

CYPRESS COLLEGE

**Instructional Program and Student Learning Outcomes Review
2025–2026 Annual Report**



April 2026

Prepared on behalf of the Instructional Program Review Committee by Myev Rees, Sarah Jones,
Abigail Awad, Bryan Ventura, and Kristina Ogasasian

Table of Contents

Introduction,	3
Purpose of Program Review,	3
Mission Statement,	3
The IPLOR Committee,	3
2025-26 IPLOR Committee Members,	4
IPLOR Handbook Revisions,	4
Specialized Instructional Program Reviews (SIPRs),	4
Reviewing 2024-2025 Structural & Process Changes,	5
IPLOR One Year Out,	5
Adjunct Position on IPLOR.	5
Midpoint Reviews,	5
2025-26 Structural and Procedural Changes,	6
CTE Short Form Transition,	6
2025-26 Review Cycle,	6
Instructional Program Full Review,	6
Instructional Midpoint Reviews,	6
Special Instructional Program Midpoint Review,	7
2025-26 Presentation Meetings with Program Representatives,	7
A Note on Ongoing and New Recommendations,	8
Ongoing Recommendations,	8
2025-25 IPLOR Commendations and New Recommendations,	10
Commendations,	10
New Recommendations,	10
Curriculum Concerns,	12
Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs),	12
Appendix A: Timeline for the 2024-2025 IPLOR Cycle,	16
Appendix B: IPLOR Full Review Rotation Schedule,	17
Appendix C: IPLOR Midpoint Review Rotation Schedule,	19
Appendix D: Programs Presenting CTE 2-Year Reports (Short Form) In Even Numbered Years,	21
Appendix E: Specialized Instructional Program Review Schedule and Student Services Program Review Schedule,	22
Appendix F: Instructional Program Review Long Form 2025-26,	23
Appendix G: Instructional Program Review Midpoint Review Form,	31
Appendix H: Specialized Instructional Program Review Midpoint Review Response Form Spring 2026,	34
Appendix I: Instructional Program Review Midpoint Review Response Form Spring 2026,	38
Appendix J: IPLOR Compliance Status Criteria developed Fall 2024, updated Spring 2026,	39
Appendix K: Instructional Program Review Compliance Status Petition,	40
Appendix L: IPLOR Presentation Guidelines Updated Fall 2025,	42
Appendix M: Specialized Instructional Program Review Summaries,	44-84

Introduction

Through a comprehensive program review process, Cypress College faculty assess instructional programs on a four-year cycle. For reference, the schedule for the four-year cycle is included in Appendix B of this document. In even-numbered years, this program review schedule aligns the full CTE program reviews with the CTE “short form” reports required every two years. Starting in 2024-2025 IPLOR developed the Midpoint Review; a short self-evaluation departments/programs complete between full reviews every two years.

This report is an overview of the year’s review process, the committee’s deliberations, and a record of insights the committee gleaned from the process into larger institutional trends and challenges.

Purpose of Program Review

The instructional program review process supports Cypress College and North Orange County Community College Districts’ strategic and master plans, distance education and technology plans, professional 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 instructional program review process and reports as a basis for evaluating resource requests. The review process incorporates the systematic, ongoing evaluation of programs using data on student success, diversity, distance education, achievement, curriculum, labor market results, and student learning outcomes to assure currency, relevancy, and innovation. The faculty reviews, dean reviews, interdisciplinary dialogue, and Instructional Program and Learning Outcomes Review (IPLOR) committee 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 quality improvements in student success.

For an overview of the program review process and history, please see the IPLOR handbook on the IPLOR SharePoint.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Cypress College Instructional Program Review Committee (IPLOR) 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.

The IPLOR Committee

Instructional Program and Learning Outcomes Review is included in the Academic Senate’s “Ten Plus One” responsibilities (as articulated in Title 5, Section 53200), and as such, IPLOR works under the purview of the Academic Senate to review instructional programs and learning outcomes and make recommendations to promote student learning and success. IPLOR is comprised of its Chair(s), the SLO coordinator, faculty representative from each division, an adjunct faculty member, a dean, an institutional researcher, and liaisons for accreditation, student services program review, and diversity. Faculty representatives are elected at the division level and serve three-year terms. The names of the 2025-26 committee members are listed below.

The IPLOR Chair or Co-Chairs serve four-year terms and are elected by the Academic Senate with input from the IPLOR members. Tenure, as well as prior service on IPLOR is required to serve as Chair or Co-Chair. The IPLOR Chair responsibilities are included in the appendix of the IPLOR handbook. The position of Chair can be divided into two Co-Chairs (as has been the case since 2023). In that case, the reassign time and duties are divided between Co-Chairs at their discretion by mutual agreement.

2025-26 IPLOR Committee Members

Sarah Jones, Co-Chair

Myev Rees, Co-Chair

Abigail Awad, SLO Coordinator

Bryan Ventura, Accreditation Liaison (Designee)

Kristina Oganessian, Institutional Research & Planning Representative

Janet Vera, Instructional Dean Representative

AnnMarie Ruelas, Student Services Program Review Liaison

Andres Carrillo, SEM

Peter Molnar, Business/CIS

Margaret Mohr, Kinesiology/Athletics

Mymy Lam, Counseling

Carolyn Caffrey, Library (joined Spring 2026)

Michael Klyde, CTE

Hilary Reuter, Social Science

Anna Cherie Gentry, Health Science

Keith Vescial, Language Arts

Grant Speich, Visual and Performing Arts (re-joined Spring 2026)

Quinn Doan, Adjunct Faculty Representative (joined Fall 2025)

IPLOR Handbook Revisions

The *Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Handbook* provides faculty and administrators with instructions, sample forms, and resources for the instructional program review process. The committee reviews and updates the handbook regularly and makes changes as necessary. Recent revisions included: Spring 2021, Fall 2023 to reflect the substantial revisions to the review process and forms, and Spring 2025 to reflect the committee restructuring and the addition of the midpoint review forms.

The last *Instructional Program Review Handbook* was approved by Academic Senate in May of 2025 and can be found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

Specialized Instructional Program Reviews (SIPRs)

SIPRs are programs that combine tailored instruction, counseling, and student services to support specific student groups. In Spring 2020 and 2021, the IPRC conducted the initial reviews of these programs, and in the Spring of 2022 the IPRC established a 4-year schedule for reviewing them. The IPLOR will complete SIPR reviews during the Spring semester. As of Spring 2023, Legacy, Puente, and STEM moved from SIPR to the Student Services Program Review (SSPR).

SIPR programs are also required to submit a midpoint review at the midpoint between full reviews. No SIPR programs were up for full review in the 2025-26 cycle. The SIPR Review Schedule appears in Appendix E.

Reviewing 2024-2025 Structural & Process Changes

IPLOR One Year Out

In Spring 2024, the Instructional Program and Learning Outcomes (IPLOR) committee was created to streamline the college's review structures. For details on the restructure, please see the 2024-2025 IPLOR Annual Report.

Two years after this restructuring, the committee is pleased to report that the restructuring was a success. The SLO coordinator is an integral part of the IPLOR committee, though the position remains autonomous and will maintain a separate handbook.

The IPLOR SharePoint drive was also established to house all IPLORs documents and information. It is currently up to date with all the ILPOR documents.

Adjunct Position on IPLOR

In the Fall of 2024, a new adjunct member position was added to the IPLOR committee. This position is compensated hourly and has proven an asset to the committee as the adjunct perspective is often underrepresented in shared governance. The committee is also pleased that the position has proven useful for the adjunct faculty member in the role. The current adjunct representative described the position as a "crucial professional development opportunity for adjuncts to... prepare for fulltime roles and potentially step into committee leadership positions in the future."

Midpoint Reviews

In 2024-25 IPLOR established the Midpoint Review form to be submitted every two years. These reviews are completed by coordinators/chairs and signed by deans. These reviews allow departments to review the goals and funding needs previously stated in their last full review and make any necessary changes. They also provide an opportunity for departments designated "Not In Compliance" or "Needs Improvement" to show they have addressed the committee's recommendations and petition for a change of status. There is a Change of Status Petition form for this purpose (Appendix K).

The committee division representatives review the Midpoint Review from the departments in their divisions and report back to the committee. Departments then receive the Midpoint Review Response Form noting completion of the Midpoint report and any comments from the committee (Appendix H). In cases where the department chair is the IPLOR division rep, one or both IPLOR Co-Chairs reviewed the report and provided feedback.

For 2024-25, the Midpoint Review was optional for those departments who completed the Annual Update Form (since discontinued) the year prior. In 2025-26, the Midpoint Review forms were required for all Cycle 4 departments.

The committee agreed that the timely completion of the Midpoint Review in 2025-26 would not be a required for a department to be “In Compliance” at their next full review. However, in 2026-27 and following, the timely completion of the Midpoint Review will be a requirement for an “In Compliance” Status. The Midpoint Review has been added to the Compliance Criteria document.

2025-26 Structural and Procedural Changes

No structural changes were made to the IPLOR committee in 2025-26. IPLOR added an Instructional Program Midpoint Review Response Form to provide feedback on the midpoint reviews. The committee also developed a Presentation Guidelines document (Appendix L) as well as a Compliance Criteria document (Appendix J) to help departments/programs complete the review process successfully.

CTE Short Form Transition

In Spring of 2026, in consultation with the Accreditation Committee and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, IPLOR agreed to transition the review of the 2-year CTE “short forms” out of IPLOR’s jurisdiction.

Per California Code, Education Code - EDC § 78016, “every vocational or occupational training program offered by a community college district shall be reviewed every two years by the governing board of the district.” Historically, IPLOR has served as the review body for these CTE “short forms.” However, this practice does not meet the educational code.

IPLOR will collect the CTE “short forms” as usual in 2026-27 to allow the relevant parties to create a new process for getting the CTE forms to the board, after which IPLOR will no longer be involved. At that time, the IPLOR Co-Chairs will update the handbook.

2025-26 Review Cycle

Instructional Program Full Review

Anthropology
Biology
English
ESL
Ethnic Studies
Foreign Language
History
Library
Music
Philosophy
Physical Science

Instructional Midpoint Reviews

Art (did not submit review)
Chemistry
Communication Studies
Counseling
Dance (did not submit review)

Economics
Kinesiology
Mathematics
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology

Special Instructional Program Midpoint Review

Dual Enrollment
Honors
Distance Ed
STEM (2)

2025-26 Presentation Meetings with Program Representatives

After reviewing the written program review Long Form Reports, the committee meets with program representatives in November to hear presentations and ask any questions. The presentations are usually given by department coordinators or chairs, but any fulltime faculty member can be designated by their chair to present, and all faculty are welcome.

The presentations are a required part of the review process and provide departments with the opportunity to humanize their reports, highlight their accomplishments, and call additional attention to any pressing needs. Presentation guidelines are provided to all program Chairs with their other IPLOR materials in the first weeks of the Fall term. Meetings are held remotely via Zoom.

Below is the schedule for the 2025-26 cycle. The names of the presenters are listed on the Summaries in Appendix

November 3th

Anthropology
Biology
English
ESL

November 10th

Foreign Language
History
Ethnic Studies

November 17th

Music
Philosophy
Library
Physical Science

A Note on Ongoing and New Recommendations:

Many of the new recommendations for the 2025-26 cycle are continuations of ongoing recommendations from years past. As these past recommendations have not been addressed, or were not adequately addressed, some problems have evolved and grown into issues requiring new considerations. We have chosen to list these issues under both sections to show the new dimensions of these ongoing concerns.

Ongoing Recommendations:

Below are recommendations made in previous IPRC/IPLOR Annual Reports, which have not yet been sufficiently addressed. The years in parentheses represented the Annual Report in which the recommendation originally occurred.

1. Urgent Health and Safety Needs: There are safety needs in several programs that have not been addressed. For example, the LRC needs security cameras. They do not have enough, and many of the ones they do have do not work. They are necessary to maintain a safe environment for students and staff. Further, several programs are coping with health and safety issues related to weather and temperature. Several CTE programs need to conduct class in the open air and should be provided with a temporary shelter to protect from rain, or to provide shade on exceptionally hot days. There are also several CTE indoor workspaces that are not heated or do not have air conditioning and so students regularly do their work in unreasonably cold or hot environments. (2024-25)
2. Student Research Support: 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 problematic for the students to conduct research, since they cannot request approval from the IRB and any research cannot be published. 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)
3. Faculty Retirement Hiring: A disproportionate number of departments are anticipating full-time faculty retirements in the next year. Further, several departments not facing retirements have strong needs for additional faculty. As a result, faculty prioritization is likely to become very competitive in the next few years. The committee strongly encourages the College to allocate resources accordingly, and it encourages departments to plan proactively for these changes with the understanding that not all retirements will be immediately replaced. (2023-2024, 2024-2025)* Please also see 2025-26 New Recommendations.
4. IT Staffing Needs: The 2023-24 report revealed that although the quality of the current IT staff is exceptional, the number of IT professionals and technicians on campus is alarmingly inadequate, and the IT equipment currently on campus is outdated. The IPLOR strongly recommends that the College increase the number of IT professionals available and make all necessary updates to aging IT technology on campus. (2023-24)

5. **DEI and Equity Gap Guidance:** Faculty need more guidance and professional development training on how to close equity gaps. Programs and Departments are given disaggregated data that show equity gaps, but some faculty do not know how to respond to equity gaps effectively, and are therefore, unsure of how to answer the DEI related questions on the program review form. Further, different kinds of gaps may require different responses, and faculty need strategies to deal with them.

The 2024-25 review process also revealed that some faculty members are under-informed on the complex social systems, histories, and cultural frameworks that create and reinforce inequity and exclusion. Some are also unclear on what DEI specifically entails. This was primarily a concern in CTE programs. The current state of national politics and public discourse around DEI is further muddling its meaning. Consequently, there is a need for clear definitions and training across campus. (2024-25)

6. **Sources of Outside Funding:** The Committee would like to note that with the hold harmless ending, budgets may become increasingly tight. It is therefore imperative that when departments and programs apply for funding, they show that outside sources of funds, such as Strong Workforce, have been exhausted prior to applying for funds directly from the College. This will allow more funds to be available for programs whose resource needs do not qualify for outside grants.

The committee also recommends more transparency and stronger coordination among funding sources to avoid duplication of requests. At present, those overseeing one funding source often do not know what other funding sources are doing.

It is also imperative that CTE-top coded programs applying for Strong Workforce/Perkins funding include maintenance and replacement costs in their funding requests. This is especially important for big ticket items like sonography equipment, simulators, etc.

Relatedly, the committee recommends the college review and improve the process or methods by which programs are chosen for funding. Concerns have been raised that the current system creates inequitable funding allocation and has encouraged program collusion and inequitable “quid pro quo” arrangements in the past. (2024-25)

7. **Need for more Math and English Support:** There is a significant need for more tutoring in English and math. This is likely being caused in part by AB 705/1705. The need is impacting programs well beyond math and English, as students are required to be proficient in math and English skills across many disciplines.

The 2024-25 review revealed a considerable need for more and higher quality tutors at LRC, MLC, SI, and Tutoring. These programs are remarkably effective at improving student success and are well used by students. With proper support, they could be doing so much more to alleviate the deficits in math and English skills. The college should also clarify the process for hiring new managers/coordinators for these specialized programs. There is a dire need for managers and coordinators but a great deal of confusion regarding how those

positions are categorized, funded and filled. (2023-24, 2024-25)* Please also see 2025-26 New Recommendations.

8. A Help Desk Staffed by Academic Computing: Currently, all student computing questions and needs are being addressed by one person, a former academic computing employee who was reassigned to the LRC. Moreover, this position does not have administrative rights and so cannot address some student needs. The committee strongly recommends creating a help desk staffed by multiple people from Academic Computing with administrative rights to meet students' needs. (2024-25)

2025-26 IPLOR Commendations and New Recommendations

Below are the global trends IPLOR noted from the 2025-2026 Instructional Program and Learning Outcomes Review process and the Committee's specific recommendations.

Commendations

The 2025-2026 review cycle revealed a commendable commitment among departments to student success, equity in all its meanings, and proactive planning for potential future instability as we come out of the hold-harmless period.

Across divisions, departments have made admirable advancements in adopting and developing zero cost texts/open educational resources as well as utilizing culturally relevant materials. These advancements demonstrate a meaningful commitment to substantive equity efforts that directly address student need. That commitment was also apparent in departments' willingness to collaborate productively with student centered outreach programs.

This cycle also showcased the college faculty's commitment to curricular innovation and program development. The departments under review this year have developed new courses, AAs, and AATs. They have also made commendable efforts to make their pathways clearer and easier for students to navigate.

Finally, all the departments up for full review this year met the 90% threshold for SLO completion. The departments vary on how, or if, they use their SLO data and why, but all were committed to the importance of completing their SLOs for accreditation.

New Recommendations

The 2025-26 cycle revealed that many of the unaddressed ongoing recommendations from years past still require attention. The challenges and burdens they identify are now becoming larger problems.

1. Student Preparedness as the Result of AB 705 / AB 1705 and Cal-GETC Changes: Due to AB 705 / AB 1705 students are still coming to class woefully underprepared for college-level work. This is particularly apparent in reading, writing, and computational skills. As a result, the tutoring resources the college offers are overburdened to the point where they simply cannot meet student demand, despite heroic efforts. This has been a perennial concern now since 2019 and yet the library and learning resource center remain understaffed and underfunded. Please see items 7 and 8 in Ongoing Recommendations above.

The committee strongly recommends the college expand the tutoring programs and provide the LRC and Library with the resources they need. That said, as it seems that faculty will need to contend with the effects of AB 705 and 1705 for the foreseeable future, the committee recommends the college create a more comprehensive response to the negative consequences of this legislation, rather than placing that burden entirely on faculty, the LRC, and other Student Services.

2. **The Need for More Fulltime Faculty:** Many departments called attention to their need for more fulltime faculty. The IPLOR committee has called attention to this need for the last three years. Please see item 3 in Ongoing Recommendations above.
3. **Improve Technology and Academic Computing Support:** Departments reported a continuing need for more updated technology for faculty, and more academic computing support for students. Please see item 4 and 8 in Ongoing Recommendations.
4. **Division Staffing Needs:** Several departments reported that their divisions need more fulltime staff to support students, faculty, and administrators in the running of the division. The departments most acutely impacted are in Social Science and Language Arts, but this has shown to be a campus wide issue. Existing fulltime staff members are already overwhelmed, and they are facing further cuts in support staff. It should be noted that these fulltime staff members keep divisions running and they are often the first people to respond to urgent student needs. Moreover, fulltime staff members have (or can develop) detailed institutional knowledge and memory particular to the division in which they work. An ever-rotating pool of part-time staffers cannot be expected to develop this kind of expertise, and that expertise is invaluable to keeping divisions running smoothly.
5. **Address Space, Facilities, and Infrastructure Constraints:** Several departments noted concerns with facilities and infrastructure. These concerns took various forms. Some departments have been removed from their customary classroom spaces with no apparent justification. Others are concerned by constraints on space emerging quickly after an expansion or renovation that was supposed to alleviate those constraints. Still others are concerned about health and safety maintenance for existing facilities. Please see item 1 in Ongoing Recommendations.
6. **A Cohesive College Response to Misuse Use of AI by Students:** Departments from across campus are struggling with the widespread student use of AI to violate academic integrity standards. The pervasiveness of this problem cannot be overstated. Overwhelmingly, faculty feel that the college has not done enough to support them in dealing with AI-cheating or to provide a proactive and useful response—other than to telling faculty to create individual AI policies (which are ignored), and then file ChAt reports when they are violated (an untenable expectation when upwards of 50% of the students in a class are cheating with AI).

The 2025-26 review found that academic integrity is the central concern for faculty regarding AI. This requires a college-wide response. The college must put forward a cohesive and practical plan to provide faculty with effective tools to authentically assess student learning,

verify online students' identities, and protect honest students from the effects of AI cheating on the classroom and campus culture.

This is not simply an issue of academic integrity—which would be urgent enough. This is also an issue of morale. When faced with rampant AI-enabled fraud, faculty suffer undue levels of stress as they try to combat it. Many are overburdened by the unsustainable *ad hoc* solutions they have developed. More have simply resigned themselves to the reality that their students are rampantly cheating and there is nothing they can do about it. This is particularly urgent for faculty who teach online. As agentive AI develops further, it will become increasing impossible to differentiate students from AI.

Curriculum Concerns

Several departments expressed concern over the changes to the college's degree requirements, as prompted by the changes to Cal-GETC. These departments felt these changes would impact enrollment and compromise the academic rigor of the local degree. Moreover, several departments expressed frustration that equity concerns were often cited as the motivation for lowering degree requirements. The departments noted that these changes lowered the number of required classes in subject areas directly related to social and cultural systems, as well as constructions of race, gender, and identity.

Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs)

CSLO Summary Table

Fall 2025 Program Review Departments	Courses Assessed		Successful Assessments	
	# Offered	% Assessed	# Assessed	% Successful
Anthropology	16	100.0%	11,198	84.2%
Biology	16	100.0%	19,407	76.3%
English	40	100.0%	22,489	82.0%
ESL	17	100.0%	2,155	85.9%
Ethnic Studies	16	100.0%	10,750	78.8%
Foreign Languages	22	100.0%	4,760	89.0%
History	15	100.0%	14,126	87.8%
Library Science	1	100.0%	177	79.1%
Music	45	100.0%	18,464	90.9%
Philosophy	12	100.0%	4,829	80.2%
Physical Sciences	35	97.1%	22,836	86.4%
Total since Fall 2021	235	99.6%	131,191	84.0%

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

ISLO Summary Table

ISLOs	Exceeded Expectations		Met Expectations		Did not Meet Expectations		Total Assessed	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Breadth of Knowledge, Competencies, & Skills								
Humanities & the Arts	31,953	71.0%	6,829	15.2%	6,226	13.8%	45,008	100.0%

Social Sciences	20,307	56.7%	9,759	27.3%	5,720	16.0%	35,786	100.0%
STEM	15,627	56.9%	5,688	20.7%	6,156	22.4%	27,471	100.0%
Communication								
Reading	58,252	62.2%	19,755	21.1%	15,657	16.7%	93,664	100.0%
Writing	60,302	62.4%	20,331	21.0%	15,975	16.5%	96,608	100.0%
Communicating	45,720	67.7%	11,708	17.3%	10,097	15.0%	67,525	100.0%
Presenting	19,594	74.2%	3,663	13.9%	3,144	11.9%	26,401	100.0%
Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency								
Analysis	44,347	61.5%	15,861	22.0%	11,909	16.5%	72,117	100.0%
Computation	11,572	60.7%	3,787	19.9%	3,694	19.4%	19,053	100.0%
Research	38,529	62.4%	13,807	22.3%	9,450	15.3%	61,786	100.0%
Problem-solving	30,399	61.3%	11,552	23.3%	7,618	15.4%	49,569	100.0%
Technology	27,489	71.2%	6,160	16.0%	4,951	12.8%	38,600	100.0%
Personal, Academic, & Professional Development								
Personal Responsibility	36,668	61.6%	13,375	22.5%	9,452	15.9%	59,495	100.0%
Global Citizenship	18,137	54.2%	9,114	27.2%	6,200	18.5%	33,451	100.0%
Equity	12,349	53.2%	6,823	29.4%	4,059	17.5%	23,231	100.0%

SLO Program Review Expectations

Departments undergoing instructional program review are required to assess 90% of courses each semester. For departments to be designated as “In Compliance,” the IPLOR Committee requires them to meet this standard—unless there are compelling extenuating circumstances. The committee also recommends that department coordinators continue to encourage all faculty to participate in the CSLO assessment process. Departments undergoing instructional program review are also required to complete the CSLO-to-Department PSLO mapping in eLumen. Over the past several years, faculty participation rates have increased significantly, contributing to more meaningful discussions within departments. After reviewing and discussing SLO data, departments have been creating action plans to support the goals of the department and college. The goal continues to be the ongoing improvement of instruction to help students succeed.

SLO Summary of 2025-2026 Program Review

This program review cycle, six departments met the 90% completion threshold every semester, and the remaining five departments met this threshold for most semesters. The department coordinators of departments with some missing data are reminded to run participation reports and follow up with faculty who have not completed their SLOs.

Departments undergoing instructional program review are required to have at least one PSLO written in Curricunet for each of their degrees and certificates. Eight departments have written PSLOs for every degree and certificate either active or pending in Curricunet. The remaining three departments have written PSLOs for some of their degrees and certificates but are missing written PSLOs for others.

Most departments have completed the Department PSLO mapping. For many departments, the mapping is done in a way that multiple PSLOs have identical mapping and the information is not distinct. Thus, it is difficult to determine true achievement in PSLOs when many areas are mapped

the exact same way. While our campus is transitioning our PSLO measurements to be the PSLOs for degrees and certificates, the current PSLO mapping is identical to the ISLO mapping, and faculty revisiting these mapping decisions to create distinct measures is still beneficial.

SLO Coordinator Update and Recommendations

1. Ongoing – SLOs in Course Syllabi: CSLOs are required to be listed on faculty syllabi every semester, and the CSLOs listed must match the active CSLOs in the Course Outline of Record (COR) in Curricunet. A process is in place to facilitate this requirement. The SLO Coordinator has created a guide to assist faculty in meeting this requirement. Additionally, the SLO Coordinator sends a reminder email to all faculty at the beginning of the Fall and Spring semesters. The Curricunet specialist creates a comprehensive Excel file with links to each COR (which include the active CSLOs) for every course, broken down by division, and forwards it to the SLO Coordinator. The SLO Coordinator then forwards it to the deans. Division deans (or their designee) then check faculty syllabi in their respective divisions to ensure accurate active CSLOs are listed. While the process is going well for the most part, broader implementation and involvement from deans are needed.
2. Ongoing – Department Coordinator Oversight: The committee continues to recommend that department coordinators communicate effectively and frequently with faculty to encourage CSLO assessment completion. Both fulltime and adjunct faculty are required to complete CSLO assessments as part of their duties, as outlined in their respective contracts. Full-time faculty are also required to participate in the design and assessment of PSLOs. The SLO Coordinator is committed to offering guidance to any department that may need assistance.
3. Update – Technology Needs: In the 2024-2025 annual report, the committee strongly recommended “that the college seek out and implement a system that connects Curriculum, SLOs, the Catalog, and Canvas.” We are pleased to see the college implement this recommendation. This year, Cypress College is implementing CourseDog and eLumen Insights in Parallel. We are told our SLOs will be pushed from our new curriculum manager (CourseDog) to our new SLO data manager (Insights). We are optimistic that this will eliminate the need for the SLO coordinator to manually input all CSLOs and PSLOs into eLumen each year.
4. Update – Reassigned Time: In the 2024-2025 annual report, the committee recommended “increasing the reassign time for the SLO Coordinator from 60% to 80% to meet the growing responsibilities and demands required to keep up with accreditation standards.” If the changes in SLO software from eLumen Legacy to eLumen Insights and in curriculum management software from CurricUNET to CourseDog prove to be effective, than maintaining 60% reassigned time is acceptable. However, if SLO Coordinator is required to manually update eLumen Insights with all curriculum updates, then the increased reassigned time would be appropriate.

5. New – eLumen Legacy End-of-Life: eLumen announced the end of the eLumen Legacy product, and thus our campus began the process of transitioning to eLumen Insights. Campus access to eLumen Legacy will end on June 30, 2025. This end-of-life deadline has two broad implications. First, faculty will not be able to “backfill” data to improve any SLO Completion percentages below 90%. The SLO Coordinator has emailed each dean with the department SLO Completion rates for the data that will be on the department’s next program review (up to four years). The SLO Coordinator has emailed each department coordinator if their department has a semester below 90% completion. Second, faculty need to submit their Spring 2026 SLOs prior to June 10, 2026. Some faculty submit their SLOs at the beginning of the following semester, but due to the software transition, this will not be allowed. IPLOR representatives have been making announcements to their faculty at division meetings regarding the importance of completing Spring 2026 SLO Assessments before June 10, 2026.
6. New - Implementation of eLumen Insights: Insights is the SLO Software offered by eLumen that is embedded within Canvas. Faculty will be able to assess their SLOs in conjunction with their assignments in Canvas, hopefully improving the ease of SLO Data collection. In Fall 2025, Cypress College began the process of implementing eLumen Insights. The SLO Coordinator, Curriculum Specialist, and Institutional Research attended Cohort meetings and customized the software in Beta to fit our college. In Spring 2026, a volunteer pilot of eight faculty will use eLumen Insights to submit their SLOs. eLumen Insights will be used campus-wide beginning Fall 2026. Faculty are encouraged to attend an Insights Training conducted by the SLO Coordinator in Fall 2026.
7. New - Changes to PSLO mapping: Historically, the “Department PSLOs” were identical to the ISLOs. Departments were required to adopt these ISLOs as their own. However, this is not the best practice used by colleges across the state. As a result of our transition to eLumen Insights, our campus is taking the opportunity to begin measuring the “Degree and Certificate PSLOs”. This is a more common practice across our peer institutions. Departments can still observe what we call “Department SLOs” in the future by looking at ISLO summaries for all courses taught in their department, so we are not losing any information by making this transition. Instead, we will now be able to measure and assess the written PSLOs that faculty have developed for their degrees and certificates. Accreditation, IPLOR Committee, Curriculum Committee, and the SLO Coordinator are collaborating on how PSLOs will be written, mapped, and assessed in future years.

Appendix A: Timeline for a typical IPLOR Cycle

May: Email the deans with the next programs required to submit both Long Form and CTE Short Form reports by October 15.

Summer : IPLOR sends the prepopulated long and short self-study forms and SLO summary reports to Department Coordinators and Deans.

August: Send deadline reminders and Program Review Resources to Department Coordinators and Deans.

September: Committee plans to meet two to three times during the month.

October 10: Faculty submit their full review and midpoint point review to their deans for comments and signature.

October 25: Faculty submit their final Reports to the IPLOR Chair (s).

November: Presentations every Monday, schedules permitting, from 3-5 (approximately four 15-minute presentations per week).

December: Program Review Summaries will be sent to all the programs under review.

February: Committee meets to review results and feedback from summaries.

February: Committee reviews CTE short forms

March/April: Prepare final report for submission to the Academic Senate, PBC, and PAC.

April / May: Present the annual report to the Academic Senate, PBC, and PAC. Replace termed out committee members. Add the annual report to the Program Review SharePoint.

Appendix B: IPLOR Full Review Rotation Schedule

CYCLE #1: Fall 2028, Fall 2023 (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 2025, 2029 (11 programs)

Anthropology
Biology
English
ESL
Ethnic Studies
Foreign Language
History
Library
Music
Philosophy & Religious Studies
Physical Science

CYCLE #3: Fall 2026, 2030 (11 programs)

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

CYCLE #4: Fall 2027, 2031 (11 programs)

Art
Chemistry

Communication Studies
Counseling
Dance
Economics
Kinesiology
Mathematics
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology

Appendix C: IPLOR Midpoint Review Rotation Schedule

CYCLE #1: Fall 2026, 2030, 2034 (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: 2027, 2031, 2035 (11 programs)

Anthropology
Biology
English
ESL
Ethnic Studies
Foreign Language
History
Library
Music
Philosophy & Religious Studies
Physical Science

CYCLE #3: Fall 2024, 2028, 2032 (11 programs)

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

CYCLE #4: Fall 2025, 2029, 2033 (11 programs)

Art
Chemistry

Communication Studies
Counseling
Dance
Economics
Kinesiology
Mathematics
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology

Appendix D: Programs Presenting CTE 2-Year Reports (Short Form) In Even Numbered Years

Accounting
Administration of Justice
Air Conditioning & Refrigeration
Automotive Collision Repair
Automotive Technology
Aviation & Travel Careers
Computer Information Systems
Commercial Music,
Court Reporting
Dental Assisting
Dental Hygiene
Diagnostic Medical Sonography
Engineering Technology
Geography/GIS
Health Information Technology
Hotel, Restaurant, and Culinary Arts
Human Services
Journalism
Management/Marketing
Media Arts Design
Funeral Services (Mortuary Science Mortuary Science Baccalaureate Degree)
Nursing
Photography
Psychiatric Technology
Public Health
Radiologic Technology
Theatre Arts

Appendix E: Specialized Instructional Program Review Schedule and Student Services Program Review Schedule

The following is a list the Specialized Instructional Programs recognized by the College and required to participate in Specialized Instructional Program Review:

Distance Education (2023)

Dual Enrollment (2023)

Honors/Service Learning (2023)

Learning Resource Center (formally Cypress Writing Center and English Success Center (2024)

Math Learning Center (2024)

Tutoring (2024)

Study Abroad*

Supplemental Instruction (2024)

Teacher Preparation**

*Study Abroad is currently being run out of Fullerton College, and the IPLOR will not review it unless or until it returns to Cypress College.

**Teacher Preparation is undergoing a reorganization to make a more viable Specialized Instructional Program. The program is expected to provide an update on the status of this revision by the next scheduled review cycle.

The Specialized Instructional Programs will participate in review in the Spring according to the following 4-year cycle:

CYCLE #1 (Spring 2024, 2028, 2032, 2036)

Dual Enrollment

Honors/Service Learning

Teacher Preparation*

CYCLE #2 (Spring 2025, 2029, 2033, 2037)

Distance Education

English Success Center

Math Learning Center

Tutoring

Supplemental Instruction

Study Abroad**

Appendix F: Instructional Program Review Long Form 2025-26

Division:
Department:
Department Coordinator:
Date:

Please complete all the areas listed below by October 10th, and submit a copy of this form to your Division Dean for completion. After the Division Dean has completed the Division Dean Evaluation portion of the form, submit an electronic copy to the Instructional Program Review Committee Chair by October 25th.

For help completing this form, please contact your Instructional Program Review Committee representative, or the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

Mission Statement

Mission statements broadly describe the overall purpose of an organization. Your department mission should represent the purpose of the department while supporting the college's mission statement. Provide your department mission statement, and briefly describe how it supports the college mission.

College Mission Statement

Cypress College transforms lives through lifelong learning with educational opportunities including transfer to four-year institutions, associate degrees, certificates, and a baccalaureate degree. We are dedicated to forging academic and career pathways to support the achievement of our students, enhancing their economic mobility, fostering equity, and enriching society.

Department Mission Statement

[Insert department mission]

1. Describe how your department mission statement supports the college's mission statement. If it does not, please explain why or provide revision.

Department Data Trends

2. Enrollment-Related Trends - Please review the enrollment-related data trends in the table below. Comment on any significant changes and describe any actions taken for improvements.

Fall

[Insert table here]

Spring

[Insert table here]

3. Full-Time Faculty Ratio - Please fill in the table below related to the number of instructors in the department. If there were any significant staffing issues, reassigned time, or leaves that impacted educational quality or student success, please explain.

2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
---------	---------	---------	---------

Adjunct Faculty

Full-Time Faculty

Total

4. Degrees and Certificates - Please review the degrees and certificates awarded in your department and comment on any notable trends.

[Insert table here]

Note. Cypress College's ACCJC institution-set standards for degree and certificate completion are 1,266 degrees and 1,298 certificates that are 16+ units.

5. Transfer Rate - Please review the transfer rate of degree-earning students in your program and comment on any notable trends.

[Insert tables here]

Note. Cypress College's ACCJC institution-set standard for transfer volume is 575.

6. Course Success Rates - Please review the following course success rates and comment on any notable trends.

Fall

[Insert tables here]

Note. Cypress College's ACCJC institution-set standards for successful course completion is 70.2%.

Spring

[Insert tables here]

Note. Cypress College's ACCJC institution-set standards for successful course completion is 70.2%.

7. Distance Education - Please provide an overview of the role of distance education (i.e., online or hybrid courses) as a delivery method in your department. Identify any issues that may be impacting course success rates as it relates to distance education.

[Insert tables here]

a. Please comment on course success rates for on-campus instruction, including best practices and strategies to improve success rates.

b. Please comment on course success rates for online and/or hybrid instruction, including best practices and strategies to improve success rates.

8. Student Equity Data - Please review the following student equity data and identify any notable equity gaps in course success rates and provide specific examples of how your program is addressing these gaps. Additionally, you may use this as an opportunity to describe any equity-related support your department would like from the IPR Committee (e.g., suggested professional development, strategies from colleagues, etc.)

[Insert tables here]

Note. The equity gap represents the percentage point difference from the average course success rate. To help guide your analysis, please examine and comment on any large gaps (greater than 5-10 percentage points when compared to either the highest performing group or the average success rate for the department) for large groups of students (greater than 30).

9. Guided Pathways – Please review the following guided pathways data and identify any areas for improvement for first-time students as well as any strategies or best practices for improving guided pathways related outcomes for students in your department.

[Insert figures here from Guided Pathways Dashboard]

Note. Data presented reflects the [Guided Pathways dashboard](#) for the department.

10. Labor Market and Employment Data (CTE only) – Review the labor market and employment data below and comment on any trends that may impact your program.

[Insert table here]

Note. Data presented refers to the [Strong Workforce Program dashboard](#) in the CCCCO LaunchBoard for the most recently available academic year.

11. Department Data Overall – Describe how these data and other factors relate to the department's effectiveness as a whole. In addition, comment on how your department data and other factors contribute or relate to our institution-set standards, which are summarized in a table below.

Institution-Set Standards	Standard Goal	Stretch Goal
Course Success Rates	70.2%	75.3%
Certificates	1,298	2,499
Associate Degrees	1,266	2,123
Bachelor's Degrees	2	9
Transfers	575	957

Course Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (CSLOs) and Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

PSLO and CSLO assessment provides faculty with an opportunity for dialogue and for the identification of best practices and challenges in achieving learning outcomes. Please review the CSLO and PSLO data for your department and respond to the following questions.

Course Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs)

[Insert Fall table here for Fall 2018 – Fall 2021]

Note. All CSLOs are aggregated at the course level. N/A refers to a course not being offered within a particular term while 0 refers to a course being offered but not assessed within a particular term. Percentages refer to the percentages of all enrolled students who met or exceeded the standard for a particular CSLO for that course.

[Insert Spring table here for Spring 2019 – Spring 2022]

Note. All CSLOs are aggregated at the course level. N/A refers to a course not being offered within a particular term while 0 refers to a course being offered but not assessed within a particular term. Percentages refer to the percentages of all enrolled students who met or exceeded the standard for a particular CSLO for that course.

12. After reviewing the **Course** SLO assessment data, please respond to the following questions.

[Insert table here of courses assessed by semester]

- a. If your percentage of courses assessed is not 100%, what seems to be the largest obstacle in assessing within this timeframe?
- b. Based on your CSLO results, are there any unique attributes for the delivery mode (online, hybrid, and on campus) that need to be addressed?
- c. Please include highlights from your course SLO results and action plans, including best practices and challenges. What changes will be made to course curriculum, methodology, and the SLO process as a result of this assessment?
- d. What resources are needed to implement these changes?

Department Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

[Insert table here]

Note. All PSLOs are presented based upon the mapping from CSLOs to PSLOs present within e-Lumen.

13. After reviewing the PSLO assessment data, please respond to the following.

- a. List improvements made as a result of the PSLO and CSLO review process.
- b. After reviewing your PSLOs, what changes, if any, would you make to PSLOs and CSLOs?
- c. What resources are needed to implement these changes?

Degree and Certificate Program Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

14. Have you written your degree/certificate PSLOs and pre-launched them in Curricunet? If not, please indicate your process and timeline for completing this task along with any obstacles that may have hindered progress.

Curriculum

15. What new courses are you planning that will be going through the curriculum committee review process?

16. If there are courses that have not been revised in the last six years:

- a. Provide a list of these courses:
- b. What is the plan for reviewing these courses?

Diversity and Equity

17. 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?
18. Discuss specific ways the department is equity-minded, and its efforts to ensure culturally relevant curriculum and pedagogy. For example, when your students look into your classrooms, are they seeing a window or a mirror? How can the college help you in these efforts?
19. 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?
20. What have been the positive and/or negative impacts on your department because of the equity and diversity mission of the college, and what has your department done to foster diversity of thought and ideas?

Student Support Services & Campus Involvement

21. How does your department assist your students so that they can succeed in your class? (e.g., tutoring, supplemental instruction, explanation of study skills that are effective in your discipline such as how to read the textbook, impact of AB 705, referrals to DSS)
22. Please briefly summarize your department's involvement in campus-wide committees and initiatives. This information is meant to ensure that departments exercise a substantial voice in furthering the college's mission and decision-making processes.

Department Objectives

23. Past Action Plans – Using the last Instructional Program Review, please copy and paste the department's past action plans/objectives using the provided format.

Goal: {insert goal statement here}

Supports Strategic Plan Area:

Objective: {insert first objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Objective: {insert second objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Were these goals met? Please explain.

24. New or Updated Action Plans - Based on the information provided in this report, use the provided format to list your department's goals for the next four years to improve learning outcomes for your students. Each goal should support at least one Strategic Plan area, Institutional Student Learning Outcome (ISLOs), and/or Program Student Learning Outcome (PSLOs), as well as include the funding needed and consequences of not receiving requested resources or funding. Please copy and paste formatting as necessary for each goal and objective. Please ensure that if you are requesting fiscal resources within your action plan, that you also include those resources in the budget section below.

Note. [Cypress College 2021-2024 Strategic Plan](#) (refer to strategic directions and goals as necessary) and ISLOs and PSLOs are referenced in the [Cypress College Catalog](#).

Goal: {insert goal statement here}

Supports Strategic Plan Area:

Supports Institutional and Program Student Learning Outcomes:

Objective: {insert first objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Objective: {insert second objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Resources Needed and Budget Implications

List the needed resources and specify a dollar amount for each request. Additionally, please note if the request is for program maintenance or improvement, if the request is one-time or an ongoing need (if ongoing, please specify how often), and notate if the request is a department, division, or campus need (if multiple areas are impacted). Please also include the approximate number of students annually impacted by each request. Please ensure that your requests for resources are also included in the updated action plans for the department above.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								

*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount:

Type:

Need:

Length:

Purpose:

Age:

F = Faculty

D = Department

O = One-Time Need

CN = Critical Need

N = New Request

Total \$ amount for request

C = Classified/Admin.

V = Division

T = Technology

M = Maintenance

C = Campus

C = Continuing/On-Going

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact:

of students impacted per year

Publication Review

As part of the program review process, please conduct a review of your department webpage and other publications (e.g., College Catalog) to ensure all information is accurate. Please note any inaccuracies you identified as a result of this review and provide an action plan for implementing the corrections. To request changes to your webpage, contact the Office of Campus Communications, specifically Cari Jorgensen, Web Contact Specialist at cjorgensen@cypresscollege.edu.

25. If there were any inaccuracies on your department webpage, **catalog**, and/or publications, please note them below:

26. What is your plan for implementing corrections and/or the continuous review of this information?

27. If you are a CTE program with a [program specific accreditation requirement](#), is your website up-to-date with your most current programmatic accreditation status? To request changes to your webpage, contact the Office of Campus Communications, specifically Cari Jorgensen, Web Contact Specialist at cjorgensen@cypresscollege.edu.

Instructional Program Review Participation

28. List the names of faculty and staff who participated in the review process.

29. **Describe the involvement of faculty and staff in the program review process.**

Department Coordinator (print and sign):

Date of meeting when Department Coordinator presented this Instructional Program Review form to department faculty:

Division Dean Evaluation

This portion of the Instructional Program Review form is to be completed by the Division Dean.

Mission Statement

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

Department Data Trends

2. Do you agree with the department's evaluation of their five-year enrollment trends? Why or why not? Did the department miss any important information from the table?

3. Do you agree with the department's evaluation of their degree and certificates table? Why or why not? Did the department miss any important information from the table?

4. Do you agree with the department's evaluation of their success rates for both on campus and online/hybrid instruction? Did the department miss any important information from the table?

5. Do you agree with the department's effectiveness as a whole? Why or why not? Did the department miss any important information?

Learning Outcomes Assessment

6. According to the Department SLO Assessment Report (summary report), has the department assessed the course-level SLOs within the last four years? If not, what seems to be the largest obstacle in the process?

7. What resources or recommendations can you suggest to the department to support expanding best practices and/or overcoming obstacles related to SLO results and future action plans?

Curriculum

8. What are your thoughts on the proposed and current curriculum indicated in this report?

Diversity and Equity

9. What are your thoughts on the department's diversity and equity efforts as indicated in this report?

Student Support Services

10. What are your thoughts on how the department assist students so that they can succeed in class?

Department Objectives

11. Do you agree with the department's evaluation of meeting their past goals met? Why or why not?

12. Based on the information provided in this report, do the department's goals for the next three years to improve learning outcomes for all their students make sense?

Resources Needed and Budget Implications

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

Final Approval

Division Dean Signature:

Date Reviewed:

After Dean's review and discussion with Department Coordinator:

Department Coordinator Signature:

Date:

Appendix G: Instructional Program Review Midpoint Review Form

Note: The form will be sent to departments with a landscape orientation to allow great ease of use. For the sake of formatting in this report, it is in portrait orientation below.

Instructional Program and Learning Outcomes Review Midpoint Review [Insert Department Name]

Department Coordinator:

Date:

Please complete all the areas listed below by October 10th, and submit a copy of this form to your Division Dean for completion. After the Division Dean has completed the Division Dean Evaluation portion of the form, submit an electronic copy to the Instructional Program Review Committee Chair by October 25th.

This form should be completed collaboratively with input from all full-time members of the department.

For help completing this form, please contact your Instructional Program Review Committee representative or the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

Section 1: Goal Progress

Please provide updates on the department's goals submitted in the last Instructional Program Review (IPR). See Question #24 on your last IPR form. Your description of progress (column 3) and next steps (column 4) need not exceed XXX words. Using bulleted lists is encouraged. **If no additional support is needed (column 5)**, Please copy and paste the chart below as necessary to report on each goal stated in your last IPR.

Goal 1 (as stated in your last IPR): **Insert Goal Here**

Objectives for Goal 1	Progress	Description of Progress (N/A if No Longer Applicable or Not Started)	Next Steps	Additional Support or Resources Needed to Make Progress or Achieve Goal
1	☐ No Longer Applicable ☐ Not Started ☐ Some Progress ☐ Significant Progress ☐ Completed			☐ No Change from last IPR form ☐ Additional Support Needed (complete section 3 below)

2	☐ No Longer Applicable ☐ Not Started ☐ Some Progress ☐ Significant Progress ☐ Completed	c		☐ No Change from last IPR form ☐ Additional Support Needed (complete section 3 below)
3	☐ No Longer Applicable ☐ Not Started ☐ Some Progress ☐ Significant Progress ☐ Completed			☐ No Change from last IPR form ☐ Additional Support Needed (complete section 3 below)
4	☐ No Longer Applicable ☐ Not Started ☐ Some Progress ☐ Significant Progress ☐ Completed			☐ No Change from last IPR form ☐ Additional Support Needed (complete section 3 below)

Section 2: Additional Goals

If your department has identified new goals since your last program review, please list them below. (Note: [Cypress College 2021-2024 Strategic Plan](#) (refer to strategic directions and goals as necessary) and ISLOs and PSLOs are referenced in the [Cypress College Catalog](#).) Please copy and paste formatting as necessary for each new goal and its objectives.

Goal: {insert goal statement here}

Supports [Strategic Plan](#) Area:

Supports [Institutional and Program Student Learning Outcomes](#):

Objective: {insert first objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Objective: {insert second objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Section 3: Resources Needed and Budget Implications

Based on this midpoint review, does your department have updated or new resource requests?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If no, continue to the next section.

If yes, please provide the updates or new requests below:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount:

Type:

Maintenance

Need:

Length:

Purpose:

Age:

Received Request

Impact:

Total \$ for request

F = Faculty C = Classified/Administration T = Technology M =

D=Department V=Division C=Campus

O=One-Time Need C=Continuing/Ongoing Need

CN = Critical Need M = Program Maintenance I = Program Improvement

G=Program Growth

N = New Request RR=Repeated, Received Request RN = Repeated, Not

of students impacted per year

Section 4: Annual Update Preparation

Please list the names of the full-time faculty in your department below and state their role in this midpoint review (e.g., writer, reviewer). Please add the name of any adjunct faculty who participated.

Please copy and paste the lines below as necessary.

Names of People Involved:

Faculty Name: _____ Role: _____

Faculty Name: _____ Role: _____

Faculty Name: _____ Role: _____

Section 5: Evaluation and Approval

To finalize the update, it must be reviewed by the division dean for their comments, feedback, and recommendations. The division dean must sign the form.

Feedback from Reporting Dean:

Dean's Signature:



Instructional Program and Learning Outcomes Review Specialized Instructional Program Midpoint Review [Insert SIPR Area]

Program Coordinator(s):

Date:

Please complete all the areas listed below by **April 1st** and submit a copy of this form to your Division Dean for completion. After the Division Dean has completed the Division Dean Evaluation portion of the form, submit an electronic copy to the Instructional Program Review Committee Chair by **April 15th**.

This form should be completed collaboratively with input from all full-time members of the department.

For help completing this form, please contact your Instructional Program Review Committee representative or the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

Section 1: Goal Progress

Please provide updates on the department's goals submitted in the last Specialized Instructional Program Review (SIPR). (See Question #13 on your last SIPR form.) Using bulleted lists is encouraged in your description of progress (column 3) and next steps (column 4). Please copy and paste the chart below as necessary to report on each goal stated in your last SIPR.

Goal 1: {insert goal statement here}

Objectives for Goal 1	Progress	Description of Progress (N/A if No Longer Applicable or Not Started)	Next Steps	Additional Support or Resources Needed to Make Progress or Achieve Goal
1 {insert first objective here}	☐ No Longer Applicable ☐ Not Started	{insert brief description here}	{insert brief list here}	☐ No Change from Last SIPR Form

	☐ Some Progress ☐ Significant Progress ☐ Completed			☐ Additional Support Needed (Complete section 3 below.)
2 {insert second objective here}	☐ No Longer Applicable ☐ Not Started ☐ Some Progress ☐ Significant Progress ☐ Completed	{insert brief description here}	{insert brief list here}	☐ No Change from Last SIPR Form ☐ Additional Support Needed (Complete section 3 below.)
3 {insert third objective here}	☐ No Longer Applicable ☐ Not Started ☐ Some Progress ☐ Significant Progress ☐ Completed	{insert brief description here}	{insert brief list here}	☐ No Change from Last SIPR Form ☐ Additional Support Needed (Complete section 3 below.)
4 {insert fourth objective here}	☐ No Longer Applicable ☐ Not Started ☐ Some Progress ☐ Significant Progress ☐ Completed	{insert brief description here}	{insert brief list here}	☐ No Change from Last SIPR Form ☐ Additional Support Needed (Complete section 3 below.)

Section 2: New Goals

If your department has identified new goals since your last program review, please list them below. (Note: [Cypress College 2025-2028 Strategic Plan](#) (refer to strategic directions and goals as necessary) and ISLOs and PSLOs are referenced in the [Cypress College Catalog](#).) Please copy and paste formatting as necessary for each new goal and its objectives.

Goal: {insert goal statement here}

Supports [Strategic Plan](#) Area:

Supports [Institutional and Program Student Learning Outcomes](#):

Objective: {insert first objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Objective: {insert second objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Section 3: Resources Needed and Budget Implications

Based on this midpoint review, does your department have updated or new resource requests?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If no, continue to the next section.

If yes, please provide the updates or new requests below:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								

*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount: Total \$ for request

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Administration T = Technology M = Maintenance

Need: D=Department V=Division C=Campus

Length: O=One-Time Need C=Continuing/Ongoing Need

Purpose: CN = Critical Need M = Program Maintenance I = Program Improvement G=Program Growth

Age: N = New Request RR=Repeated, Received Request RN = Repeated, Not Received Request

Impact: # of students impacted per year

Section 4: Midpoint Review Preparation

Please list the names of the personnel in your department below. Please add the name of any Cypress College employee who participated. Copy and paste the line below as needed.

Names of People Involved:

Name: _____

Section 5: Evaluation and Approval

To finalize the update, it must be reviewed by the division dean for their comments, feedback, and recommendations. The division dean must sign the form.

Feedback from Reporting Dean:

Dean's Signature:



**Instructional Program and Learning Outcomes Review
Midpoint Review Response Form
[Insert Department Name]**

Department Coordinator:

IPLOR Division Representative:

Date:

1. The Department has adequately addressed the following areas of the Midpoint Review:

___ Section One: Goal Progress

___ Section Two: New Goals

___ Section Three: Resources Needed and Budget Implications

2. The Division Dean has reviewed and signed the Midpoint Review form.

___ Yes

___ No

3. The IPLOR Division Representative approves the Midpoint Review.

___ Yes

___ No

4. Comments and/or Recommendations:

Appendix J: IPLOR Compliance Status Criteria developed Fall 2024, updated Spring 2026

IPLOR Compliance Statuses

In order to be found “In Compliance”, departments/programs must meet all of the following criteria.

“In Compliance”:

- The department/program has thoughtfully completed the report in full and presented it to the IPRC committee per the presentation guidelines.
- All full-time members of the department/program have contributed to, or approved of, the report and all perspectives are fairly represented.
- The department/program’s publications and websites are up to date and accurate.
- The department/program has assessed CSLOs for at least 90% of their courses each semester.
- The department/program has completed their Department PSLO mapping in eLumen.
- The program has written Degree and Certificate PSLOs for all its degrees and pre-launched them in Curricunet.
- The report shows evidence that the department/program has reflected on its previously stated goals, if and how they were or were not met, and has a plan in place to meet any unmet goals that are still relevant.
- The department/program has identified any budget needs as precisely as possible and provided adequate justification for those budget requests.
- The department/program reports reasonable student success rates and is taking active steps to increase student success where needed.
- The department/program is aware of, and is meeting, any requirements or standards set by relevant outside accreditation or certification bodies (such as industry licensing boards).
- The report shows evidence that the department/program is abreast of any changes or developments in its larger industry or field.
- The report shows evidence that the department has taken meaningful steps to close any equity gaps, create inclusive curricula when possible, and generate a safe and welcoming learning environment for students from a variety of backgrounds.
- The department/program has submitted complete midpoint review forms between full reviews by the required deadline.

“Needs Improvement” indicates that the department/program has met some but not all of the above criteria.

“Not In Compliance” indicates that the department /program has not met a critical number of the above criteria.

Appendix K: Instructional Program Review Compliance Status Petition

Instructional Program and Learning Outcomes Review Compliance Status Petition

Programs who wish to petition for an “In Compliance” or “Compliance Needs Improvement” status may submit this form during their Midpoint Review.

Please complete all the areas below by October 10th and submit a copy of this form to your Division Dean for completion. After the Division Dean has completed the Division Dean Evaluation portion of the form, submit an electronic copy to the Instructional Program Review Committee Chair(s) by October 25th.

For help completing this form, please contact your Instructional Program Review Committee representative, or the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

Division:

Department:

Department Coordinator:

Date:

1. When was your department’s last full program review (e.g., Fall 2024)?
2. Which compliance status did your department receive following this review?
 - Needs Improvement
 - Not in Compliance
3. Which criterion/criteria did your department NOT meet? Check all that apply.
 - The department has thoughtfully completed the report in full and presented it to the IPRC committee per the presentation guidelines.
 - All full-time members of the department have contributed to, or approved of, the report and all perspectives are fairly represented.
 - The department’s publications and websites are up to date and accurate.
 - The department has assessed CSLOs for at least 90% of their courses each semester.
 - The department has completed their Department PSLO mapping in eLumen.
 - The department has written Degree and Certificate PSLOs for all its degrees and/or certificates and pre-launched them in Curricunet.

- The department's program review report shows evidence that the department has reflected on its previously stated goals, if and how they were or were not met, and has a plan in place to meet any unmet goals that are still relevant.
 - The department has identified any budget needs as precisely as possible and provided adequate justification for those budget requests.
 - The department reports reasonable student success rates and is taking active steps to increase student success where needed.
 - The department is aware of, and is meeting, any requirements or standards set by relevant outside accreditation or certification bodies.
 - The report shows evidence that the department is abreast of any changes or developments in its larger industry or field.
 - The report shows evidence that the department has taken meaningful steps to close any equity gaps, create inclusive curricula when possible, and generate a safe and welcoming learning environment for students from a variety of backgrounds.
 - The department has submitted complete annual update forms in years when not under full program review (beginning in 2023).
 - The department's courses have been revised in the last six years.
4. Explain how your department now meets the criterion/criteria and plans to meet the criterion/criteria on a consistent basis moving forward. (Attach supporting documentation, if appropriate.)

Department Coordinator Signature:

Division Dean Recommendation

This portion of the petition is to be completed by the Division Dean.

1. Do you agree with the department's description of their remediation efforts?
2. Do you recommend that the Instructional Program Review Committee change the department's status to "In Compliance"? Please explain.

Dean Signature:



**Instructional Program and Learning Outcomes Review
Presentation Guidelines**

As Part of the IPRC review process, the committee invites department chairs or program representatives to share key points from the program's submitted report. This meeting consists of a brief presentation, followed by a question and answer session with the committee. This document provides guidelines to help department chairs or program representatives create an effective presentation.

What are the goals of the presentation?

The presentation portion of the IPRC's review process is meant to accompany the long-form report programs/departments submit to the committee every four years. You can assume that the committee members have already read your report and are familiar with the basics of your program. However, the presentation is an opportunity for programs/departments to introduce the committee to your program in person, to highlight any notable accomplishments of your program, and to call attention to any pressing needs your program may have.

How long should the presentation be and what form should it take?

Your meeting with the IPRC should take about 45 minutes, 30 minutes of which is for introductions, and your presentation. The remaining time will be used for a question and answer session with the committee. You need not take the entire 30 minutes for your presentation provided you cover the areas noted below. Presentations are generally conducted via Zoom, but can be done in person at the program's request. Many programs find it helpful to create a presentation deck (via PowerPoint, Prezi, or the like) to keep their presentations organized and to make sure they cover the requested information. This is encouraged, but optional. The more structured and concise your presentation is, the better.

Who should present?

The Department Chair/Coordinator or designated program representative should deliver the presentation. Other faculty members are also welcome to join the meeting. There should be evidence in your presentation that all full-time faculty members were consulted and contributed to the final report and presentation, even if they are not present for the presentation. If there are significant differences of opinion among full-time faculty on a particular portion of your report, please note those differences in your presentation so all viewpoints are represented.

What should the presentation cover?

- The presentation is an opportunity to humanize your report, to highlight your program's mission, accomplishments, budgetary or other needs, and to note any significant changes your program might have undergone since your last review.
- Your presentation should review the goals set out in your last program review and how those were met. If those goals were not met, please explain why not and what needs to be done to meet them in the future.

- Your presentation should address how your department/program mission relates to Cypress College's mission.
- Your presentation should also address whether your program/departments published materials (i.e., catalog, website) are accurate and complete. If these materials are not current, please present your timeline or plan to update them.
- **SLOs and PSLOs:** Please discuss your department's SLO data results including CSLO assessment and Department PSLO assessment. Explain how your department has used this data to help improve student success and outcomes in your program(s). Identify and describe areas for improvement, and share any improvement plans resulting from SLO assessment results.
- **DEI:** Please describe your program's efforts to identify challenges, close achievement gaps, and increase access for diverse student populations. Note how your program promotes equity—in curriculum, hiring, student outreach, etc.—and note any unique challenges it faces in meeting its equity goals. Discuss how your program will improve learning outcomes for underrepresented and historically underserved students.
- **Budget:** Please highlight any important budget requests **and include dollar amounts.**



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: Anthropology

Presenter: Craig Goralski

Date: 11/4/ 25

The goal of the IPLOR 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 IPLOR.

 X **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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

Commendations

The Anthropology Department delivered a thorough presentation demonstrating deep engagement with data, equity, and student success. The committee commends the department on their collaborative effort in completing the program review

Enrollment has rebounded strongly since the pandemic, and hybrid course success rates are notably high.

The Anthropology department has shown a clear commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. They have adopted a social justice–oriented OER textbook for ANTH 101, which is culturally

responsive and anti-racist. The program's integration of social justice themes, global citizenship, and cultural awareness into coursework is exemplary.

The Anthropology faculty are to be commended for their hands-on teaching methods, including the use of bone casts, artifact replicas, and fieldwork, which enrich student learning. They have also prioritized career readiness, by developing a Career-Ready Archaeology Technician Certificate and partnerships with Dental Hygiene and other disciplines.

The program has made laudable interdisciplinary efforts. Anthropology is pursuing a new partnership with Ethnic Studies and the Puente Program (starting Spring 2026), featuring a Chicana/o/x Studies course sequence to increase visibility and student engagement. The committee also fully supports the department's plans to continue collaborations with other programs (e.g., Mortuary Science, Dental Hygiene), as well as greater promotion of the Archaeology Technician Certificate as a viable career pathway.

The department's student-centered approach, including mentoring through the Anthropology Club and continued engagement with alumni is exemplary. The Anthropology faculty's involvement in campus life, and committee leadership has also been stellar. Finally, the department is to be congratulated on its participation in the production of an Emmy-nominated project demonstrating both excellence and creativity!

The Anthropology faculty expressed an important concern noted by several other departments. Namely, that the current professional development reimbursement process (pre-pay then reimburse) is a barrier to participation and requires revision. If Anthropology and other departments are to maintain their standards of excellence, funding for conference participation, research development, and the like, must be a priority.

Recommendations

While the department shows clear strengths, there are a few areas for continued growth:

Success rates are somewhat below the college average. However, the department is making meaningful efforts in this area.

The number of degrees and certificates awarded and transfer rates have varied year to year. The committee recommends the department increase promotion of anthropology pathways and clearer communication about career options

The committee also recommends Anthropology's relevance across disciplines (architecture, healthcare, education, etc.) be emphasized more strongly in marketing materials, the website, and outreach events. Highlighting achievements such as the Emmy nomination and alumni success stories could boost awareness.

Further, the committee recommends the department consider exploring partnerships with NOCE or other community programs to better serve lifelong learners, and develop pathways for older students who may wish to audit courses rather than enroll for grades.

The committee noted the reliance on adjunct faculty and reassigned time for full-time faculty, but it seemed clear from the presentation that hiring an additional full time faculty member at this point

may be premature. The committee fully supports the department's plan to carefully discern its specific faculty needs in future when more enrollment data is available.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 60.0% Spring 2022 – 85.7%
Fall 2022 – 100.0% Spring 2023 – 100.0%
Fall 2023 – 100.0% Spring 2024 – 100.0%
Fall 2024 – 100.0% Spring 2025 – 100.0%

Comments: Although the percentage of courses assessed in the 21-22 academic year is on the lower side, the Anthropology department has shown outstanding CSLO assessment completion rates since Fall 2022. The committee encourages the Anthropology department to continue this trend.

As a result of the assessment process, the department continues to analyze data and has provided thoughtful insight into why they believe their on-campus-only courses tend to have higher success rates than their online courses. The department noted interest in additional professional development opportunities to improve their online modalities.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 93.8.0% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the program learning outcome, Presenting. The anthropology department also noted a desire to improve the Global Citizenship PSLO as they view this learning objective as integral to the subject of anthropology. The committee commends the Anthropology department for using the PSLO data to reflect and improve student learning outcomes.

The Anthropology department has written PSLOs for its three degrees and certificates (status is pending for all three). These PSLOs will be active in CurricUNET by Fall 2026.

Budget Comments

The department's budget requests are modest and well justified. The primary need is for teaching casts and instructional materials for ANTH 101 Lab.

The department may consider allocating or requesting funds for marketing and promotional materials — such as table banners, posters, or improved web presence — to raise awareness of anthropology courses and their relevance to general education pathways and career preparation.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
------	-----------------	---------	-------	-------	---------	----------	------	---------

1	Plastic Cast - Gigantopithecus blacki Skull and Jaw "Reconstruction" BC-140	\$443	F	D	O	I	N	~830
2	Plastic Cast - Male Chimpanzee Leg, Articulated SC-003-75-A	\$368	F	D	O	I	N	~830

***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 RR = Repeat/Received RN =

Impact: Request Repeat/Not Received # of students impacted per year



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: Biology

Presenter: Stephanie Spooner

Date: 11/4/ 25

The goal of the IPLOR 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 IPLOR.

 X **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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

Commendations:

The Biology Department delivered a clear, data-informed, and equity-focused presentation that effectively highlighted the program's growth, student outcomes, and ongoing innovations. The biology department is to be commended on their improvements in student success and transfer preparation.

Transfer and degree completion rates are very strong. The department boasts a 92% transfer rate and 90% persistence at university. The number of students earning the AS-T degree has more than doubled since 2021, demonstrating the program's success in preparing students for transfer. High fill rates, long waitlists, and strong enrollment trends indicate sustained demand for biology courses and degree pathways.

The department is commended on its efforts to integrate equity-focused practices. Faculty employ transparent teaching methods, culturally relevant course materials, and in-house lab manuals designed to reflect student diversity and address bias in science education. The adoption of

Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) materials and the creation of a culturally responsive, DEI-aligned anatomy textbook were highlighted as major accomplishments.

The opening of the new Science Study Center in the Learning Resource Center (LRC) was a major achievement. The center provides tutoring, Supplemental Instruction (SI), and access to anatomical models and microscopes—resources that have enhanced student learning and success. The department's collaboration across disciplines, especially with Health Science, ensures that students have access to key prerequisite courses for allied health pathways.

The department's change from a three-course to a two-course sequence has been especially effective in improving degree completion.

Recommendations:

The department faces significant challenges due to extremely high demand for courses—especially allied health prerequisites. Waitlists remain long, and classroom space is limited. Expansion of facilities and scheduling flexibility should be prioritized to meet student demand.

There is a high adjunct-to-full-time ratio (27:11), which creates strain on existing full-time faculty and limits capacity for planning, mentoring, and outreach. The addition of at least three new full-time faculty members was identified as a critical need.

Success rates for African American/Black, Latinx, Native American, and former foster youth students remain below college averages. Continued work on culturally responsive teaching, enhanced tutoring, and mentorship are recommended.

Success rates are lower in hybrid and online courses, particularly in lab-based sections, which is to be expected. The committee recommends the college support the Biology department creating more opportunities for in-person or synchronous engagement, and using e-tutoring or virtual labs where possible.

Program level student learning outcomes (PSLOs) should be reexamined to ensure distinctions among STEM, reading, and analytical competencies are clear and measurable.

The Biology department's challenges stem from institutional constraints—particularly the lack of physical space and staffing. These should be prioritized at the college and district levels to sustain the department's continued excellence.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 100%	Spring 2022 – 100%
Fall 2022 – 100%	Spring 2023 – 92.3%
Fall 2023 – 100%	Spring 2024 – 100%
Fall 2024 – 100%	Spring 2025 – 100%

Comments:

The biology department is commended for doing an excellent job consistently assessing course student learning outcomes. As a result of the assessment process, the department continues to analyze data and brainstorm strategies to increase student learning. The biology department has also brainstormed a robust list of best practices such as “Increased use of Playposit or similar system to integrate self-check questioning throughout the student's learning experience” and

“Incorporating synchronous review sessions” to increase student success. The committee recommends that the department track the progress of student learning outcomes as they implement these strategies.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

The Biology department has written PSLOs for its only degree (Biology Associate in Science Degree for Transfer), and this program is active in Curricunet. The Biology department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 81.0% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the program learning outcome, Problem Solving.

Budget Comments:

The Biology Department presented a compelling case for additional resources. The top priorities identified as: 1. Hiring three new full-time faculty members to meet the growing demand and improve the full-time to adjunct faculty ratio. 2. Expanding classroom and laboratory space to accommodate additional course sections and reduce waitlists. 3. Additional administrative and stockroom support to sustain expanded offerings and improve operational safety.

The department’s budget requests are justified and directly aligned with institutional goals of equity, access, and student success.

Overall, the Biology Department is viewed as a model of student-centered and equity-driven instruction, but it urgently needs institutional support to continue meeting student demand and sustaining its high standards.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Full-time faculty (3)	300,00	F	D	C	G	RN	2000
2	Acid cabinet installation	7,500	T	D	O	CN	N	unknown
3	Garbage disposal installation	2,300	T	D	O	CN	N	unknown
4	Incubator for microbiology labs	10,000	T	D	O	CN	RN	600
5	Model replacement cycle funding	26,000	T	D	C	CN	RN	2000
6	Biol 101 lab upgrade supplies	5,000	T	D	O	I	N	600
7	4-year Laptop	36,000	T	D	C	M	N	4000

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
	replacement cycle							
8	Anatomical model purchases for biol 231 lab rooms	22,000	T	D	O	I	N	1200
9	Microscope cameras for lab rooms	3,760	T	D	O	I	N	750
10	Anatomical model purchases for biol 210 lab rooms	22,000	T	D	O	I	N	720
11	Additional models for science study room, LLRC	20,000	T	D	O	I	RN	2500
12	Increased supply funding for lab growth	10,000	T	D	C	G	N	500
13	Additional projectors in lab rooms	15,000	T	D	O	I	N	600
14	Upgrade doc cams and matrix switches in all biology rooms	130,000	T	D	O	I	N	4000
15	Faculty stipend for anatomy curriculum development	5,000	T	D	O	I	N	2000
16	Visible Body subscription	30,000	T	D	C	I	N	2000
17	Fluorescent Microscope, accessories, and training	30,000	T	D	O	I	RN	600

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
18	Student hourly support	30,000	C	D	C	G	RR	unknown

19	Laboratory Tech or Laboratory Clerk	100,000	C	D	C	G	RR	unknown
----	--	---------	---	---	---	---	----	---------

***TABLE** *Total \$ amount for request*

CODE

KEY

Amount:

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*



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: English

Presenter: Kathleen McAlister

Date: 11/4/ 25

The goal of the IPLOR 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 IPLOR.

 X **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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

Commendations

The English Department presented a thorough and data-informed review that effectively showcased its student success initiatives, equity-centered practices, and innovative approaches to instruction. The department is to be commended for its comprehensive presentation, campus engagement, and general success despite myriad internal and external challenges—including the significant continued challenges created by AB705 and 1705, which have compromised student success rates.

English faculty have identified several challenges associated with Winter Intercession course offerings, which have been compounded by attempts from outside departments and individuals to influence English curriculum decisions. In response, the department has established a minimum timeframe for composition courses to better support student success. Although this timeframe does not allow for 4-unit composition courses to be offered during

the 5-week Winter Intersession, it does allow for these courses offered during the expanded 6-week Summer Session. Maintaining departmental autonomy and academic integrity is vital for this (and all) department's continued success.

The English faculty have demonstrated a deep commitment to student equity and access through multiple initiatives, including the English Bridge and Peer Tutoring Programs, both of which have improved success rates, particularly among disproportionately impacted groups. Peer tutors embedded in ENGL 1000 and 1000E courses have been especially effective in raising outcomes for Latinx, female, and financial-aid students. The department also collaborates closely with the Writing Center, Legacy and Puente Programs, and other affinity groups to provide holistic support. The department's culturally relevant and inclusive curriculum further promotes social justice and diverse perspectives.

Enrollment and fill rates have increased steadily from 2021 to 2025, showing resilience and growth following pandemic disruptions. The department meets or exceeds ACCJC standards for most courses, and high transfer rates indicate strong preparation for degree completion.

The English Department is to be praised for its creativity and innovation. It developed a career-focused certificate in Creative Writing. A Future Teachers Certificate is currently under development, and the department intends to explore a Professional Writing Certificate. The department also organizes events like a visiting writers series and other collaborations with the library. These efforts are exemplary examples of community-building, equity-centered teaching, and academic rigor.

Overall, the English Department is commended for its innovation, student-centered practices, and equity-driven approach, and is seen as a model for resilience and academic excellence in a rapidly changing educational landscape.

Recommendations

While the English Department demonstrates clear strengths, there may be some opportunities for continued growth and strategic focus:

The department noted that some courses fall slightly below the college's success average, particularly online and hybrid sections. The department is encouraged to continue its already ongoing focus on pedagogy, tutoring, and early support strategies.

The largest equity gap exists for Pacific Islander students. Expansion of peer tutoring and targeted outreach through affinity cohorts could help close that gap.

The state placement policies have led to underprepared students enrolling directly in college-level English. The English Department faculty are encouraged to continue evaluating the effectiveness of English Bridge and other readiness initiatives and share best practices to support underprepared learners with the rest of the campus community.

Degree completion fluctuated and may be affected by external changes such as CalGETC reducing humanities requirements.

The committee would also like to note the challenges the English department faces related to AI use and plagiarism in writing. Developing AI awareness modules and academic honesty guidelines could support faculty and students alike.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 96.0%	Spring 2022 – 91.7%
Fall 2022 – 95.8%	Spring 2023 – 86.4%
Fall 2023 – 95.7%	Spring 2024 – 95.7%
Fall 2024 – 95.7%	Spring 2025 – 92.7.%

Comments: The percentage of courses assessed over the last 8 semesters is 95.0%. The English department has shown strong CSLO assessment completion rates aside from Spring 2023.

It is recommended that the department coordinator send out an email to the English Faculty each semester with a friendly reminder to complete CSLO assessments. It is also recommended that the department coordinator run faculty participation reports in eLumen at the end of each semester to follow up with faculty with missing CSLO assessments in a timely manner.

As a result of the assessment process, the department continues to review data results and discuss teaching methodologies – such as AI use in English curriculum – to maintain a high standard.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

The department has written PSLOs for its 2 degrees and certificates, and all of these programs are active in Curricunet. The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 90.3% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the program learning outcome, Equity.

Budget Comments

The committee fully supports the department's budget requests. The department's primary funding priorities include expanding the Peer Tutoring Program and hiring additional full-time faculty to meet instructional and service demands. Requests also include support for administrative staff and coordination of student engagement events, such as visiting writers and creative showcases. Sustained funding is necessary to continue the English Bridge program, tutoring, and affinity-based learning communities—all of which directly address student equity and success.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Peer Tutoring Program Expansion (Annually)	\$150,000.00	F	C	C	M	RN	2,000+
2	Cypress Writing Center Faculty Liaison Support (Annually)	\$20,000.00	F	C	C	M	RR	4,000+
3	Administrative Assistant II for English Department and Language Arts Division	\$100,039.18	C	V	C	CN	RN	6,000+
4	English Bridge Program Expansion (Annually)	\$38,000.00	F	C	C	M	RR	600+
5	Student Success Advocates	\$20,000	C	V	C	CN	RR	6,000+
6	Annual Open House Event and Funding for Swag & Snacks @ Recruitment Events	\$4,000	M	C	C	M	RR	200+
7	Faculty Hiring (2 Replacement/New Positions)	\$250,000.00	F	D	C	CN	RR	6,000+
8	Professional Development for Faculty including Norming Sessions	\$12,000	M	C	C	M	RR	6000+
9	Permanent Funding for Sole Image Journal	\$3,000	M	C	C	M	RR	1,000+
10	Visiting Writer Series Collaboration	\$3,000	M	C	C	M	RR	500+

11	Funding for Student Voices Conference and Faculty Mentors	\$8,000	F	C	C	M	RR	1,000+
12	Learning Cohorts	\$16,000	F	C	C	M	RR	216+

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount:	Total \$ amount for request							
Type:	F = Faculty	C = Classified/Admi n.	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						



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: ESL

Presenter: Alison Robertson and Kathy Wada

Date: 11/4/ 25

The goal of the IPLOR 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 IPLOR.

 X **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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.
ESL Program Evaluation Summary

Commendations

The ESL Department provided a clear report that demonstrated exceptional faculty collaboration, student advocacy, and statewide leadership. The department is to be commended on its pioneering efforts in creating Guided Pathway ESL Milestone Certificates—the first of their kind in the state—and for achieving Cal-GETC approval for three GE courses, a major equity accomplishment for ESL and ISP students.

Enrollment and fill rates have increased since the pandemic, reflecting growing student engagement and the department's strong instructional quality. The introduction of the Linguistics class in Fall 2021 has expanded academic pathways for ESL students and continues to generate high interest

and full course enrollments. Student success rates in in-person courses are particularly strong, and all CSLOs have been consistently assessed at 100%.

Faculty are to be commended for their leadership and extensive involvement across campus and at the state level, including participation in governance, professional development, and programs such as Ascend. The department has also created supportive communities through the Language Exchange Center, student clubs, and Canvas learning spaces.

The department's equity-minded approach—advocating for financial aid eligibility, anti-bias initiatives, and greater institutional recognition of ESL achievement—has shifted the narrative of ESL as supplemental instruction to one that celebrates the impressive multilingualism of its students and the academic strength they bring to the college.

Finally, ESL is to be commended on its significant graduation and transfer numbers. For example, for the 2020-2021 cohort, 36 students (47%) received a bachelor's degree or higher out of 79 graduates.

Overall, the ESL Department is doing innovative, equity-driven, and deeply student-focused work, setting a high standard for excellence and advocacy within the college and statewide.

Recommendations:

While the department demonstrates exceptional leadership and innovation, reviewers identified a few areas for continued development and institutional support:

Streamlining the auto-award process for milestone certificates would ensure students receive timely recognition for their accomplishments.

Success rates remain below the ACCJC standard, particularly for Latinx, DSS, and younger students (19 or under). Collaboration with Institutional Research to gather more disaggregated data may help in identifying specific barriers and tailoring interventions.

Like many departments, ESL faces ongoing challenges as the result of AB 705/1705. Strengthening placement guidance, perhaps in partnership with counselors and NOCE non-credit ESL, could help students enroll at the appropriate course level and improve retention.

The department cited widespread use of AI and reduced academic preparation post-pandemic as major challenges. The department is encouraged to continue its AI literacy and integrity policies, along with its efforts at incorporating metacognitive learning tools to build confidence and writing skills.

The department's immigrant and multilingual student population faces unique challenges in the current political and educational climate. The committee strongly recommends the college advocate for immigrant students and to further invest in ESL as a core academic program.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 100% Spring 2022 – 100%

Fall 2022 – 100% Spring 2023 – 100%
 Fall 2023 – 100% Spring 2024 – 100%
 Fall 2024 – 100% Spring 2025 – 100%

Comments:

The ESL department is commended for doing an excellent job consistently assessing course student learning outcomes. The department continues to review data results and instructor reflections. We commend the ESL department for thoughtfully using their instructor reflections for improvement and to meet the needs of their students. As a result of this assessment process, the ESL department held additional norming sessions to improve learning outcomes consistency.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

The ESL department has written PSLOs for its 10 degrees and certificates, and all of these programs are active in Curricunet. The ESL department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 92.6% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the program learning outcome, Global Citizenship.

Budget:

The ESL Department presented well-documented budget requests focused on sustainability, professional development, and administrative support. Primary funding needs include: Administrative staffing for program coordination and the Language Exchange Center.

Funding for norming sessions, departmental conferences, and professional development.

Continued financial support for state and national conference attendance to maintain leadership and visibility in the ESL field.

Resources for scholarships and workshop supplies that directly support student engagement and success.

The committee fully supports these requests.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Language Exchange Staffing	\$30,000	C	V	C	G	N	1,500+
2	Norming	\$6,000	M	D	C	M	RN	400
3	Certificate Workshop Supplies	\$250	M	C	C	G	N	200
4	Potluck Scholarship Event	\$500	M	D	C	M	RR	400
5	Conference Attendance	\$12,000	M	D	C	M	RN	400+
6	Department/Division Administrative Assistant II	\$100,039.18	M	V	C	CN	RN	2,000+

7	Student Success Advocates	\$20,000	M	V	C	G	RR	2,000+
*TABLE CODE KEY								
<i>Amount:</i>		<i>Total \$ amount for request</i>						
<i>Type:</i>		<i>F = Faculty</i>	<i>C = Classified/Admin.</i>	<i>T = Technology</i>	<i>M = Maintenance</i>			
<i>Need:</i>		<i>D = Department</i>	<i>V = Division</i>	<i>C = Campus</i>				
<i>Length:</i>		<i>O = One-Time Need</i>		<i>C = Continuing/On-Going</i>				
<i>Purpose:</i>		<i>CN = Critical Need</i>	<i>M = Prog. Maintenance</i>	<i>I = Prog. Improvement</i>	<i>G = Prog. Growth</i>			
<i>Age:</i>		<i>N = New Request</i>	<i>RR = Repeat/Received</i>	<i>RN = Repeat/Not Received</i>				
<i>Impact:</i>		<i># of students impacted per year</i>						



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: Ethnic Studies

Presenter: Giovanni Hortua and Daniel Lind

Date: 11/10/ 25

The goal of the IPLOR 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 IPLOR.

 X **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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

ESL Program Evaluation Summary

Commendations:

The Ethnic Studies Department has experienced major enrollment growth due to AB 1460 and the CalGETC Area 6 requirement. Course offerings have expanded significantly, and two new full-time faculty have been hired since the last review.

The department is active in supporting students, enriching teaching practices, and preparing students for rigorous coursework. Increased sections—up to 30–35—are consistently filling due to GE demand.

The department collaborates widely across campus, including tutoring partnerships, student preparation programs, and ASCEND/Starfish initiatives. Faculty teach across all four Ethnic Studies subfields and maintain strong course success rates near the college average.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends the Ethnic Studies department review the Presentation Guidelines that the committee sent to all departments. Although a slide deck is not required, departments are asked to come to the presentation meeting prepared with some kind of presentation. This requirement is also listed on the Compliance Status rubric.

The presentation meeting exists to allow departments to humanize their reports. A prepared presentation, (with or without a slide deck) is an opportunity to demonstrate work faculty do with students—the value of which may not be adequately reflected on the Program Review form. The Ethnic Studies department is undoubtedly doing such work, but the lack of presentation was an unfortunate omission.

The department reported low AA/AAT degree completion rates and expressed the need for supplemental instruction. The committee recommends improving course sequencing, and more robust communication with counseling to help AA/AAT completion rates.

Success rates are improving, but are still low for certain groups. The committee recognizes that it may be impossible to determine causes from the data. That said, there are equity gaps for Native American, Pacific Islander, students aged 50+, and former foster youth. The department also noted challenges transitioning students from online/Zoom modalities to in-person classes, especially given the rigor of exams and assessments.

It should also be noted that there has been a great deal of discussion between Ethnic Studies and other departments in Social Science regarding disciplinary boundaries, and the changes brought by AB1460 and the new Area F/Area 6 requirements—as well as the college's change in degree requirements for Area F/Area 6.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 85.7%	Spring 2022 – 87.5%
Fall 2022 – 90.9%	Spring 2023 – 100.0%
Fall 2023 – 90.0%	Spring 2024 – 100.0%
Fall 2024 – 91.7%	Spring 2025 – 90.9%

Comments:

The Ethnic Studies department has met the 90% threshold for accreditation since Fall 2022. The committee recommends that the Ethnic Studies coordinator continue to send out an email to ETHS Faculty (particularly adjunct faculty) each semester with a friendly reminder to complete CSLO assessments. It is also recommended that the department coordinator run faculty participation reports in eLumen each semester to follow up with Faculty with missing CSLO assessments. The Ethnic Studies department has recognized that changes in modality (from online in 2021 to more on-campus classes in 2025) have impacted student learning outcomes. For courses with notably low CSLOs, the Ethnic Studies department is encouraged to continue discuss teaching methodologies to maintain a high standard.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

The department has written PSLOs for its 7 degrees and certificates, and all of these programs are active in Curricunet. It is recommended that the department edit the PSLO section for the degree in Curricunet so that the individual PSLOs for the degree are written as separate PSLOs as opposed to all combined into one PSLO. The affected degrees are Social Justice Studies: Native American Studies Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T), Social Justice Studies: Asian-

American Studies Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T), and Social Justice Studies: African-American Studies Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T).

The department has not completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. 83 out of 99 CSLOs are not yet mapped to PSLOs. Completing this mapping is essential to meaningful PSLO results.

The Ethnic Studies department should reassess PSLO mappings. PSLOs for social sciences, reading, writing, analysis, global citizenship and equity have the same mappings and are not distinct. Similarly, mappings for research and personal responsibility are also the same. Thus, it is difficult to determine true achievement in PSLOs when many areas are mapped the exact same way.

Budget Comments

The primary budget request is for an additional full-time faculty member to sustain rapid program growth. This appears to be necessary. The department did not provide an exact salary range, but we assume the salary would be commensurate with current faculty salaries.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Full-Time Faculty [1]	Ongoing faculty salary and compensation	F	D	C	G	N	450
2	Guest Speaker Funding	\$20,000	F	D	C	I	RN	2000
3	Conferences and Field Trips	\$10,000	F	D	C	I	RN	200
4								
5								
6								
7								



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: Foreign Languages

Presenter: Karen Le Cornet

Date: 11/10/ 25

The goal of the IPLOR 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.

 X **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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

ESL Program Evaluation Summary

Commendations

The Foreign Languages Department is to be commended for its strong commitment to student success, cultural engagement, innovation in curriculum, and campus leadership. The department boasts high-quality Canvas course shells, particularly the ZTC (Zero Textbook Cost)–ready shells that promote instructional consistency and accessibility. The department offers an impressive range of degrees and certificates, including AA-Ts, CTE-focused pathways, and a newly developed local AA in Japanese.

A significant strength of the department is its robust cultural and co-curricular engagement, including the International Cultural Festival, World Language Preview Day, movie nights, clubs, and other events that foster belonging, cultural awareness, and community connection. Participation in social media outreach has also bolstered visibility and recruitment.

Enrollment has rebounded strongly since the pandemic, surpassing pre-pandemic levels despite the department offering fewer sections. Success rates remain high in many advanced-level courses, reflecting strong student motivation and effective instruction. The department has also demonstrated leadership in ZTC/OER creation, including French, Japanese, and Spanish ZTC pathways, OER remixing projects, and contributions to collegewide ZTC initiatives.

The faculty's leadership in professional development is also commendable—including involvement in DEIA training, Communities of Practice, and various campus committees. The new study abroad program in Kyoto—designed to be accessible to low-income and first-generation students—is a major achievement. Overall, the Foreign Languages department is doing excellent work and requires more support.

Recommendations / Areas for Improvement

The department noted equity gaps for Black/African American, Latinx, Pacific Islander, as well as DSS students—but the department is clearly prioritizing making their classes as accessible as possible to a wide range of students. Success rates for some lower-division courses—especially French 101C, CHIN 101C, and SPAN 202C—may need focused intervention and more support services.

Perhaps predictably, listening and speaking SLOs are lower in asynchronous online sections due to limited opportunities for spontaneous oral communication. The committee recommends increased support for communicative practice in online modalities.

The department's enrollment has been impacted by the shift from a required subject area to an elective. This now requires the department to develop more robust recruitment efforts, contextualized certificates, and experiential learning opportunities. The committee strongly recommends the college support these efforts as they are being made necessary by factors outside the department's control.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 100%	Spring 2022 – 100%
Fall 2022 – 100%	Spring 2023 – 100%
Fall 2023 – 100%	Spring 2024 – 100%
Fall 2024 – 100%	Spring 2025 – 100%

Comments:

The Foreign Language Department is commended for doing an excellent job consistently assessing course student learning outcomes. The co-coordinator's efforts to remind and support full time and adjunct faculty to complete their SLO assessments have been effective.

The department is also commended for revising the curriculum to develop five SLOs in their language courses, highlighting skills of intercultural competence and understanding.

As a result of the assessment process, the Foreign Language department continues to review data results and discuss teaching methodologies (e.g. scaffolding assignments, increasing formative feedback, and active learning activities) to maintain a high standard.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

The department has written PSLOs for 4 of its 7 degrees and certificates that are active in CurricUNET. (The degrees and certificates missing PSLOs are Spanish Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T), Foreign Language: Elementary Level Certificate, and Foreign Language: Intermediate Level Certificate.

The department has added many new CSLOs to department courses active Fall 2025, so the department is encouraged to complete the PSLO mapping for these new CSLOs in eLumen.

The Foreign Language department is an exemplary example of using PSLO results to review, assess, and improve. For example, Foreign Language faculty have used scaffolding to increase "Writing" and "Analysis" PSLOs and incorporated additional cultural and global perspectives into their curriculum supporting the "Global Citizenship" PSLO.

Budget Comments

The clearest need is for additional full-time faculty, especially in Japanese, Chinese, and Spanish, to meet student demand, support expanding programs, and relieve the strain on current faculty.

The department has also demonstrated a need for increased administrative support to assist with cultural events, logistics, ZTC/OER maintenance, dual enrollment coordination, and departmental operations. An Admin II role was estimated at \$97,039.18 plus \$3,000 for initial setup.

Overall, the department is stretched very thin relative to both its workload and its contributions to campus culture.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Full-Time Faculty Hire (Japanese/ Chinese dual qualification)	\$150,000	F	D	C	CN / G	N	240 students per year
2	Adjunct faculty compensation for training and department meetings	\$5,000 annually	F / C	D / V	C (annual)	I / G	RN	All department students (about 2400 students per year)
3	Department Co-Curricular activities and	\$6,000 annually	T / M	D	C (annual)	M / I / G	RN	All department students
Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
	events (World Language Preview Day, student club events, movie nights, collaboration between programs and club)							(about 2400 students per year)
4	ZTC maintenance, development and support (Chinese, French, Japanese, Spanish)	\$40,000 (about \$10,000 per program)	T	D	C (multi-year project)	M / I / G	N	All department students (about 2400 students per year)
5	Conference financing (professional development for full-time and adjunct faculty)	\$10,000	T	D / V	C	I / G	RN	All department students

					(annual)			(about 2400 students per year)
6	Improvement / update for HyFlex Equipment for HUM 107 (ceiling mics, podium PC, cameras, cables)	\$10,000	T	D / V	O	CN / I	N	270 students per year
7	Administrative**** Assistant II for the Division	\$97,039.18 (annual salary and benefits), plus \$3,000 for equipment and setup	C	D / V	C (annual)		N	All department and Language Arts Division students (about 7500 students per year)
8	Full-Time Faculty Hire (Spanish)	\$85,755 (annual salary and benefits at minimum quals.)	F	D	C	CN/G	N	240 students per year

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Total \$ amount for request

Amount:

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



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: History

Presenter: David Halamy, Carol Lewis, Bryan Seiling, Vincent Romo

Date: 11/4/ 25

The goal of the IPLOR 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 IPLOR.

 X **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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

Commendations:

The History Department provided a thorough report to the committee. The report was composed collaboratively by all full-time faculty members and reflected adjunct faculty concerns. The faculty is to be commended for their increased enrollment and fill rates. These gains are the direct result of the faculty's hard work in overhauling the major pathway, creating more robust and accessible forums for communication with students, efforts in student recruitment, including the History Major Canvas shell, among other initiatives. They have also expanded their modality offerings and made their schedule of classes more flexible and better able to meet changing student needs.

The History Department has also successfully and significantly expanded their dual enrollment offerings. The department is successfully rising to the increased demand for dual enrollment courses by expanding offerings and enhancing coordination with partnering high schools. Their success rates are near or at campus averages, with increases in AA-T degrees earned.

Further, the department demonstrates a strong commitment to OER and ZTC implementations, which contributes meaningfully to equity and student affordability. They have been a campus

leader in this area. The History faculty have designed their program so that students can complete an AA in History without incurring any textbook costs. The department has fully met its initial goals in this area and is now pursuing new initiatives to expand and strengthen its OER and ZTC efforts. The department's campus involvement is to be commended. They have a faculty representative on the Distance Education Committee who is also a faculty advisor for the ASCCC CVC-OEI. History faculty are also represented on the Peer Online Course Review team (POCR) and are part of the consortium with the CVC (California Virtual Campus). The department was instrumental in obtaining grants for POCR, the implementation of OER within online classes, and the close captioning of courses with the DECTA grant.

History faculty have strong criticisms of how the college has executed its DEIA initiatives. They contend that these initiatives do not always serve the goals of DEIA but often work to create ideological litmus tests and police dissenting views. The History faculty have also raised concerns regarding how the college deals with religious and religio-cultural diversity and discrimination, specifically antisemitism.

The department's willingness to have difficult conversations regarding how to best implement DEIA initiatives is commendable. As a result, their diversity and equity efforts seem thoughtful, effective, and student-centered.

Recommendations:

The equity gaps for Black/African American, Pacific Islander, and former foster youth are significant but not unique to History. As noted above, the History department is clearly committed to equity initiatives such as OER and ZTC materials as well as to offering culturally relevant curriculum that centers historically marginalized groups. The department plans to continue and expand this work. The History department has been particularly impacted by the loss of lecture hall space. The college has not provided satisfactory justification for unilaterally prohibiting the use of these spaces for actual instruction. They are clearly designed for instruction, yet, no other use has been specifically identified.

The History department voiced concerns related to AB 1460 and the changes in CalGETC Area F and 6 requirements. The department demonstrates strong performance and growth, but requirements once filled by History courses (and other Social Science courses) are now fulfilled by Ethnic Studies courses. The department's concerns center on how these changes will impact future enrollment.

Further, History, like many Humanities and Social Science departments at Cypress College, feel undervalued by the policies the College has adopted regarding degree requirements. These policies have exacerbated the History department's fear that they will be further undermined by other department's course offerings. The history department is doing excellent work to prepare students for a variety of futures. The college should support and celebrate them for this work.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 100%	Spring 2022 – 100%
Fall 2022 – 100%	Spring 2023 – 100%
Fall 2023 – 100%	Spring 2024 – 100%
Fall 2024 – 100%	Spring 2025 – 88.9%

Comments:

The History Department is commended for doing an excellent job consistently assessing course student learning outcomes. As a result of the assessment process, the department continues to review data results and discuss teaching methodologies to maintain a high standard. For example,

History faculty are creating additional assignments and resources to scaffold learning to improve CSLO outcomes.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

The department has written PSLOs for its one degree, and this program is active in Curricunet. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 87.9% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the program learning outcome, Writing.

The history department has added many new CSLOs to department courses active Fall 2025, so the department is encouraged to complete the PSLO mapping for these new CSLOs in eLumen.

The history department should reassess PSLO mappings. PSLOs for social sciences, reading, writing, analysis, and research have the same mappings and are not distinct. Similarly, mappings for communicating, presenting, problem-solving, technology, personal responsibility, global citizenship, and equity are also the same. Thus, it is difficult to determine true achievement in PSLOs when many areas are mapped in the exact same way.

Budget Comments

Major budget needs include adjunct OER compensation, funding for targeted marketing to potential majors, funding for updated instructional technology such as microphones and gimbals, and funding for ChatGPT and other digital tools. The committee fully supports these funding requests.

The department also emphasized a strong need for research database access (e.g., Kanopy, American Mosaic). They made requests for HyFlex equipment updates and additional professional development support—particularly for adjunct faculty. These are all legitimate asks the committee supports.

The committee notes the request for added security funding. However, such funding would not be for instructional use by History department, and so they fall outside of our scope. That said, the committee recommends the college take any security concerns seriously.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Targeted marketing	\$1,000	Technology	Department	Ongoing	Improvement	New	All students needing History
2	Adjunct Stipends for OER/DE	\$10,000	Faculty	Department	One-Time Need	Improvement & Growth	New	All students taking History
3	2 Rode Wireless Microphones	\$275	Technology	Department	One-Time Need	Improvement & Growth	New	600 Per Semester
4	2 Hohem iSteady M7 Gimbal	\$500.00	Technology	Department	One-Time Need	Improvement & Growth	New	600 Per Semester

5	CHATgpt Plus Plan	\$300.00/yr	Technology	Campus	Ongoing	Improvement & Growth	New	Campus
Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
6	Campus Security Office Enhancements	\$150,000	Classified	Campus	Ongoing	Critical Need	New	Campus

***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



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: Library

Presenter: Monica Maldonado Doman, Leslie Palmer, Joyce Peacock Annette Young
Carolyn Caffrey, Treisa Cassens

Date: 11/17/25

The goal of the IPLOR 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 IPLOR.

 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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

Commendations

The Library Faculty Reviewers presented a complete and thorough report and gave an informative and polished presentation. The Library Department has demonstrated strong overall performance, a commitment to student-centered services, and sustained improvement efforts.

The department has increased enrolment and maintains consistently high success rates in LIB 100. The Library's return to pre-pandemic hours has strengthened student access, while its extensive student-facing resources continue to support academic success across the college. The program's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion is evident through its action plan to close equity gaps, targeted collaborations with campus programs, and initiatives such as OER and Zero-Textbook-Cost efforts, DEI-centered book lists, and systems for reporting offensive language in publications.

The faculty's instructional contributions are substantial, including twenty-one information literacy YouTube videos and more than two hundred research guides widely embedded in courses. Librarians cultivate students' confidence in their research abilities through targeted instruction and individualized support. They also collaborate closely with faculty across disciplines,

providing resources, expertise, and pedagogical partnership that strengthen teaching and learning campus-wide.

Recommendations

The committee recommends the faculty continue their targeted interventions and partnerships to close equity gaps where possible.

Enrollment and success metrics in LIB 100 were complicated by phantom students. It should be noted that future enrollment may be impacted by changes in GE pathways.

Operational challenges persist as limited staffing may force early closures during absences or emergencies, underscoring the need for additional personnel.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 100.0%	Spring 2022 – N/A
Fall 2022 – 100.0%	Spring 2023 – N/A
Fall 2023 – N/A	Spring 2024 – 100.0%
Fall 2024 – N/A	Spring 2025 – 100.0%

Comments:

The library department is commended for doing an excellent job consistently assessing course student learning outcomes when they offer courses. The library department noted that the low success rates in Spring 2024 were a result of phantom student enrollment. The department adjusted for this issue and it appears to have been resolved for the Spring 2025 course.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. However, we recommend the library department reassess PSLO mappings: PSLOs for reading, writing, communicating are not distinct; PSLOs for analysis, research, problem-solving, and technology are not distinct; and PSLOs for personal responsibility and global citizenship are not distinct. Thus, it is difficult to determine true achievement in PSLOs when many areas are mapped the exact same way.

The library has additional department PSLOs, and one highlight from these PSLOs is that 83.1% of students met or exceeded expectations in being able to identify, retrieve, and organize potential information resources.

Budget Comments

The committee strongly supports the Library's funding requests. The highest priority is hiring a full-time Systems Librarian. Additional classified staff will also be essential to maintaining consistent operating hours and expanding student support.

The committee further supports the Library's requests for upgrades to the Library Instruction Room, including technology improvements and a laptop cart, as well as facility enhancements such as study pods, charging lockers, and updated furniture based on student survey data.

Continued funding for databases remains critical, especially considering projected annual cost increases of up to ten percent.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
------	-----------------	---------	-------	-------	---------	----------	------	---------

1	Systems Librarian	\$86,000-\$158,000	F	C	C	CN	RN	16,857 students based on Fall 2025 student headcount data
2	Classified staff	\$66,000-\$79,000	C	C	C	CN	RN	16,857 students based on 2025 student
								headcount data
3	Library Instruction Room Improvements	\$957 + laptop cart (still pending price quote from AC as of 10/23/25)	T	D	O	CN	N	1,000 students a year on average
4	Databases	10% yearly increase	T	C	C	M	RR	16,857 students based on 2025 student headcount data
5	Furniture	\$7,466.83 per unit	M	C	O	I	N	115,014 students based on 2024-2025 gate count
6	Charging Lockers	\$4,319 per unit	T	C	O	I	N	115,014 students based on 2024-2025 gate count

7	Mobile Digital Screens	\$599.98 per screen	T	C	O	I	N	A minimum of 11,430 students used group study rooms in 2024-25	
---	------------------------	---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--	--



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: Music

Presenter: Gary Gopar

Date: 11/17/ 25

The goal of the IPLOR 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 IPLOR.

 X **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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

Commendations

The Music program continues to demonstrate high student success rates, strong SLO assessment performance, and dynamic engagement with the college community. The department has increased enrollment and section offerings. This has been driven in part by strong dual-enrollment partnerships. The department has developed three new commercial music certificates, including opportunities for students to pursue professional Avid certification. High transfer rates among AA-T students further reflect program effectiveness.

Further, Music faculty have developed the program's culturally responsive curriculum, including multiple music history offerings and the highly enrolled History of Hip Hop course, which highlights contributions from marginalized communities. The department's collaboration with student support programs (EOPS, DSS, VRC, Legacy, Puente, LGBTQ+ resources, and more) further shows the faculty are invested in creating a welcoming and inclusive environment.

Overall, the program serves as a vibrant part of our campus culture, enriching the community through its performances, outreach efforts, and consistent engagement with students and the broader public.

Recommendations

Some online offerings—especially synchronous sections—show significantly lower success rates, and alignment between official seat counts and appropriate class sizes should be reviewed in collaboration with the dean.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 100%	Spring 2022 – 100%
Fall 2022 – 100%	Spring 2023 – 93.3%
Fall 2023 – 96.8%	Spring 2024 – 100%
Fall 2024 – 100%	Spring 2025 – 100%

Comments:

The music department is commended for doing an excellent job consistently assessing course student learning outcomes. As a result of the assessment process, the department continues to review data results and discuss teaching methodologies to maintain a high standard.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

The department has written PSLOs for its 3 degrees and certificates, and all of these programs are pending in Curricunet with future effective term Fall 2026. The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. However, we recommend the music department reassess PSLO mappings, because the PSLOs for humanities and the arts & personal responsibility have the same mappings and are not distinct. Thus, it is difficult to determine true achievement in PSLOs when many areas are mapped the exact same way. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 91.2% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the program learning outcome, Communicating.

Budget Comments

The Music faculty was asked to provide a complete budget chart. From their presentation, the committee agrees that their needs are clearly demonstrated and reasonable. Funding priorities include administrative support, marketing and outreach staff, a full-time lab technician for commercial music, equipment and software needed for the new certificate programs, SMART classroom upgrades, faculty hiring, and support for vocal ensemble tours.

Budget table requested



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: Philosophy and Religious Studies

Presenter: Myev Rees and Will Heusser

Date: 11/10/25

The goal of the IPLOR 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 IPLOR.

 X **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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

Commendations

The Philosophy and Religious Studies Department delivered a clear, well-organized, and highly informative presentation. The PowerPoint demonstrated the department's purpose, values, and ongoing development.

The Philosophy and Religious Studies Department has experienced an increase in the number of courses offered, sections available, and FTES generated. Enrollment in online courses remains especially strong, and PHIL 100 continues to fill each term. The department offers a range of modalities including in-person, online, hybrid, Zoom, and late-start, which allows students to select learning formats that suit their needs.

The newly launched AA in Religious Studies is an important addition to the program. The department also added new curriculum including Introduction to Christianity, which is likely to generate additional student interest and further strengthen enrollment.

Faculty implement evidence-based teaching practices and demonstrate a strong commitment to culturally relevant pedagogy. Participation in CoRe has led to improved transparency, detailed rubrics, zero-cost course materials, captioned lecture content, and universally accessible assignment design.

The Philosophy and Religious Studies department serves both majors and non-majors, emphasizing that all students can benefit from its courses. While supporting current majors and encouraging growth through a new AA in Religious Studies, the department also noted its interdisciplinary approach, accommodating students pursuing minors, double majors, or broad academic interests. The department prioritizes developing critical thinkers who can participate as global citizens in a diverse democracy, which contributes meaningfully to the college's general education mission. The Philosophy Club is highly active, hosting guest speakers and community events that enhance the student experience. Last year, the club organized a guest lecture that drew faculty from multiple departments, students, and classified staff. The event sparked engaging discussions on ethics and the practical application of ethical theory in daily life. Building on this success, the department aims to establish an annual guest lecture series, bringing prominent thinkers to the Cypress community. The department is actively engaged in shared governance and campus life. Faculty members hold leadership and advisory roles, including co-chairing IPLOR, advising student clubs like the Philosophy Club, Muslim Student Association, and Karma4Change, and organizing campus events such as guest lecturers. Faculty also contribute to committees overseeing professional development, sabbaticals, and curriculum decisions, advocating for the integrity of degree requirements.

Recommendations

Although improving, student success rates remain below the college average. If the Learning Resource Center were able to provide a philosophy-trained tutor, it would support success in reading, writing, and logic-intensive coursework.

The department is encouraged to examine modality-based success rates since success rates in hybrid and synchronous online sections are lower and should be evaluated for best practices. In addition, the department should continue to identify best practice for addressing equity gaps. Continued investment in guest lectures and student-focused events is recommended, along with ongoing support for the Philosophy Club and its expansion as a hub for engagement and community building.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 75.0% Spring 2022 – 77.8%

Fall 2022 – 100.0% Spring 2023 – 87.5%

Fall 2023 – 100.0% Spring 2024 – 100.0%

Fall 2024 – 100.0% Spring 2025 – 100.0%

Comments:

The Philosophy and Religious Studies department is commended for identifying the roadblocks from CSLO completion, has made meaningful changes, and is now doing an excellent job consistently assessing course student learning outcomes since Fall 2023. It is recommended that the department coordinators continue to email their faculty each semester with a friendly reminder to complete CSLO assessments, particularly those faculty who are the only instructor for a particular course.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

The department has written PSLOs for two of its three active degrees and certificates in Curricunet. The department should revise the Philosophy Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T) to include written PSLOs. The department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen.

The philosophy and religious studies department shared their desire to support “global citizens who can fully participate in a democracy rooted in the free exchange of diverse ideas”. According to the PSLO results, 79.1% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the program learning outcome, Global Citizenship. The department is encouraged to consider ways the SLO process could support the department’s vision of creating global citizens.

Budget Comments

Requests include \$2,000 for a guest lecture series (including promotion, honorariums, ect.) and \$500 for desk copies. These are modest, student-centered, and aligned with program goals.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Lecture Series	2,000	F	D	C	G	N	150
2	Books	500	M	D	C	I	RN	100

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty C =
Classified/Admin.

Need: D = Department V = Division

Length: O = One-Time Need

Purpose: CN = Critical M = Prog.
Need Maintenance

Age: N = New Request RR = Repeat/Received

Impact: # of students impacted per year



Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes Committee Evaluation Summary

Program: Physical Sciences

Presenter: Kirk Domke

Date: 11/17/ 25

The goal of the IPLOR 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 IPLOR.

 X **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.)

 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 comments below.)

 Not In Compliance – The program has failed to meet the requirements of the Instructional Program Review and Learning Outcomes committee during this review period or has failed to make the necessary improvements stipulated in previous reviews. The program will only be allowed to apply for emergency funding. The program may petition to change its compliance status at the mid-point review using the IPLOR Petition form found on the IPLOR SharePoint.

Commendations:

The Physical Science program has demonstrated strong academic performance and steady growth across its six subject areas. Their success and transfer rates remain high. Enrollment is returning to pre-pandemic levels and they have seen an increase in the number of degrees and certificates offered.

Faculty actively support student success through supplemental instruction, tutoring, workshops, and expanded office hours. The program maintains excellent SLO assessment completion, reaching 97.1% overall, and continues to expand culturally relevant pedagogy, including inclusive curricular revisions in geology and transparent grading practices across multiple disciplines. Collaboration with MESA, STEM², and dual-enrollment partnerships further supports underrepresented students pursuing STEM fields. Reviewers consistently noted the clarity and thoroughness of the program's report, particularly in its analysis of all six disciplines.

Recommendations

The Physical Science program is an exceptionally large program that encompasses many scientific subfields. It is difficult from the data tables to determine some specifics. Per the discussion with the committee the Physical Science program is encouraged to work with internal research to make sure they are getting the data they need without creating an undue burden on their unique program review process.

Because equity gaps vary substantially by subject area, aggregated data makes it difficult to assess program-level needs.

The committee recommends the department address success rates in GEOL 130 and GEOL 190 and increase SLO completion—especially through coordinated adjunct participation. The committee also encourages the program to continue recruiting qualified physics tutors and to examine enrollment composition, which remains highly male-dominated.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2021 – 90.9%	Spring 2022 – 100.0%
Fall 2022 – 81.8%	Spring 2023 – 100.0%
Fall 2023 – 100.0%	Spring 2024 – 100.0%
Fall 2024 – 95.5%	Spring 2025 – 100.0%

Comments:

The physical science department is commended for doing an excellent job consistently assessing course student learning outcomes, with the exception of Fall 2022.

It is recommended that the department coordinators email faculty each semester with a friendly reminder to complete CSLO assessments. Several departments within the physical sciences indicated that soliciting adjunct participation can be challenging. Therefore, we recommended that the department coordinator run faculty participation reports in eLumen each semester to follow up with particular faculty with missing CSLO assessments.

As a result of the assessment process, each of the six subject areas continues to review data results and discuss teaching methodologies to maintain a high standard. The departments recognize that courses with supplemental instruction or tutoring support through the LLRC have better CSLO performance than those without.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes ☒ No ☐ Other ☐

Comments:

The department has written PSLOs for 10 of its 11 degrees and certificates, and all of these programs are active in Curricunet. The degree missing written PSLOs is the Geology Associate in Science Degree for Transfer (AS-T). The department has completed almost all PSLO mapping in eLumen for its six subject areas, however the Engineering Technology department is missing PSLO mapping for three of its SLOs. The physical sciences department should consider reevaluating their PSLO mapping, as several PSLOs are mapped in such a way that they are not distinct. For example, in Engineering and Physics, all mapped PSLOs are done so identically, thus, it is difficult to determine true achievement in PSLOs.

Budget Comments

Budget requests for the Physical Science program are extensive because they reflect the needs of six distinct disciplines housed within a single department. The program identified multiple full-time faculty hires as essential, noting that one of the four requested positions was approved.

Additional funding is also needed for equipment, staffing, laboratory materials, tutoring support, and software licenses. Many of the requests are high-cost items. The committee recommends the program provide detailed item descriptions and amounts to strengthen their budget requests.

Rank	Name of Request	Amount	Type	Need	Length	Purpose	Age	Impact
1	Physics faculty (2)	\$85,755 minimum	F	D	C	G	N	1300
2	Elec. & magnetism hardware/software	\$10,000	T	D	O	M	RR	200
3	Engineering Technology faculty	\$85,755 minimum	F	D	C	G	N	500
4	Hardware/software for EDLAs	\$50,000	T	D	O	M	N	500-1000
5	Field equipment, fees, and fuel	\$14,000	M	D	C	G	N	200/yr
6	Stockroom equipment refresh	\$2,000	T	D	O	M	RR	600
7	Software Bisque telescope mount	\$11,500	T	D	O	I	RN	300/yr
8	Physics tutoring (Tutoring Center)	\$3,000	C	C	C	I	N	500-1000
9	Astronomy faculty	\$85,755 minimum	F	D	C	G	RN	1300
10	Professional planetarium program	\$25,000	T	C	O	I	RR	all campus
11	Prep course for calc-based physics	\$10,000	T	D	O	M	N	600
12	On-campus observatory	\$80,000	T	C	O	G	RN	all campus
13	Engineering lab hardware and software	\$95,000	T	D	O	G	RN	500
14	Lab technician	\$30,000	C	V	C	I	RN	1200
15	GEOL 115 travel	\$7,000	T	D	C	I	N	60/yr
16	Adjunct faculty	\$19,000 minimum	F	D	C	G	N	600
17	Geology tutor	\$3,000	C	C	C	I	N	300/yr
18	Geology outreach	\$4,000	T	C	O	G	RR	all campus
19	Advanced mechanics hardware/software	\$6,000	T	D	O	M	RR	600
20	Waves, heat, optics equipment	\$3,000	T	D	O	M	RR	100
Rank	Name of Request	Amount	Type	Need	Length	Purpose	Age	Impact
21	Observational laboratory	\$20,000	T	D	O	G	RN	1200
22	Upkeep of astronomy gear	\$4,000	M	D	C	M	RN	1200

23	Geology class supplies	\$3,000	T	D	O	M	RR	1200
24	Physics outreach	\$1,000	T	C	O	G	RN	200
25	Elementary physics equipment	\$2,000	T	D	O	M	RR	250
26	Modern Physics course	\$16,000	T	D	O	M	RN	30