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|  |
| --- |
| **CONTINUATION**  I don’t doubt that Business Administration is a good program. However the document reads like a cut and paste job from another report that was already available. Answers are often not relevant to the questions for instance information that should have been included in ‘Pattern of Service” is found in Productivity. Supplemental data re: Student Success is not linked to the program. There is a great tie in to the mission statement in supplemental data, but not in the mission statement area etc…  **The information provided in the report is not always complete or fully responsive, but the department on the whole seems healthy. Course SLOs have been developed for every course and assessed. Program SLOs are in the development stage. Curriculum is current, except for one course, which is pending. The measures of student success and efficiency seem to show a tendency towards modest improvement. No serious problems are evident.** |

| **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 program’s student population closely mirrors the campus population. The report claims that all discrepancies are within 2-3%, but the percentage of women in the program (51.6) is actually 4.1% less than the percentage for the school (55.7) – a fact not mentioned in the report. Perhaps there should be efforts to encourage more women to enter the field of business. The figures do not, however, seem to be sufficiently different to constitute a problem.** | | |
| ***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 report indicates that the instructional curriculum of the department prepares students for the world of business, and points to the collaborative efforts with the Western Association of Food Chains. However, it does not address the issues of operation/pattern of scheduling and alternate delivery methods. Nor, except for a general statement, does it demonstrate that the courses that are currently offered meet student needs. Alternative delivery methods are discussed in other parts of the report, but should have been included here.** | | |
| **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**  **A tendency towards modest improvement is evident in the statistics. The supplemental data regarding unemployment rates is basically irrelevant since it is not related specifically to this program.**  EMP Data shows that student success and retention is steadily increasing. Program notes increase in FTES and certificates awards. Supplemental Data regarding unemployment rates is informative but not directly tied to the | | |
| ***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: MEETS**  **Course SLOs have been developed and assessed for all courses. A three year plan is on file. Program SLOs are in process of development.** | | |
| **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 report asserts that the department provides a quality education appropriate to a collection of students with diverse goals – transfer, certificate, or skill upgrade objectives.** | | |
| ***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**  Program notes growth in FTEs and increase in Certificates. Program notes that short-term and hybrid courses, and partnership with Stater Bros could be responsible for growth | | |
| ***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: MEETS**  **One problem: a single course, BUSAD 222 is not current, though it is pending. The report should have mentioned this. Otherwise, the information provided indicates relevance, currency, and articulation.** | | |
| **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 report indicates two trends: globalization and recent emphasis on corporate malfeasance, and indicates how the program has responded to them.** | | |
| ***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: DOES NOT MEET**  **The report indicates various accomplishments of the program. However, it does not show how the department is building on these. Some information on this was provided in the response to the question on trends – i.e. continuing with the Stater Brothers partnership – but should have been given here.** | | |
| ***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: DOES NOT MEETS**  Program identifies that the economy and limited space at 4 yr colleges have increased the need for lower level business courses but does not address planning. Does the program plan to increase offerings of lower level courses and decrease other offerings to accommodate these students?  **No plan is given concerning how the department will maintain quality in the face of budget cuts.** | | |
| **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 report shows the department’s efforts to incorporate the strategic initiatives of technology, partnerships, and campus climate.** | | |