**Program Efficacy Report  
Spring 2011**

**Name of Department**: Art

**Efficacy Team: Damon Bell, Michael Mayne, Jesse Galaviz**

**Overall Recommendation (include rationale): CONTINUATION**

**Next Program Efficacy: 2013/2014**

|  |
| --- |
| **– There is more good here than bad. The program seems to be improving although the report seems like a quick assessment vs. a well thought out analysis.** |

| **Strategic Initiative** | **Institutional Expectations** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Does Not Meet** | **Meets** |
| **Part I: Access** | | |
| ***Demographics*** | *The program does not provide*  *an appropriate analysis regarding identified differences in the program’s population compared to that of the general population* | *The program provides an analysis of the demographic data and provides an interpretation in response to any identified variance.*  *If indicated, plans or activities are in place to recruit and retain underserved populations.* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS –** The document provides a detailed analysis of the demographic data including gender, ethnicity, ability and age. The only underserved group identified is the African American student population. They are trying to attract more students from that demographic through Black artist exhibits with plan for a show that will specifically attract younger African American students. | | |
| ***Pattern of Service*** | *The program’s pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.* | *The program provides evidence that the pattern of service or instruction meets student needs.*    *If indicated, plans or activities are in place to meet a broader range of needs.* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does Not Meet**  The program discusses its overall plan for course offerings and how they are equitably distributed throughout the morning, afternoon, and evening hours and throughout the various days of the week (M W, T R, and F and Sat. classes). The data does not discuss the fill rates of these classes nor does it discuss which classes are most popular or have the best retention. This information seems more like a recitation of data than an analysis of the data. | | |
| **Part II: Student Success** | | |
| ***Data demonstrating achievement of instructional or service success*** | *Program does not provide an adequate analysis of the data provided with respect to relevant program data.* | *Program provides an analysis of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals.*  *If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS –** The Art department identified the development of more online courses as a goal. They have submitted five courses to curriculum committee for alternate delivery.  A concise EMP summary is provided in this section that details the ebb and flow of their FTES between 2005 and 2010. Although retention rates remain stable there has been a slight decline in online enrollment. | | |
| ***Student Learning Outcomes*** | *Program has not submitted student learning outcomes for all courses certificates or degrees. Does not have a three-year plan on file.*  *Program has not analyzed assessment results and implemented changes where appropriate.* | *Program has submitted student learning outcomes for all courses certificates or degrees. Program has a three-year plan on file.*  *Program has analyzed assessment results and implemented changes where appropriate* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does Not Meet**  The program has submitted SLOs and has gathered data regarding the SLOs, however, no assessment has been made from the data. Likewise, no changes have been implemented. | | |
| **Part III: Institutional Effectiveness** | | |
| ***Mission and Purpose*** | *The program does not have a mission, or it does not clearly link with the institutional mission.* | *The program has a mission and it links clearly with the institutional mission.* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS –** The Art department provides quality art education to a diverse community of learners. The community of learners served by the Art department closely mirrored the college’s population. | | |
| ***Productivity*** | *The data does not show an acceptable level of productivity for the program, or the issue of productivity is not adequately addressed.* | *The data shows the program is productive at an acceptable level.* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS --** The department has experienced an increase in FTES which that attribute to the increase in college enrollment and the move to a new facility. | | |
| ***Relevance, Currency, Articulation*** | *The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.* | *The program provides evidence that curriculum review process is up to date. Courses are relevant and current to the mission of the program.*  *Appropriate courses have been articulated with UC/CSU or plans are in place to articulate appropriate courses.* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does Not Meet**  The curriculum process is not up to date. Most of the classes have not been articulated since 2001 – 03. They were due for articulation 2008 – 09. Again, speculation was made that things will improve and should be articulated in the near future. | | |
| **Part IV: Planning** | | |
| ***Trends*** | *The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.* | *The programidentifies and describes major trends in the field. Program addresses how trends will affect enrollment and planning. Provides data from internal research or research from the field for support.* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS –** The Art department identifies the state budget, unemployment, returning veterans and displaced university students as the current trends for the program. They also refer to returning faculty as a trend because they lost the Art history instructor and may loss another within two years. | | |
| ***Accomplishments*** | *The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.* | *The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS --**  The program is slowly growing including the Art Club, annual art shows, the Raku Dinner, trips to museums, and a strong community presence**.** | | |
| ***Weaknesses/challenges*** | *The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.* | *The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS --** The program recognizes that it needs to update the curriculum more often and work closer with the articulation officer to ensure articulation of current courses. The plan to explore internships as a way to address the needs of students in the programs. | | |
| **Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate** | | |
|  | *Program does not demonstrate that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships or Campus Climate.*  *Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships or Campus Climate* | *Program demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.*  *Program has plans to further implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.* |
| **Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS --** The departments are using state of the art technology for graphics, multimedia design, ceramics and glassblowing. There is a partnership with California Glass Exchange to provide internships, networking and other invaluable experiences for students. The mention that students are comfortable in the environment but they do not mention anything about the building relative newness in this section. | | |