

CYPRESS COLLEGE

Instructional Program Review 2022–2023 Annual Report



Draft Date: March 2023

Prepared on behalf of the Instructional Program Review Committee by Myev Rees, Stephanie Rosati, Jennifer Coopman, and Kristina Ogasian

Table of Contents (Active Links)

INTRODUCTION.....	3
COVID-19.....	3
DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION.....	3
PURPOSE OF PROGRAM REVIEW.....	4
PROCESS OVERVIEW.....	4
MISSION STATEMENT.....	5
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK, FORMS, & EVIDENCE LOCATION.....	5
A GENERAL NOTE ABOUT EVIDENCE.....	5
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES.....	5
MEETINGS WITH INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REPRESENTATIVES.....	6
OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS.....	6
Program Completion: Certificates and Degrees.....	6
Distance Education.....	7
Online Instruction.....	7
Distance Education Training.....	7
Student Equity and Disaggregation.....	7
Completed SLO Reporting Recommendations from previous years.....	8
Remaining recommendations that are in progress of being addressed.....	9
CTE 2-YEAR REPORTS (SHORT FORM).....	10
SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM (SIP)REVIEW 4-YEAR SCHEDULE.....	10
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM RELATED COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	10
GLOBAL COMMENDATIONS:.....	10
GLOBAL RECOMMENDATIONS:.....	11
Ongoing Recommendations.....	11
New Recommendations.....	12
BUDGET REQUESTS AND RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS:.....	12
Ongoing Budget Needs and Requests.....	13
A Special Note about the Campus Theater.....	13
Newly Identified Budget Needs and Requests.....	13
LOOKING FORWARD.....	13
APPENDIX A: TIMELINE FOR THE 2022-2023 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW CYCLE.....	15
APPENDIX B: ROTATION SCHEDULE (NEW 4-YEAR CYCLE STARTING 2016).....	16
APPENDIX C: PROGRAMS PRESENTING CTE 2-YEAR REPORTS (SHORT FORM).....	17
APPENDIX D: DEPARTMENT PLANNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW FORM.....	18
APPENDIX E: SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE.....	25
APPENDIX F: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMARIES.....	26
Auto Collision Repair.....	27
Auto Technology.....	
Court Reporting.....	
Dental Assisting.....	
Diagnostics Medical Sonography.....	
Funeral Services.....	
Geography/GIS.....	
Management and Marketing.....	
Mortuary Science.....	
Nursing.....	
Psychiatric Technology.....	
Radiologic Technology.....	

Introduction

Through a comprehensive program review process, Cypress College faculty assess their programs on a four-year cycle. For reference, the schedule for the four-year cycle is included in the [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.

Over the last few years, The Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) has revised the review process to tie it more closely to the larger college planning and budget processes. The Instructional Program Review Form each department submits is updated to reflect any new instructional priorities, as well as for, ease of use. A regular review of the form is conducted each spring. After submitting their written material, each department under review makes an in-person presentation to the IPRC highlighting the program’s work and needs. The program then receives a Review Summary based on the written materials, presentation, and ensuing discussion. The Summary contains a Compliance Status that is tied to the program’s eligibility for funding as well as a Budget Resource Table containing information to better inform budget and resource allocation decisions across campus. This Summary is then attached to any future requests made by the department or program for One-Time Funding, Faculty and Classified Prioritization, and other budget and resource needs.

COVID-19

The 2022-2023 academic year marked a turning point in the college’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting disruptions. The fall of 2022 saw the full return of most programs to in-person instruction with all full-time faculty returning to campus two or more days a week. Like no other recent crisis, the pandemic stretched the resources of the campus and placed unprecedented burdens on faculty, administration, and staff. The impact on enrollment continues to be seen, and while the campus has rebounded admirably, some lasting difficulties are to be expected. However, with these trials come new opportunities to serve our students in innovative ways.

Over the last several years, departments and programs across campus have shown remarkable resilience and an impressive capacity for creative pedagogical innovation. Indeed, some of these innovations have proven so valuable in meeting the changing demands of a post-pandemic landscape, many departments and programs are planning to adapt some of their pandemic-inspired solutions for a post-pandemic world.

One area that needs further exploration is the continued use of remote instruction in its various forms. For a variety of reasons, asynchronous, synchronous, and hybrid modes became more popular with students during the pandemic and student surveys express a strong desire that these modalities not only continue post- pandemic, but that they be expanded.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

A central focus of the Instructional Program Review Committee continues to be the diversity, equity, and inclusion work being done on campus by departments and programs. This was a continuation and expansion of work that started in previous years. The Instructional Program Review Form completed by each department was amended in 2020 to contain a diversity, equity, and inclusion section. It contains set of a questions designed to foster conversations about the work being done by programs to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion across campus and in the surrounding community. These questions were included as a separate addendum to the review form in 2020 and were added to the form itself in 2021 to further institutionalize the DEI focus into the instructional program review process.

A focus on diversity, equity and inclusion will continue to be part of the process going forward, and the process is by no means complete. As the college efforts and focus on DEI shift and grow, so will that of Instructional Program Review. New questions may need to be developed, and the forms and summaries will certainly need to be revised. To ensure this, a review of the questions and form will be conducted each spring. The goal is to have these discussions lead to concrete action and a commitment to bring about necessary reforms to College and District policies, practices, and personnel.

Purpose of Program Review

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

assessments contribute to the evidence-based evaluation of programs, which are summarized in an annual report to foster institutional effectiveness, appropriate resource allocation, and ongoing improvements in student success.

Process Overview

Instructional Program Review is included in the Academic Senate's "Ten Plus One" responsibilities (as articulated in Title 5, Section 53200), and as such, the IPRC works under the purview of the Academic Senate to review instructional programs and make recommendations to promote student learning and success. The IPRC is comprised of a faculty representative from each division, a dean, two institutional researchers, and liaisons for SLOs, Accreditation, Student Services, and Diversity. Faculty representatives are elected at the division level and serve three-year terms. The IPRC chairperson serves a three-year term and is elected by the Academic Senate with input from the IPRC members. Prior service on the IPRC is required to serve as chair. The IPRC Chair responsibilities are included in the appendix of the *Program Review Handbook*. The position of chair can be shared by members of the committee if needed and responsibilities are divided as members deem appropriate.

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

Copies of the completed Instructional Program Review Forms, the committee summaries, and the IPRC's Annual Reports were historically posted in the Instructional Program Review folder on the campus "J" Drive. However, a recent cyber-attack on the campus made that drive inaccessible. In place of the J Drive, the Office of Campus Communications created an Instructional Program Review Committee Sharepoint, which is accessible via the Program Review webpage on cypresscollege.edu. All instructional program review documents, including committee summaries, will be housed there.

Beginning in Spring 2019, a Compliance Status was added to the Instructional Program Review Summaries. The status reflected the degree of compliance with the expectations of Instructional Program Review and was tied to a department or program's ability to apply for and access regular sources of college funding. The main purpose of the revision was to comply with an accreditation recommendation to demonstrate a more direct tie between the review of our instructional programs and the larger college planning and budget processes. In Fall 2020, a Budget Table was added to the Identified Budget and Resources Needs section of the IPRC Summary. Each department will be expected to attach their Review Summary to all future resource and budget requests.

Mission Statement

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

Instructional Program Review Handbook, Forms, & Evidence Location

The Department Planning and Instructional Program Review Handbook provides faculty and administrators with instructions, sample forms, and resources for the instructional program review process. The committee updated the *Program Review Handbook* in the Spring of 2021 and again in the Spring 2023 to reflect the substantial revisions to the review process and forms. To help run the committee meetings and better document the review process, Meeting Bylaws were created and added to the Appendix of the handbook. The Bylaws may be updated as needed and such revisions do not need to wait until the scheduled 4-year review of the handbook. The Department Planning and Instructional Program Review Handbook can be found on the Cypress College Program Review webpage. Copies of the Instructional Program Review Committee meeting agendas, minutes, as well as Program Review Summaries and copies of this report can be found on the IPRC Sharepoint.

A General Note about Evidence

Occasionally, faculty disagree about the meaning of evidence, data, and research used in evaluating student learning. The IPRC welcomes dialogue that may lead to a collective understanding of evidence. Therefore, the instructions to faculty acknowledge that they are being asked to comment on statistical data with the understanding that a range of variables may be present and that causal assumptions may not be statistically valid. Faculty are encouraged to view program review as an opportunity to evaluate data, exchange ideas about trends, comment on noteworthy accomplishments, and identify areas of need where the program would benefit from assistance or resources. The presentations should result in conversations that The IPRC is committed to improving the accuracy of data and facilitating positive, open, and collaborative discussions.

Instructional Program Review Committee Representatives and Terms

Division Faculty	Representative	Email
Business/CIS	Peter Molnar	pmolnar@cypresscollege.edu
CTE	Michael Beard	mbeard@cypresscollege.edu
Counseling	Ernesto Heredia	eheredia@cypresscollege.edu
Fine Arts	Maha Afra	mafra@cypresscollege.edu
Health Science	Anna Cherie Gentry	agentry@cypresscollege.edu
Language Arts	Sarah Jones	sjones@cypresscollege.edu
Library	Joyce Peacock	jpeacock@cypresscollege.edu
Kinesiology	Margaret Mohr	mmohr@cypresscollege.edu
SEM	Sujata Chiplunkar	schiplunkar@cypresscollege.edu
Social Science	Myev Rees	mrees@cypresscollege.edu
Administrative		
Dean	Lisa Gaejte	lgaejte@cypresscollege.edu
IRP	Bryan Ventura	bventura@cypresscollege.edu
IRP	Kristina Oganessian	koganesian@cypresscollege.edu

Chair	Stephanie Rosati	srosati@cypresscollege.edu
Assistant Chair	Myev Rees	mrees@cypresscollege.edu
Student Services Liaison	AnnMarie Ruelas	aruelas@cypresscollege.edu
Accreditation Faculty Chair	Jill Bauer	jbauer@cypresscollege.edu
SLO Coordinator	Jennifer Coopman	jcoopman@cypresscollege.edu
Diversity Liaison/BLM Task	Regina Rhymes	rrhymes@cypresscollege.edu

Meetings with Instructional Program Representatives

After reviewing the written program reviews, the committee met with the following program representatives in Fall 2022. All meetings were held remotely via Zoom though programs were given the option of presenting their reports in person.

November 7

Hotel, Restaurant, and Culinary (Lisa Clark and Amanda Gargano)
 Psychiatric Technology (Jaime Ramos)
 Automotive Technology (Martin Orozco)

November 14

Geography /GIS (Eric Bladh)
 Diagnostics Medical Sonography (Nancy Corrales & Lynn Mitts)
 Radiological Technology (Michael Frianeza)

November 21

Management and Marketing (Jeannie Jo)
 Funeral Services (Jolena Grande and Damon de la Cruz)
 Automotive Collision Repair (Larry Ramos)

November 28

Court Reporting (Carolee Freer)
 Dental Assisting (Joel Silva)
 Nursing (Dr. Colleen Peralta, Michael Faraci and Thu Pham)

Overview of Findings

Institutional Research and Planning provided faculty with pre-populated data to help them evaluate their programs and improve student learning. This is the seventh year the data included distance education success rates, transfer data, labor market wage and employment data, and student equity information in the form of disaggregated student achievement data. The added statistics have allowed departments/programs to more meaningfully analyze where they are successful and where they need improvement. Previous concerns about the accuracy of this information remain. In some instances, transfer data and labor market data do not appear to match what some faculty believe to be true anecdotally.

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

Program Completion: Certificates and Degrees

With the implementation of SB 440 and SB 1440, the number of Associate Degree for Transfer has greatly improved the transfer and completion rates for several programs. Others have certainly felt the impact of the COVID-19 restrictions and may have a lingering impact in the immediate future. It is believed that the movement to expand Dual Enrollment opportunities for high school students, increased marketing, and social media outreach, and expanded access to support services for all students will help mitigate this impact and create opportunities for these same programs to build their enrollments in the future

Distance Education

Distance Education deserves the gratitude of the entire Cypress College community for meeting the demands of the pandemic and helping the college prepare for a post-pandemic landscape. The shift to remote instruction in Spring 2020 could not have been done without the aid of the DE Team. By facilitating the rapid review and approval of curriculum

for DE delivery, enhancing course Canvas shells with support services, and training faculty to teach in an online setting, the program led the way and positively impacted every class and student at Cypress College.

The Distance Education Committee (DEC) continues to do substantial work in reshaping and establishing shared governance support for distance education on the campus. The campus is in a far better place regarding distance education than it has ever been, and this has been due to the hard work of the DEC and DE Team. The work of the entire team has been an excellent example of the collaboration of classified staff, faculty, and administration at Cypress College. Without their great work going above and beyond once again, the campus would not have been able to meet the unusual challenges of the past several years.

Online Instruction

Beginning Fall 2018, every class, regardless of mode of instruction, received a Canvas shell to allow instructors to give digital access to course materials, assignments, and grades. Such online resources help keep students informed as to their progress in the course, allow for greater faculty/student interaction, and promote student success. Departments, programs, and clubs have created shells to better communicate with members, promote their work, and create a sense of community. Canvas also provides an excellent means of communicating with students allowing for the distribution of important information, announcements, and surveys.

The widespread use of Canvas across campus has also allowed faculty to communicate with counselors and other support services across campus to better serve our students. Canvas has allowed the global integration of student services and counseling and offers the opportunity for self-enrolling Canvas support sites. The program then facilitated, supported, and developed training for various LMS integrations to provide various essential services and resources for faculty and students. They are central to accessibility compliance which should be of high concern for the college and district.

As we returned to on-campus instruction, many departments and programs continue to offer courses in alternative modalities including asynchronous online, synchronous remote (via Zoom), hybrid, and the like. There are various issues that need to be addressed for this to continue with success, including but not limited to potential curriculum revisions, recording and privacy policies, and support technology and personnel. These alternative modalities have proven popular with students and have opened more flexible pathways for them to complete their education goals. The IPRC supports continued exploration of alternative-modality class offerings as we transition into a post-pandemic world.

Distance Education Training

The DEC should be applauded for their efforts in training and supporting faculty over the last three years. They increased the frequency and awareness of training and expanded the resources available for faculty. This was key in the campus being able to meet the demands brought by the pandemic. Due to their efforts, most faculty now have at least some basic Canvas skills. As such, future training is being modified to incorporate more synchronous and asynchronous online pedagogy, DEIA pedagogy, and Canvas LTIs advanced skills.

As we moved out of COVID restrictions, faculty who received emergency certification to teach online while the campus was shut down were required to meet the more rigorous traditional training requirements for online instruction. For the most part, faculty have risen to this new requirement without issue.

With the ongoing popularity of alternative modalities however, new discussions are now necessary to determine if more, or more frequent, ongoing distance education training should be required of faculty moving forward. Specifically, departments and programs are asking if some form of ongoing re-certification of all faculty who teach online would be beneficial moving forward and if so, what that would entail. While the details would still need to be worked out, the IPRC supports the idea of having faculty go through some sort of a re-certification process at regular intervals.

Student Equity and Disaggregation

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

Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs)

CSLO Summary

Fall 2022 Program Review Departments	Courses Assessed		Successful Assessments	
	# Offered	% Assessed	# Assessed	% Successful
Automotive Collision Repair	27	81.5%	1,185	92.1%
Automotive Technology	26	84.6%	3,787	90.6%
Court Reporting	51	98.0%	5,980	88.3%
Dental Assisting	12	100.0%	1,169	97.9%
Diagnostic Medical Sonography	10	100.0%	980	97.3%
Funeral Services	6	100.0%	113	99.1%
Geography/GIS	13	100.0%	4,673	85.2%
Hotel, Restaurant, & Culinary Arts	21	100.0%	5,368	93.4%
Management	7	100.0%	9,409	95.8%
Marketing	4	100.0%	1,340	87.6%
Nursing	18	100.0%	6,079	97.6%
Psychiatric Technology	8	100.0%	2,022	97.8%
Radiologic Technology	17	94.1%	7,694	94.9%
Total since Fall 2018	220	95.0%	49,799	93.2%

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

ISLO Summary

ISLOs	Exceeded Standard		Met Standard		Did not Meet Standard		Total Assessed	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Breadth of Knowledge, Competencies, & Skills								
Business & CIS	10,691	67.4%	3,956	24.9%	1,214	7.7%	15,861	100.0%
CTE	7,918	77.3%	1,506	14.7%	816	8.0%	10,240	100.0%
Health Sciences	12,538	76.8%	3,193	19.5%	602	3.7%	16,333	100.0%
Humanities & The Arts	23	76.7%	7	23.3%	0	0.0%	30	100.0%
Social Sciences	2,681	77.0%	274	7.9%	526	15.1%	3,481	100.0%
Communication								
Reading	31,724	73.2%	8,798	20.3%	2,808	6.5%	43,330	100.0%
Writing	26,243	72.6%	7,421	20.5%	2,469	6.8%	36,133	100.0%
Communicating	31,680	74.2%	8,331	19.5%	2,706	6.3%	42,717	100.0%
Presenting	25,226	72.5%	7,457	21.4%	2,098	6.0%	34,781	100.0%
Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency								
Analysis	24,863	77.4%	5,039	15.7%	2,205	6.9%	32,107	100.0%
Computation	15,576	76.3%	3,205	15.7%	1,639	8.0%	20,420	100.0%
Research	21,944	76.5%	4,940	17.2%	1,793	6.3%	28,677	100.0%
Problem-solving	26,741	77.4%	5,639	16.3%	2,147	6.2%	34,527	100.0%
Technology	26,027	73.0%	7,502	21.0%	2,139	6.0%	35,668	100.0%
Personal, Academic, & Professional Development								
Personal Responsibility	24,161	72.1%	7,304	21.8%	2,025	6.0%	33,490	100.0%
Global Citizenship	12,105	75.3%	2,655	16.5%	1,308	8.1%	16,068	100.0%
Equity	17,635	69.8%	6,000	23.8%	1,628	6.4%	25,263	100.0%

Completed SLO Reporting Recommendations from previous years

Since the eLumen system was adopted, various instructional packets, instructional videos, and training workshops have been created to aid faculty in completing their CSLO assessments and also to help programs with Department PSLO assessment. In addition, the SLO Coordinator has made concerted efforts to update all programs on the CSLO/PSLO work that needs to be completed and has offered help and guidance to all departments that need it. These efforts have increased the CSLO completion rates for departments and allowed many recommendations from previous years to be addressed.

For instance:

Courses are being assessed every semester. The expectation is that at least one CSLO will be assessed for every course. Faculty are encouraged to assess all CSLOs for all sections of courses to provide more meaningful data to the program. Some programs have already been regularly doing so.

All departments are expected to assess Department PSLOs by having the CSLO to PSLO mapping in eLumen complete by the time they participate in instructional program review. All departments reviewed this cycle completed their mapping, and the SLO Committee and IPRC are both committed to guiding others through the process.

A Resources for Student Learning Outcomes (RSLO) Canvas course shell was created by the SLO Coordinator that includes information on CSLOs, CSLO assessment, Department PSLOs, Mapping CSLOs to Department PSLOs, Department PSLO assessment, Degree & Certificate PSLOs, the SLO Handbook, an SLO Committee members list and SLO Committee minutes.

An updated SLO Handbook was created and posted on both the Cypress College SLO webpage and the Resources for Student Learning Outcomes Canvas shell. This handbook contains instructions on how to use eLumen to assess CSLOs, how to complete the CSLO to PSLO mapping process, a template for a degree and certificate PSLOs, and how to run various reports, among other things.

CSLO Status Reports showing the percentage of courses assessed for each division and department are created by Institutional Research and Planning every semester and can be found on the SLO webpage and in the RSLO Canvas course shell.

A workgroup created by the SLO Accreditation Steering Subcommittee created a guide and instructions for implementing Degree & Certificate PSLOs. Beginning Fall 2023, programs should have PSLOs written and pre-launched in CurricUNET for all degrees and certificates for their program and the completion of this task is expected for compliance in Fall 2023 instructional program review. The SLO Coordinator has sent out instructional guides and information to Department Coordinators that includes a template for writing degree and certificate PSLOs. The SLO Coordinator, SLO Committee, and Curriculum Committee are committed to offering guidance to any department or program that may need assistance in writing and inputting these Degree & Certificate PSLOs in CNET.

A process was created to ensure that the CSLOs listed on the faculty syllabi are accurate and match the CSLOs that are listed on the Course Outline of Record (COR) in CurricUNET. This had been an on-going issue underscored in our most recent accreditation report. For faculty, the SLO Coordinator created a guide to facilitate the process and established the policy of sending out a reminder email to all faculty at the beginning of the fall and spring semesters. Division deans (or their designee) would then check each Faculty syllabus in their respective divisions for accurate active CSLOs in the syllabi. A comprehensive Excel file with the links to each COR (which include the active CSLOs) for every course broken down by division has been created, and it will be forwarded to the deans by the SLO Coordinator. While the process has been created, there still needs to be broader implementation and dean involvement. The VPI will be heading this effort.

The criteria for CSLO assessments that departments and programs must meet when going through Instructional Program Review was established. Beginning with Fall 2019, the percentage of courses assessed for each semester should be at least 90%. There should be an exception to Spring 2020 due to the transition to completely remote instruction in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. For Spring 2020, the percentage of courses assessed should be at least 70%. For any subsequent semesters with percentages below 90%, the program should write a brief description on the Instructional Program Review Self-Study Form describing the reason for the lower percentage. The exception statement will be considered by the IPRC in assigning the department's Compliance Status.

Remaining recommendations that are in progress of being addressed:

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

A system that can connect our Curriculum system and our SLO system is still very much needed. Every semester, there are issues in eLumen, which need to be checked and fixed manually by the SLO Coordinator. Also, when there are any revisions to CSLOs or new CSLOs that have been created, these also must be individually entered

into eLumen by the SLO Coordinator. In addition, each time a CSLO is added or revised, a new assessment needs to be created for that course by the SLO Coordinator.

Continued efforts by department coordinators to encourage all faculty to participate in the SLO process is recommended. There has been great growth in the campus culture regarding SLOs over the past several years. Many departments and programs have exceptional CSLO assessment completion rates and have completed the PSLO mapping. However, increased communication by department coordinators is recommended to encourage more Faculty participation. Fulltime faculty have been required to participate in the SLO process for a few years, and the Adjunct Faculty Contract states that they are required to participate in the collection and entry of CSLO assessment data. The IPRC and the SLO Committee are committed to offering guidance to any department or program that may need assistance in encouraging adjunct faculty participation in the CSLO process.

CTE 2-Year Reports (Short Form)

Cypress College additionally reviews each CTE TOP-coded program every two-years (this is known as the “short-form”). These reviews are completed in even numbered years. Institutional Research and Planning provided all CTE programs with labor market wage and employment data, student equity disaggregation, and certificate and degree updates to assist faculty in assessing their programs. The IPRC received 24 CTE Reports (See Appendix C for a list of programs that submitted the short form this cycle). The committee’s commendations and recommendations are as follows:

1. CTE programs under review demonstrated a commitment to student success. The labor market data presented shows strong demand for CTE students, with students accepting favorable job placement and living wages. CTE students are successfully passing exams at the national, state, and regional levels. Established student pathways are actively supporting students earning certificates and degrees, as well as supporting those seeking transfers, and employment.
2. Facilities and Equipment are aging for many CTE programs and need immediate attention. Programs are struggling to stay current with industry standards, accreditation requirements, and modern equipment due lack of funding. Many CTE programs rely of grants or one-time funding to meet these needs, putting extra work on CTE faculty to continue operating successful programs.
3. More classified support is needed to for the CTE programs’ continued success. Divisions and faculty are stretched thin maintaining accreditation standards, in addition to continuing needs for marketing, outreach, industry partnerships, grants, facility/equipment maintenance and budgets.

Specialized Instructional Program (SIP) Review 4-Year Schedule

SIPs 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. Beginning in spring 2024, the IPRC will conduct SIP reviews during the spring semester. To accommodate the new schedule, some SIPs will be undergoing review before 4 years has passed since their initial review. The new schedule appears in [Appendix D](#). As of spring 2023, Legacy, Puente, and STEM have been moved from SIP to the Student Services Program Review (SSPR).

Instructional Program Related Commendations and Recommendations

All programs under review submitted their required review forms. These forms covered the required topics, and they provided detailed plans for achieving their stated actions and goals. The IPRC provided a written summary of the committee’s evaluation to each program presenter for any modifications or updates. The final completed review forms and the committee summaries are posted on the new campus SharePoint site that replaced the old campus “J-drive.”

Global Commendations:

The departments and programs under review demonstrated great innovation, flexibility, and patience in meeting the continually evolving needs of students in the post-pandemic world. These programs have experimented with various modalities of instruction, made important adjustments, and come out of the pandemic nimbler than ever.

Most of the departments and programs under review this year have continued to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives across campus and in the community. Although more work remains, as a whole, the programs under review this year have taken significant steps to ensure the success of historically underrepresented or undeserved populations of students.

The departments and programs under review demonstrated a commitment to staying current in their respective fields. For many programs, this commitment resulted in admirable rates of student success, an increased number of degrees and certificates awarded, and laudable post-degree employment rates.

The departments and programs under review made a commitment to updating their publications, webpages, Canvas shells, and other aspect of their public face. This is a means of publicizing programs at the college and providing public outreach with the hope of increasing student awareness and enrollment.

Global Recommendations:

The following is a list of Global Recommendations that reflect common issues shared across campus. The recommendations are broken down into two categories. The first is Ongoing Recommendations which remain from previous IPRC Annual Reports. The second is New Recommendations which have come from the reviews this cycle.

Ongoing Recommendations:

Below are Global Recommendations made in previous IPRC Annual Reports, but which have not yet been sufficiently addressed. It is hoped that these items will not remain on this list for multiple reports. The years in parentheses represented the Annual Report in which the recommendation originally occurred.

The funding and support for the DE Team remains wholly inadequate. The role and responsibilities of the team have expanded greatly over the past five years; yet their support and funding has not kept up with the pace. The recent COVID-19 crisis further highlighted how overextended the DE Team has become. The IPRC strongly urges the College to meet the needs of the DE Team as outlined in their DE Plan. (2018-2019)

All programs are encouraged to continue to revise their budgets to include specific line items for maintaining/updating equipment and addressing recurring budgetary needs. This should include a revision of supply budgets to meet the current needs for and costs of supplies. This budget should also prioritize resources based on program needs and distinguish whether the expenses are new, on-going, or needed for program growth. This budget should include any costs currently covered by grants or outside funding sources, and the department is encouraged to prepare for the end of any such funding, particularly its impact on the maintenance of equipment and technology. (2019-2020)

Reassigned Time continues to be an issue for several programs. Increasingly, faculty are being asked to take on more non-classroom duties, and there needs to be a reexamination of the released time received as compensation. A more standardized and scheduled process for reviewing reassigned time across campus should be developed. Reassigned time needs to be increased and decreased based on the changing needs of programs and positions. (2019-2020)

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)

Departments and programs should encourage their adjunct faculty to participate in the CSLO data collection and entry process. The Adjunct Faculty contract and Adjunct Instructor Evaluation form now require part-time faculty to enter CSLO data and perform other clerical functions related to the SLO process. Because of this new language, adjunct faculty should now be expected to assess at least one CSLO for each of the classes they teach and enter the results through eLumen. The SLO Coordinator has made concerted efforts to inform departments and programs of this fact, but the message doesn't seem to be getting to everyone. This is the responsibility of all fulltime faculty, particularly coordinators. The SLO Committee and IPRC are both committed to helping programs receive the guidance and resources they need to meet this obligation. (2020-2021)

Departments and programs on campus impacted by the state-imposed restrictions on course repeatability should work together to address the issue and organize efforts to petition the state to revise the policy. This is an issue of particular interest to the Business, Fine Arts, and Kinesiology Divisions. (2020-2021)

The IPRC recommends each department and program engage in the Cypress Course Redesign (CoRe). Based on principles and practices initially introduced through the Long Beach Curriculum Audit, CoRe explores how every department, despite course content, can make immediate, impactful revisions to course curriculum, pedagogy, and outreach to make their classes and programs more equity-minded and welcoming to students. Increasing the number of faculty who go through the Course Redesign should be a priority for the College. There remains enough funding in the Title V grant for two more cohorts of 15 to go through the Course Redesign, but the need for further cohorts may continue for up to five years. The campus will need to find resources and support to continue this work after the grant expires. This can partly be addressed through Professional Development activities on FLEX Day and throughout the semester, but the CoRe efforts need to be fully supported and funded by the campus. (2020-2021)

Several departments across campus expressed a need for greater marketing and social media outreach to help promote their programs and increase enrollments. Resources currently exist for this, but there needs to be greater effort to make faculty aware of them. One suggestion is to have professional development activities dedicated to explaining the resources that exist and best strategies and practices for using them. We know that departments that have increased

their marketing have seen increased outreach, enrollment, and retention, and other departments could benefit from their example. Through this effort, there may be a need to increase campus funding and resources, and the IPRC supports a broad campus discussion about how to combine the various needs for marketing and outreach to get some economy of scale. (2020-2021)

All departments and programs are encouraged to continue updating their publications, web pages, and other aspects of their public face. This is an important way each department can publicizing their programs, expand marketing, and help with public outreach. Aside from improving the image of the department and college, it is hoped these efforts will increase student enrollment and retention. (2020-2021)

New Recommendations:

The following recommendations reflect the committees' evaluation of the programs up for review in the fall of 2022. Any recommendations that are not fully addressed over the next year will roll over to the Global Recommendations: Ongoing section of next year's IPRC Annual Report.

Several of the programs under review this year had substantive needs regarding facilities and/or equipment/technology updates. In some cases, the unmet needs are creating risk to student and faculty safety. In other examples, updates to relevant technology are necessary to ensure students are competitive on the job market.

The IPRC agrees that time needs to be given for classes to grow, particularly new classes being used to improve and clarify pathways for students.

The completion rates for SLOs and PSLO mapping remain low. This is true for both adjunct faculty (as noted in the ongoing recommendations, see above) and full-time faculty. The SLO committee has set a goal of 90% course completion for all programs and many programs under review did not meet that goal. All departments and programs are encouraged to ensure that all faculty, both full-time and adjunct, are aware that SLO completion is a required part of their employment contracts.

Budget Requests and Resource Allocations:

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

During the reviews, there were common budget and resource requests shared by multiple programs and departments of the College. They are detailed below, broken down into two categories. The first is Ongoing Budget Requests which are carried over from previous Annual Reports. It is hoped that items on this list will not remain from year to year. The second is New Budget Requests that came from programs under review this past fall. They all have the full support of the IPRC.

Ongoing Budget Needs and Requests:

Below are resource and budget needs that were in previous IPRC Annual Reports and were once again expressed by departments participating in review this cycle. They have yet to be sufficiently addressed, and it is hoped that these items will not remain on this list for multiple reports. The date in parentheses at the end of item's description is the year of the Annual Report in which it first appeared.

Several programs continue to demonstrate clear needs for new full-time faculty lines. The Faculty Prioritization process since Spring 2020 has been limited only to critical or emergency needs, while retirements, outside accreditation requirements, and the needs of effective instruction continue to place some programs under a great strain. This is a high priority. (2018-2022)

Several programs under review expressed a need for greater classified support to help meet the needs of their programs and the needs of their division. In some cases these needs were putting outside accreditation processes at risk. The IPRC supports the revision of the Classified Prioritization process being done in PBC, particularly the inclusion of the Program Review Summaries to help inform decisions regarding classified support. With so many departments and programs expressing the need, it is essential that the College has a transparent and well-documented process for hiring additional Classified employees. This is a high priority. (2020-2022)

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

establish accurate, right-sized budgets, the College needs to commit to funding them and not leaving essential, on-going resources to the One-Time Funding process. This has been a longstanding issue in the college planning and budget process that the revisions to the Program Review process are designed to address. (2020-2022)

Many departments under review expressed a need for updated technology, along with improvements and/or repairs to their facilities. The need to be current applies to every discipline, but it is particularly important for those programs that must maintain the industry standard for their professions or risk failing to adequately prepare their students for the workplace. These technology needs and their regular maintenance and upgrades should be included in the Technology Master Plan and appropriately funded. This is an area with potential of economy of scale. (2020-2022)

A Special Note about the Campus Theater:

For several semesters, the IPRC has expressed concern with the lack of timely and adequate maintenance, repair, and upgrade of the Campus Theater. The theater serves the whole college as a community exhibition hall, a campus meeting area, a stage for student and community performances, a venue for Opening Day events, and many other purposes. Yet, much of the burden for the upkeep of the theater has fallen on the departmental budgets of the programs in Fine Arts or left to piecemeal improvements made when extra funds are available. A regular schedule for the maintenance and improvement which reflects the shared campus responsibility for the Theater needs to be established and supported by the budget.

This is an issue that has been raised many times in many ways in the past. Previous Instructional Program Review Forms, Program Review Summaries, the past four Program Review Annual Reports, and a Special Academic Senate Resolution all state that maintenance and upgrades of the Campus Theater are needed and responsibility that should fall on the College as a whole. It is beyond time for the College to step up and make this a budget priority.

The Campus Theater is a “front porch” to the College that offers both a public face and welcoming entrance to the rest of the campus. But this potential has been unappreciated resulting in wasted opportunities for both the departments and programs that use it and the campus overall. Investing in developing that potential would increase the College impact in the community, bring in new potential revenue, and, most important, be a great benefit to students and the campus.

For immediate action, the IPRC supports the use of One-Time Funds at the District being used to make repairs and upgrades to the theater. Recent Budget and Financial Reports show the District continues to maintain a large fund of one-time money from which previous amounts were sent to the campuses. In the past, some of that money was allocated to address certain needs of the theater, but it was insufficient to meet the need. A percentage of any future allocations to the campus should be reserved for addressing the unmet needs of the Campus Theater.

Newly Identified Budget Needs and Requests:

The following resource and budget needs come from the comprehensive review of all the programs that presented to the committee this past fall. Any recommendations that are not fully addressed over the next year will roll over to the Ongoing Budget Needs and Requests section of next year’s IPRC Annual Report.

The IPRC supports expanding the funding needed to update the facilities and technologies of the relevant programs under review this year.

The IPRC also supports funding for other projects and events related to the promotion of DEI work on campus and in the community. Departments and programs have expressed the benefits of attending conferences and seminars, creating cultural events and festivals, hosting guest speakers, and many other activities with a DEI focus. But these also require resources and funding.

Looking Forward

The programs up for the full review in Fall 2023 are identified in [Appendix B](#). In November 2023, the IPRC will begin meetings with those programs. IPRC committee members overwhelmingly prefer to continue meeting on Zoom. We have found it to be a far more efficient modality for everyone involved. That said, as with this year, the programs under review in 2023 will be given the option of presenting in-person, on-campus should that be their preference.

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

The committee will also work to expand the dialogue regarding issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion in the review process and across campus. Balancing the many views and opinions will be critical and every effort will be made to

ensure that all voices are heard. But the commitment to continue the conversation and convert that dialogue into action that brings lasting change will not be deterred.

Lastly, the IPRC will continue to work closely with the SLO Committee to ensure that all departments and programs are aware of the contractual requirement of adjunct faculty to collect and enter CSLO data. This is part of the next step in creating a campus culture where SLO assessment is continuous and meaningful.

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

Appendix A: Timeline for the 2022-2023 Instructional Program Review Cycle

May 2023: Email the deans with the next programs required to submit reports by October 15.

Summer 2023: IRPC sends the prepopulated self-study forms and SLO summary reports to the deans by Opening Day in August.

August 2023: Send deadline reminder email to all deans.

September 2023: Committee plans to meet twice during the month.

October 10, 2023: Faculty submit their self-studies to their deans for comments and signature.

October 24, 2023: Faculty submit their final self-study reports to the IPRC Chair.

November 2023: Presentations every Monday from 3-5 (four 15-minute presentations per week).

December 2023: Program Review Summaries will be sent to all the programs under review.

February 2024: Committee meets to review results and feedback from summaries.

March/April 2024: Prepare final report for submission to the Academic Senate, PBC, and PAC. Note: If the Program Review Chair's position is due to be replaced, forward a copy of the job description (found in the Program Review Handbook on the website) to the current Academic President; ask that a call for applicants be put out. Review the applicants with the committee and collaborate with the Academic Senate president to select a new chair.

April 2024/May 2024: Present the annual report to the Academic Senate, PBC, and PAC. Replace termed out committee members who have served for three-years. Add the annual report to the Program Review website and post the self-studies on the Sharepoint site.

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

CYCLE #1: Fall 2016, 2020, 2024 (13 programs)

Accounting

Administration of Justice (New to PR) Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Aviation & Travel Careers

CIS

Dental Hygiene

Health Information Technology Human Services

Journalism

Media Arts Design Mortuary Science Photography Theater Arts

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

Anthropology Biology English

ESL

Ethnic Studies Foreign Language History

Library (New to PR) Music

Philosophy & Religious Studies Physical Science

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

Auto Collision Repair Auto Technology Court Reporting Dental Assisting Geography/GIS HRC (Culinary Arts)

Management/Marketing

Mortuary Science Baccalaureate Degree (NEW Program) Nursing

Psychiatric Technology

Radiologic Technology/Medical Diagnostics

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

Art Chemistry

Communication Studies Counseling

Dance Economics Mathematics Political Science Kinesiology Psychology Sociology

Appendix C: Programs Presenting CTE 2-Year Reports (Short Form)

The following CTE programs presented Two-Year Reports:

Accounting
Administration of Justice
Air Conditioning & Refrigeration
Automotive Collision Repair
Automotive Technology
Aviation & Travel Careers
Computer Information Systems
Court Reporting
Dental Assisting
Dental Hygiene
Diagnostic Medical Sonography
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
Radiologic Technology
Theatre Arts

Appendix D: Department Planning and Program Review Form 2022

Division:

Department:

Department Coordinator:

Date:

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

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

Mission Statement

Mission statements broadly describe the overall purpose of an organization. As a department, your purpose should support the mission of your division and the college as a whole.

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

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

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.

Full-Time Faculty Ratio - Please comment on the full-time faculty FTEF ratio reported below. If there were any significant staffing issues, reassigned time, or leaves that impacted educational quality or student success, please explain.

Note. The data summarizes the percent of FTEF taught by full-time faculty for the year.

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

Note. Cypress College's ACCJC institution-set standards for degree and certificate completion are 1,277 degrees and 571 certificates that are 18+ units.

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

Note. Cypress College's ACCJC institution-set standards for transfers is 879.

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

Note. Cypress College's ACCJC institution-set standards for successful course completion is 72.0%.

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.

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

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

Student Equity – Please review the following student equity data and identify any notable equity gaps in course success rates, as well as any strategies to improve course success rates for the student subpopulations.

Note. The equity gap represents the percentage point difference from the average course success rate.

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.

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.

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)

Note. All SLOs 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 SLO for that course.

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

If your percentage of courses assessed is not 100%, what seems to be the largest obstacle in assessing within this timeframe?

Based on your CSLO results, are there any unique attributes for the delivery mode (online, hybrid, and on campus) that need to be addressed?

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?

What resources are needed to implement these changes?

Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

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

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

List improvements made as a result of the PSLO and CSLO review process.

After reviewing your PSLOs, what changes, if any, would you make to PSLOs and CSLOs?

What resources are needed to implement these changes?

Curriculum

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

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

Provide a list of these courses:

What is the plan for reviewing these courses?

Diversity and Equity

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?

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?

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?

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

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)

Department Objectives

Past Action Plans – Using the last Department Planning and 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.

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

Note. [Cypress College 2017-20 Strategic Plan](#) (refer to directions, goals, and objectives as necessary) and ILOs and PLOs are referenced in the [Cypress College Catalog](#) (see page 5).

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.

Rank	Request Name	Amount	Maintenance or Improvement	One-Time or Ongoing	Dept., Div. or Campus Need	# Students Impacted
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						

Note. Please indicate safety needs with a * in the request name

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.

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

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

Department Planning and Program Review Participation

Department Coordinator (print and sign):

Participating Faculty (print and sign):

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

Division Dean Evaluation

This portion of the Department Planning and Program Review form is to be completed by the Division Dean.

Mission Statement

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

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?

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?

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?

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

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?

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

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

Student Support Services

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

Department Objectives

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

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

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 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 (2021)
Dual Enrollment (2021)
English Success Center (2021)
Honors/Service Learning (2020)
Math Learning Center (2021)
Tutoring (2021)
Study Abroad*
Supplemental Instruction (2021) Teacher Preparation**

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

**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 Summaries

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

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

Auto Collision Repair

Auto Technology

Court Reporting

Dental Assisting

Diagnostics Medical Sonography

Funeral Services

Geography/GIS

HRC (Culinary Arts)

Management/Marketing Mortuary Science Baccalaureate Degree (NEW Program)

Nursing

Psychiatric Technology

Radiologic Technology/ Medical Diagnostic

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Automotive Collision Repair

Presenter: Larry Ramos

Date: November 21, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments:

Automotive Collision Repair program report noted some critical maintenance needs. Though the data shows gaps in student success rate, committee members in the field note that student success in this program may be measured in other ways. For example, the program routinely

places students in high paying jobs in the industry even prior to completion so students may not be motivated by traditional academic markers such as certificates or degrees earned.

To stay up to date with the field, the program is planning to launch an Automotive Vinyl Wrap Program in the future. Finally, the program is working on incorporating a lab portion of the course ARC 020, but will require resources to do so.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0%	Spring 2019 – 76.9%
Fall 2019 – 100.0%	Spring 2020 – 61.5%
Fall 2020 – 100.0%	Spring 2021 – 91.7%
Fall 2021 – 91.7%	Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 81.5%. The semester CSLO assessment completion percentage was low for Spring 2020 but has improved and been good the following semesters. It is recommended that the Automotive Collision Repair department continue to implement strategies to continue with the high CSLO assessment completion percentages. As a result of assessment, the department noted that instructors need to incorporate some lab activities to help student success and retention rates in ACR 020. The department also noted that additional equipment specific to this course would help students complete lab activities and stay engaged for the entire semester.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Automotive Collision Repair department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. According to the Department PSLO data table, 92.1% of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for all Department PSLOs. It is recommended that the department revisit the PSLO mapping to discuss ways to make the PSLO data more distinct and meaningful. It is recommended that the department explore and discuss the possibility of writing CSLOs for courses that map to the PSLO subcategory, Equity. As a result of the assessment process, the department noted, “Students are assisted in filling out task sheets which outline core competencies as listed by NATEF, National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation.” The

department noted that ongoing updates of equipment and facilities would help improve student learning and success.

Commendations:

The Automotive Collision Faculty show consistent passion and concern for students and their success. The committee would like to specifically commend Larry Ramos on his dedication to his program. Mr. Ramos became Department Chair shortly after being tenured, and has run the department on his own during the past year due to the illness of the other full-time faculty in his department. He also serves on the school's curriculum committee and has no clerical support. As noted above, students who complete the program have ample employment opportunities and are routinely earning more than a living wage. This is due in no small part to faculty involvement in helping students enter the work force by connecting them with potential employers. It should also be noted that the program boasts a very high success rate for veterans (93.1%).

Recommendations:

The safety of the lab is of utmost concern. As noted in the budget section of this summary, vital repairs are needed to keep students and faculty safe. Further, the committee recommends that the program work with groups like Legacy to address the large equity gap with African- American students.

As noted above, the committee recommends that the program maintain its recently improved SLO and PSLO completion rates. To this end, it may be helpful to create a SLO lab for faculty to complete the SLOs together to ensure SLOs are entered on time.

We also recommend that the program work with the SLO coordinator to enhance the elumen connection between PSLOs and CSLOs.

Finally, we recommend the program create a detailed plan to address the gaps that have developed in student success data. This program may benefit from automatically awarding certificates to students who have done the work to earn them but are not applying for them at completion.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department

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

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Lab floor	\$40K	M	D	O	CN	N	200
2	Paint on walls	\$10K	M	D	O	M	N	200
3	NATEF Recertification	\$3K	M	D	O	M	N	200
4	Required Instructor Industry Training	\$7500	M	D	O	M	N	200
5	Roof cover for Tech Ed 3 107 lower lot w/lighting	\$15K	T	D	O	CN	N	200
6	Mix Room Ventilation	\$100K	T	D	O	CN	RN	200
7	Cover and gate between vehicle storage yard and building 10	\$25K	T	D	O	CN	N	200

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Admin. T = Technology/Materials M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time C = Continuing/On-Going

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

Age: N = New Request RR = Repeat/Received RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The program has demonstrated a critical need for facilities maintenance to ensure student and faculty health and safety. The mixing room ventilation need is putting student and faculty health at risk and the lab floor is now a fall hazard. This should be addressed as soon as possible

The committee also supports the funding request for roof covering and the gate between the storage and building 10 as these are necessary for the program to function properly.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation Program: Automotive Technology

Presenter: Martin Orozco

Date: November 7, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments:

The Auto motive Technology Program report noted some important program needs and impressive program successes, but the self-study left some details of the current program and future planning unaddressed. For example, the low success rate of AT 105 C is not addressed,

nor were the stated equity gaps. The department is open to more group training on diversity, implicit bias, and microaggressions to foster inclusiveness within the department, but there are no current plans in place to implement such training. Finally, the program predicts 4 of the 6 full time faculty may retire in the following three years and therefore planning is necessary in order to help the program through the transitions.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0%	Spring 2019 – 91.7%
Fall 2019 – 80.0%	Spring 2020 – 76.9%
Fall 2020 – 75.0%	Spring 2021 – 68.8%
Fall 2021 – 56.3%	Spring 2022 – 73.3%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 84.6%. The semester CSLO assessment completion percentages have been low the last 6 semesters. The committee recommends that either the Department Coordinator or a designee follow up with faculty by sending email reminders to complete CSLO assessments each semester. We also recommend that the Department Coordinator or a designee remind adjunct faculty in the department that CSLO assessment is included in their contract.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Automotive Technology department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Automotive Technology PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 94% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Research. The committee recommends that the department explore and discuss the possibility of writing CSLOs for courses that map to the PSLO subcategories in Personal, Academic, & Professional Development. The department noted that more funding to purchase emerging technology for instructional equipment and more instructional space would help improve student learning and success.

Commendations:

The committee commends the program on revising its fundamentals course to encourage more

women to enter the field of Automotive Technology. Further, the committee commends the program on its past “crash course” workshop in basic automotive maintenance designed to increase female applicants. According to the program, they need more DEI training for faculty, but they are to be commended for identifying this need and working toward this goal.

The committee also commends the program on its success in graduate earnings. The report noted that the median change in earnings for its students is 64% compared to the statewide rate of 35%. Finally, it is commendable that the program offers breaks to students so that they can participate in the free meal program.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends that the Automotive Technology Department Coordinator take a more hands-on and proactive approach to faculty compliance with SLOs, equity initiatives, and pedagogical standards. SLOs are part of the adjunct contract and compliance should be enforced via the adjunct evaluation process. The committee recommends that the program invite the SLO coordinator to offer a SLO training workshop, or real-time lab, to ensure SLO completion. The program is also encouraged to extend a similar invitation to representatives from Legacy, Puente, or from the DEI committee for equity training.

Although, the committee shares the program leadership’s concerns for academic freedom, the department coordinator should feel empowered to strongly encourage professional development for faculty related to teaching methodologies and lesson planning to enhance educational effectiveness and student achievement. In addition, the committee recommends that the program create a detailed plan to recruit faculty with more pedagogical competency. Hiring a recruiter may be part of that plan, but a more detailed strategy for improving teaching competency is also needed.

Finally, the committee recommends that Automotive Technology strategize, plan, and execute ways to help students apply for their eligible certificates such as by means of workshops or seminars.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Added Work Space	\$500K	T	D	O	I	N	600
2	Added Vehicle Storage	\$500K	T	D	O	I	N	600
3	Specialized diagnostic equipment	\$200K	T	D	O	I	N	600
4	Shop Lighting	\$100K	T	D	O	I	N	600
5	Faculty Recruiter	\$85K	F	D	O	I	N	600
6	Professional Development	\$10K	?	D	O	I	N	600

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Admin. T = Technology/Materials M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time C = Continuing/On-Going

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

Age: N = New Request RR = Repeat/Received RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The program has demonstrated a need for funding to improve or increase workspace and equipment including a classroom for the Toyota and Subaru programs, which are growing in popularity. With Buildings TE-1 (the schools forgotten building) and TE-3 scheduled for remodel the report did not state if the work on these two buildings would address the issue of badly needed shop space for Auto Tech.

The committee supports the funding request for improved shop lighting as this is a safety issue.

The committee agrees with the program that funding for professional development is needed, but a more detailed plan for improving teaching competency is needed.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Court Reporting **Presenter:** Carolee Freer **Date:** November 28, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments:

The Court Reporting program presented a comprehensive report noting an increase in total certificates issued to students and demonstrated a need for a second full-time faculty member. The presentation noted that its average student is atypical for Cypress College, often older, and starting a second career in court reporting.

Program CSLOs:

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

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 94.4%	Spring 2019 – 90.6%
Fall 2019 – 97.1%	Spring 2020 – 100.0%
Fall 2020 – 97.1%	Spring 2021 – 95.0%
Fall 2021 – 92.7%	Spring 2022 – 82.4%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 98.0%. Although the Spring 2022 CSLO assessment completion percentage was low, the Court Reporting department has done an excellent job of assessing CSLOs all other semesters. After reviewing the CSLO assessment data, the Court Reporting department noted that student success rates have increased since having instruction back on campus part time after being fully remote due to the pandemic. As a result of the assessment data, the department also noted they have altered curriculum to include non-credit courses with the goal to increase student learning and success rates.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Court Reporting department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Court Reporting PSLOs. According to the Department PSLO data table, 88.3% of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for most Department PSLOs. It is recommended that the department revisit the PSLO mapping to discuss ways to make the PSLO data more distinct and meaningful. As a result of the PSLO and CSLO review process, the department noted, “The faculty is more aware of the goals that students need to achieve in order to be successful in the program.”

Commendations:

Court Reporting is to be commended on its increase in certificates issued. The program is one of the few programs in the state and appears to be equipping students very well for jobs that are in high demand.

Recommendations:

The presentation noted that there can be an economic barrier for students in this program. It might be helpful if the program could offer grants or scholarships for students to pay for the needed equipment. The program clearly demonstrated a need for an additional full-time faculty member to meet student demand.

Although there was a marked improvement in this program since its last review, it is imperative the program stay current with voice technology in court reporting in order to best equip students for the changing demands of the field.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Full Time Faculty	\$65K	F	D	C	I	RN	80-100

*Amount: Total \$ amount
for request*

Type: F = Faculty C = T = M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time C = Continuing/On-

*Need
Going*

Purpose: CN = Critical Need M = Prog. I = Prog. G = Prog. Growth

Maintenance Improvement

Age: N = New Request RR = RN = Repeat/Not

Repeat/Received Received

*Impact: # of students
impacted*

BUDGET COMMENTS:

1. The department has demonstrated the need for a full-time faculty hire. They have made this request in the past and have not received the funds. The program is one of the few court reporting programs in the state and there is a high demand for qualified court reporters.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Dental Assisting

Presenter: Joel Silva

Date: November 28, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments:

The Dental Assisting program that noted some important improvements to the program and impressive, SLO completion rates, and student success rates. There was however some important information missing from the original report. The committee asks that the program see the requests below for further information in the program's response to this summary.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0% Spring 2019 – 100.0%

Fall 2019 – 100.0% Spring 2020 – 100.0%

Fall 2020 – 100.0% Spring 2021 – 100.0%

Fall 2021 – 100.0% Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 100.0%. The Dental Assisting department is doing an outstanding job of assessing CSLOs. After reviewing the CSLO assessment data, the Dental Assisting department noted that student success rates declined somewhat during the pandemic. The department also noted that updated radiology machines and software are needed to help improve student success as the downtime due to machines not functioning properly impacts student performance. The department also noted that a resource needed to help implement changes to improve student success would include more IT assistance with trouble shooting data issues related to digital radiographic machines.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Dental Assisting department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The vast majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Dental Assisting PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 99.4% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Research. It is recommended that the department revisit the PSLO mapping to discuss ways to potentially make the PSLO data more distinct and meaningful. After reviewing PSLO data results, the department noted that English was added as a prerequisite to help improve student success rates.

Commendations:

The Dental assisting program is serving students very well and preparing them for in-demand jobs. They are to be commended on their high student success rates, as well as their recruiting and success rates of their male students, who are a minority in the field. They also made excellent use of Strong Workforce funding to obtain cutting edge technology for their students. Their SLO completion rate is also impressive.

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

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The department has demonstrated the need for a full-time faculty hire to meet the needs of a growing program. *Between the submission of the program's report and of the writing of this summary, this position has been approved but not yet filled.

Air and water filters are necessary for student and faculty safety.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation Program: Diagnostic Medical Sonography

Presenter: Nancy Corrales & Lynn Mitts

Date: November 14, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments:

The Diagnostic Medical Sonography Program report noted some urgent and important program needs and impressive program success.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0%	Spring 2019 – 100.0%
Fall 2019 – 80.0%	Spring 2020 – 100.0%
Fall 2020 – 100.0%	Spring 2021 – 100.0%
Fall 2021 – 100.0%	Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 100.0%. Although the Fall 2019 CSLO assessment completion percentage was somewhat low, the Diagnostic Medical Sonography department has done an excellent job of assessing CSLOs since that semester. It was noted by the department that the Program Director's involvement with ensuring CSLO assessment completion after Fall 2019 has helped with the CSLO assessment completion percentages.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Diagnostic Medical Sonography department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Diagnostic Medical Sonography PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 100.0% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Equity. In addition, 98.2% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Presenting.

Commendations:

The committee commends the program on an impressive 100% pass rate on national board exams and a 92% retention rate. Moreover, the program runs at full capacity and maintains a stellar 100% employment rate for their graduates.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends that the program continue with efforts to recruit and support more male and African American students. The committee further recommends the program continue to utilize the strong workforce funds to gain adequate technology and equipment. We also recommend the program encourage students to check their major to allow for accurate date and information for guided pathways data.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Full Time Faculty	\$90K	F	V	O	CN	RN	40
2	Equipment Maintenance	\$5-10K	M	D	C	M	N	40
3	Sonography equipment	\$100K	T	D	C	I	N	40
4	Staff Development	\$3.5K	C	D	C	I	N	40
5	Advisory meeting	\$200	C	D	C	M	N	40
6	App for Reaccreditation	\$3-5K	C	D	C	M	N	40

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Admin. T = Technology/Materials M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time C = Continuing/On-Going

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

Age: N = New Request RR = Repeat/Received RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

BUDGET COMMENTS:

1. The program has demonstrated an urgent need for a full-time faculty member and a dedicated Clinical Coordinator to meet accreditation standards. Currently, the Program Director cannot fulfill both positions because accreditation standards do not allow it.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Funeral Services

Presenter: Jolena Grande and Damon de la Cruz

Date: November 21, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments:

The Funeral Services report noted some critical program needs and impressive program successes. The department appears to have low enrollment though the percentages presented in the report do not represent the capacity of the program. Due to the nature of the pilot program which began in 2017 and pending legislation, the program was unable to function at its full capacity. The AB927 bill just passed in 2021 which will allow the Bachelor of Science in Funeral Services program to continue permanently. Subsequently, the program does not have Guided Pathways data or Labor Market and Employment data. The program is now working on creating the seamless pathway for the students.

This program has struggled with lack of full-time faculty. As of 2022 the department has 4 full-time faculty. This need was noted previously in the 2018 program review. As a result of this unmet need, the B.S program is not in compliance with ACCJC.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0% Spring 2019 – 100.0%

Fall 2019 – 66.7% Spring 2020 – 100.0%

Fall 2020 – 100.0% Spring 2021 – 100.0%

Fall 2021 – 100.0% Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Comments:

Although the Fall 2019 CSLO assessment completion percentage is low, the Funeral Services department has been doing an excellent job of assessing CSLOs all other semesters. As a result of the assessment process and the data results, the department noted they are looking forward to launching the true BSFS 8-semester program Fall 2024. The department also noted that hiring a full-time faculty member would help support the BSFS program.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The eLumen PSLO summary report is included, but the data table is based off of courses in the BSFS program other than Mortuary Science courses. The Mortuary Science courses that are part of the BSFS program are not mapped and Health Science 361 is not mapped.

Commendations:

The Funeral Services Program is an example of a well-developed and well-followed plan for success. The program should also be commended on their commitment to equity on multiple fronts. In the male dominated field of mortuary science, a majority of the program's students are female. Further, the program has been particularly successful with African American students. The program strives to partner with Legacy and its faculty have enthusiastically participated in Legacy's mentor program. This is particularly important given that the African

American community is vastly underrepresented by the current racial make-up of funeral professionals. The program shows a 100% success rate for African American students and only positive equity gaps exist for other groups.

Recommendations:

The IPRC recommends that the program the website be updated and relaunched as it has been down since Spring 2022.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Full Time Faculty	\$100K	F	D/V/C	O	CN	RN	150
2	Full Time Admin Assistant	\$85K	C	D	O	CN	RN	150
3	Department Budget Supplementation	\$50K	M	D	O	M	RN	150

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Admin. T = Technology/Materials M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time C = Continuing/On-Going

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

Age: N = New Request RR = Repeat/Received RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

BUDGET COMMENTS:

ACCJC Standard III.A.7 states that at least one full-time faculty member be assigned to the baccalaureate program. This standard is technically satisfied by a full-time faculty member in the program coordinator position. That said, the program has demonstrated

a reasonable need for both an additional full- time faculty member and a dedicated full- time administrative assistant.

With regard to the Administrative Assistant position, the program presentation noted that the current patch work solution of splitting an administrative staff member between departments has resulted in both departments being underserved.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Geography / GIS **Presenter:** Eric Bladh **Date:** 11/14/2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments:

The Geography / GIS program made an impressive and informative presentation highlight the programs many successes.

Program CSLOs

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

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0%	Spring 2019 – 100.0%
Fall 2019 – 100.0%	Spring 2020 – 88.9%
Fall 2020 – 100.0%	Spring 2021 – 100.0%
Fall 2021 – 100.0%	Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 100.0%. The Geography/GIS department is doing an excellent job of assessing CSLOs. As a result of the assessment process, the department identified the need to restructure some of the CSLOs to obtain more distinct data.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Geography/GIS department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Geography/GIS PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 85.6% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Technology.

Commendations:

The committee commends the program on its dedication to staying current in the field. As the presentation noted, drone technology is a growing rapidly field the program is committed to equipping students to meet the demands of work in the field through its software and technology. The department is also working to create a GIS certificate in drone mapping.

Further, the department is in the process of curriculum revisions based upon standards relating to the geospatial competency model.

The Geography/GIS program also impressively integrates community collaboration into its learning goals and has completed projects in partnership with the Irvine Great Park and Los Alamitos School District. The program's faculty and leadership have also shown an admirable commitment to diversity and equity in the classroom and in the field at large.

Finally, the committee specifically recognizes the commitment Eric Bladh has shown to his program. When faced with the issue of competing courses offered at Fullerton College, Eric Bladh made public comments at FC's curriculum committee meeting and joined the Cypress College curriculum committee in response to this issue.

Recommendations:

As the program already knows, it is critical that Geography/GIS stay current with equipment, and technology, as well as in hiring adjuncts who are current and active in the industry. The committee recommends Geography/GIS continue to build its program to increase transfer rates and fill rates for the higher-level courses. Adding related certificates, including one for GIS Aerial Mapping for example, would likely be helpful in recruiting students and maintaining success rates. From the program's presentation, it would also seem prudent to ensure that the Aerial Mapping Certificate courses have the appropriate prerequisites as this certificate requires that students already have drone operation skills. Similarly, "Major Checks" may also help with tracking unidentified geology majors.

The committee recommends the program develop a plan to address the lower fill rates in the higher-level courses. The program noted that student success rates were lower in these courses when offered in an online modality. The committee recommends the program consider a hybrid modality to potentially address this disparity. Finally, the committee recommends the program continue working toward its goal of increasing the number of transfers to the CSU system.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	ESRI ArcGIS Site License	\$2500	T	D	C	M	N	50
2	Done2 Map Licence	\$1500	T	D	C	M	N	50

*Amount: Total \$ amount
for request*

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Admin. T = Technology/Materials M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time C = Continuing/On-Going

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

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The program has demonstrated a need for funding to maintain its access to current technology.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Hotel, Restaurant, and Culinary Arts **Presenter:** Lisa Clark and Amanda Gargano **Date:** November 7, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments: The HRC representatives presented a well-written and comprehensive review that reflected the program's commitment to student success, equity, campus service, and continued program growth and improvement.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 94.1%	Spring 2019 – 80.0%
Fall 2019 – 100.0%	Spring 2020 – 100.0%
Fall 2020 – 92.9%	Spring 2021 – 100.0%
Fall 2021 – 100.0%	Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 100.0%. The Hotel, Restaurant, & Culinary Arts department is doing an excellent job of assessing CSLOs. As a result of the assessment process, the department identified the need to rebrand and update curriculum for HRC 170 (Beverage Management). The department noted that hiring more Faculty and having a larger facility with additional lab space would help facilitate the expansion of the program.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Hotel, Restaurant, & Culinary Arts department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed (84%+) are meeting or exceeding the standard for Hotel, Restaurant, & Culinary Arts PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 99.4% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Research. In addition to the Department PSLOs, the department has also written Degree & Certificate PSLOs for the program.

Commendations:

The HRC is to be commended on a course success rate of 89.5%. This is due in part to the program's commitment to "intrusive" or comprehensive and proactive advising. Further, the HRC program is particularly well organized for student success. Guided Pathways is integrated into the program to promote student success and achievement, and stackable certificates and 2 pre-transfer degrees are offered. An impressive 159 certificates were awarded during the 2021- 2022 school year. Further, HRC has developed a mentorship program, which is in the planning process and will launch in 2 months to promote student success.

The HRC program is also to be commended on revising their department mission for greater equity and inclusion.

Finally, the committee commends the HRC Faculty for fully embracing distance ed training and

for their impressive level of involvement in shared governance and campus service.

Recommendations:

The HRC Program is encouraged to continue to improve success rates for diverse groups of students especially male students, African American students, students with disabilities, and LatinX students by actively seeking out collaboration opportunities with programs like Legacy and Puente.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	FT Classified Lab Tech	\$80k	C	D	C	CN	RN	800
2	FT Faculty	\$120K	F	D	C	CN	RN	800
3	Campus Funded Lab Fees	\$60K	T	D	C	M	RN	400
4	Relocate to Cypress Campus	\$24 Mil	T	D/C	O	PG	N	600
5	Remodel/Expansion of the HRC at the Anaheim Campus	\$6Mil	T/M	D/C	O	PG	N	600
6	Maintenance/ Facility Repair	\$50K	M	D	O	I	N	400

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Admin. T = Technology/Materials M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time C = Continuing/On-Going

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

Age: N = New Request RR = Repeat/Received RN = Repeat/Not Received

*Impact: # of students
impacted*

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The committee supports HRC's budget requests for a full-time Lab Tech to meet safety needs, and a full-time faculty member in Nutrition/Food Science. The Lab Tech need is a safety concern and the program has requested this additional position since 2009.

The program has demonstrated that relocating HRC to the Cypress Campus would double the number of students served by the program, and provide the program with the new technology necessary to stay relevant and ensure technological competence of faculty and students.

Lottery funds are available for some lab fees, but not for all, therefore greater equity regarding lab fees is included within the program's budgetary goals.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Management & Marketing

Presenter: Jeannie Jo

Date: November 21, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments:

The Management & Marketing program presented a comprehensive report that detailed the programs needs and highlighted their substantive successes. The Management & Marketing program have seen some predicable impact on enrollment from the pandemic, but they maintain an above 80% transfer rate. Course success rates have also recovered and are going up. Management success rates for Fall 2021 is at 92.1% and Spring 2022 is at 89.9% both above division and college rates. Marketing's success rates for Fall 2021 is at 84.5% and Spring 2022 is at 75.7% below division but still above college rates.

The program is responding to student demand for more hybrid modality courses and is expecting further growth with these new offerings.

Management and Marketing stated that increasing the number of degrees and certificates was a primary goal. To that end, they are offering extra credit in various courses to students who set up a Comprehensive Educational Plan. Further, they are working toward enhancing teaching methods and recruiting students from under-represented groups.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Management:

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0%	Spring 2019 – 100.0%
Fall 2019 – 80.0%	Spring 2020 – 100.0%
Fall 2020 – 100.0%	Spring 2021 – 100.0%
Fall 2021 – 100.0%	Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Marketing:

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0%	Spring 2019 – 100.0%
Fall 2019 – 100.0%	Spring 2020 – 100.0%
Fall 2020 – 100.0%	Spring 2021 – 100.0%
Fall 2021 – 100.0%	Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Comments:

The Management & Marketing department is doing an excellent job of assessing CSLOs.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Management & Marketing department has completed both the PSLO mapping in eLumen

for Management and the PSLO mapping in eLumen for Marketing. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for both areas of Management and Marketing. One of the highlights from the Management PSLO data results is that 96.2% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Analysis. It is recommended that the department revisit the Marketing PSLO mapping to discuss ways to make the PSLO data more distinct and meaningful.

Commendations:

The program has created an innovative and successful “Shark Tank” experience for the students to compete and demonstrate their learning in a fun and engaging way. The “Shark Tank” project (based on the popular reality television show of the same name) provides an opportunity for students to present a product or entrepreneurial idea and the winners receive public recognition and vouchers for the College Bookstore.

The Management and Marketing program is to be commended on how it has weathered the pandemic and its improving enrollment and student success rates. Finally, the program makes ample and successful use of social media to reach students and stay relevant.

Recommendations:

As they noted in their presentation, the Management and Marketing program should work toward closing equity gaps and recruiting more students from under-represented groups.

The committee also recommends increased training or hiring to address the specialized areas necessary to keep their students competitive in the job market—though as the program noted, new faculty hires and financial support for training will be necessary to meet this goal.

Instead of making counselor meetings and education plans extra credit, the program might consider making them required assignments embedded in the curriculum.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Shark Tank	\$6K	T	V	C	M	N	100+

2	Adjunct Faculty	\$20K	F	D	C	I	RN	200
3	New Program training / New Curriculum in Mkt	\$15K	T	D	O	I	RN	200

*Amount: Total \$ amount
for request*

Type: F = Faculty C = T = M = Maintenance

Classified/Admin. Technology/Materials

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time C = Continuing/On-Going

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

Age: N = New Request RR = Repeat/Received RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The program demonstrated a critical need for adjunct faculty. The program is experiencing, and expecting even more growth and all current full time and adjunct faculty are teaching the maximum allowed courses.

The program further demonstrated a need for new training and curriculum to stay current in the field. Given the dynamic nature of the management and marketing industries, it is vital that the program keep equipping students with up to date curriculum. *

Give the success of the Shark Tank project, and the excitement the project generated among students, the committee fully supports the program's request for funding to keep the project going.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Nursing

Presenter: Dr. Colleen Peralta, Michael Faraci and Thu Pham

Date: November 28, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments:

The Nursing programs report highlighted some important success and several critical needs in faculty and staffing. The Board of Registered Nursing requires adequate space and administration for a simulation and skills lab. Currently, both share the same space which is compromising the compliance of the program.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0%	Spring 2019 – 100.0%
Fall 2019 – 84.6%	Spring 2020 – 85.7%
Fall 2020 – 90.0%	Spring 2021 – 100.0%
Fall 2021 – 100.0%	Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 100.0%. Although the Fall 2019 CSLO assessment completion percentage was somewhat low, the Nursing department has done an excellent job of assessing CSLOs since that semester.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Nursing department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The vast majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Nursing PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 99.6% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Research. In addition, 99.0% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Computation.

Commendations:

The nursing program presented a comprehensive report that reflected wide faculty participation in the review process. The program is to be commended on its strong commitment to student success, its diverse faculty and the commitment its faculty has shown to providing qualified nursing graduates for the community. The program has used innovative tutoring, mentoring, and remediation techniques to help students to succeed in the program and or re-enter the program. This has resulted in strong course completion rates and overall low equity gaps. This has been particularly impressive given that the program has been woefully understaffed.

Recommendations:

The program is encouraged to look into already available computing spaces that might help meet their computer testing needs in the short term and to request and formulate a detailed quote for the computer lab to meet the long -term need. As the program already noted in their presentation, modernizing the curriculum was recommended by the director. If funds are

required to accomplishing that, the program should include the amount needed in their written response to the IPRCs summary.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	SIM Coordinator	\$98.4K	F	D	C	CN	RN	180
2	Full-Time Faculty	\$295.2K	F	D	C	CN	N	180
3	Clinical Coordinator	\$73.8K	C	D	C	CN	N	180
4	Student Success Coord	\$70.11K	C	D	C	I	N	180
5	Computer Lab	\$?	T	V	O	I	N	1000

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Admin. T = Technology/Materials M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus
Length: O = One-Time C = Continuing/On-Going

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

Age: N = New Request RR = Repeat/Received RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The program has demonstrated a critical need for a full-time simulation coordinator to help provide simulation clinical hours. Due to the pandemic, the clinical sites and facilities have changed, and the program is lacking in clinical sites for the students. As a result, the program must rely on patient simulation to meet clinical hours. The program has relied on grant money to fund the simulation/skills lab coordinator, but due to the temporary status of the position, the attrition rate is extremely high (approximately one year, and the employee leaves). The result is that the program invests time and money training the individual only to have them take their skills elsewhere.

Two faculty will be leaving/retiring soon and will require replacement. The program has need of four full-time faculty positions, but are only requesting two.

The committee supports the request for the student success coordinator to help students meet program standards and goals, enhance retention, and help students to re-enter the program with greater success.

The committee also supports the request for a full-time clerical clinical coordinator, which would be classified staff, to support the rotation of students at various off-site facilities and the required documentation necessary to facilitate required clinical hours. This position will help to increase enrollment which has not rebounded since the pandemic.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Psychiatric Technology

Presenter: Jaime Ramos

Date: November 7, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments: The Psychiatric Technology Department presented a clear report that outlined the programs notable student success rates and areas for improvement.

Program CSLOs:

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

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0%	Spring 2019 – 100.0%
Fall 2019 – 57.1%	Spring 2020 – 50.0%
Fall 2020 – 40.0%	Spring 2021 – 66.7%
Fall 2021 – 40.0%	Spring 2022 – 66.7%

Comments:

The semester CSLO assessment completion percentages have been low the last 6 semesters. It was noted by the department that there is a plan to set up a process with the Dean to send friendly reminders to faculty to complete CSLO assessments. It was also noted that the Department Coordinator will include an SLO agenda item during department meetings.

It is recommended that either the Department Coordinator or Course Coordinators also follow up with faculty by sending email reminders to complete CSLO assessments each semester. If assessment scorecards are missing in eLumen, it is recommended that Faculty contact the SLO Coordinator with this information.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Psychiatric Technology department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The vast majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Psychiatric Technology PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 98.2% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcomes, Analysis and Equity.

Commendations:

The Psychiatric Technology program has clearly identified its largest deficits and concerns and the program has a respectable student success rate as measured by their PSLO standards. Its faculty are using innovative pedagogical methods such as the “flip the classroom” technique. Moreover, PTA and CNA certificates will be ready to implement and award in the Fall of 2023. The program also completed a new program mission.

Recommendations:

The Psychiatric Technology program noted that they have failed to meet the state board exam pass rates required. The program also noted deficiencies in student’s writing skills—a contributing factor to the low pass rates. As was also recommended by the Board of Vocational Nursing and Psychiatric Technicians Accreditation body, the committee recommends strengthening the selection criteria by adding an English pre-requisite. The committee also

recommends the program specify a date, timeline, and strategy to fulfill the goal of raising the passing scores for the board examination above the national average by 10% or greater.

The committee fully supports the program’s stated objective to launch a mentoring program and a three-day on-boarding process to increase student success. The program might also work towards bridging the gap in enrollment through increased marketing and refilling the marketing position to bring in more, and more qualified, applicants.

At an administrative level, the committee recommends more faculty training in Tableau as well as more faculty involvement in the program review process. Further, the committee recommends that the program retrieve and include Guided Pathways data in future program reports. Finally, the committee strongly recommends the program leadership increase the percentage of CSLO completion by identifying a timeline and strategy to fulfill this goal.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Program Completion Mentoring	\$4,125	T	D	C	I	N	48
2	Onboarding of New Students	\$1,650	T	D	C	I	N	48
3	Osmosis	\$4,800	T	D	O	I	N	48
4	Medication Chart	\$50K	T	V	O	I	N	72
5	Continued Accreditation	\$5K	M	D	C	M	N	72

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Admin. T = Technology/Materials M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time C = Continuing/On-Going

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

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Radiologic Technology **Presenter:** Michael Frianeza **Date:** November 14, 2022

Instructional Program Review Committee Summary

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

Program Compliance Status:

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

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

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

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

General Comments:

Radiological Technology presented a report that highlighted some important needs and successes. The program has adapted well to the challenges faced by the pandemic and has grown such that modernizations are now required for its continued efficacy.

The program noted some important changes currently underway, or quickly approaching. First, they will remove RADT 260 from the program due to a change in the licensing exam which no longer requires fluoroscopy. Second, one full time faculty is planning to retire soon which will leave a deficit causing the program to be non-compliant with the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology accreditation requirements.

The program also noted in their presentation that RADT 142 and RADT 146, two prerequisite courses, have lower success rates due to high attrition rates. Apparently, students often drop these classes and take them again at a later date for a higher grade.

Up to date equipment is the greatest and most urgent need for this program. The program noted that the students are not receiving adequate training as a result of the old and outdated machines. This was corroborated by their dean.

Program CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2018 – 100.0%	Spring 2019 – 100.0%
Fall 2019 – 80.0%	Spring 2020 – 100.0%
Fall 2020 – 77.8%	Spring 2021 – 81.8%
Fall 2021 – 100.0%	Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Comments:

Although the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 CSLO assessment completion percentages were low, the Radiologic Technology department has done a good job of assessing CSLOs since then. It is recommended that the Radiologic Technology department continue to implement strategies to achieve high CSLO assessment completion percentages. As a result of the assessment process, the department created an action plan that includes ongoing review and revision of assessments for validity. The department also noted that obtaining state-of-the-art radiography equipment is vital to ensure the students' quality of learning.

Program PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Radiologic Technology department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The vast majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Radiologic Technology PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 99.9% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Equity. In addition, 99.8% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Global Citizenship.

Commendations:

The Radiologic Technology Program is very effective in producing high levels of student success and in placing those students into well-paying jobs. Fill rates remain consistently high despite recent low enrollment trends across the college. They currently run at maximum capacity with two cohorts of students. The program also boasts impressive numbers on the Program Effectiveness Measures. The Program participates also in professional development activities related to diversity and equity.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends that Radiological Technology identify gaps within the program data presented in the report. Further, in addition to the continuing the one-on-one early intervention strategy for struggling students, the committee recommends the program develop and implement new strategies in difficult courses to improve these equity gaps.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

The IPRC supports the department in the resource and budget needs identified in the table below. The program has provided evidence and data, including but not limited to student success/retention rates, FTES targets, and SLO outcomes data, to support their request. The requests are ranked based on their overall need to the program, and the both the department and the IPRC agree to that ranking. The comments that follow the table further explain the need for each request. (*Use the **Table Code Key** below to help in reading the chart.)

#	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Radiology Equipment	\$500K	T	D	O	I	N	74
2	Full Time Faculty Member (Retiree Replacement)	\$90K	F	D/V	C	M	N	120
3	Equipment maintenance	\$5K-10K	M	D	C	M	?	74
4	Staff Development	\$600	C	D	C	M	?	45
5	Radiology Advisory Meetings	\$400	C	D	C	M	?	74
6	Application for re-accreditation and site visit	\$3-5K	M	D/V	C (every 8 Years)	M	RR	74

*Amount: Total \$ amount
for request*

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Admin. T = Technology/Materials M = Maintenance

Need: D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length: O = One-Time Need C = Continuing/On-Going

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

Age: N = New Request RR = Repeat/Received RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact: # of students impacted

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The department has demonstrated the need for a full-time faculty hire to replace the outgoing faculty member when that faculty member retires. If they are not allowed this new hire, they will be out of compliance with Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology accreditation. The program clearly demonstrated that the current equipment in this program is quickly reaching its end of life and repairs are no longer feasible. The program has asked for one-time funding for new digital radiology equipment. Radiologic Technology did try to push this through grant funding but was denied due to high cost of the equipment. Without the new equipment, the program will not be able to equip future students with the necessary training for needed for employment.