**Program Efficacy Evaluation and Recommendation**

**Spring 2012**

|  |
| --- |
| **Program: Reading** |
| **Reviewers: Ed Millican, Yolanda Simental, Aaron Beaver** |
| **Overall Recommendation with Rationale:**  **CONTINUATION. This program clearly merits continuation. We have one serious concern regarding student success, but that is currently being addressed by the Department. All other categories meet or exceed the rubrics as indicated.** |

**Part I: Access**

| **Strategic Initiative** | **Institutional Expectations** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Does Not Meet** | **Meets X** |
|  | | |
| 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 warranted, discuss the plans or activities that are in place to recruit and retain underserved populations. |
| 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 warranted, plans or activities are in place to meet a broader range of needs. |
| **Demographics:** **Meets or** **Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **MEETS. In general, the demographic data regarding this program closely match that of the school as a whole. The one discrepancy suggesting under-service of Hispanics is adequately explained, and that issue hopefully will be addressed by the development of an ESL Reading course which is in the works. The next review of this program in three years should be careful to observe whether progress has, in fact, been made in this regard.**  **Patterns of Service: Meets or Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **MEETS. The scheduling of classes by the Reading Department appears sensitive to the needs of the student body. The number of courses is insufficient to meet the demand, but that seems true for about every Department these days.** | | |

**Part II: Student Success**

| **Strategic Initiative** | **Institutional Expectations** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Does Not Meet** | **Meets** |
|  | | |
| 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. |
| Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes | | Program has not completed the first three-year SLO/SAO cycle. | Program has completed the first three-year SLO/SAO cycle. Discusses how SLOs were evaluated and has plans to continue SLO process. | | --- | --- | | |
| **Student Success: Meets or Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **DOES NOT MEET. The student success rate achieved a high point of 59% in the 08-09 school year. This score remained steady the following year (58%) but then declined precipitously (to 47%) in 10-11. The Department suspects that a faulty assessment instrument is the reason for the decline, and is working with the Office of Research to gather data on this. The evaluation of “does not meet” simply reflects the fact that the cause for the decline has not yet been identified, and consequently appropriate remedial steps have not yet been taken. This evaluation is somewhat unfair to the Department, since the problem only emerged recently and they have not had much time to deal with it. Indeed, a one-year decline could merely be a random fluctuation. Naturally, when this program is reviewed again in three years, the reviewing team should be particularly careful to note the Departmental trends in student success.**  **SLOs: Meets or Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **MEETS. SLOs have been established for all courses in this Department, as well as a three-year cycle for assessment and improvement. Two courses that currently are not being offered have not been assessed.** | | |

**Part III: Institutional Effectiveness**

| **Strategic Initiative** | **Institutional Expectations** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Does Not Meet** | **Meets** |
|  | | |
| 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. |
| 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. |
| 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 the curriculum review process is up to date. Courses are relevant and current to the mission of the program.  Appropriate courses have been articulated or transfer with UC/CSU or plans are in place to articulate appropriate courses. |
| **Mission and Purpose: Meets or Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **MEETS. The Department shows a clear commitment to serving a diverse student body with a variety of resources and technologies.**  **Productivity: Meets or Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **MEETS. Productivity statistics indicate steady improvement over the last several years. The campus WSCH/FTEF goal of 525 has not quite been attained, but – as the Departmental report indicates – that is not to be expected in a program where classes are capped at 28.**  **Relevance, Currency and Articulation: Meets or Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **MEETS. All course curricula are current, as is the catalogue information. Reading courses, with one exception (READ 102), do not articulate with either UC or CSU. It is regrettable that, due to budgetary constraints, the one transferrable course is not currently being offered (see below).** | | |

**Part IV. Planning**

| **Strategic Initiative** | **Institutional Expectations** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Does Not Meet** | **Meets** |
| **Part IV: Planning - Rubric** | | |
| Trends | The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided. | The program ~~identifies~~ and describes major trends in the field. Program addresses how trends will affect enrollment and planning. Provide data or research from the field for support. |
| Accomplishments | The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning. | The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning. |
| Challenges | The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning. | The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning. |
| **Trends: Meets or Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **MEETS. The Department has documented a probable increased need for Reading courses in the future.**  **Accomplishments: Meets or Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **MEETS. The Department can point to accomplishments in terms of increased lab space, learning communities, and online and hybrid courses.**  **Challenges: Meets or Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **MEETS. The Department notes the familiar challenges of finding qualified adjunct faculty and the need for more sections to meet student demand. As noted earlier, due to the high demand for basic skills classes – and limited resources – the one transferrable Reading course is not offered at this time. That’s too bad, but seemingly unavoidable.** | | |

| **Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Does Not Meet** | **Meets** |
| 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. |
| **Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate: Meets or Does Not Meet  Reviewer Feedback:**  **MEETS. The Reading Department has formed a partnership with the Automotive Department. It participates in Humanities Day activities, to highlight the success of Reading students. It is also partnering with the San Bernardino Adult Schools in a program, entitled “Transitions to Success,” which is designed to improve the college readiness of students. A commitment to technological innovation is also asserted and documented.** | | |