**Program Efficacy Report  
Spring 2011**

**Name of Department**: Math

**Efficacy Team: Dena Murillo-Peters, Ed Millican, Yolanda Simental**

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

**Next Program Efficacy: 2013/2014**

|  |
| --- |
| **Continuation:** Program is currently meeting the needs of the institution as demonstrated by the responses to the questions and the document’s evidence of critical self-study. Further explanation is requested in the following categories: demographics, student success rates, content review for Math 266, trends and campus climate. |

| **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:**  **Does Not Meet.** The Math Department states that the demographic figures for their Department are “less than 5%, well within error margins” of the figures for SBVC with regard to gender and ethnicity.  The concern is that the margin of error was not defined and there is no explanation given. The figures for the Department and the College are both head counts, where there is no margin of error.  The ethnicity figures do not show much difference between Department and College, but with regard to gender, there is a discrepancy of 5%--the Department population is 60.9% female while the comparable figure for the College is 55.7%.  This may not be a problem, but it seems like a sufficiently significant difference to warrant explanation.  At least the Department should have said they are aware of the discrepancy, and are keeping an eye on it. Further explanation is recommended on this matter. | | |
| ***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:**  **Meets:** The program has provided evidence that the pattern of service meets student needs.. | | |

| **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 Math Department reports holding steady at a student success rate of 53%.  Further explanation is required on this figure. This seems low, but in view of the subject (which many people have phobias about) it may not be.  Is 53% good for math courses? The Department should have provided information as to why this is an adequate success rate. | | |
| ***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:** The program has submitted student learning outcomes for all courses. Program has a three-year plan on file. | | |
| **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 program has a mission and it links clearly with SBVC’s mission statement. | | |
| ***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 data shows the program is productive at an acceptable level. | | |
| ***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 course, MATH 266, is long overdue for content review--the review date was 2006!  This delay is not explained by the Department.  The Department does not say that they are doing anything to correct this.  The other 29 Math courses appear to be current. Further explanation needs to be provided on the action plan to correct the above item. | | |
| **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:**  **Does Not Meet:** The program did not identify major socio-economic trends that might affect employment opportunities in mathematics or the need for mathematical skills generally in the workforce.  It seems pretty obvious that math is needed by many people and will continue to be, but the Department should be cognizant of such trends, and should have said something about 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:**  **Meets:** The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning. | | |
| ***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 incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning. | | |
| **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:**  **Does Not Meet:** The response to campus climate needs to be further explained. The response given was that the faculty have open door policies. In view of the fact that Math is a subject that many people have problems with, it would seem that the Department should be more proactive in developing campus events and programs dedicated to the proposition that Math is fun and important.  For example, the initiatives described under Partnerships are the sort of thing it would be good to see at SBVC. | | |