

CYPRESS COLLEGE

Instructional Program Review 2023–2024 Annual Report



Draft Date: March 2023

Prepared on behalf of the Instructional Program Review Committee by Myev Rees, Jill Bauer,
Jennifer Coopman, Bryan Ventura, and Kristina Ogasian

Table of Contents

Introduction,	1
Mission Statement,	1
Purpose of Program Review,	1
Instructional Program Review Process Overview,	1
The IPR Committee,	2
2023-24 IPRC Chair Changes,	3
Instructional Program Review Handbook and Forms,	4
The SharePoint,	4
2023-24 Charter,	4
2023- 24 New Guides and Support Materials for Departments and Programs under Review,	4
Specialized Instructional Program Review (SIPR)4-Year Schedule,	5
2024 SIPR Presentation Meetings with Program Representatives,	5
CTE 2-Year Reports (“Short Form”),	5
The Annual Update Turned Mid-Point Review Process and Form,	5
Ongoing Recommendations,	6
2023-2024 Instructional Program Review Findings and Recommendations,	7
The Post-Pandemic New Normal,	7
The Impact of Legislative Changes,	8
Retirements and Additional Faculty Needs,	8
Enrollment,	8
Awarding Degrees and Certificates,	8
IT Needs,	9
DEI and Equity Gaps,	9
Strong Workforce and Other Sources of Outside Funding,	9
A Note About the Fine Arts Building Move and its Impacts,	9
Student Success Rates,	9
AI and Academic Honesty,	10
Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs),	10
CSLO Summary,	10
Ongoing SLO Reporting Recommendations,	11
2023-2024 SLO Reporting Recommendations,	12
CSLO Assessment Completion Rates	
Appendix A: Timeline for the 2024-2025 Instructional Program Review Cycle,	14
Appendix B: IPR Full Review Rotation Schedule,	15
Appendix C: IPR Mid-Point Review Rotation Schedule,	17
Appendix D: Programs Presenting CTE 2-Year Reports In Even Numbered Years,	19
Appendix E: Specialized Instructional Program Review Schedule and Student Services Program Review Schedule,	20
Appendix F: Instructional Program Review Long Form 2023-24,	21
Appendix H: Instructional Program Review Mid-Point Review Form Spring 2024,	32
Appendix I: Specialized Instructional Program Review Summaries,	35
Appendix J: Instructional Program Review Summaries,	44

Introduction

Through a comprehensive program review process, Cypress College faculty assess instructional programs on a four-year cycle. For reference, the schedule for the four-year cycle is included in Appendix B of this document. In even-numbered years, this program review schedule aligns the full CTE program reviews with the CTE “short form” reports required every two years. Starting in 2023-2024, the College instituted an annual update process in which the programs not undergoing full review provide a brief description of progress made and resources needed on their goals.

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

Mission Statement

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

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, guided pathways, 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.

Instructional Program Review Process Overview

The Instructional Program Review process is tied to the larger college planning and budget processes. The IPRC reviews the instructional program review form every spring and makes any necessary changes to reflect new instructional priorities, institutional requests, and/or to respond to feedback from departments regarding clarity and ease of use.

At the start of the academic year, departments under review receive the form pre-populated with data from the office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP).

Institutional Research and Planning provides departments with pre-populated data to help them evaluate their programs and improve student learning.

Departments are 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.

Departments then complete the form, and submit the material to the committee. 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 committee then discusses each report and presentation and arrives at consensus commendations and recommendations, and (as of 2019) votes on the departments' compliance status.

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.

A department can be found In Compliance, Compliance Needs Improvement, or Not in Compliance. One of major projects the 2023-24 committee undertook was to update and expand of the IPRC handbook to include clear, enumerated criteria for each status designation. Those criteria are now available in the handbook, and are included in the materials given to programs prior to their review.

The program then receives a review summary based on the written materials, presentation, and ensuing discussion. The summary contains the compliance status that is tied to the program's eligibility for funding and (as of fall 2020) a budget resource table containing information to better inform budget and resource allocation decisions across campus.

Departments are given the opportunity to respond to these summaries in writing, should they wish to do so. 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.

Starting in fall 2024, departments found Not In Compliance may petition to change their compliance status, provided they have addressed the issues that resulted in the non-compliance decision. They can petition to do so via the new Compliance Status Petition Form, which the IPRC is developing.

In the spring of each year, the IPRC Chair /Co Chairs, with help from Accreditation Faculty Liaison, the Institutional Research & Planning Representative, and the SLO Coordinator Liaison, compose the Annual Report. The Annual Report summarizes committee's findings and documents any changes the committee adopted to the review process, or materials. The committee then reviews the Annual Report draft, makes suggestions for changes or improvements, and votes to approve the document. The Annual Report is then presented to Academic Senate, distributed to the entire campus via the SharePoint, the North Orange County Community College District, and the Board of Trustees.

The IPR Committee

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 names of the 2023-24 committee members are listed below.

The IPRC Chair or Co-Chair serve three-year terms and are elected by the Academic Senate with input from the IPRC members. Tenure, as well as prior service on the IPRC is required to serve as Chair or Co-Chair. The IPRC Chair responsibilities are included in the appendix of the *Program Review Handbook*. The position of chair can be divided into two Co-Chairs (as of 2023, see below). The responsibilities and reassign time are then divided as members deem appropriate.

2023-24 IPRC Chair Changes

In previous years, the IPRC has been headed by a chair, who, at times, shared some of the leadership responsibilities (and corresponding reassign time) with an Assistant Chair. In the summer of 2023, facing a chair vacancy and a lack of faculty interest in the role, the committee proposed dividing the leadership duties and reassign time evenly between two Co-Chairs—Jill Bauer and Myev Rees. The committee also determined that where Assistant Chairs had previously been allowed to also serve as their division reps, this would not be appropriate for Co-Chairs. This decision was brought to Academic Senate for approval, which was granted.

After discussion, the two Co-Chairs divided the duties of the Chair as they deemed appropriate. Future Co-Chairs may divide responsibilities differently depending on their particular schedules, needs, or skills. Thus far, the new Co-Chair arrangement has been very successful.

2023-24 IPRC Representatives

Jill Bauer jbauer@cypresscollege.edu - Co-Chair

Myev Rees mrees@cypresscollege.edu - Co-Chair

Bryan Ventura bventura@cypresscollege.edu - Accreditation Liaison

Kristina Oganessian koganessian@cypresscollege.edu - Institutional Research & Planning Representative

AnnMarie Ruelas aruelas@cypresscollege.edu - Student Services Program Review Liaison

Janet Vera – Instructional Dean Representative

Jennifer Coopman jcoopman@cypresscollege.edu - SLO Coordinator Liaison

Regina Rhymes rrhymes@cypresscollege.edu - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Liaison

Sujata Chiplunkar schiplunkar@cypresscollege.edu - SEM

Peter Molnar pmolnar@cypresscollege.edu - Business/CIS

Margaret Mohr mmohr@cypresscollege.edu - Kinesiology/Athletics

Ernesto Heredia eheredia@cypresscollege.edu - Counseling

Vacant – Library

Michael Beard mbeard@cypresscollege.edu - CTE

Hilary Reuter - Social Science

Anna Cherie Gentry agencyentry@cypresscollege.edu - Health Science

Bret Kaufman - bkaufman@cypresscollege.edu - Language Arts

Maha Afra - mafra@cypresscollege.edu - Visual and Performing Arts

Instructional Program Review Handbook and Forms

The *Instructional Program Review Handbook* provides faculty and administrators with instructions, sample forms, and resources for the instructional program review process. The committee reviews and updates the handbook regularly and makes changes as necessary. Recent revisions occurred in spring 2021, and again in fall 2023 to reflect the substantial revisions to the review process and forms. The current *Instructional Program Review Handbook* was approved by Academic Senate in October 2023 and can be found on the IPRC SharePoint.

The SharePoint

The Office of Campus Communications created an Instructional Program Review Committee SharePoint, which is accessible via the IPRC webpage on cypresscollege.edu. All instructional program review documents, including the handbook, the IPRC Charter, a list of committee members, committee meeting schedules, the Long and Short Review forms, the annual update forms, meeting agendas and minutes, committee summaries, annual reports, and support materials for departments under review are housed there.

2023-24 Charter

In the fall of 2023, all governance groups were required to submit a group charter to PBC and PAC. The IPRC discussed, drafted, and voted on the final version of a Charter in October of 2023. It is now available on the IPRC webpage and via SharePoint.

2023- 24 New Guides and Support Materials for Departments and Programs under Review

To increase the transparency of the review process, and to help programs and departments complete the review process as successfully and painlessly as possible, the 2023-24 committee created several new resources which were distributed to departments prior to their review. These new resources included clearer criteria for compliance status and a presentation guide that spelled out the committee's expectations for department presentations.

Providing more training and transparency for programs going under review remains a priority for the IPRC. The committee will continue to develop and improve these resources in 2024-25. The IPRC currently plans to create short video trainings on how to complete the Long Form Report, and the new Mid-Point Review (see below), among other tutorials.

2023-24 IPRC Presentation Meetings with Instruction Program Representatives

After reviewing the written program review Long Form Reports, the committee met with the following program representatives in November 2023 to hear their presentations and ask any questions. All meetings were held remotely via Zoom though programs were given the option of presenting their reports in person.

November 6th:

Art (Donovan Howard)

Chemistry (Robin De Roo and Patricia Menchaca)

Communication Studies (Michael Brydges, Liana Koeppel, John Lambros, Jennifer Page)

Political Science (Gloria Badal)

November 13th:

Counseling (Jacky Rangel and Robert Grantham)

Dance (Maha Afra)

Economics (Parwinder Sidhu and Fola Odebunmi)

Mathematics (Adam Eckenrode and David Nussbaum)

November 27th:

Kinesiology (Margaret Mohr and Colin Preston)

Psychology (Randy Martinez)

Sociology (Regina Rhymes and Larry Curiel)

Specialized Instructional Program Review (SIPR) 4-Year Schedule

SIPRs are programs that combine tailored instruction, counseling, and student services to support specific student groups. In spring 2020 and 2021, the IPRC conducted the initial reviews of these programs, and in the spring of 2022 the IPRC established a 4-year schedule for reviewing them. Beginning in spring 2024, the IPRC will complete SIPR reviews during the spring semester. As of spring 2023, Legacy, Puente, and STEM moved from SIPR to the Student Services Program Review (SSPR). The SIPR Review Schedule appears in Appendix E.

Per the schedule, the 2023-24 IPRC Committee reviewed Honors, Dual Enrollment, and Distance Education in March 2024. The SIPR Review form and the completed reports for 2023-34 are housed on the SharePoint.

2024 SIPR Presentation Meetings with Program Representatives

March 11th:

Distance Education (Treisa Cassens, Elli Constantin, Samantha Simmons)

Dual Enrollment (Stephanie Teer, Andrea Laguna Morales)

Honors (Kathryn Sonne, Penny Gabourie)

CTE 2-Year Reports (“Short Form”)

The IPRC additionally reviews each CTE TOP-coded program every two-years in even numbered years. No short forms were required for 2023- 24.

The Annual Update Turned Mid-Point Review Process and Form

With the Office of Institutional Research & Planning, the IPRC determined that although the 4-year schedule for Program Review meets institutional needs and accreditation requirements, the time span between reports often results in departments requiring funds or other interventions between reviews. It also means that keeping long-term departmental goals front-of-mind between reviews can be difficult for coordinators and faculty, as they are also tasked with addressing the myriad immediate needs of their students and programs.

To remedy this, the 2023-24 IPRC approved an Annual Update. The Annual Update was intended to be a short form whereby departments could annually assess progress made on their long-term goals (as stated in their last Instructional Program Review Report), and register any new budget needs that may have arisen since their last instructional program review. The Annual Update was also intended

to give the IPRC a wider perspective on how programs and departments were doing collegewide, year-to-year, and to identify any meaningful trends. The 2023-24 Annual Update form is available in Appendix G.

The Annual Update forms were distributed in fall 2023, collected, and reviewed by the committee in spring 2024. The general themes gleaned from the Annual Update forms are reflected in this report. The IPRC also solicited feedback from faculty on the Annual Update process and form to determine efficacy, and identify how the process or form could be improved.

From this feedback, the committee determined that: 1. An *annual* update presented more work than necessary for department coordinators and faculty, as it did not allow them sufficient time to measure progress on their goals, and 2: the form itself required simplification, clarification, and formatting changes for greater ease of use.

To that end, the IPRC created a clearer, simpler, easier to complete form entitled the Mid-Point Review. It is available in Appendix C. The committee further determined that departments should submit this form every *two* years—at the mid-point between full Instructional Program Reviews. On this schedule, departments will reap the goal-assessing and budgeting benefits the committee intended, while keeping the additional work to a minimum. The proposed Mid-Point Review schedule is available in Appendix C.

Finally, the IPRC committee determined that at the time of the Mid-Point Review, departments could also petition to have their Compliance Status changed using an additional petition form (currently under development) whereby they would present evidence of changes made. Departments designated as In Compliance or Compliance Needs Improvement will not be reassessed until their next full program review.

The new Mid-Point Review and Compliance Status Petition will take effect Fall 2024 pending Academic Senate approval.

The IPRC will review these Mid-point Reviews every spring, note any meaningful campuswide trends in the Annual Report, and re-vote on any compliance status petitions. If a compliance status is changed, the department's Program Review Summary (available on the SharePoint) will be amended to reflect the new status.

Ongoing Recommendations:

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

1. 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. (2019-2020) This issue is currently being taken up and examined by Academic Senate as of 2023-24.

2. There needs to be greater institutional support for research being performed by students in programs across campus. There is a great need for technology, including laptop computers and database subscriptions, to support research. An important step would be for Cypress College to establish an Institutional Review Board (IRB). When a campus does not have an IRB, it is problematic for the students to conduct research, since they cannot request approval from the IRB and any research cannot be published. Also, any research that is done by faculty or students at Cypress College cannot be published or shared at a professional conference because we lack an IRB. (2019-2020)
3. 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). This issue arose again for some departments in 2023-24.
4. The IPRC recommends each department and program engage in the Cypress Course Redesign (CoRe). (2020-2021) Since this recommendation was first made, CoRe has proven to be a successful and effective program. The committee urges the College to find resources to continue this work after the Title V grant expires.
5. 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)
6. All departments and programs are encouraged to continue updating their publications, web pages, and other aspects of their public face. (2020-2021)

2023-2024 Instructional Program Review Findings and Recommendations

Below are the global trends IPRC noted from the 2023-24 Instructional Program Review process and the Committee's specific recommendations.

The Post-Pandemic New Normal

The 2023-24 Instructional Program Review process revealed that, although the crises of the pandemic and its immediate aftermath have passed, these periods have left an indelible mark on the College, if not higher-education generally. In short, we now have a new normal. Students have become accustomed to having a variety of instructional modalities to choose from. However, student success rates for online learning in various modalities remains lower for many disciplines than in person student success rates—a reality repeatedly noted by faculty in their program review reports this year. Faculty too have had to adjust to the post-pandemic educational landscape by working more remotely, experimenting with new pedagogical methods—and in many cases, these adjustments have brought new needs into sharp relief. Faculty will require greater flexibility, further investment in DE,

and additional training for programs such as Starfish. Additionally, curriculum updates will likely be impacted for many departments as they revise their courses and programs to adjust to this new normal. Enrollment is up slightly college wide, however it will take more time to rebound to pre-pandemic levels.

The Impact of Legislative Changes

Many of the departments under review in 2023-2024 (in addition to many more who completed the Annual Update form), experienced a variety of negative outcomes due directly to legislative changes—particularly AB705/AB1705. Instructors from Chemistry, to Psychology, to Communications are struggling to teach their curricula to students who do not possess the basic math or English language skills required for an introductory-level course. They report lower student success rates, higher drop rates, and higher levels of faculty fatigue and frustration.

Retirements and Additional Faculty Needs

A disproportionate number of departments are anticipating full-time faculty retirements in the next two years. Further, the 2023-24 Review process also determined that several departments not facing retirements have strong needs for additional faculty. As a result, faculty prioritization is likely to become very competitive in the next few years. The committee strongly encourages the College to allocate resources accordingly, and it encourages departments to plan proactively for these changes with the understanding that not all retirements will be immediately replaced.

Enrollment

Although overall college enrollment is up, enrollment continues to be a challenge for many programs—particularly for in-person courses. Faculty across many programs expressed frustration that high enrollment caps, and high enrollment minimums can result in necessary classes being canceled or moved into an online modality that does not result in the same student success rates. If the college administration continues to encourage faculty to return to in-person instruction as a necessary part of maintaining a vibrant campus community, the Committee recommends the Administration reassess course enrollment caps and minimums for in-person courses.

Awarding Degrees and Certificates

Some of the programs under review in 2023-24 would benefit from a systematic process using DegreeWorks to track student progress and notify them when the requirements for a degree or certificate have been met or are close to being met. Currently, some students who meet the requirements for a certificate or degree are not petitioning for them. However, the current “auto-awarding” process does not actually reflect an automatic process and creates additional work for Institutional Research particularly when the DegreeWorks software is already in place. Students should be further encouraged to meet with their major counselor as frequently as possible to assure they are aware of their progress.

Creating a more systematic process using DegreeWorks would provide evidence of the success these programs are already achieving. This is particularly relevant for CTE programs wherein students often complete the requirements for various licensing, or complete the courses needed for gainful employment in the field, but do not petition for the relevant certificate for various reasons.

IT Needs

The 2023-24 report revealed that although the quality of the current IT staff is exceptional, the number of IT professionals and technicians on campus is alarmingly inadequate and the IT equipment currently on campus is outdated. The IPRC strongly recommends that the College increase the number of IT professionals available and make all necessary updates to aging IT technology on campus.

DEI and Equity Gaps

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.

The 2023-24 review process revealed a continued commitment to DEI initiatives across campus. Equity gaps for several significant groups—particularly African American students—do still require attention and intervention. However, IPRC was impressed by the thoughtfulness, innovation, and commitment to equity measures all the departments under review this year demonstrated.

The committee noticed that one small group of students, foster youth, continues to struggle demonstratively more than others. This population is admittedly small and so the data can be easily influenced by just one or two students—but the committee would like to note that even very small populations may require direct intervention. To that end, the committee recommends departments, as well as the College as a whole, think creatively about how to best support this particularly vulnerable population.

Strong Workforce and Other Sources of Outside Funding

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

A Note About the Fine Arts Building Move and its Impacts

The Art department was an outlier in the 2023-24 Program Review process. The department is struggling acutely as a result of the building move and retrofitting and renovation initiatives, as well as with the demands of an adjunct-heavy faculty, and multiple facilities-dependent course offerings. The result of this was that the department did not fully innumerate its resource needs on its submitted Long Form Report. Consequently, the committee was not able to make informed budget recommendations. Please see the Art department's full summary for details.

Student Success Rates

Throughout the 2023-24 Review process, the IPRC attempted to identify factors that could explain why the Institution-Set Standard for Course Success Rates fell slightly below the standard. No central cause emerged from the Program Reviews. That said, the committee believes the lower success rates are the result of various of factors coalescing.

Programs described challenges such as AB705/AB1705 implementation and impacts. Further, asynchronous online modalities, as well as accelerated 8-week online classes remain popular, yet students often woefully underestimate the difficulty of these classes. Departments also noted that despite clear communication from faculty, students often underestimate the discipline and self-advocacy skills required for success in an online environment versus in-person classes where student-faculty interaction is more organic and thus, student learning can be more directly monitored and supported.

AI and Academic Honesty

AI was a recurrent theme in this year’s discussions. AI programs may provide new and creative opportunities for instruction, but they also pose an existential threat to academic honesty. Faculty are reporting that students are using AI programs to generate essays, research papers, discussion board posts, and other assessments. These methods of academic dishonesty are largely undetectable and their use is therefore, very difficult to definitively prove.

Some faculty in fields that have been historically research and writing-heavy are switching to in-class hand-written exams, and/or oral exams. These assessment methods however, are not always conducive to meeting the stated learning and skill-building outcomes of the course, and are also often not aligned with the approved course curriculum outline. At this stage, the committee is not able to make any specific recommendations, but is encouraged by the creation of the Academic Senate’s new Cypress Artificial Intelligence Task forces and looks forward to its findings and proposed solutions.

Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs)

CSLO Summary

CSLO Summary

Fall 2023 Program Review Departments	Courses Assessed		Successful Assessments	
	# Offered	% Assessed	# Assessed	% Successful
Art	43	95.3%	19,541	89.5%
Chemistry	9	100.0%	14,027	88.4%
Communication Studies	10	100.0%	14,519	86.6%
Counseling	14	100.0%	11,664	90.8%
Dance	28	96.4%	3,174	97.1%
Economics	3	100.0%	2,670	86.8%
Kinesiology	100	93.0%	28,766	93.8%
Public Health Science	11	100.0%	2,083	91.3%
Mathematics	25	100.0%	26,396	70.6%
Political Science	7	100.0%	6,448	88.0%
Psychology	14	100.0%	19,584	84.4%
Sociology	8	87.5%	9,332	82.2%
Total since Fall 2019	272	95.9%	158,204	85.9%

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

ISLO Summary

ISLOs	Exceeded Expectations	Met Expectations	Did not Meet Expectations	Total Assessed
-------	-----------------------	------------------	---------------------------	----------------

	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Breadth of Knowledge, Competencies, & Skills								
Humanities & the Arts	15,690	46.1%	14,626	43.0%	3,710	10.9%	34,026	100.0%
Kinesiology/Athletics	13,137	85.0%	1,115	7.2%	1,205	7.8%	15,457	100.0%
Social Sciences	15,876	52.3%	9,765	32.2%	4,731	15.6%	30,372	100.0%
STEM	16,107	39.8%	14,925	36.9%	9,391	23.2%	40,423	100.0%
Communication								
Reading	57,710	59.2%	24,708	25.4%	14,991	15.4%	97,409	100.0%
Writing	50,661	60.7%	21,333	25.6%	11,457	13.7%	83,451	100.0%
Communicating	55,712	62.0%	22,536	25.1%	11,554	12.9%	89,802	100.0%
Presenting	37,564	66.5%	12,396	21.9%	6,527	11.6%	56,487	100.0%
Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Information Competency								
Analysis	56,887	58.6%	25,451	26.2%	14,773	15.2%	97,111	100.0%
Computation	23,041	56.8%	8,378	20.7%	9,122	22.5%	40,541	100.0%
Research	44,625	66.6%	14,502	21.6%	7,918	11.8%	67,045	100.0%
Problem-solving	55,923	55.8%	27,227	27.2%	17,011	17.0%	100,161	100.0%
Technology	55,908	63.4%	18,922	21.5%	13,341	15.1%	88,171	100.0%
Personal, Academic, & Professional Development								
Personal Responsibility	53,949	65.2%	17,631	21.3%	11,120	13.4%	82,700	100.0%
Global Citizenship	45,958	69.9%	11,926	18.1%	7,859	12.0%	65,743	100.0%
Equity	26,211	69.8%	6,485	17.3%	4,833	12.9%	37,529	100.0%

Ongoing SLO Reporting Recommendations

CSLOs are required to be listed on the faculty syllabi every semester and the CSLOs listed must match the active CSLOs listed on the Course Outline of Record (COR) in Curricunet. A process is in place to facilitate this requirement. The SLO Coordinator created a guide for faculty to facilitate this requirement. The SLO Coordinator also sends out a reminder email to all faculty at the beginning of the fall and spring semesters. The Curricunet specialist creates a comprehensive Excel file with the links to each COR (which include the active CSLOs) for every course broken down by division and forwards this to the SLO Coordinator who then forwards it to the deans. Division deans (or their designee) then check faculty syllabi in their respective divisions for accurate active CSLOs. While the process is going well for the most part, broader implementation and more dean involvement is needed. The VPI should be heading this effort.

The committee continues to strongly recommend that the college seek out and implement a system that connects our Curriculum system and our SLO system. Every semester, there are issues in eLumen which need to be checked and fixed manually by the SLO Coordinator. The current system also requires the SLO Coordinator to individually enter any and all revisions to CSLOs or new CSLOs into eLumen. Further, the SLO Coordinator is also required to create a new assessment for each course every time an CSLO is added or revised. This is both inefficient and unsustainable.

Departments and programs undergoing Instructional Program Review are required to meet the 90% assessment rate threshold establishing in 2019. In order for departments to be designated as “In Compliance” IPRC requires that departments meet this standard—unless there are compelling extenuating circumstances. The committee also recommends that department coordinators continue to encourage all faculty to participate in the SLO process. In the past several years, the campus culture has grown increasingly supportive of the SLO process. Many departments and programs have exceptional CSLO assessment completion rates and have completed the PSLO mapping and have written PSLOs for their degrees and certificates. However, the committee recommends that department coordinators communicate effectivity and often with faculty to encourage more SLO participation. Fulltime faculty have been required to participate in the SLO process for several years, and the adjunct faculty contract also states that adjunct instructors 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.

The committee recommends that departments continue to write PSLOs for all degrees and certificates within their departments and prelaunch the programs (degrees/certificates) in Curricunet is recommended. The IPRC, the SLO Committee, and the Curriculum Committee are committed to offering guidance to any department or program that may need assistance.

2023-2024 SLO Reporting Recommendations

The committee strongly recommends the college hire a designated eLumun technical support classified staff member. As noted above, the SLO Coordinator is currently tasked with both faculty outreach and professional development training, and the significant manual technical support the eLumen system requires. A designated eLumen support staff member would alleviate the SLO Coordinator and free them to offer more support and development opportunities for faculty and consequently, better serve the college’s overall SLO goals. An eLumen support staff member would also allow the position of SLO Coordinator to be filled by a larger pool of faculty members, thereby avoiding a situation wherein that essential position sits vacant due to lack to interest.

CSLO Assessment Completion Rates

Many departments under review in 2023-24 worked very hard to bring their CSLO assessment completion rates up to the required minimum of 90% prior to their review. Those who completed their CSLO assessments on time are to be commended. However, some programs put off this work until the last possible moment and several departments continued to make updates after the submission deadline. This disrupted the committee’s timeline as data were being adjusted after the long form report had been submitted and reviewed by the committee. Further, some programs trying to retroactively complete CSLO assessments from previous years could not do so as some adjunct instructors no longer had access to eLumen. Due to this disruption, the IPRC resolved that in future, the committee will not accept SLO changes to the long form report after the October submission deadline.

Department coordinators are strongly encouraged to email faculty each semester to remind them to complete their CSLO assessments. They are further encouraged to follow up with faculty who have not completed their assessments prior to the start of the next term.

Some departments noted that they would like their SLO data to be more meaningful. Departments with high CSLO assessment completion rates, such as Communication Studies and Math, demonstrated that faculty cooperation and the nature of the discipline itself, can coalesce to create truly meaningful data. They are to be commended. Of course, due to the varied nature of academic disciplines, methods for producing meaningful data will vary. The requirement to meet at least a 90% CSLO assessment completion rate remains. If programs wish to make the SLO process meaningful, the IPRC recommends programs avail themselves of the generous resources and trainings offered by SLO Coordinator, and that they do so well in advance of their review.

Appendix A: Timeline for the 2024-2025 Instructional Program Review Cycle

May 2024: Email the deans with the next programs required to submit both Long Form and CTE Short Form reports by October 15.

Summer 2024: IRPC sends the prepopulated long and short self-study forms and SLO summary reports to Department Coordinators and Deans.

August 2024: Send deadline reminders and Program Review Resources to Department Coordinators and Deans.

September 2024 Committee plans to meet two to three times during the month.

October 10, 2024: Faculty submit their self-studies to their deans for comments and signature. Faculty have the option of submitting a Mid-Point Review. Mandatory Mid-Point Reviews will begin in 2025-26.

October 24, 2024: Faculty submit their final Reports to the IPRC Chair (s).

November 2024: Presentations every Monday, schedules permitting, from 3-5 (approximately four 15-minute presentations per week).

December 2024: Program Review Summaries will be sent to all the programs under review.

February 2025: Committee meets to review results and feedback from summaries.

February 2025: Committee reviews CTE short forms

March/April 2025: Prepare final report for submission to the Academic Senate, PBC, and PAC. Note:

April 2025/May 2025: Present the annual report to the Academic Senate, PBC, and PAC. Replace termed out committee members. Add the annual report to the Program Review SharePoint.

Appendix B: IPR Full Review Rotation Schedule

CYCLE #1: Fall 2020, 2024, 2028 (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 2021, 2025, 2029 (11 programs)

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

CYCLE #3: Fall 2022, 2026, 2030 (11 programs)

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

CYCLE #4: Fall 2023, 2027, 2031 (11 programs)

Art
Chemistry

Communication Studies
Counseling
Dance
Economics
Kinesiology
Mathematics
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology

Appendix C: IPR Mid-Point Review Rotation Schedule

CYCLE #1: Fall 2026, 2030, 2034 (13 programs)

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

CYCLE #2: 2027, 2031, 2035 (11 programs)

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

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

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

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

Art
Chemistry

Communication Studies
Counseling
Dance
Economics
Kinesiology
Mathematics
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology

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

Accounting

Administration of Justice

Air Conditioning & Refrigeration

Automotive Collision Repair

Automotive Technology

Aviation & Travel Careers

Computer Information Systems

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 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 Long Form 2023-24

Division:
Department:
Department Coordinator:
Date:

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

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

Mission Statement

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

College Mission Statement

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

Department Mission Statement

[Insert department mission]

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

Department Data Trends

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

Fall

[Insert table here]

Spring

[Insert table here]

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

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

Adjunct Faculty
Full-Time Faculty

Total

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

[Insert table here]

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

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

[Insert tables here]

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

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

Fall

[Insert tables here]

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

Spring

[Insert tables here]

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

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

[Insert tables here]

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

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

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

[Insert tables here]

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

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

[Insert figures here from Guided Pathways Dashboard]

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

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

[Insert table here]

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

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

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

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

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

Course Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs)

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

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

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

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

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

[Insert table here of courses assessed by semester]

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

Department Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

[Insert table here]

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

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

Degree and Certificate Program Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

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

Curriculum

15. What new courses are you planning that will be going through the curriculum committee review process?
16. If there are courses that have not been revised in the last six years:
- a. Provide a list of these courses:
 - b. What is the plan for reviewing these courses?

Diversity and Equity

17. Has your department had conversations about implicit bias, micro-aggressions, or other more subtle forms of racism? If so, how have those conversations impacted your department's curriculum, pedagogy, training, and outreach? If not, what is the department's plan moving forward? How can the college help you in these efforts?

18. Discuss specific ways the department is equity-minded, and its efforts to ensure culturally relevant curriculum and pedagogy. For example, when your students look into your classrooms, are they seeing a window or a mirror? How can the college help you in these efforts?

19. How do you include social justice/social equity in your program? How has your program adapted or transformed in the past 5 years to include social equity and social justice to equitize marginalized and underrepresented groups? What has been your greatest success in these efforts? What barriers have you encountered in these efforts?

20. What have been the positive and/or negative impacts on your department because of the equity and diversity mission of the college, and what has your department done to foster diversity of thought and ideas?

Student Support Services & Campus Involvement

21. How does your department assist your students so that they can succeed in your class? (e.g., tutoring, supplemental instruction, explanation of study skills that are effective in your discipline such as how to read the textbook, impact of AB 705, referrals to DSS)

22. Please briefly summarize your department's involvement in campus-wide committees and initiatives. This information is meant to ensure that departments exercise a substantial voice in furthering the college's mission and decision-making processes.

Department Objectives

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

Goal: {insert goal statement here}

Supports Strategic Plan Area:

Objective: {insert first objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Objective: {insert second objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Were these goals met? Please explain.

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

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

Goal: {insert goal statement here}

Supports Strategic Plan Area:

Supports Institutional and Program Student Learning Outcomes:

Objective: {insert first objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Objective: {insert second objective here}

Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Resources Needed and Budget Implications

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

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

*TABLE CODE KEY

Amount:

Type:

Need:

Length:

Purpose:

Age:

F = Faculty

D = Department

O = One-Time Need

CN = Critical Need

N = New Request

Total \$ amount for request

C = Classified/Admin.

T = Technology

M = Maintenance

V = Division

C = Campus

C = Continuing/On-Going

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact:

of students impacted per year

Publication Review

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

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

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

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

Instructional Program Review Participation

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

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

Department Coordinator (print and sign):

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

Division Dean Evaluation

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

Mission Statement

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

Department Data Trends

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

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

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

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

Learning Outcomes Assessment

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

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

Curriculum

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

Diversity and Equity

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

Student Support Services

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

Department Objectives

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

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

Resources Needed and Budget Implications

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

Final Approval

Division Dean Signature:

Date Reviewed:

After Dean's review and discussion with Department Coordinator:

Department Coordinator Signature:

Date:

Instructional Program Review Annual Update [Insert Department]

Department Coordinator:

Date:

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

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

Goal Progress

Please provide any updates to the 2-4 goals submitted in the Instructional Program Review (IPR) or updated during the previous Instructional Program Review Annual Update (IPRAU).

Goal (from IPR or IPRAU)	Alignment with College Plans and Initiatives	Progress (Not started, Some Progress, Significant Progress, Completed)	Evidence and Summary of progress	Next Steps	Support or Resources Needed to Make Progress or Achieve Goal
1					
2					
3					
4					

Resources Needed (as needed)

List all additional resources needed to make progress or complete your goals. Be sure to align your goals to each request, provide an estimated cost, and prioritize the requests. For example, if you have a total of 5 requests, regardless of category, they should be prioritized, with Priority # 1 being the most important and Priority # 5 being the least important. If you do not have any new resource requests, you can indicate that below.

Please note that if you request new classified staff, faculty, or resources through one-time funding, you must submit those requests through their respective processes.

Please provide a brief justification for resources needed [Describe]

Personnel (Classified Staff and Faculty)

Request	Justification and Impact on Goals	Estimated Cost	Priority #
Facilities (see Facilities Modification Request)			
Request	Justification and Impact on Goals	Estimated Cost	Priority #
Technology/Equipment/Supplies			
Request	Justification and Impact on Goals	Estimated Cost	Priority #
Professional Development			
Request	Justification and Impact on Goals	Estimated Cost	Priority #

Career Technical Education Supplemental Information

This CTE review is to be completed by CTE departments every two years during the fall of even-numbered years. This will be submitted alongside the annual update form. The Program Review Committee will review the reports and submit them to the VPI who will submit them to the BOT in compliance with Ed Code 78016. For Program Effectiveness and Student Success data, please refer to the [Instructional Program Review Dashboard](#).

1. Program Mission, Goals, Status		
<i>Significant Changes in Past 2 Years</i>	<i>Minor Changes in Past 2 Years</i>	<i>No Changes in Past 2 Years</i>
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div>		
<small>(In place of these instructions, please provide 1 to 3 sentences highlighting any notable changes in mission, goals, or status, etc.) (To fill out the box electronically, click on a box, select "format" or "layout" and then shape fill with the paint bucket.)</small>		
2. Labor Market Demand for this Program		
<i>Meets Demand</i>		<i>Does Not Meet Labor Market Demand</i>
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div>		
<small>(Visit the Strong Workforce Dashboard and evaluate the labor market demand in the Program Snapshots Reports for your program(s). Highlight any notable changes in labor market, wages, advisory input, surveys, enrollment, etc. O*NET or other sources may also be used)</small>		

3. Program Effectiveness: Student Success		
<i>Exceeds Benchmarks</i>	<i>Meets Benchmarks</i>	<i>Below Benchmarks</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under Title 5 55003.b.4, prerequisites and corequisites for CTE courses and programs must be reviewed at least every two years for effectiveness and disproportionate impact. Check here to confirm that this review has been completed: Yes___ <p>(Provide 1 to 3 sentences describing how this program is of demonstrated effectiveness, specifically in employment & student success, which may include jobs, certificates, degrees, transfers, SLOs, partnerships, faculty qualifications, diversity, grants, equipment, etc.)</p>		
4. External Factors, Duplication of Programs		
<i>No External Factors</i>		<i>Many External</i>
<i>Factors</i>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>(Provide 1 to 3 sentences explaining how external factors may influence this program, including any duplication of manpower training in the college's service area, or notable changes in legislation, CCCCO mandates, Perkins, Tech Prep, CalWORKs, WIA, BOG, etc.)</p>		
5. Resources		
<i>Minor Needs</i>		<i>Major Needs</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>(Please provide 1 to 3 sentences highlighting any notable changes in budget, manpower, and resources)</p>		
6. Two-Year Plan		
<i>Significant Growth Anticipated</i>	<i>On Track for Next 2 Years</i>	<i>Need Significant Resources or</i>
<i>Changes</i>		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>(Provide 1 to 3 sentences highlighting notable changes in recommendations; project future trends, personnel and equipment needs, etc.)</p>		

Annual Update Preparation

Please describe the collaboration and process followed for completing your annual update. Please list the names of the people involved in preparing the report, the process of soliciting input, and involvement by their involvement.

Names of People Involved

Report Preparation Process and Involvement

Evaluation and Approval

To be finalized the update, it must be reviewed by the area Dean for their comments, feedback, and recommendations. The department Dean must sign the form.

Feedback from Reporting Dean:

Dean's Signature:

Appendix H: Instructional Program Review Mid-Point Review Form Spring 2024

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

Instructional Program Review Midpoint Update [Insert Department Name]

Department Coordinator:

Date:

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

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

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

Section 1: Goal Progress

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

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

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

	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Completed			(complete section 3 below)
3	<input type="checkbox"/> No Longer Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Not Started <input type="checkbox"/> Some Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Completed			<input type="checkbox"/> No Change from last IPR form <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Support Needed (complete section 3 below)
4	<input type="checkbox"/> No Longer Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Not Started <input type="checkbox"/> Some Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Completed			<input type="checkbox"/> No Change from last IPR form <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Support Needed (complete section 3 below)

Section 2: Additional Goals

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

Goal: {insert goal statement here}
 Supports [Strategic Plan](#) Area:
 Supports [Institutional and Program Student Learning Outcomes](#):

Objective: {insert first objective here}
 Person(s) responsible:
 Timeframe:
 Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Objective: {insert second objective here}
 Person(s) responsible:
 Timeframe:
 Fiscal resources needed (if applicable):

Section 3: Resources Needed and Budget Implications

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

- Yes
- No

If no, continue to the next section.
 If yes, please provide the updates or new requests below:

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

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount:

Type:

Maintenance

Need:

Length:

Purpose:

Age:

Received Request

Impact:

Total \$ for request

F = Faculty

C = Classified/Administration T = Technology

M =

D=Department

V=Division

C=Campus

O=One-Time Need

C=Continuing/Ongoing Need

CN = Critical Need M = Program Maintenance

I = Program Improvement

G=Program Growth

N = New Request RR=Repeated, Received Request

RN = Repeated, Not

of students impacted per year

Section 4: Annual Update Preparation

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

Please copy and paste the lines below as necessary.

Names of People Involved:

Faculty Name: _____ Role: _____

Faculty Name: _____ Role: _____

Faculty Name: _____ Role: _____

Section 5: Evaluation and Approval

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

Feedback from Reporting Dean:

Dean's Signature:



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Distance Education

Presenter: Treisa Cassens

Date: 3/11/2024

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:

Distanced Education is an essential program that touches all aspects of the college. It is fundamentally necessary that it be well funded, well-staffed, and appreciated for the vital role it plays.

Commendations:

DE is commended on the outreach and support it has provided faculty and staff during the pandemic and post-pandemic period. DE also transitioned the college from a CVC home college to a teaching college and established the POCR team. They also successfully hired a director and instructional designer.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends DE extend its Canvas and other support initiatives to students as well as faculty. Though many students are technologically savvy, this should not be assumed, and some students may be left behind.

The committee also recommends the DE organize a second OTT program now that the college has the Cidi Labs software.

Resources Needed and Budget Implications

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	LTI Softwares and Integrations **SEE ATTAACHED**	40,000-100,000/year	Maintenance and Improvement	D/V/C	C	I	N	All online classes : students and faculty

LTI/API Software Integrations in the Cypress College LMS:

Respondus – Respondus 4.0 license, LockDown Browser license, Respondus Monitor License and tiered per user costs: contracted and paid to July 31, 2025 Cost (2 years): \$13,613 Cost (additional): \$2000 per 1,000 users

Turn-It-In – Originality, AI Detector and TFS: Contracted and paid to July 31, 2025 Cost (3 years) FTE fee and annual fee: \$113,546.12 (approximately 38,000 a year) Upgrade to include originality and AI Detector: 3/2024 to 7/2025: \$7142.15

CidiLabs – UDOIT advantage, DesignPLUS, TidyUP: contracted and paid to December 19, 2026 Cost (2 years): \$38,120

Pronto: contracted to December 2026 Cost: \$13,687 - \$18,102/ year

Other Integrations – paid for by other divisions or free:

NetTutor (online tutoring and Pieces): contracted and paid to 2026 - LRC

3C Media: integrated and free

Access Pearson: integrated and free

ADAPT: integrated and free

Alexander Street Video: integrated and free

Attendance: integrated and free

Badgr: contracted and paid to 2026 – Library/DE

Canvas Studio: contracted and paid through the state

Cengage Learning: integrated and free

Cirrus: integrated and free

ConexED: integrated and free

Coursera Course: integrated and free

CypressZoom: integrated and free

Dropbox: integrated and free

Electude LTI Tool: integrated and free

eLumen: contracted and integrated – VPI Office

Evolve: integrated and free

Films on Demand: integrated and contracted to 2025 – Library

Flash Reference: integrated and free

Folio: integrated and free

Follett Discover/ Brytewave: contracted and integrated – campus

Goodheart-Wilcox Publisher: integrated and free

Google Assignment: integrated and free

iClicker Sync: integrated and free

LibApps: : integrated and contracted to 2025 – Library

Lumen Learning: integrated and free

MathType: integrated and contracted through SEM

McGraw-Hill Connect: integrated and free

Microsoft Hill SIMnet: integrated and contracted through AC

MyEnglish Lab: integrated and contracted through LA

MyOpenMath: integrated and contracted through SEM

Hardware:

OWL Labs – meeting OWL and campus license for use and maintenance

Cost: \$5,382.12 (5)

Cost: \$36,365.63 (30)

Recommendations:

The committee supports the above budget needs. It is vital DE remain well-funded as their role is only likely to grow in the coming years.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Dual Enrollment

Presenter: Stephanie Teer & Andrea Laguan Morales

Date: 3/11/2024

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 Dual Enrollment program has grown significantly and is poised to grow further. The program

has achieved a commendable student success rate and low equity gaps. It appears to be effectively and efficiently run. It has also made excellent use of Guided Pathways for both Transfer and CTE pathway.

Commendations:

The Dual Enrollment program is to be commended on its high success and retention rates—90% and higher for most of the time frame listed. Their enrollment is also growing in no small part due to their effective outreach efforts. Their equity gaps are also impressively low. Over all, the Dual Enrollment program is doing excellent work.

Recommendations:

Program has demonstrated a need for permanent staff. Currently the program appears to be understaffed, and this will only continue to be an issue as it rolls out the ninth-grade dual enrollment program next year. As the ninth-grade programs rolls out, the committee also recommends the program consider increasing training for faculty who may not be accustomed to such young students.

Resources Needed and Budget Implications

Rank	Current	Name of Request	Amount *	Type *	Need *	Length*	Purpose *	Age *	Impact *
1	(1) Temp Program Manager	(1) Permanent Program Manager	\$154,595 w/ benefits	C	D	C	CN, M, I, G	RN	1500 – 3000 /yr.
3	(4) Adjunct counselors	(5) Adjunct Counselors	\$277,389 w/ benefits	F	D	C	CN, M, I, G	RN	1500 – 3000 /yr
4	N/A	(2) Permanent Student Service Specialists	\$175,636 w/ benefits	C	D	C	CN, M, I, G	RN	1500 – 3000 /yr
5	(9) Profess ional Experts	(5) Profess ional Experts	\$126,125 w/ benefits	C	D	C	CN, M, I, G	RN	1500 – 3000 /yr

Recommendations:

The Dual enrollment program demonstrated a clear need to institutionalize their staffing funding so they are not dependent on grants from year to year. If the College wants their increase of FTES, it will need to further support Dual Enrollment.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Honors

Presenter: Kathryn Sonne & Penny Gabourie

Date: 3/11/2024

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 honors program is continuing to do an excellent job. Funding for the program however, has been on a downward trend.

Commendations: The honors program has done an excellent job at overcoming the challenges posed by the pandemic. It has developed a designated Canvas shell for students and its interactions with the community have brought more students to the program. Honors Program students continue to outperform the comparison group on all measures and boasts a 91% transfer rate.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends that academic computing set up a SharePoint for the program.

Resources Needed and Budget Implications

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Honors Ambassadors	4,000	F	C	C	G	N	10+
2	Honors Space/Furnishings	20,000	F	C	O	G	N	120+
3	Travel/Conference Support	20,000	F		C	M	RR	30+
4	Course Field Trips	1,000	F		C	M	RN	250+
5	Honors Club Events & Awards	3,000	F		C	M	RN	120+
6	Supplies	500	F		C	M	RR	120+
7	Shared Classified Staff Position	70,000	C	V	C	I	N	250+

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount:

Total \$ amount for request

Type:

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

Need:

D = Department V = Division C = Campus

Length:

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

Purpose:

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

Age:

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

Impact:

of students impacted per year

Recommendations:

There is a demonstrated need for more funding and for a designated honors space on campus. The honors program continues to grow and be successful and honors students would benefit from having a space of their own support their continued success.

Appendix J: 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 #4: Fall 2023, 2027, 2031 (11 programs)

Art

Chemistry

Communication Studies

Counseling

Dance

Economics

Kinesiology

Mathematics

Political Science

Psychology

Sociology



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Art

Presenter: Donovan Howard

Date: 11/6/2023

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 Art Department is facing myriad challenges. Some of which are due to the disruption the recent move caused and inadequate support from the College during the difficult transition.

It is also clear that Professor Howard is doing his utmost to lead his adjunct-heavy department but is understandably overwhelmed by the scope of his new role as department coordinator for such a large and multifaceted program. As a result, several key areas have been neglected. The Department's web publications need updating. SLO and PSLO rates are very low. The program mapping is incomplete. There are conflicts between the Art Department and the Media and Design program that require outside leadership intervention. Finally, there is a breakdown in communication between the Department and counseling resulting in students being misdirected and taking unnecessary, non-transferable, or repeat courses. These issues, in other circumstances, would necessarily mean the committee would determine the Art Department not in compliance. However, due to the unusual circumstance the Department faces the committee is assigning the Needs Improvement designation.

Further, the long form IPRC report provided was incomplete and though the committee reached out multiple times to the Department, the report remains incomplete. As a result, the committee's recommendations should be viewed as its best efforts to assess the Art Department's needs with the information provided.

CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2019 – 73.0% Spring 2020 – 47.4%

Fall 2020 – 69.2% Spring 2021 – 79.3%

Fall 2021 – 92.6% Spring 2022 – 93.3%

Fall 2022 – 90.6% Spring 2023 – 80.6%

Comments:

The Art Department has assessed CSLOs for at least 90% of Art courses for the Fall 2021, Spring 2022, and Fall 2022 semesters. The department noted a plan to send out emails to adjunct faculty with reminders to complete the CSLO assessments. It is recommended that the department coordinator run faculty participation reports in eLumen each semester to follow up with Faculty with missing CSLO assessments.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Art Department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Art PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 97.4% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Computation.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

There are PSLOs written for the active Art Associate in Arts Degree in Curricunet. There is a PSLO written in Curricunet for the Studio Arts Associate in Arts for Transfer Degree (AA-T), but with a pending status. The Art Department should pre-launch the Studio Arts Associate in Arts for Transfer Degree (AA-T) in Curricunet. The Art History Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T) is launched in Curricunet, but there are no PSLOs written for the degree. The Art department should contact Marbelly Jairam, the Curriculum Specialist, and add at least one PSLO to the program (degree).

Commendations:

The Department has worked diligently to expand and redefine the role art plays in community building, to incorporate artwork into overall campus life, and to showcase student work. The results of this innovative thinking can be seen in the student success stories. The Department has made admirable efforts to increase equity with holistic and effective methods—rethinking whole frameworks as well as addressing the more mundane challenges diverse groups of students face. Overall success rates are above the College average and just below the division.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends the Art Department address its foundational administrative issues as soon as possible—including SLO and PSLO completion, website updating, and program mapping. It is also imperative they complete their budget requests.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Fork Lift	\$7,999	C -M	D	O	M I G	RN	180
2	Light Kits x6	\$2400	T -F	D	O	M I G	N	50
3	Hover-Cam Ultra 8 x6	\$2400	T- F	D	O	M I G	N	275
4	Mac Book Pro x25	\$35,000	T	D	O	M I G	R N	100
5	Vinyl Cutter	\$350	T-F-C	D	O	M I G	N	50
6	Cintq Pro x25	\$50,000	T-F	D	O	M I G	N	100
7	VR- set x 15	\$7500	T-F	D	O	M I G	RN	50
8	CNC router	\$7000	T-F	D	O	M I G	RN	200
9	DSLR CAMERA	\$10,000	T-F	D	O	M I G	RN	75
10	PLA 3D printer x3	\$2000	T-F	D	O	M I G	RN	200

11	Laser Router	\$5000	T-F	D	O	M I G	RN	
----	--------------	--------	-----	---	---	-------	----	--

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Total \$ amount for request

Amount:

Type:

F = Faculty

C = Classified/Admin.

T =

M = Maintenance

Technology

Need:

D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length:

O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/On-Going

Purpose:

CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age:

N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact:

of students impacted per year

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The committee supports above noted budget requests. Although the budget chart is not complete, it is clear the Department needs more full-time faculty to function properly.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Chemistry

Presenter: Robin De Roo and Patricia Menchaca

Date: 11/6/23

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 Chemistry Department provided a complete report; however, the presentation to the committee was inadequate. It is clear that the Chemistry Department's greatest need is for a full-time faculty member to teach Organic Chemistry. Professor De Roo noted a trend that requires attention. Namely, students who take General Chemistry A in the fall followed by General Chemistry B in the spring have higher success rates than those who take A in the spring and B in the fall as

students forget material over the summer recess. An additional full-time faculty member for Organic Chemistry will make it possible to remedy this.

There was a sharp drop in degrees and certificates issued in 2022-23 but the Department boasts a 100% transfer rate.

Due to changes related to AB 704, the Department is struggling to fulfill its curriculum as students often do not have the math skills required for success. Chemistry has comparable success rates among ethnic groups, though the data indicate African-American students are not completing TLE or TLM in their first year.

CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2019 – 100.0% Spring 2020 – 100.0%

Fall 2020 – 100.0% Spring 2021 – 100.0%

Fall 2021 – 100.0% Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Fall 2022 – 100.0% Spring 2023 – 100.0%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 100.0%. The Chemistry Department is doing an excellent job of assessing CSLOs. As a result of the assessment process, the Department identified learning outcomes that students weren't fully mastering and made improvements in the classroom to address those areas. For example, in Chemistry 111A, faculty noted that students struggled with the nomenclature of compounds and the Department designed a plan to implement more quizzes in lectures to improve student success on this learning outcome. Instructor feedback shows that students improved in those nomenclature skills after the new learning strategy was introduced. The Chemistry Department noted they will need additional Chem Draw licenses, Molecular Models, and an additional full-time Faculty member to support ongoing student learning and success.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Chemistry Department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The vast majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Chemistry PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 97.8% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Communicating.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

The two active Chemistry degrees in Currucunet include PSLOs. The Chemistry Department has written PSLOs for the Chemistry Associate in Science Degree for Transfer (AS-T) and for the Chemistry Associate in Science Degree for UC Transfer.

Commendations:

The Chemistry department should be commended on its 100% transfer rate, as well as its participation in the Black professionals in STEM panel. They have also participated in various community outreach initiatives and five faculty members participated in the CoRE program.

Recommendations:

The department chair is encouraged to give the presentation in future. Full-time faculty member Robin De Roo answered some of the committee's questions to the best of her ability but since she was not given adequate time or instructions by her chair on what to present, many questions went unanswered.

Identified Resources and Budget Needs:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Add one Organic Chemistry Full-time Faculty	\$150,000 per year	F	D	O	CN	RN	100
2	Increase supply budget to cover cost increase due to inflation	Additional \$3000 per year	M	D	C	CN	RN	1600
3	Chemistry Technician from 11 to 12 month	Additional \$7000 per year	C	D	O	CN	RN	1600
4	Hire a 12-month full-time laboratory clerk	\$110000 per year	C	D	C	M	RN	1600



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Counseling

Presenter: Jacky Rangel and Robert Grantham

Date: 11/13/23

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 counseling department is facing some upcoming retirements and has requested an additional full-time faculty member to address students interested in BIS and CIS. Overall, the department is working toward closing equity gaps and preparing well for upcoming changes to state requirements.

CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2019 – 100.0% Spring 2020 – 100.0%
 Fall 2020 – 100.0% Spring 2021 – 100.0%
 Fall 2021 – 100.0% Spring 2022 – 100.0%
 Fall 2022 – 100.0% Spring 2023 – 100.0%

Comments:

The Counseling Department is doing an excellent job of assessing CSLOs for their courses.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Counseling Department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Counseling PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 91.2% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Computation.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

The Counseling Department has written PSLOs for their degrees and certificates and the programs (degrees/certificates) are active.

Commendations:

The Department’s overall success rates are above the college average. Their certificate and degree completion rates are also high. There are equality gaps but the department is aware of them and working to address them.

Recommendations:

In addition to continuing their work on the equity gaps, the committee recommends the Department address COUN 110’s low success rates, as it seems to be an outlier in an otherwise successful program.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Business Counseling faculty	\$92,627-\$110,551	F	D	O	CN	N	3000
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								

7								
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Total \$ amount for request

Amount:

Type:

Need:

Length:

Purpose:

Age:

Impact:

F = Faculty

D = Department

O = One-Time Need

CN = Critical Need

N = New Request

C = Classified/Admin.

V = Division

M = Prog. Maintenance

T = Technology

V = Division

I = Prog. Improvement

RR = Repeat/Received

M = Maintenance

C = Campus

C = Continuing/On-Going

G = Prog. Growth

RN = Repeat/Not Received

of students impacted per year

BUDGET COMMENTS:

There is a strong case for an additional full-time faculty member, particularly in light of impending retirements.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Communication Studies

Presenter: Michael Brydges, Liana Koeppel, John Lambros, Jennifer Page

Date: November 6, 2023

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 Communications Studies Department presented a detailed and impressive review and presentation. As a direct result of the pandemic, degrees and certificates awarded, as well as transfer rates, have declined since the last program review cycle.

Communications Studies' largest challenge is the Department's impending retirements. Three of the five full-time faculty are scheduled to retire in the next three-year cycles, and there is an additional need for a full-time debate coach.

The Communications Studies program today is a robust part of campus life, from faculty participation in shared governance, to the department's accomplished debate team. Further the passage of AB 928 requiring Oral Communication will increase enrollment as previous IGETC-track students will now have to fulfill an Oral Communications requirement. As a result, full-time faculty will need more support and new full-time faculty will be charged with keeping this excellent department running as well as it has.

CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2019 – 100.0% Spring 2020 – 100.0%

Fall 2020 – 100.0% Spring 2021 – 100.0%

Fall 2021 – 100.0% Spring 2022 – 100.0%

Fall 2022 – 100.0% Spring 2023 – 100.0%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 100.0%. The Communication Studies Department is doing an excellent job of assessing CSLOs. As a result of the assessment process, the Department identifies learning outcomes that students aren't fully mastering and instructors make improvements in the classroom to address those areas. The Department meets to discuss strategies and best practices for improving student success rates of learning outcomes that have been identified as not meeting the standard. It was noted that Communication Studies instructors have reported successful changes to their teaching methodology to improve student learning.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Communication Studies Department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Communication Studies PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 92.9% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Equity.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

In Curricunet, the active Communication Studies Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T) and active Communication Certificate include PSLOs. PSLOs have been written and launched in Curricunet for the Communication Studies 2.0 Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T).

Commendations:

The committee commends the Communication Studies Department on its excellent presentation, its 100% SLO rates, its use of SLO data, and its adjunct participation. Further, the committee commends the Department on adapting its curriculum certificates.

The Department is incredibly involved in campus activities and committees. Both full-time and adjunct faculty regularly participate in campus outreach events including high involvement in Forensics recruitment efforts. Internally, the Department appears to be very cohesive and collegial.

The committee also commends the Department on its efforts in DEI. Equity was added to the Department’s mission statement. Full-time and adjunct Faculty have participated regularly in equity-centered workshops, seminars, and training programs such as ASCEND and CoRe (course redesign), and have implemented equity-minded assignments in their classes.

Down the line, Communications Studies plans to collaborate with H.S. division for coursework within the Communication Studies Department for students pursuing a BS degree since the passage of the new legislative bill which will allow community colleges to offer BS degrees for various degrees.

Finally, the total overall success rate for the Department continues to increase

Recommendations:

The committee recommends the Department plan well for the eventual retirements to ensure the transition is as smooth as possible and none of the valuable work the department has built is lost.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*	
1	Replace Retiring FT Faculty (3)	\$300,000	F	C	C	CN	N	1,000 per year	
2	Replace Recording Equipment	\$20,000	T	D	O	M	N	3,000 per year	
3	OER Textbook	\$5000	F	D	O	I	N	3,000 per year	
4	Speech and Debate Team Equipment	\$ 7,000	T	D/V	O	I	N	70 per year	

4	Adjunct Faculty Equity Training Compensation	\$5,000 per year	F	D	C	I	RN	2500 per year	
5	New FT Faculty	\$100,000	F	D	C	G	RN	300 per year	



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Dance

Presenter: Maha Afra

Date: 11/13/23

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 Dance Department provided a clear and comprehensive report and presentation to the committee. The Department has faced several significant challenges of late. The pandemic and resulting campus shut-down disproportionately impacted the dance department. AB811 and its changes to course repeatability have been detrimental to the Dance Department. Further, audition requirements at various universities have impacted transfer rates. The Department is also facing the retirement of its only full-time faculty member soon.

The theater-shared resource budgeting, which presented issues for the Department in the past, seems to be improving. Although the Department has good success rates, Professor Afra noted that, as with other fine arts programs, some of the traditional markers of academic success do not adequately capture what the dance department is contributing to students' lives and the campus overall.

CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2019 – 82.6% Spring 2020 – 62.5%
Fall 2020 – 90.9% Spring 2021 – 91.7%
Fall 2021 – 88.9% Spring 2022 – 83.3%
Fall 2022 – 95.5% Spring 2023 – 91.3%

Comments:

The Dance department is doing a good job of assessing CSLOs for their courses for the most part. It is recommended that the department coordinator or designee continue to follow up with faculty to complete CSLO assessments each semester to reach the standard of assessing CSLOs for at least 90% of courses each semester. The department noted that the lack of repeatability for students is a hindrance to their program.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Dance Department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for dance PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 97.7% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Technology.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

PSLOs are written for the Dance Associate in Arts Degree and Dance Teaching Certificate and the programs (degree/certificate) are launched in Curricunet.

Commendations:

The Dance Department's contributions to both shared governance and student life are among the greatest on campus.

The Department is to be commended on its commitment to diversity and self-expression. The dance faculty are also committed to mentoring and providing the highly individualized education, testing, and academic plans needed for each student. They have also participated in successful cross-

disciplinary collaborations with Psychology, Astronomy, and Puente. Their adjunct faculty are remarkable in their commitment to, and involvement in, departmental and campus enrichment. That said, it is clear that the Department's accomplishments are largely due to Professor Afra's dedication and hard work.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends the Dance Department address the problem of adjunct faculty not completing their SLOs. The department should clearly communicate that SLOs are part of the adjunct contract.

To address the challenges of repeatability, the committee encourages the Department to explore options such as noncredit or working with the curriculum committee and the department dean to change course designation to skill building. The committee also recommends that dance faculty work closely with the dean to plan for the changes coming. Further, the program would benefit from auto-awarding if students complete all the requirements but don't apply for the degree/certificate.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Full Time Faculty		F	D	C	CN	RR	
2	Full Time Office Manager		C	D	C	CN	RR	
3	Accessibility issues	Unknown	M	C	O	I	N	
4	Projection Equipment	\$250k	T	D	O	I	N	
5	Theater deck (duron)		M	C	O	M	RR	
6	Box Office Tech	\$45k	M	V	O	M	RR	
7	Lighting Equipment	\$1m	T	C	O	M	RR	
8	Classroom A/V	\$38k	M	D	O	M	RR	
9	Sub floor		M	C	O	M	RR	
10	Dance Tech Classroom		T	D	O	M	RR	
11	Laptops		T	D	O	M	RR	

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount:

Type:

Need:

Length:

Purpose:

Age:

Impact:

F = Faculty

D = Department

O = One-Time Need

CN = Critical Need

N = New Request

C = Classified/Admin.

V = Division

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

RR = Repeat/Received

T = Technology

C = Campus

C = Continuing/On-Going

G = Prog. Growth

RN = Repeat/Not Received

of students impacted per year

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The department makes a strong case for another full-time faculty member, in addition to a replacement for Professor Afra when she retires.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Economics

Presenter: Parwinder Sidhu

Date: 11/13/23

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 Economics Department has faced declining enrollment in recent years, as well as lower than average success rates. That said, degree and transfer rates have increased and students report they are well prepared for university courses. The primary need is for more student tutors.

CSLOs:

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

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2019 – 100.0% Spring 2020 – 100.0%
Fall 2020 – 66.7% Spring 2021 – 100.0%
Fall 2021 – 100.0% Spring 2022 – 100.0%
Fall 2022 – 100.0% Spring 2023 – 100.0%

Comments:

The Economics Department is doing a great job of assessing CSLOs for their courses. As a result of the assessment process, the Department noted they plan to meet and discuss possible changes to CSLOs for ECON 100 C and ECON 105 C. The Department noted they continue to find ways to implement changes that will help the students understand course material better. The Department also noted a need for tutors as a resource to help improve students' ability to communicate and problem-solve which will then lead to higher student success rates.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Economics Department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Economics PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 92.2% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Equity.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

PSLOs are written in Curricunet for the Economics Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer Degree (AA-T) and the Business Economics Certificate. Currently, these programs (degree/certificate) are pending in Curricunet. It is strongly recommended that the department pre-launch these programs in Curricunet.

Commendations:

The Economics Department has made considerable efforts on the DEI front and are currently working with the Legacy program to offer a personal finance class for Legacy students. Their transfer rate is also commendable.

Recommendations:

The Department must pre-launch its pending Curricunet changes. The committee also recommends the Department look at the relationship between modality and success rates, especially in Econ 105. Students seem to be significantly more successful in modalities other than asynchronous, yet numerous students take it asynchronously.

The Department is also encouraged to reach out to the Learning Resource Center regarding their need for more tutors.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

No resources were requested.

BUDGET COMMENTS:

N/A



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Kinesiology

Presenter: Margaret Mohr and Colin Preston

Date: 11/25/23

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 Kinesiology department presented a clear long form report and excellent presentation. Their enrollment has rebounded since the pandemic and their student success rates are excellent. The department also has an exceptional record of participation in campus shared governance, as well as community out-reach. There is a clear need for a dedicated Counselor and a strong case to be made for an additional full-time faculty member.

CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Kinesiology**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2019 – 85.5% Spring 2020 – 83.3%
Fall 2020 – 73.7% Spring 2021 – 84.3%
Fall 2021 – 97.8% Spring 2022 – 100.0%
Fall 2022 – 96.6% Spring 2023 – 96.9%

Public Health Science**Courses Assessed:**

Fall 2019 – N/A Spring 2020 – N/A
Fall 2020 – N/A Spring 2021 – N/A
Fall 2021 – 100.0% Spring 2022 – 100.0%
Fall 2022 – 100.0% Spring 2023 – 100.0%

Comments:

The Kinesiology Department is doing a great job of assessing CSLOs for their courses. The Kinesiology Department has assessed CSLOs for at least 90% of their courses each semester since Fall 2021. The Kinesiology department noted that they plan to schedule meetings with full-time and adjunct faculty to collaborate and discuss CSLOs. As a reminder, CSLO assessment is included in both full-time and adjunct faculty contracts.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Kinesiology Department has completed the PSLO mappings in eLumen for Kinesiology and Public Health Science. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Kinesiology PSLOs and Public Health Science PSLOs. One of the highlights from the Kinesiology PSLO data results is that 92.8% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Computation. One of the highlights from the Public Health Science PSLO data results is that 95.7% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Technology.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

The active Kinesiology degrees (2) and certificates (5) in Curricunet include PSLOs.
The active Public Health Science degrees (2) and certificate (1) in Curricunet include PSLOs.

Commendations:

The Department is to be commended on its fantastic student success and transfer rates. The Department has also made excellent use of campus student engagement and professional development resources and programs such as Starfish, CoRE, Title V Road shows, and POCR. Finally, their Health and Wellness Club advertises many of the College’s offerings for students.

The Department is clearly committed to DEI initiatives. They are having robust conversations about microaggressions and other implicit bias that affects students and the campus community. In addition to their contributions to the College, Kinesiology also has an excellent record of community engagement. For example, the Miracle Baseball League helps community members with disabilities play baseball. The Department reaches out to elementary and middle school students.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends stressing to all faculty that SLOs are part of the faculty contract. The department is also encouraged to look into the disparity in success rates from Fall to Spring for KIN 145. Finally, the committee recommends the department submit its website recommendations to the Office of Campus Communications to keep webpages current.

Given that faculty prioritization may become more competitive in future years, the department might explore options for hiring non-faculty coaches.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Soccer Field renovation including synthetic turf, seating, press box, power/data, storage, & locker room.	\$3,000,000+ Capital Projects to Advise	F	D	O	I	N	200
2	Five Beach Volleyball Courts.	\$350,000+	F	D	O	G	RN	50
3	Gym I and Gym II Bleacher Replacement.	\$300,000+ Capital Projects to Advise	F	C	O	I	RN	3000

4	Baseball Field renovation including new backstop, synthetic turf, seating, press box, scoreboard, power/data.	\$3,000,000+ Capital Projects to Advise	F	D	O	I	N	50
5	Softball Field synthetic turf.	\$1,000,000+	F	D	O	I	N	100
6	Conversion of room 143 (Gym II) from M&O storage to an instructional classroom.	\$50,000+	F	D	O	G	RN	250



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Mathematics

Presenter: Adam Eckenrode

Date: 11/13/23

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 Mathematics Department provided an informative presentation to the committee. The department has faced some challenges due to AB 705 and are expecting lower student success as a result of AB 1705. They do have lower success rates than the college average, but they are on par

with mathematics departments at other schools in the area. Their greatest need is for full-time faculty members as they are anticipating two retirements in the spring.

CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2019 – 100.0% Spring 2020 – 100.0%
Fall 2020 – 100.0% Spring 2021 – 100.0%
Fall 2021 – 100.0% Spring 2022 – 100.0%
Fall 2022 – 100.0% Spring 2023 – 100.0%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 100.0%. The Mathematics Department is doing an excellent job of assessing CSLOs. As a result of the assessment process, the Department continuously meets to discuss best practices and challenges. The Mathematics Department created a 2-unit corequisite course to provide more support for Calculus 1. The Department noted that instructors discuss growth mindset with students and have increased active learning activities in the classroom, such as board work, Kahoot quizzes, and group work. The Department also noted that instructors have implemented grading for equity principles to give students multiple attempts to achieve mastery. The Department noted a testing center for make-up exams would be an invaluable resource to help improve student learning and would be an alignment with grading for equity principles.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Mathematics Department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Mathematics PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 72.9% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Communicating.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

The Mathematics Department has written a PSLO for the Mathematics Associate in Science Degree for Transfer (AS-T). The Mathematics Associate in Science Degree for Transfer (AS-T) is active in Curricunet.

Commendations:

The Mathematics Department is to be commended on its high transfer rates and for its diligence in creating clear roadmaps for student success. The Department is also committed to expanding their already valiant efforts in tutoring to help students succeed.

The Department has also made considerable effort on DEI fronts. They have implemented Culturally Responsive Mathematics Teaching and use Growth Mindset principles directly with students. This is particularly noteworthy given the equity gaps endemic in math courses at the College and community colleges throughout the State.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends the Mathematics Department plan a sustainable way to keep pace with all the resources they are offering.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	Laptops for classroom instruction	\$40,000	T	D	C	CN	RR	4,500
2	Hire full-time faculty	\$140,000	F	D	C	CN	N	3,190
3	Desktop computers for computer labs (MATH 126 and MATH 220)	\$220,000 (\$55,000 per room with 35 computers each)	T	D	O	CN	N	210
4	MathType, Kahoot, and other software	\$9,300	T	D	C	I	RR	4,500
5	Calculus Review Workshops	\$1,760 for two semesters	F	D	C	I, G	RR	770+
6	OER Development	4 units of release time	F	D	C	I, G	N	490+
7	OER Development	\$20,000 for PE contracts	F	D	C	I, G	N	490+
8	Make-up testing center staff	\$8,320	C	V	C	CN, I, G	N	15,606

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount:

Type:

Need:

Length:

Purpose:

Age:

Impact:

F = Faculty

D = Department

O = One-Time Need

CN = Critical Need

N = New Request

C = Classified/Admin.

V = Division

M = Prog. Maintenance

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

T = Technology

C = Campus

C = Continuing/On-Going

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

M = Maintenance

C = Campus

C = Continuing/On-Going

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Total \$ amount for request

of students impacted per year

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The committee supports the need for updated equipment. There is also a strong need for additional full-time faculty.

Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Political Science

Presenter: Gloria Badal

Date: November 6, 2023

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 Political Science Department, specifically Professor Badal, is to be commended on the amount of effort and work she put in to bring CSLO rates up, and to meet other Program Review metrics. However, the necessary deadline extensions, and the resulting disruption to the committee's timeline, is not sustainable for future program review cycles. This is the primary reason the committee has designated Political Science as "Needs Improvement."

The Political Science Department has suffered from the overall downturn in enrollment. Organizationally, the Department appears somewhat disjointed and in need of more direct leadership and increased communication between full-time faculty members. Future program

reviews should involve the consultation of both full-time faculty members. Adjunct instructors appear to require clearer guidance and/or more accountability.

That said, the Department yields higher course completion and success rates than its Division and the College. Faculty have been involved in the Legacy Program, and there is consensus within the Department to discuss strategies toward implementing equity-minded practices going forward.

CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2019 – 100.0% Spring 2020 – 100.0%
Fall 2020 – 100.0% Spring 2021 – 100.0%
Fall 2021 – 100.0% Spring 2022 – 100.0%
Fall 2022 – 100.0% Spring 2023 – 100.0%

Comments:

The percentage of courses assessed over the span of the last 8 semesters is 100.0%. The Political Science Department has done a great job of completing CSLO assessments.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Political Science Department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Political Science PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 100% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Computation. Also, 94.6% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Presenting.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

PSLOs have been written for the Political Science Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T) in Curricunet. It is recommended that the Department pre-launch the degree in Curricunet.

Commendations:

The committee commends the Department on its hard work in improving SLO rates. The committee also commends the Department on its high success rates and its balance of in-person and online modalities. The Department appears committed to equity and celebrating the diverse voices of its students. Professor Badal is clearly a talented and dedicated educator and her students respond accordingly.

Recommendations:

The Political Science Department is encouraged to increase communication and coordination between full-time faculty as well as between full-time faculty and adjunct faculty. There is an opportunity for enhanced coordination across all faculty, particularly regarding the departmental mission and best practices to keep up with administered requirements.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

There are no budget needs at this time. Due to drops in enrollment, a third full-time faculty member is no longer needed.

BUDGET COMMENTS:

N/A



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Psychology

Presenter: Randy Martinez

Date: 11/27/23

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 Psychology Department provided a complete report and excellent presentation. The Psychology Department had stable enrollment during an historically difficult time

for students and professors. Good course offerings, student demand, and the efforts of full-time and adjunct faculty to meet departmental needs reflect a strong, vital and flexible academic program. The Department also has an excellent overall transfer rate.

It should be noted that Psychology has been particularly impacted by AB705. Students are coming to statistics without the required math skills and to the departments more qualitative courses without the necessary writing skills.

Further, the department has cultivated a strong on-campus presence through in-person gatherings, and programs. They have also robustly participated in initiatives that benefit the campus as a whole, including Professor deDios' leadership of the CoRe program, and the Department's participation in mental health education and awareness programs.

CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2019 – 75.0% Spring 2020 – 75.0%
Fall 2020 – 61.5% Spring 2021 – 92.3%
Fall 2021 – 69.2% Spring 2022 – 91.7%
Fall 2022 – 92.3% Spring 2023 – 91.7%

Comments:

The Psychology department has assessed CSLOs for at least 90% of their courses for the Spring 2021, Spring 2022, Fall 2022, and Spring 2023 semesters. The Department noted they plan to have the department coordinator follow up with faculty with reminders to complete CSLO assessments. As a reminder, CSLO assessment is included in both Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty contracts.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Psychology department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for psychology PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 91.2% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcome, Computation.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

A PSLO has been written in Curricunet for the Psychology Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T). The department needs to pre-launch the degree in Curricunet.

Commendations:

The Psychology Department is commended on its excellent transfer rate of 84.9%.

Further, students earned 552 awards from Fall 2019 to Spring 2023. That is up 39% from the previous four-year period. The number of awards is also 37% of the total awards given in the Social Sciences during the period. Psychology AA-T degrees were 30% of all AA transfer degrees awarded, and 16% of all Associate Transfer degrees awarded including AS-Ts.

The Department has also made great contributions to the support and promotion of Student Services, and organizations like Legacy and Puente and has effectively encouraged student participation in departmental opportunities like PSY Honors and the Psychology Club. It also regularly hosts social gatherings for students that celebrate past alums and inspire current students.

The department is also deeply committed to DEI initiatives. The entire department attended a Psychological Association Teaching conference in April 2023, that focused on tools and techniques to integrate diversity, equity, and inclusion (D.E.I.) in psychology courses.

Recommendations:

The Department is encouraged to address its student success rates and equity gaps. Currently, the success rate is below the College’s yet above the Division’s for Fall 2022 at 67.2%, 66.3% for Division and 69.5% for College. Spring 2023 at 65.8% which is below the Division at 68.6% and College at 72%. That said, the impact of AB705 is likely largely to blame. Equity gaps also exist for Black at 9.5% and Latinx at 4.1%. Native American at 4.2% and Pacific Islander at 4.9%.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	FT Faculty Laptops	10000	F	D	every 4 to 5 years	M/I	RN	Approx. 53% of Psy Students
2	Galvanic skin response devices (5) and software (1)	1200	D	N	O	I	N	240
3	APA membership for each full-time faculty member	250*5 = 1250	F	D	C	I	N	
4	PsycInfo Database	Need Verification from library	T	C	C	I	N	All Psy Students

5								
6								
7								

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Total \$ amount for request

Amount:

Type:

F = Faculty

C = Classified/Admin.

*T =
Technology*

M = Maintenance

Need:

D = Department

V = Division

C = Campus

Length:

O = One-Time Need

C = Continuing/On-Going

Purpose:

CN = Critical Need

M = Prog. Maintenance

I = Prog. Improvement

G = Prog. Growth

Age:

N = New Request

RR = Repeat/Received

RN = Repeat/Not Received

Impact:

of students impacted per year

BUDGET COMMENTS:

The Department's top request was for faculty laptops, which the committee supports.

The Department may consider

adding in a request for more student instruction and/or tutoring for PSY 161.



Instructional Program Review Committee Evaluation

Program: Sociology

Presenter: Regina Rhymes and Larry Curiel

Date: 11/27/2023

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.)

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

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

General Comments:

The Sociology Department provided a complete report and presentation to the committee. The department has accomplished a great deal in some areas including DEI programing, and campus

service. It has increased in-person classes at a time when that has been difficult for many departments, and its transfer rate is very high.

However, there are areas in need of improvement including CSLO completion, curriculum updates and student success rates. The committee has designated the department “Not in Compliance” in part because the SLO completion rate was also noted in the department’s last program review wherein they were given the “Needs Improvement” designation and informed that the SLO completion must be addressed to avoid being found “Not in Compliance” in future. Unfortunately, this did not happen. Further, the curriculum has not been updated in several years and this is a requirement for compliance. These two issues require immediate attention.

CSLOs:

Is the eLumen CSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Courses Assessed:

Fall 2019 – 80.0% Spring 2020 – 85.7%
Fall 2020 – 83.3% Spring 2021 – 71.4%
Fall 2021 – 100.0% Spring 2022 – 62.5%
Fall 2022 – 100.0% Spring 2023 – 75.0%

Comments:

The Sociology Department has assessed CSLOs for at least 90% of their courses for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 semesters. It is important that the department coordinator or designee follow up with faculty each semester with reminders to ensure complete CSLO assessments. As a reminder, CSLO assessment is included in both full-time and adjunct faculty contracts.

Department PSLOs:

Is the eLumen PSLO summary report included? Yes No Other

Comments:

The Sociology Department has completed the PSLO mapping in eLumen. The majority of students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for Sociology PSLOs. One of the highlights from the PSLO data results is that 82.3% of the students assessed are meeting or exceeding the standard for the learning outcomes, Reading, Writing, and Communicating.

Degree & Certificate PSLOs:

The active Sociology Associate in Arts Degree for Transfer (AA-T) includes PSLOs in Curricunet.

Commendations:

The Department is to be commended on its high transfer rate.

Further, the Department clearly focuses on student-centered learning and equity practices by offering different pathways to student success. They have augmented their course material to include more key contributors to the discipline from marginalized backgrounds, and they have adopted digital textbooks that address developments in sociology from as recent as the last three years.

The Department’s commitment to DEI is clear.. Members of the Sociology Department organize and participate in Black History Month and Hispanic Heritage Month. In addition, students are encouraged to participate in the District P.I.E. series. The Department reviews social justice and social equity issues twice a year. One of the Department’s greatest successes has been in creating space for Black and Hispanic Students. Credit for the Legacy space goes to Professor Regina Rhymes, the faculty advisor for the Legacy Program.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends prioritizing SLO completion and curriculum updates immediately. SLOs were noted as needing improvement in the last program review cycle which is primarily why the department is now being found not in compliance. The curriculum updates in particular are absolutely necessary as soon as possible. Further, the Department is highly encouraged to read and incorporate the numerous recommendations from Dean Thomas included as an addendum to their report.

Identified Resource and Budget Needs:

Rank	Name of Request	Amount*	Type*	Need*	Length*	Purpose*	Age*	Impact*
1	One full-time Sociology faculty member	\$100,000	Faculty	Department		CN	RN	
2	Conferences	\$5,000	Faculty	Department		Program Improvement	RN	
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								

***TABLE CODE KEY**

Amount: Total \$ amount for request

Type: F = Faculty C = Classified/Admin. T = Technology M = Maintenance Need: D = Department V =

Division C = Campus

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

