected in the laboratory. This cost should be part of the larger campus maintenance and upgrades.
2. The boiler that heats the lab is an urgent maintenance need for the department. This is a cost that should be part of the regular campus maintenance and upgrade budget, and it should not fall on the budget of the program.
3. The department has a demonstrated need for a full-time faculty member. There are currently two full-time instructors edging towards retirement and currently working overload to cover department need.
4. The remaining budget and resource requests are something for which the department has demonstrated need. They should also be included in the revised, right-sized department budget that details that actual costs of running the program. They should be funded through the department's budget and not be left to the One-Time Funding process.



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Aviation and Travel Careers*

**Presenter:** Ed Valdez

**Date:** 11/23/2020

### Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the IRPC 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 IPRC.

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

   X    **Compliance – Needs Improvement** – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See **General Comments below and Recommendations #1 and #2.**)

       **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 department presented a well-written and comprehensive review that reflects a first-class program committed to student success. However, the committee did find two areas of concern that need to be addressed. First, the department's CSLO completion rate is below 90%. Second, the department has a number of courses with curriculum that is out of compliance and needs to be updated. These issues are detailed further in Recommendations #1 and #2 below. Both of these issues contributed to the department receiving its current Compliance Status. The IPRC understands that many of these issues are the result of the lack of institutional support, and the committee will provide guidance and resources to help the department address these issues. The expectation is that these issues will be addressed by the department's next review if not sooner.

#### Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 81.8%	Spring 2018 – 88.9%
Fall 2018 – 82.8%	Spring 2019 – 32.1%
Fall 2019 – 40%	Spring 2020 – 72.0%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 75%. The semester assessment completion percentages have been very low the last 3 semesters. These low percentages have been attributed to losing full-time faculty. The overall CSLO success rate for the department’s courses is 75%.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. Analysis, Problem-Solving, and Technology all have the same exact mapping in the PSLO area of Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency. In addition, Reading and Presenting have almost the exact same mapping in the PSLO area of Communication. The department may want to revisit the PSLO mapping to make it more distinct to give more meaningful data. An English course for CTE students has been created which has had a positive impact on Writing.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The department has seen an increase in enrollment, student retention, and course fill and success rates. This was made possible, in part, by the addition of a high-tech flight simulator purchased through a million-dollar donation from a former student. The donation itself reflects the impact of the program on its students and the department’s efforts to maintain contact with their students after they leave Cypress.
2. The number of students in the program has doubled since the last review in large part due to marketing and social media outreach. The division dean and counselors have been central to this and deserve special recognition for their efforts.
3. The department’s work with diversity, equity, and inclusion deserves special recognition. The program is starting to see a higher enrollment of females in the program and seeks to create a pipeline for females seeking a career in aviation. In addition, coordinated efforts with local airports let students from diverse backgrounds see themselves in the profession.
4. The program has a successful Flight Team, and for the first time since 1965, it took first place in the national competition in 2018-19. The team is also proud of its diversity, with each member claiming a different identity.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to be more diligent in assessing their CSLOs. The committee recognizes that a lack of full-time faculty forces some departments to rely on adjunct faculty to teach many classes, and in the past, this placed limitations on the department’s ability to collect and assess CSLO data. But the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language specifically regarding CSLO data input, and the department should

make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. The program's Compliance Status is being impacted by the low CSLO completion rate. The percentage of courses assessed must increase to above 90% by their next review cycle, or the department risks having their Compliance Status lowered further. In addition, the use of CSLO data in awarding credit for prior learning will make this all the more important.

2. The department has a number of courses with curriculum that is out of compliance and in need of updating. Despite the efforts of the Curriculum Committee to remind the department of the issue, the curriculum is not updated. This is a serious issue that potentially jeopardizes courses within the department. The department must update this curriculum by the next review or risk further negative impact to their Compliance Status.
3. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
4. The department is encouraged to work with Institutional Research and Planning, the Title V Data Coaches, and others to better track living wage data. Students in the program are most interested in getting training and certificates that allow them to obtain better paying jobs. As such, the number of transfers and degrees are not an accurate metric of the success of the program. Capturing the success of students who may have "jobbed out" or received a higher living wage as a result of the program is important considering the state's new Student-Centered Funding Formula awards funding based on such metrics.
5. The department is encouraged to continue exploring opportunities to provide veterans and GIs with flight training.
6. The department is encouraged to explore cross-discipline work with departments such as Photography, Journalism, and other programs interested in the use of drone technology.

### Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	FT faculty for Admin. of Justice	\$100K	F	V	C	CN	N	400
2	Classified/Administrative support	\$42K	C	V	C	M	N	1250
3	Flight and Emergency Labs	\$150K	T	D	O	I	N	850
4	Tutors, mentors, professional experts	\$50K	?	D	C	M	N	1250
5	Web advertising/marketing support	\$75K	T	V	C	I	N	1250+

#### \*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/On-Going

*Purpose:* CN = Critical Need                      M = Prog. Maintenance                      I = Prog. Improvement                      G = Prog. Growth  
*Age:* N = New Request                      RR = Repeat/Received                      RN = Repeat/Not Received  
*Impact:* # of students impacted

### **Budget Comments:**

1. It is not common for the first budget request of one department to be the hiring of a full-time faculty member in another department, but that is the situation here. The committee strongly supports the hiring of a full-time faculty member in Administration of Justice so that the Aviation and Travel Careers Department Coordinator, who is currently the coordinator of both, can focus on only one department. It is the situation where one full-time faculty hire can meet needs central to two departments.
2. The committee strongly supports the department's demonstrated need for administrative support. The need for classified staff is increasing as the program increases and the outreach and scheduling has become more demanding to manage.
3. The department has a demonstrated need for space and technology in order to expand their ability to meet a growing demand for students. Several program needs are currently being funded through the Perkins' Grant. There needs to be a contingency plan in case that funding is cut. This is an example of why the department needs an accurate, right-sized budget detailing the actual costs of the program and any grants or other outside sources of funding.



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Computer Information Services*

**Presenter:** Peter Molnar

**Date:** 11/23/2020

### **Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

  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 Computer Information Services department presented a well-written report that reflected its exceptional work and commitment to student success.

#### **Program CSLOs:**

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

#### **Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 97.1%	Spring 2018 – 94.3%
Fall 2018 – 100%	Spring 2019 – 96.6%
Fall 2019 – 95.8%	Spring 2020 – 100%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 100%. The CIS Department is doing an excellent job of assessing CSLOs. The overall CSLO success rate for the department's courses is 85.5%. The department has reduced the number of fully online courses and has offered more partially online courses, which is helping increase the success rate.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The department did a good job so that the mappings were distinct. The highest success rates for meeting expectations showed in Writing, Communicating, and Research.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The department has increased fill rates by scheduling classes when students want to take them and by consolidating some classes to help clear the pathway.
2. The department has also seen significant increases in student success. This can be attributed to standardized documents, homework, and exams for all classes, SI and tutoring, and department meetings to increase communication between full-time and part-time faculty. This success is also founded on the program's effort to create a sense of comradery and community among their students through student hacking events, shared projects, clubs and peer learning.
3. The department is a leader in the campus Dual Enrollment efforts.
4. The department also must be recognized for its CSLO assessment and mapping of its PSLOs

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department should work with Academic Computing to help meet their technology needs and to be placed in the plan for technology refresh and upgrade. CIS is an area that is continuously changing, and not having updated technology and software for the program could hurt its reputation and hinder future enrollment.
2. The department is encouraged to continue its work regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion, particularly exploring adding an equity mindset to curriculum and incorporating people of color from the industry into discussions, presentations, and workshops.
3. The department is encouraged to work with Institutional Research and Planning, the Title V Data Coaches, and others to better track CIS students who receive the divisional AS-T. These students are likely underrepresented in the departments transfer rate.
4. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
5. The department is encouraged to continue working to revise curriculum by combining similar courses into one course in effort to clarify the pathway for students. The department is strongly encouraged to keep its curriculum up to date in the process or risk





## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Dental Hygiene*

**Presenter:** Kendra Velasco

**Date:** 11/30/2020

### Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

  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 Dental Hygiene department's written materials and presentation to the committee reflect the program's exceptional work and commitment to student success.

#### Program CSLOs:

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

#### Courses Assessed:

Fall 2017 – 100%	Spring 2018 – 100%
Fall 2018 – 100%	Spring 2019 – 100%
Fall 2019 – 90%	Spring 2020 – 30%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 100%. The

unusually low percentage for Spring 2020 is due to classes not finishing because of on-campus COVID-19 restrictions. Many courses were not completed until Fall 2020. It is recommended that faculty complete the Spring 2020 CSLO assessments in eLumen as courses finish. The overall CSLO success rate for the department's courses is 96.5%.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The department did a good job so that the mappings were distinct. There is an especially high success rate for meeting standards in Reading, Writing, and Technology.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. Since the last review, the Dental Hygiene program earned a Gold Star for wage gains from the CCCCCO.
2. The department approved 4 new certificates.
3. The department must be given special recognition for its efforts to continue providing first-rate instruction during the COVID-19 crisis. While all programs on campus have suffered the stress of the pandemic, Dental Hygiene is one of a small group that has been particularly impacted by not being able to easily transfer their courses to a remote format. This placed great stress on the students, instructors, administrators, and staff to maintain all health and safety protocols. The department also expressed some frustration and concern with a perceived lack of proper supplies and administrative support.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program its action plan:

1. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
2. The department is encouraged to create a plan to address equity gaps for African American and Asian students. The restrictions of the Dental Board and its stringent requirements should not block other efforts at promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion.
3. The committee recognizes the importance of the Simulation Lab for the program, and it is recommended that the department explore alternate sources of funding for at least part of its maintenance and upkeep.

**Identified Resource and Budget Needs:**

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Front office staff	\$75K	C	V	C	I	N	40+
2	Sterilization staff	\$75K	C	D	C	I	N	40+
3	Simulation lab	\$500K	T	D	O	I	RN	40
4	Radiology suites	\$100K	T	D	O	I	N	40
5	Perioscopes	\$100K	T	D	O	I	N	40
6	Hygiene lasers	\$84K	T	D	O	I	N	40
7	Typodonts and instruments	\$18K	T	D	O	I	N	40
8	IntraOral camera	\$22K	T	D	O	I	N	40
9	DXTTR manikin and fingers	\$20K	T	D	O	I	N	40

**\*TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

Need: D = Department

Length: O = One-Time Need

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

Age: N = New Request

Impact: # of students impacted

C = Classified/ Admin.

V = Division

C = Continuing/ On-Going

M = Prog. Maintenance

RR = Repeat/ Received

T = Technology/ Equipment

C = Campus

I = Prog. Improvement

RN = Repeat/ Not Received

M = Maintenance

G = Prog. Growth

**Budget Comments:**

1. The department has a demonstrated need for an 11-month front office staff position to perform a series of duties in support of the Dental Hygiene Clinic.
2. The department also has a demonstrated need for an 11-month Sterilization staff position to assist with running the dental clinic and running the sterilization area.
3. The Simulation Lab is a central to the program and in need of upgrading. The expense of the project may warrant that it be placed on the Facilities Master Plan for upkeep.
4. Radiology suites, perioscopes, and hygiene lasers are needed and part of renovating the clinic. But they are also expensive. This makes it all the more important for the department to have an accurate, right-sized budget, and they should not be left to the One-Time Funding process. It is hoped that such future requests will be funded through their department budget.
5. The department has a need for the typodonts, Intraoral camera, and a DXTTR manikin. Due to the higher price of their other requests, the department would accept funding these over others above them in the table. These items should also be part of a detailed department budget.



**Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation**

*Program: Health Information Technology*

**Presenter:** Patti Spittler

**Date:** 11/23/2020

**Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

  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 General 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 Health Information Technology department’s written materials and presentation before the committee reflect the exceptional work being done by the program and its commitment to student success.

**Program CSLOs:**

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

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 66.7%	Spring 2018 – 60.0%
Fall 2018 – 88.9%	Spring 2019 – 88.9%
Fall 2019 – 100%	Spring 2020 – 100%

**Comments:** While all courses in HIT have been assessed over the span of 6 semesters, there is still room for improvement in the semester assessment completion percentages. The overall CSLO success rate for the department’s courses is 89.4%.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. There is a high success rate for meeting standards in all PSLO areas. In the area of Communication, Reading and Writing have the exact same mapping so the department may want to revisit the mapping to make it more distinct to give more meaningful data. This is also the case in the area of Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency where Analysis and Computation have the exact same mapping.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The department has done an exceptional job rebuilding the program with new full-time faculty and only one adjunct.
2. They earned a Bronze Star for Living Wage Increase from the Chancellor’s Office.
3. The department’s commitment to training students in multiple areas increases the student’ desirability in seeking employment opportunities.
4. The department has shown a commitment to the efforts of the college to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus and in the community. For example, the “Cultural Awareness for Health Care” seminar allows faculty and students to learn about biases and how to put them aside.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any technology maintenance and upgrades, the cost of the RHIT student exam, and any other expenses related to accreditation. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
2. The program has a need for marketing to help improve enrollment and program growth. Strong Workforce funds may be available to provide support here.
3. The department should work on a plan to address equity gaps that exist for African American, Latinx (barely at .04%), Pacific Islander students.

**Identified Resource and Budget Needs:**

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	3M Coding software	\$4,000	T	D	C	CN	N	50

2	HIM software (VLab or similar)	\$10,500	T	D	C	M	N	50
3	CAHIIM Accreditation	\$8,000	?	D	C	CN	N	
4	RHIT Exam and Study Guide	\$9750	?	D	C	M	N	52
5	Education, CHIA Conferences, plus	\$10,000	?	D	C	M	N	50+
6	Clerical for accreditation	\$5,000	?	D	C	M	N	
7	Marketing support	\$30K	T	V	C	I	N	

**\*TABLE CODE KEY**

*Amount: Total \$ amount for request*

*Type: F = Faculty*

*C = Classified/Admin.*

*T = Technology/Equipment*

*M = Maintenance*

*Need: D = Department*

*V = Division*

*C = Campus*

*Length: O = One-Time Need*

*C = Continuing/On-Going*

*Purpose: CN = Critical Need*

*M = Prog. Maintenance*

*I = Prog. Improvement*

*G = Prog. Growth*

*Age: N = New Request*

*RR = Repeat/Received*

*RN = Repeat/Not Received*

*Impact: # of students impacted*

**Budget Comments:**

1. In order to adequately train students for their career, the department has a great need to maintain software in line with the industry standards. The 3M Coder is that standard.
2. The same can be said for the HIM software. VLab is the standard and would allow the department to keep their students current in the field.
3. The department has costs related to accreditation that are critical to running the program and are usually addressed through the One-Time Funding process. These costs should be part of the department's accurate, right-sized budget. The \$8000 is actually a one-time fee every three years, so the budget could plan for that. It is hoped that such requests would not have to be included in the department's future Program Review requests for funding but will be instead funded through their department budget.
4. The committee also supports the department's request to fund the fee for the RHIT Student Exam (\$345 per student) and the need to have the fee included in their department budget. The department should not have to rely on One-Time Funding for this ongoing cost.
5. The department has a need for their instructors to stay current in the field to ensure that their students are the same.
6. The program has a demonstrated need for clerical support to assist with Program Accreditation. This support is only needed every three years, but the cost should be planned for and included in the department's detailed budget. Classified support may also be helpful in addressing some of the marketing and outreach needs of the department and division.
7. There is need for increased marketing across Health Sciences Division, but the HIT Department has a specific need to educate people as to what they do. Such efforts could help create pathways for students who do not make it into programs like Nursing and Radiology but are still interested in a career in the medical field. The department could provide a more detailed breakdown of how the requested \$30,000 will be spent. This may allow for the department to get some of the requested support, if not all, and would allow the committee to determine if there are similar needs in other departments share any new marketing resources.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Human Services*

**Presenter:** Virgil Adams, Gary Zager, and James Tapia

**Date:** 11/30/2020

**Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

  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 **General 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 department’s review materials reflect the exceptional work being done by the program and its commitment to student success.

**Program CSLOs:**

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

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 66.7%	Spring 2018 – 100%
Fall 2018 – 100%	Spring 2019 – 100%
Fall 2019 – 93.3%	Spring 2020 – 76.9%

**Comments:** While most courses in Human Services have been assessed over the span of 6

semesters, there is still room for improvement in the semester assessment completion percentages. The percentage of courses assessed for Spring 2020 was 76.97%. The overall CSLO success rate for the department's courses is 95.7%.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_X\_\_\_

**Comments:** The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen for all areas except Breadth of Knowledge, Competencies, & Skills. It is recommended that the department revisit the PSLO mapping and check the box for Social Sciences for all CSLOs for the PSLO area of Breadth of Knowledge, Competencies, & Skills. The department may want to revisit the PSLO mapping to make it more distinct to give more meaningful results for the following reasons: 1) Reading and Writing have the same exact mapping in the PSLO area of Communication 2) Communicating and Presenting have the exact same mapping in the PSLO area of Communication 3) Analysis, Research, Problem-Solving, and Technology all have the exact same mapping in the PSLO area of Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The department created a Substance Abuse and Addiction Studies Program Certificate to further the work being done in the program and to clarify the pathway for students interested in the field.
2. The department deserves special recognition for its support and guidance of the Human Services Club. Always among the largest of the student clubs on campus, its central mission is students helping students. The campus Food Bank, Clothing Drive, and other efforts to meet the material needs of our students have an impact in the community beyond education.
3. The department has been a leader in the college effort to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion across campus and in the community. The very nature of the course work deals with people of special groups, and this consideration is apparent in the curriculum, pedagogy, and outreach of the program.
4. The department has high success rates which may be attributed, in part, to the expertise and real-world knowledge of faculty helping to model professor/student interaction in the classroom.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to be more diligent in assessing their CSLOs. The committee recognizes that a lack of full-time faculty forces some departments to rely on adjunct faculty to teach many classes, and in the past, this placed limitations on the department's ability to collect and assess CSLO data. But the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language specifically regarding CSLO data input, and the department should make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. The program's Compliance Status is being impacted by the low CSLO completion rate. The percentage of courses assessed must increase to above 90% by their next review cycle, or the department risks further negative impact on their Compliance Status.
2. The department is encouraged to continue revising courses and curriculum to support degree completion, and to expand offerings in Home Care, Hospice Care, and

Gerontology and to explore possible cross-departmental work with Health Sciences and Administration of Justice.

3. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by any grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and better define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
4. The IPRC has worked to create a review process that is thorough, meaningful, and transparent. Through the revision of the forms used in review, the processes used to notify participants, and the follow-up summaries linking budget requests to the larger campus budgeting procedures, the committee has sought to ensure the integrity of program review and has been accountable in doing so. The committee expects that same level of integrity, responsibility, and accountability from the programs under review.

**Identified Resource and Budget Needs:**

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Laptops and monitor	\$6,700	T	D	O	M	N	200

**\*TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/ Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

**Budget Comments:**

1. The department’s requests for computer needs to help with remote instruction were forwarded to the VPI to be addressed with special COVID funding.



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Journalism*

**Presenter:** Michael Coronado

**Date:** 11/16/2020

### **Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

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

   X    **Compliance – Needs Improvement** – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See comments below and Recommendations #1 and #2.)

       **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 Journalism Department presented a program review reflecting its commitment to student success. However, the committee did find two areas of concern that need to be addressed. First, the department's PSLO mapping is incomplete and CSLO completion rate is below 90%. Second, the department has a number of courses with curriculum that is out of compliance and needs to be updated. These issues are detailed further in Recommendations #1 and #2 below and have contributed to the department receiving its current Compliance Status. The IPRC understands that some of these issues are the result of the lack of institutional support, and the committee will provide guidance and resources to help the department become compliant. The expectation is that these issues will be addressed by the department's next review if not sooner.

#### **Program CSLOs:**

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 66.7%	Spring 2018 – 100%
Fall 2018 – 100%	Spring 2019 – 57.1%
Fall 2019 – 75.0%	Spring 2020 – 66.7%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 57.1%. The semester assessment completion percentages have been 0% each of the last 3 semesters. The low percentages have been attributed to lack of adjunct faculty participation. The overall CSLO success rate for the department’s courses is 71.4%.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The department has not completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The department is to be commended for reviving a program that had taken a downturn due to recent retirements, particularly considering they only have one full-time faculty member who is new to the program and campus to shoulder the burden.
2. Enrollment is moving in the right direction, and the program has shifted focus to fundamental skill building and ethics. The creation of a Media Literacy course is an example of this.
3. The program has good success rates that is in part attributed to having an industry professional with contacts in the profession.
4. Opportunities for student news have been revived and have been well received by students. It provides much needed experience and offers a source for campus news.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to be more diligent in assessing their CSLOs and need to complete the mapping of their PSLOs. The committee recognizes that a lack of full-time faculty forces some departments to rely on adjunct faculty to teach many classes, and in the past, this placed limitations on the department’s ability to collect and assess CSLO data. But the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language specifically regarding CSLO data input, and the department should make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. The program’s Compliance Status is being impacted by the low CSLO completion rate and the fact that PSLO mapping incomplete. The percentage of courses assessed must increase to above 90% and their PSLO mapping must be complete by their next review cycle, or the department risks having their Compliance Status lowered further.
2. The department needs to revise its curriculum. There are a number of courses with curriculum that is out of compliance and in need of updating. This is a serious issue that potentially jeopardizes courses within the department. Despite the efforts of the Curriculum Committee to remind the department of the issue, the curriculum is not updated. It is recognized that a lack of full-time faculty has been a barrier here, but this is

important work that must be prioritized by the department. This curriculum must be updated by the next review.

3. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
4. The IPRC strongly suggests the department consult with other programs in their division about maximizing and sharing space in the remodel of the Fine Arts Building.
5. The department is encouraged to continue developing additional Certificates and Degrees and further clarifying the pathway for students interested in the field.
6. The department needs to develop a plan for addressing the equity gaps that exist for African American and Latinx students.

### Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Fulltime faculty member	\$100K	F	D	O	M	N	85+
2	4 40-inch flat screen TVs	\$4,000	I	D	O	I	N	85+
3	Glass walls for department							

#### \*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/ Admin.

T = Technology

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing / On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat / Received

RN = Repeat / Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

### BUDGET COMMENTS:

1. The department has a need for a full-time faculty member. The burden of running the department has fallen into the hands of one person, which has strained the program.
2. Some of the department's demonstrated budget and resource requests should become part of the revised, right-sized department budget that details that actual costs of running the program, and they should not be left to the One-Time Funding process.
3. There are some needs for the department that are expected to be addressed in the remodel of the Fine Arts building.



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Media Arts Design*

**Presenter:** Katalin Angelov and Ian Holmes

**Date:** 11/16/2020

### **Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

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

   X    **Compliance – Needs Improvement** – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See **General Comments below and Recommendations #1 and #2.**)

       **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:** Media Arts Design presented a review that reflected the department's commitment to student success and the campus efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. However, the committee did find two areas of concern that need to be addressed. First, the department's CSLO completion rate is below 90%. Second, the department has a number of courses with curriculum that is out of compliance and needs to be updated. These issues are detailed further in Recommendations #1 and #2 below and have contributed to the department receiving its current Compliance Status. The IPRC understands that some of these issues are the result of the lack of institutional support, and the committee will provide guidance and resources to help the department address these issues. The expectation is that these issues will be resolved by the department's next review if not sooner.

**Program CSLOs:**

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 81.3%	Spring 2018 – 93.3%
Fall 2018 – 61.5%	Spring 2019 – 27.8%
Fall 2019 – 35.0%	Spring 2020 – 48.3%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 75%. The semester assessment completion percentages have been very low the last 4 semesters. These low percentages for the last 4 semesters have been attributed to zero adjunct faculty participation. The overall CSLO success rate for the department's courses is 89.8%.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. There is a high success rate for meeting the standard in the area of Communication and also in the area of Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency. In the area of Communication, Communicating and Presenting have the exact same mapping so the department may want to revisit the mapping to make it more distinct to give more meaningful data.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The department has worked to clarify the pathways for students in the program giving them the ability to transfer more quickly. They are restructuring certain certificates, made the AA in Graphic Design, and, most importantly, are seeking to create an AS-T.
2. MAD is a leader on the campus in promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion. They are committed to highlighting artists from diverse backgrounds as examples of the richness and diversity of the industry. An upcoming collaborative concert between Music, MAD and Dance is an example of how diversity and social justice are common themes in all the department's projects.
3. The department's commitment to keeping track of their students once they leave the program is excellent. This sort of after care is a further example of the department's commitment to student success.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to be more diligent in assessing their CSLOs. The committee recognizes that a lack of full-time faculty forces some departments to rely on adjunct faculty to teach many classes, and in the past, this placed limitations on the department's ability to collect and assess CSLO data. But the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language specifically regarding CSLO data input, and the department should make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. The program's Compliance Status is being impacted by the low CSLO completion rate. The percentage of courses assessed must increase to above 90% by their next review cycle, or the department risks further negative impact on their Compliance Status.

2. The department needs to revise its curriculum. There are a number of courses with curriculum that is out of compliance and in need of updating. This is a serious issue that potentially jeopardizes courses within the department. Despite the efforts of the Curriculum Committee to remind the department of the issue, the curriculum is not updated. It is recognized that a lack of full-time faculty has been a barrier here, but this is important work that must be prioritized by the department. This curriculum must be updated by the next review.
3. The department is encouraged to continue clarifying the pathway to completion and address classes with low fill rates. This may require restructuring the transfer degree and revising curriculum to have more of a MAD focus. The department is reminded to consider the impact of these revisions on any other departments or programs and to collegially consult with them as necessary.
4. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by any grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and better define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
5. The program should develop a plan for addressing equity gaps exist for African American and Latinx students.
6. The department is encouraged to work with Institutional Research and Planning, the Title V Data Coaches, and others to identify new metrics that more accurately track the success of students in the program.
7. The department is encouraged to continue exploring the use of the CTE nature of the program to gain Strong Workforce funding.

**Identified Resource and Budget Needs:**

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Fulltime faculty member	\$100K	F	D	C	I	RN	360
2	Equity-minded symposium	\$8,000	?	C	C	I	N	4,000+
3	Professional workshops	\$4500	?	V	C	I	N	4,000+
4	MAD Student Club	\$500	?	D	C	M	N	500+

**\*TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount: Total \$ amount for request  
 Type: F = Faculty                                    C = Classified/ Admin                                    T = Technology/Equipment                                    M = Maintenance  
 Need: D = Department                                    V = Division                                    C = Campus  
 Length: O = One-Time Need                                    C = Continuing/ On-Going  
 Purpose: CN = Critical Need                                    M = Prog. Maintenance                                    I = Prog. Improvement                                    G = Prog. Growth  
 Age: N = New Request                                    RR = Repeat/Received                                    RN = Repeat/Not Received  
 Impact: # of students impacted

**BUDGET COMMENTS:**

1. The department has a need for an additional full-time faculty member. They have to space out when they can offer courses, slowing the student path to completion. This would also help with increasing the number of core classes available. This has been an ongoing request of the department.
2. Some of the department's demonstrated budget and resource requests should become part of the revised, right-sized department budget that details that actual costs of running the program, and they should not be left to the One-Time Funding process.



**Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation**

*Program: Mortuary Science*

**Presenter:** Jolena Grande and Damon de la Cruz

**Date:** 11/30/2020

**Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

  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 Mortuary Sciences department presented a review of their Associated Arts degree that demonstrated it was a first-rate program dedicated to student success.

**Program CSLOs:**

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

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 100%	Spring 2018 – 75%
Fall 2018 – 85.7%	Spring 2019 – 71.4%
Fall 2019 – 100%	Spring 2020 – 0%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 96.6%. For the most part, the Mortuary Science department is doing a nice job of assessing CSLOs. The unusually low percentage for Spring 2020 is due to classes not finishing because of on-campus COVID-19 restrictions. It is recommended that faculty complete the Spring 2020 CSLO assessments in eLumen for the remaining courses that haven't been assessed yet. It was noted that the department anticipates 100% completion for future semesters once the Canvas integration that connects the Canvas gradebook to eLumen is implemented. The overall CSLO success rate for the department's courses is 95.6%.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen for the area of Breadth of Knowledge, Competencies, & Skills. All CSLOs have the exact same mappings to PSLOs in the area of Breadth of Knowledge, Competencies, & Skills. It is recommended that the department revisit the PSLO mapping and map the CSLOs to the other three PSLO areas for more distinct and meaningful results.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The department saw a great increase in fill rates prior to the COVID crisis.
2. The department is one of the leaders on campus in promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion. With all the have done in revising curriculum, pedagogy, and outreach, the department is committed to doing even more and having conferences, seminars, and other opportunities to explore diversity. It is the true sign of leader that sees the work they have yet to do without waiting for others to catch up.
3. The department must be given special recognition for its efforts to continue providing first-rate instruction during the COVID-19 crisis. While all programs on campus have suffered the stress of the pandemic, Mortuary Science is one of a small group that has been particularly impacted by not being able to easily transfer their courses to a remote format. They were forced to conduct in-person learning as distance learning was not acceptable to their accrediting body. This placed great stress on the students, instructors, administrators, and staff to maintain all health and safety protocols. The department also expressed some frustration and concern with a perceived lack of proper supplies and administrative support.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the AA program, one that is separate from the Baccalaureate degree. This budget should also include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
2. The IPRC is concerned that issues with the department Baccalaureate degree may have a negative impact on the rest of the program. The department is urged to more clearly distinguish between the budget, resource, and other needs of the AA program and those

of the BA program. It's also recognized that the department's desire to create of a 4-year program may resolve many of the current issues, but it would assuredly create others. The committee supports a broader campus discussion about creating such a program.

3. The department is encouraged to work to mitigate the immediate and long-term impact of the COVID crisis. There was a decrease in the success rate, and enrollment is predicted to be cut in half by the decision to not to have a new cohort in Spring 2021.
4. The department is encouraged to create a plan to address equity gaps that exist for African American, American Indian, Latinx, and Pacific Islander students.
5. The department could be more diligent in assessing their CSLOs. The committee recognizes that a lack of full-time faculty forces the department to rely on adjunct faculty at times, and in the past, this placed limitations on a department's ability to collect and assess CSLO data. But the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language specifically regarding CSLO data input, and the department should make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. In addition, the use of CSLO data in awarding credit for prior learning will make this all the more important.

### Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Fulltime faculty replacement for AA	\$100K	F	D	C	M	N	150
2	Dedicated computer lab	TBD	T	V	O	M	N	2500
3	BSFS Coordinator/Faculty	\$100K	F	D	C	M	RN	150
4	ASMS Program reassigned time	\$35K	C	D	C	M	N	150
5	Restorative art instructional equipment	\$75K	T	D	O	I	N	100
6	Alkaline Hydrolysis/incineration unit	\$500K	T	D	C	I	N	300
7	Administrative Assistant II	\$60K	C	V	C	M	N	150
8	Designated professional development \$	\$75K	C	D	C	I	N	150
9	Marketing budget	\$10K	?	V	C	I	N	300

#### \*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/ Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/ On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

### Budget Comments:

1. The department has a need for a full-time faculty member. There was a replacement for a retirement that was put on hold due to COVID, but an additional full-time faculty member will be needed to meet new accreditation requirements of the program. It should be underscored that the IPRC sees this as a demonstrated need for the AA

- program and not the BA program.
2. The department needs a dedicated computer lab, but campus space allocations and the necessary technology are lacking. This may require some of the requests to be placed in the college Facilities Master Plan for regular maintenance and upgrades.
  3. The department has a demonstrated need for a full-time faculty member to serve as BSFS Department Coordinator. The IPRC sees the need for the position, but also the need for the Mortuary Science program to address some lingering issues with the Baccalaureate degree program. There needs to be a clearer distinction of the budget and resource requests for administration of the Associate and the Baccalaureate degrees.
  4. The department has a demonstrated need to increase the reassigned time for the ASMS Program Director. The duties of the position have increased beyond the original compensation. Like all reassigned time, this should be reevaluated each semester to be sure the work being required of the position carries adequate compensation.
  5. The department has a need for the restorative art instructional equipment. This is essential to the program in preparing students for the field. This equipment should also be part of the department's accurate, right-sized budget detailing the actual cost of the program, and they should not be left to the One-Time Funding process. It is hoped that such requests would not have to be included in the department's future Instructional Program Review but will be instead funded through their department budget.
  6. The department has a need for the Alkaline Hydrolysis/incineration unit if it wants to keep current in the field. The nature and high price of the item suggest that it needs to be part of the college Facilities Master Plan and funded through the college budget. If the department could work to get alternate funding to help offset some of the cost of the unit that would aid in the college being able to fund it.
  7. The department and division have a demonstrated need for an Administrative Assistant II position.
  8. The department has expressed a need for dedicated professional development funding. They have requested \$15,000 per faculty member. This type of funding should be part of their detailed departmental budget and not brought through the One-Time Funding process.
  9. The department has a need for more marketing materials. This will be all the more important given the enrollment hit the department experienced as a result of COVID-19.
  10. The department has many other requests for resources in its current review that are central to the effective operation of the program. Some are large ticket items and others smaller, but each should be part of the department's accurate, right-sized budget. The department should have its operating budget increased to meet these regular operating costs, and it should not have to rely on the One-Time Funding process.

*Program: Photography*

**Presenter:** Tony Maher

**Date:** 11/09/2020

### **Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

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

   X    **Compliance – Needs Improvement** – The program review covers all of the topics and provides a detailed plan with dates and people responsible for achieving stated actions/goals; however, there are areas the program needs to address and show improvement on for the next review cycle. The program may apply for all available funding, but additional information may also need to be provided to support future funding requests. (See **General Comments below and Recommendations #1 and #2.**)

       **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 Photography Department presented a review that reflected a program committed to student success and one with the potential for great growth. However, the committee did find two areas of concern that need to be addressed. First, the department's PSLO mapping is incomplete and CSLO completion rate is below 90%. Second, the department has a number of courses with curriculum that is out of compliance and needs to be updated. These issues are detailed further in Recommendations #1 and #2 below and have contributed to the department receiving its current Compliance Status. The IPRC understands that some of these issues are the result of the lack of institutional support, and the committee will provide guidance and resources to help the department become compliant. The expectation is that these issues will be addressed by the department's next review if not sooner.

**Program CSLOs:**

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 60.0%	Spring 2018 – 66.7%
Fall 2018 – 83.3%	Spring 2019 – 33.3%
Fall 2019 – 50.0%	Spring 2020 – 70.0%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 50%. This low percentage has been attributed to lack of adjunct faculty participation. It was acknowledged that changes need to be implemented to increase faculty participation in assessing CSLOs. It is recommended that full-time faculty in the department follow up with adjunct faculty to assure the CSLO assessments are being completed. The overall CSLO success rate for the department's courses is 94%.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The PSLO mapping in eLumen is partially done. The mapping has not been completed for the following PSLO areas: Communication; Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency; Personal, Academic, & Professional Development

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The department has done tremendous work reviving a struggling program that was in decline and doing so with very little resources. The only full-time faculty member was only recently hired and is to be commended for shouldering the burden.
2. The program has high success rates.
3. Photography is a leader in the efforts of the college to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. The department has placed equity at the heart of its curriculum, pedagogy, and outreach in an effort for the students to see themselves reflected in the program. The department is also working on a Social Equity certificate highlighting this area, focusing on marginalized individuals, and creating a reflection/mirror for students.
4. The department has also been successful in creating partnerships with other departments demonstrating the multiple pathways available to students in the field and providing practical experience and career training.
5. The department deserves special recognition for its response to the COVID-19 crisis. They established a system for students to borrow equipment allowing them to continue the full hands-on learning experience even during remote instruction. This was positively by students and not something surrounding colleges were able to offer their students.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to be more diligent in assessing their CSLOs and need to complete the mapping of their PSLOs. The committee recognizes that a lack of full-time faculty forces some departments to rely on adjunct faculty to teach many classes, and in the past, this placed limitations on the department's ability to collect and assess CSLO data. But the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language specifically

regarding CSLO data input, and the department should make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. The program's Compliance Status is being impacted by the low CSLO completion rate and the fact that PSLO mapping is incomplete. The percentage of courses assessed must increase to above 90% and their PSLO mapping must be complete by their next review cycle, or the department risks further negative impact on their Compliance Status.

2. The department needs to revise its curriculum. There are a number of courses with curriculum that is out of compliance and in need of updating. This is a serious issue that potentially jeopardizes courses within the department. Despite the efforts of the Curriculum Committee to remind the department of the issue, the curriculum is not updated. It is recognized that a lack of full-time faculty has been a barrier here, but this is important work that must be prioritized by the department. This curriculum must be updated by the next review.
3. The department is encouraged to keep exploring options to partner with other entities on campus like Theater, Journalism, and the athletic teams.
4. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
5. The department is encouraged to create a plan for addressing equity gaps that exist for African American, Native American, and LatinX students.

### Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Fulltime faculty member	\$100K	F	D	C	M	N	600
2	Classified help	\$75K	C	V	C	M	N	4000+
3	Darkroom upgrade	TBD	M	D	O	M	N	600
4	Printers	\$25K	T	D	O	I	N	600
5	Laptop cart	\$60K	T	D	O	I	N	600

#### \*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/ Admin.

T = Technology/ Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/ On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat/ Received

RN = Repeat/ Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

**Budget Comments:**

1. Photography is operating with only one full-time faculty member, and this is putting a strain on the program and impacting course offerings, fill rates, and competition/retention. It is also a factor in the issues the department faced with CSLOs and curriculum. Addressing this need should be a priority.
2. The department and the division have a demonstrated need or classified support.
3. The department has a need to upgrade the darkroom. It is anticipated that some of these needs will be addressed with the remodel of the Fine Arts Building.
4. The remaining budget and resource requests of the department are needed. But they should also be part of the department's accurate, right-sized budget detailing the actual cost of the program, and they should not be left to the One-Time Funding process. It is hoped that such requests would not have to be included in the department's future Instructional Program Review but will be instead funded through their department budget.



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Theater*

**Presenter:** James Hormel and Donny Jackson

**Date:** 11/09/2020

### **Instructional Program Review Committee Summary**

The goal of the 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 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 IPRC.

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

  X   **Compliance – Needs Improvement** – The program review covers all 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 **General Comments below and Recommendation #1.**)

       **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 Theater Department presented a thorough review that demonstrated a program committed to student success. Their work in the area of diversity, equity, and inclusion across the campus and community deserves special recognition. However, the committee did find one area of concern that needs to be addressed. The department's CSLO completion rate is below 90%. This issue is detailed further in Recommendation #1 below and has contributed to the department receiving its current Compliance Status. The IPRC understands that some of this is the result of the lack of institutional support, and the committee will provide guidance and resources to help the department address these issues. The expectation is that these issues will be resolved by the department's next review if not sooner.

**Program CSLOs:**

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2017 – 71.4%	Spring 2018 – 88%
Fall 2018 – 46.2%	Spring 2019 – 60.7%
Fall 2019 – 60.7%	Spring 2020 – 51.5%

**Comments:** The percentage of courses assessed over the last 6 semesters is 82.5%. The largest obstacle for the department not reaching that 100% marker has been attributed to lack of adjunct faculty participation. The overall CSLO success rate for the department’s courses is 93.2%.

**Program PSLOs:**

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes  No  Other

**Comments:** The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The department did an excellent job at mapping and was able to draw meaningful conclusions. There is a high success rate for meeting the standard in the area of Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency. It was noted that in the area of Communication, Writing is one PSLO of concern and the department plans to utilize resources on campus, such as tutorial programs, to help improve these skills.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The addition of two full-time faculty members has helped the department to expand its curriculum and course offerings, and to create additional degrees and certificates. The AS in Technical Theater, AA in Performance Theater, and the AA-T are building a stronger program and encouraging students on to a four-year degree. The introduction and creation of some new technical theatre design courses and the separation of the certificates for science (technical) and art (performing) illustrates the department’s understanding of the need of its students to be better prepared for their professions. This was all made possible by a grant the program received for the development of a design lab. Professor Donny Jackson deserves special recognition for securing the grant.
2. The department’s work in the area of diversity, equity and inclusion on the campus and in the community is something for which they should receive special recognition. The program considers diversity central to Theater and the Arts in general, and their curriculum, pedagogy, and student outreach are guided by it. As was said during their presentation, the department “teaches empathy” and strives to show students a mirror of themselves in their courses, programming, and casting. The “Diversity in Theater” course, which brings an array of guest speakers to discuss their specific experience with students in the department, is just one example. The largest group of DSS students are also in the Fine Arts. While the department is supportive of all the equity efforts on campus, it would like to see more active support of the LGBTQ community at Cypress. The committee strongly shares that sentiment.
3. Through its many productions, the Theater Department has acted as an excellent “front porch” of the campus for the surrounding community. There is even greater potential for the college to benefit further from this marketing tool if it is willing to invest in the people and resources needed to adequately run a major campus theater.

4. The program has strong success rates with passionate instructors.
5. The department is committed to building community among their students in the following ways: converting a “Green Room” into a student lounge, entering student productions in the Kennedy Center American College Theatre festival, holding award banquets, and bringing back the Theatre festival at Cypress College.
6. Theater is a leader on the campus in Dual Enrollment. Many, if not all, of the productions in a given year involve students from local high schools. These students often continue on to Cypress once they have graduated.
7. COVID-19 has brought the theater industry to a standstill, which may have a trickle effect on enrollment. Community and other partnerships have also been negatively impacted. The Theatre Arts faculty, staff, and students were able to mitigate some of the issues with lack of in-person contact with aplomb.

### **Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The department needs to be more diligent in assessing their CSLOs. The committee recognizes that a lack of full-time faculty forces some departments to rely on adjunct faculty to teach many classes, and in the past, this placed limitations on a department’s ability to collect and assess CSLO data. But the Adjunct Faculty Evaluation Form now contains language specifically regarding CSLO data input, and the department should make a greater effort to involve their adjunct faculty in the process. The program’s Compliance Status is being impacted by the low CSLO completion rate. The percentage of courses assessed must increase to above 90% by their next review cycle, or the department risks further negative impact on their Compliance Status.
2. The IPRC fully supports the need for the regular maintenance and upgrades of the Campus Theater to be part of the larger campus budget and included in the college’s Facilities Master Plan. In this and previous reviews, the Theater Department identified resource needs and made requests for funding stemming from the lack of timely and adequate maintenance, repairs, and upgrades to the Campus Theater. Even with some one-time funding coming from the District to address some these problems, far more issues remain. The Theater department, along with other departments in the Fine Arts Division, need to have the theater updated to stay safe, stay competitive, and to keep growing and expanding their programs. They also need to have the college share more of these costs and not have the burden fall on their program budgets. Seeing this as a Cypress issue and not just a Theater or Fine Arts one will go a long way in clearing up a perceived lack of communication, transparency, and support for the theater.
3. The department needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. Related to this, the department needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
4. The department is encouraged to work with other programs in their division and across campus that are being impacted by the course repeatability issue. For many students in the department, a degree is secondary to the experience and skills they obtain. Many of the classes in the program are designed to build skills and students often benefit from being able to take them more than once. Current repeatability restrictions are a significant impediment to that.

5. The department is encouraged to make a plan to address equity gaps that exist for African American, American Indian, and LatinX students. The program should continue to work with the Math Department to address a stumbling block for some of their students.
6. The department is asked to let the library know of any plays or other material it can purchase to make available to students.

### Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Box Office/Marketing/Digital		C	V	C	CN	RN	15K+
2	Master Electrician		C	V	C	CN	RN	15K+
3	Costume Shop Supervisor		C	V	C	M	RN	15K+
4	Theater upgrades							

#### \*TABLE CODE KEY

*Amount:* Total \$ amount for request

*Type:* F = Faculty

C = Classified/ Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

*Need:* D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

*Length:* O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/ On-Going

*Purpose:* CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

*Age:* N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

*Impact:* # of students impacted

### Budget Comments:

1. The department is in critical need of classified/administrative support. First would be a person to handle the Box Office, Marketing, and Digital presence of the Campus Theater. This is a common position at other colleges, including our sister campus; in fact, many places have a full staff to handle these needs. This should be a campus priority.
2. Another critical need for the department is a Master Electrician. This is a safety concern, and someone other than a faculty member should have oversight in the area. This is also considered to be a need of the campus and not just the department or division.
3. A third position of need for the department and division is a Costume Shop Manager. The shop is not able to be adequately staffed by part-time help. This would also be a benefit to the entire campus.
4. The department has other demonstrated needs in technology, equipment maintenance, and theater repairs that may be addressed in the remodel of the Fine Arts building. Some of their budget and resource requests should become part of the revised, right-sized department budget that details that actual costs of running the program, and they should not be left to the One-Time Funding process.

## Appendix H: Specialized 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, 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 in the Instructional Program Review section of the college website.

The following Specialized Instructional Programs presented their reviews in Spring 2021:

- Distance Education
- English Success Center
- Math Learning Center
- Tutoring
- Supplemental Instruction
- Dual Enrollment
- Legacy



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Distance Education*

**Presenter:** Kathleen McAlister and Treisa Cassens

**Date:** 3/22/21

### *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 IPRC.

**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 General 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:** Distance Education presented review materials that underscore how essential they are in the success of students in every division and department of the college. It would have been impossible for the college to make the transition to remote instruction forced by the pandemic without the hard work of the DE Program and DE Team.

#### **Program SSLOs:**

Did the program provide SSLO data?    Yes        No **X** Other       

**Comments:** The program needs to develop SSLOs and provide supporting data by the next review cycle.

### **Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. No department or program deserves more praise than DE for meeting the demands of the pandemic. The shift to remote instruction in Spring 2020 could not have been done without the aid of the DE Program. By facilitating the rapid review and approval of curriculum for DE delivery, enhancing course Canvas shells with support services, and training faculty to teach in an online setting, the program led the way and positively impacted every class and student at Cypress College.
2. The program has done an excellent job improving student success rates for online courses. Historically, online classes regularly have success rates double digits lower than face-to-face classes. Recently, this gap has been narrowed to 2-3% with some classes showing no gaps at all. This is sign of the strength of the program.
3. The program established a DE Addendum and compliance process for reviewing DE curriculum that was missing at the campus. An additional DE addendum was created for those instructors who wish to specify synchronous teaching.
4. DE must almost be commended for not only leading the campus migration from Blackboard to Canvas for online instruction, but for also supporting and training the campus in the expansion of the Canvas LMS to all classes.
5. The program has also developed an extensive system of training. They increased the frequency and awareness of training, updated the Faculty Handbook and College Website for Canvas, created “web enhanced training” for Canvas, and updated faculty certification for Canvas. This helped the program triple the number of active DE-trained/certified faculty from Spring 2020 to Fall 2020.
6. The program has expanded student access to support services. Canvas has allowed the global integration of student services and counseling and offers the opportunity for self-enrolling Canvas support sites. The program then facilitated, supported, and developed training for LMS integrations such as Turnitin.com, ALLY, Canvas Studio, GoReact, Proctorio, Respondus, Lockdown Browser, Labster, Zoom, Screencast-O-matic. These integrations have received positive feedback from both students and faculty and should be considered essential resources for the program going forward.

### **Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The program needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the program is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding. Related to this, the program needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs. But this should all be done in the context of DE having its own campus-level budget line item that is committed to fully and permanently funding the program.
2. The program is encouraged to develop SSLOs with the appropriate data to better track the impact and success of their program. The program will be expected to have SSLOs and data to analyze by their next review cycle.
3. The IPRC supports the program’s goals of creating a POCR Team and joining the CVC. It is recognized that multiple conversations need to take place with different entities at the college and district, but the committee encourages the program in those efforts and offers its support where possible.
4. DE is encouraged to continue its restructure of the program support model. Establishing an official DE Committee with members from each division on campus was an essential

start, but there is still work left to be done. The scope and role of the DE Program has grown significantly in the last 5 years, but the institutional support in terms of technology and personnel has not increased to meet that workload. The program needs a more defined structure that includes a fulltime DE Project Manager, an increase in reassigned time for the DE Coordinator and potential support, and the required Instructional Designers all with well-defined roles. This structure would be supported by the new, right-sized program budget.

5. The program is encouraged to address concerns of disciplines such as Math that need more security, particularly regarding testing, in order to offer courses online.

### Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC 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 requests. The requests are ranked based on their overall need, and both the program and the IPRC agree to the ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Instructional Designer (1 to 3)	TBD	F	C	C	CN	N	All
2	Software Integrations for Canvas	TBD	T	C	C	M	N	All
3	Fulltime DE Project Manager	TBD	F/C	C	C	M	N	All
4	Increase DE Coordinator Reassigned time	TBD	F	C	C	M	N	All

#### \*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

### Budget Comments:

1. The program has a demonstrated need for Instructional Designers. Ideally, there would be three or more, but there is a dire need for at least one. This is viewed as a high priority by both the program and the committee.
2. The software integrations referenced provide various essential services and resources for faculty and students. In particular, they are central to accessibility compliance which should be of high concern for the college and district. Currently many of these integrations are being provided by the federal and state funds as well as publishers offering access to products during the pandemic. Both these funds and access cannot be expected to last indefinitely, and the campus needs to prepare to for that eventuality to ensure these services are not interrupted. This is seen as a high priority of both the program and the committee.
3. The program has a demonstrated need for a fulltime DE Project Manager.
4. There is a demonstrated need to increase the reassigned time for the DE Coordinator. The scope of the job has increased to the point that 60% is no longer enough. There

needs to be 100% reassigned time for the DE Coordinator. This may be split by two people, but there is the need to compensate the coordinator for the work they are now doing.

5. These and other DE budget requests would be more properly included in the program's right-sized budget. But that budget must be supported and well-funded by a campus-level line item. The DE Program is too essential to rely on One-Time Funding or other non-permanent sources of revenue.



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

### *Program: Dual Enrollment*

**Presenter:** Stephanie Teer, Ruth Gutierrez, and Henry Hua

**Date:** 4/05/21

### ***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 IPRC.

  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 General 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 General 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 by the next cycle, it may be recommended for Program Discontinuance. (See Comments below.)

**General Comments:** Dual Enrollment presented an excellent review that underscores its commitment to student success. It is a model Specialized Instructional Program on campus.

### **Program SSLOs:**

Did the program provide SSLO data?            Yes    No    Other   X  

**Comments:** The program may need to develop SLOs that are specific to their work as a Specialized Instructional Program (SIP). There is a concern that current SSLO and CSLO data may not be wholly appropriate for assessing the impact and success of the program. (See Recommendation #2 below).

### **Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. Dual Enrollment must be commended for the growth of the program over the past four years. Beginning with a small number of classes taught at a handful of high schools, the program now offers multiple classes with well-defined pathways at nine high schools over four Districts. This growth was the direct result of Cypress College faculty, administration, and staff working collaboratively with each other and with their partners at the districts and high schools to align their mission, goals, and resources to best promote student success. It is truly an example of integration at its best.
2. The program growth has been accompanied by a tremendous increase in enrollment, even during the pandemic. This can be attributed, in part, to the introduction of new Dual Enrollment pathways offering students different opportunities to explore academic interests and career goals. The development of Dual Enrollment embedded models has also made it easier for students to participate in the program by allowing them to take classes as part of their regular school day instead of after school when they may have other familial or employment obligations.
3. Dual Enrollment has excellent student success rates, often higher than those for the same course not taught in conjunction with the program. This is the result of a strategic support structure that offers excellent instruction, student support services, and developmental workshops. This structure is a proven success that should be seen as a model of the integration of the resources of the campus and our community partners in promoting and achieving student success.
4. The program must be commended for its focus on equity. Instead of focusing on the traditional AP student or others in high school already on a path to college, the program has gone to great lengths to recruit students who are not on such a path, may have no expectation of going to college, and are often from underserved populations. Having embedded Dual Enrollment classes has a particular appeal for students whose afterschool responsibilities prevent them from taking Dual Enrollment classes. Similarly, by introducing the guided pathway model to students early in high school allows them to visualize and plan for a future education and career.

### **Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The program needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the program is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding. The program has done a good job of defining its budget and resource requests which will help the IPRC better advocate for its needs. But this should all be done in the context of Dual Enrollment having its own campus-level budget line item that is committed to fully and permanently funding the program.
2. The program is encouraged to develop SLOs to track the specific impact of their work and to identify the proper data needed to access them. The unique nature of the program may not be able to be tracked by the current SSLOs or CSLOs. While these may be of use in reviewing the program, the committee recommends exploring the creation of SLOs specific to the SIPs. To achieve this, the IPRC Chair will arrange a meeting with the SLO Coordinator, Student Services Coordinator, and the Coordinators of the various SIPs to discuss the issue. It may be that a SIP SLO Coordinator may need to be added under the umbrella of the campus SLO structure. Programs will be expected to have specific SLOs or update the committee on this process by their next review cycle.

- The program is encouraged to continue with the plan to reorganize its support structure. The two-part plan to increase support and make the personnel and funding more permanent has the full support of the IPRC and the committee is committed to advocating for the plan.

### Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC 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. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Permanent Program Manager	\$132,625 w/benefits	C	D	O	M	N	TBD
2	Permanent Program Coordinator	\$103,576 w/benefits	C	D	O	M	N	TBD
3	Adjunct Counselors (3)	\$139,191 w/benefits	F	D	O	M	N	TBD
4	Professional Experts (5)	\$126,125 w/benefits	F	D	O	M	N	TBD
5	Adult Hourlies (5)	\$66,925 w/benefits	C	D	O	M	N	TBD

#### \*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

### Budget Comments:

- There is a need for more permanence to the staff and funding of the program. In their review, the program details a two-part plan for scaling up the program and addressing these issues. The chart above reflects the first part of the plan, the Intermediary Phase, and should be seen as a first step toward creating the support structure need to maintain and grow the program.
- The second step of development is also contained within the programs current review and has the support of the committee. It would add two permanent Student Services Specialists and decrease the number of Professional Experts and Adult Hourlies from five to three. Each SIP is being placed on a 4-year review cycle to mirror that of the Instructional Programs. To accommodate this, Dual Enrollment has been asked to return for review before four years. It is hoped that this will also allow for the IPRC to further advocate for the second part of the plan. The success of the program relies on a specific support structure that needs to be properly funded.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: English Success Center*

**Presenter:** Treisa Cassens

**Date:** 3/15/21

*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 IPRC.

**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 English Success Center presented a review that underscores the great work being done to make students more successful in their classes.

*Program SSLOs:*

Did the program provide SSLO data?    Yes **X** No        Other       

**Comments:** The program showed ample evidence to support their first SSLO. The IPRC recommends developing more questions to include in the student survey used to demonstrate success in meeting their SSLO #2.

**Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The ESC has done a tremendous job transitioning to remote instruction and the use of Zoom. It was a collaborative effort that was quite successful despite limitations of personnel and resources.

- The ESC has been instrumental in helping students succeed in their classes. Data shows there are often double digit increases in success among students who utilize the resources of the ESC and those that do not. This is an impact that is felt by students in all of the divisions of the college.
- The ESC has been invaluable in helping the college adjust to the implementation of AB705. Key in this was the program's shift to alter support for English from a basic skills focus to a writing center focus.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

- The program needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the program is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding. Related to this, the program needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
- The program is encouraged to develop eDLAs to replace the paper DLAs. This has proven successful in the MLC, and it is believed it would be a benefit to the ESC as well.
- The program is encouraged to revise the tool used for assessing SSLO #2 to better track the impact and success of their program and to help in their requests for more staffing and other resources.
- The program is encouraged to reach out to the necessary departments for faculty liaisons to help with the work of the ESC.
- The ESC is encouraged to work with other programs of the LRC to better market the programs and services offered.
- The program is encouraged to offer New Instructor Training for English faculty. This has proved to be a good practice for Math faculty, and it is believed English faculty would benefit as well.

**Identified Resource and Budget Needs:**

The IPRC 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 requests. The requests are ranked based on their overall need, and both the program and the IPRC agree to the ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	ESC Tutoring Center Coordinator	TBD	C	D	C	M	N	ESC
2	Instructional Assistant, 12 months	TBD	C	D	C	M	RN	ESC
3	Computers and other equipment for online tutoring	TBD	T	V	C	I	N	ESC
4	Tutor/Faculty Mentor hires	TBD	F/C	V	O	M	RR	ESC

**\*TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

**Budget Comments:**

1. There is a need for a dedicated ESC Tutoring Center Coordinator to more efficiently run the program and increase needed student and faculty outreach. This is seen as a high priority by the program and committee.
2. The ESC has a need for an Instructional Assistant. This has proven to increase the success of the MLC, and it is believed it would do the same for the ESC. This person should be on a 12-month contract. This is also seen as a high priority by the program and committee.
3. As tutoring increasingly moves online, there will be a need for technology to keep up with the demand. The ESC will need computers and other equipment to aid in the transition.
4. The program is always in need of tutors and faculty mentors. The pay rates are not competitive, so there can be a problem recruiting new tutors.



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Legacy*

**Presenter:** Regina Rhymes, Annette Letcher, Virgil Adams, Troy Davis

**Date:** 3/22/21

### *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 IPRC.

  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 Legacy Program presented a review that underscores its commitment to student success. The program must be commended for the growth it has experienced over the past 5 years. There was a point when the program was in jeopardy, but today it is a model of the superior Specialized Instructional Programs on campus.

#### *Program SSLOs:*

Did the program provide SSLO data?    Yes        No   X   Other       

**Comments:** The program needs to develop SSLOs and provide supporting data by the next review cycle.

**Commendations:**

The IRPC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The program must be commended for the work it has done over the past 6 years to build the program into one of the model Specialized Instructional Programs on campus. It is a true success story, and much credit should be given to the team that leads the program, particularly its coordinator Professor Regina Rhymes.
2. The program has high student success, retention, and persistence rates. Students in the program are graduating, transferring, and earning degrees and certificates in high numbers. In particular, the program has begun tracking the success of students that are transferring to 4-year institutions.
3. A key to this success is the wrap around services the programs provide for students. The program was recently moved from the Language Arts Division to Student Services in an effort to underscore and expand this focus. Students in the program have benefitted greatly from the increased services. The recent addition of a fulltime Counselor will only improve these efforts.
4. The program has made powerful connections with students that last long after they leave Cypress. This was evident in the students who participated in the review. All three students gave powerful testimony to the impact the program has made on them. One stated they felt they were “not alone.” Another said the program helped them stay in school and achieve her goals. Faculty mentors, peer mentors, and Apprentice Teams have had strong influences on students, helped create these connections, and contributed directly their successes. These connections are furthered strengthened by speakers, conferences, and events that help students address current topics, build a sense of community, and experience personal growth. The college tours arranged by the program are just another example of this. They are more networking and relationship building experiences than simple campus visits.
5. The program must also be commended for its collaborative teaching model and commitment to developing the whole person. At the center of the program is a recognition that student success is based on far more than cognitive ability. They address the biological needs of students like food, clothing, and shelter to mitigate the impact of poverty and environment; they focus on psychological wellness and mindfulness; and they offer a social model containing, networking, mentoring, and sense of community. The idea is to ensure their students have the tools and resources that allow them to flourish.

**Recommendations:**

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The program needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the program is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding. Related to this, the program needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs. It is believed that the program has an ability to scale up its services, but the campus must make a commitment to fully fund this budget once it established.
2. The committee supports Legacy’s goal of expanding the number of students from a cohort of 27 to a Learning Community of 100. This would allow the program could service more African American and First-Time students. The program attempted this in Fall 2019 and actually saw a drop in success and retention, but this was the result of the infrastructure, resources, and funding not scaling up to meet the increased student need.

The program structure and plan are sound, but they require a commitment of resources and funding from the college to support this growth.

3. The program is encouraged to continuing work on developing a Summer Bridge Program. Such programs have proved effective in other areas, and Legacy has a well-organized plan that promises to be similarly successful. The college is encouraged to support this effort with the appropriate resources and funding.
4. The program needs to develop SSLOs with the appropriate data to better track the impact and success of their program. The program will be expected to have SSLOs and data to analyze them by their next review cycle.

**Identified Resource and Budget Needs:**

The IPRC 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 requests. The requests are ranked based on their overall need, and both the program and the IPRC agree to the ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the *Table Code Key* below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Chrome and hotspots	\$6,000	T	D	C	M	N	
2	Student Workers	\$12,000	C	D	C	M	RR	
3	Administrative support	\$40,000	C	D	C	M	N	
4	Multi-media Equipment	\$1,000	T	D	O	M	N	
5	Student Artwork and showcasing	\$1,000	T	D	O	M	N	
6	Tutors	\$6,000	C	D	C	M	N	

**\*TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

**Budget Comments:**

1. The IPRC strongly supports the Legacy Program’s budget and resource requests. Many of their requests would ideally be covered as part of a right-sized, fully funded program budget. Many of the requests being made are essential to the effective running of the program and should not be left to One-Time Funding or other less permanent sources of revenue.



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Math Learning Center*

**Presenter:** Treisa Cassens and Cindy Shrout

**Date:** 3/15/21

### *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 IPRC.

  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 Math Learning Center presented a review that underscores the great work being done to make students more successful in their classes.

#### *Program SSLOs:*

Did the program provide SSLO data?    Yes   X   No        Other       

**Comments:** The program showed ample evidence to support their first SSLO. The IPRC recommends developing more questions to include in the student survey used to demonstrate success in meeting their SSLO #2.

#### **Commendations:**

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The MLC has done a tremendous job transitioning to remote instruction and the use of Zoom. It was a collaborative effort that was quite successful despite a limitation of resources.
2. The program was aided in that transition by the development of eDLAs that replaced the old paper ones. They allow the program to be more efficient, tailor assistance to a student's specific needs, and increase student success. The eDLAs have also been helpful in the college's response to the implementation of AB705. Students can now receive help with introductory concepts that can at times be a struggle in transfer level classes.
3. The MLC has been instrumental in helping students succeed in their math classes. Data shows there are often double digit increases in success among students who utilize the resources of the MLC and those that do not. This success is not just limited to students taking Math classes as students from Chemistry, Physics, Psychology, and Sociology are also regular users of the Math eDLAs.

### Recommendations:

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The program is encouraged to revise the tool used for assessing SSLO #2 to better track the impact and success of their program and to help in their requests for more staffing.
2. The program needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the program is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding. Related to this, the program needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
3. The MLC is encouraged to work with other programs of the LRC to better market the programs and services offered.
4. The program is encouraged to make plans to address equity gaps that exist for African Americans, Native Americans, and LatinX students.

### Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC 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 requests. The requests are ranked based on their overall need, and both the program and the IPRC agree to the ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	MLC Tutoring Center Coordinator	TBD	C	V	C	M	N	MLC
2	Reclass of Classified support	TBD	C	V	C	M	N	MLC
3	Tutor/Faculty Mentor hires	TBD	F/C	V	C	M	N	MLC
4	Textbooks	TBD	T	V	O	I	N	MLC
5	Calculators	TBD	T	V	O	I	N	MLC
6	Tablet and equipment for online tutoring	TBD	T	V	O	I	N	MLC

#### \*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

*Length:* O = One-Time Need      C = Continuing/On-Going  
*Purpose:* CN = Critical Need      M = Prog. Maintenance      I = Prog. Improvement      G = Prog. Growth  
*Age:* N = New Request      RR = Repeat/Received      RN = Repeat/Not Received  
*Impact:* # of students impacted

**Budget Comments:**

1. There is a need for a dedicated MLC Tutoring Center Coordinator to more efficiently run the program and increase needed student and faculty outreach.
2. Classified support has been essential in running the MLC. However, this support needs to be upgraded from an Instructional Aid to an Instructional Assistant with increased employment to 12 months.
3. The program is always in need of tutors and faculty mentors. The pay rates are not competitive, so there can be a problem recruiting new tutors.
4. The program has a need for textbooks and calculators. These items should be part of a right-sized budget and not left to the One-Time Funding process.
5. As tutoring increasingly moves online, there will be a need for technology to keep up with the demand.



## Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Supplemental Instruction*

**Presenter:** Treisa Cassens

**Date:** 3/15/21

### *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 IPRC.

  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:** This was the first Specialized Instructional Program Review for SI as a stand-alone program. The review materials show great value and potential for growth and support the decision to separate it out from Tutoring.

#### *Program SSLOs:*

Did the program provide SSLO data?    Yes   X   No        Other       

**Comments:** The program showed ample evidence to support their first SSLO. The IPRC recommends developing more questions to include in the student survey used to demonstrate success in meeting their SSLO #2.

## Commendations:

The IPRC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The program has done a tremendous job adjusting to the move to remote instruction. Being forced to conduct sessions via Zoom actually expanded the opportunities for SI meetings resulting in an increase of student use of program during the pandemic. It also freed the program from class and space restrictions that created problems in the past.
2. The program has a well-documented record of helping students to be successful, often showing double digit increases in success when compared to students who do not participate. This is all the more impressive given the program focusses on high level, high drop courses. This success has had a positive impact on every division of the college.

## Recommendations:

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The program needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the program is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding. Related to this, the program needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
2. The program is encouraged to revise the tool used for assessing SSLO #2 to better track the impact and success of their program and to help in their requests for more staffing and other resources.
3. The program is encouraged to develop department liaisons to help with the recruitment and training of SI leaders within specific content area. It may be useful to create a more formalized structure or offered stipends. Such requests should be spelled out in the chart.
4. The program is encouraged to work with other programs of the LRC to better market the programs and services offered.

## Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC 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 requests. The requests are ranked based on their overall need, and both the program and the IPRC agree to the ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	LRC Manager	TBD	C	V	C	M	N	LRC
2	More Staff	TBD	C	D	C	M	RN	LRC
3	Tutor/Faculty Mentor hires	TBD	F/C	V	C	M	RR	LRC
4	Fulltime SI Tutoring Coordinator	TBD	C	D	C	M	N	LRC

### \*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

## Budget Comments:

1. The program has a demonstrated need for a LRC Manger to help oversee all of the programs and services of the LRC. This is a request that will have a positive impact on the ESC, MLC, and Tutoring programs as well. As such, this is seen as a high priority by the program and committee.
2. There is a demonstrated need to additional staff in the LRC. Classified support has been essential for the running of the ESC, MLC, and Tutoring, and it is believed it will be a benefit to SI. This is also seen as a high priority by the program and committee.
3. The program is always in need of tutors and faculty mentors. The pay rates are not competitive, so there can be a problem recruiting new tutors.
4. SI has a need for a fulltime Tutorial Coordinator to more efficiently run their program and meet student needs.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

*Program: Tutoring*

**Presenter:** Treisa Cassens

**Date:** 3/15/21

***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 IPRC.

  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:** Tutoring presented a review that underscores its value as a program committed to student success.

***Program SSLOs:***

Did the program provide SSLO data?    Yes   X   No        Other       

**Comments:** The program showed ample evidence to support their first SSLO. The IPRC recommends developing more questions to include in the student survey used to demonstrate success in meeting their SSLO #2.

**Commendations:**

The IRPC finds the following work of the program to be noteworthy and commendable:

1. The program has done a tremendous job transitioning to remote instruction through the use of Zoom. It was a collaborative effort that was quite successful despite limitations of personnel and resources.
2. Tutoring has been instrumental in helping students succeed in their classes. Data shows there are often double digit increases in success among students who utilize Tutoring resources and those that do not. Every division of the college has benefitted from this service.
3. Tutoring should be commended for having a diverse pool of tutors and mentors.

### Recommendations:

The IPRC makes the following recommendations to aid the program in its action plan:

1. The program needs to have an accurate, detailed budget that reflects the true cost of running the program. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the program is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding. Related to this, the program needs to prioritize and clearly define their budget and resource requests to help the IPRC better advocate for its needs.
2. The program is encouraged to revise the tool used for assessing SSLO #2 to better track the impact and success of their program and to help in their requests for more staffing and other resources.
3. The program is encouraged to work with other programs of the LRC to better market the programs and services offered.
4. The program is encouraged to make plans to address equity gaps that exist for African American students.

### Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC 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 requests. The requests are ranked based on their overall need, and both the program and the IPRC agree to the ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (\*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	LRC Manager	TBD	C	V	C	M	N	LRC
2	Reclassify LRC staff to higher level positions and 12-month contracts	TBD	C	D	C	M	RN	LRC
3	Computers and other equipment for online tutoring	TBD	T	V	C	I	N	LRC
4	Tutor/Faculty Mentor hires	TBD	F/C	V	O	M	RR	LRC

#### \*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty

C = Classified/Admin.

T = Technology/Equipment

M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/On-Going

Purpose: CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age: N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

### Budget Comments:

1. The program has a demonstrated need for a LRC Manager to help oversee all of the programs and services of the LRC. This is a request that will have a positive impact on the ESC, MLC, and SI programs as well. As such, this is seen as a high priority by the program and committee.
2. There is a demonstrated need to reclassify LRC staff to high levels with 12-month contracts. Classified support has been essential for the running of Tutoring and the LRC, but current staffing level and contracts restrict the program from functioning at its highest level. This has proved successful for the MLC, and it is believed it would do the same for Tutoring. This is also seen as a high priority by the program and committee.
3. As tutoring increasingly moves online, there will be a need for technology to keep up with the demand. Tutoring will need computers and other equipment to aid in the transition.
4. The program is always in need of tutors and faculty mentors. The pay rates are not competitive, so there can be a problem recruiting new tutors.
5. The program has a need for more space to accommodate student demand. These concerns were originally part of the plans for Measure J funds, but the project is not currently on the Facilities Master Plan. It is important that important renovation remain on the campus radar.