

Program Efficacy Report Spring 2013

Name of Department: Corrections

Efficacy Team: Stacy Meyer, Sheri Lillard, and Joel Lamore

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): Continuation

Correction's report overall addresses each area specifically, with developed examples and good analysis. The program provides good evidence it is strong on Access, Student Success, Effectiveness, Planning, Technology, Partnerships and Campus Climate. The single "does not meet" represents a discussion that is somewhat off topic rather than an actual program fault. The team recommends Continuation.

Strategic Initiative	Institutional Expectations	
	Does Not Meet	Meets
Part I: Access		
Demographics	<i>The program does not provide an appropriate analysis regarding identified differences in the program's population compared to that of the general population</i>	<i>The program provides an <u>analysis</u> 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.</i>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets</p> <p>Analysis covers several aspects of the program's demographics very well. For instance, the explanation for slight over-representation by women is explained well by noting the program's popularity with single mothers. But there is some under-representation (10% below campus average) by whites which is unexplained. In general, the program's demographics seem in line with campus numbers.</p>		
Pattern of Service	<i>The program's pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.</i>	<i>The program provides <u>evidence</u> 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.</i>

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

The analysis here is thorough, with specific mention of scheduling of courses (including online offerings), discussion of challenge of insuring completion of certificates in a timely manner given budget driven section cuts. Evidence provided includes the fact that certificate can still be completed within 2 years. The pattern of service offered seems thoughtfully balanced to meet student needs despite cuts.

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 program's retention and success, which are good, are put in context with both internal and statewide measures analyzed. The supplemental data included (job outlook, changes in state laws, etc.) are relevant and put in context.

Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes

Program has not demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.

Program has demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

Good evidence of SLO cycle and usage. The SLOs are assessed each semester, have been updated and used to drive improvements (instruction and textbook changes, for example).

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 mission links to institutional mission. The analysis connects the college mission of "quality education" to preparation of students for careers in corrections and discusses the program demographics that support the college mission to serve "a diverse community of learners".

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.

<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets</p> <p>The analysis points out the high productivity of the program with reference to rising (and above campus goal) WSCH while also pointing out that FTES has not dropped as precipitously as might be expected due to loss of sections. The discussion also notes the need for a full-time faculty position for Corrections (the current FT faculty is shared with Administration of Justice), the addition of which would help the department increase its efficiency.</p>		
<p>Relevance, Currency, Articulation</p>	<p><i>The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>Out of date course(s) that are not launched into CurricuNet by Oct. 1 may result in an overall recommendation no higher than Conditional.</i></p>	<p><i>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.</i></p>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets</p> <p>All courses are current, including being up to date with new TMC and C-ID descriptors. The special issues relating to articulation are carefully explained.</p>		
<p>Part IV: Planning</p>		
<p>Trends</p>	<p><i>The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.</i></p>	<p><i>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.</i></p>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets</p> <p>Addresses trends, talks about completion of certs (trends are included in planning to get students through program)</p>		
<p>Accomplishments</p>	<p><i>The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.</i></p>	<p><i>The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.</i></p>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does Not Meet</p> <p>Though a number of program strengths are identified, they do not clearly enough connect to planning. The analysis discussed problems caused by some of the strengths and discussed planning to mitigate those. But how actual strengths are taken into consideration in planning is not explicitly analyzed.</p> <p>The evaluators, however, believe the expectations for this area could be more clearly stated.</p>		
<p>Weaknesses/challenges</p>	<p><i>The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.</i></p>	<p><i>The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.</i></p>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets</p> <p>The major challenge identified is the loss in sections due to budget cuts. The plans for mitigating the cuts are clear. In addition, the program has plans for when some sections might be restored.</p>		
<p>Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate</p>		

	<p><i>Program does not demonstrate that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.</i></p> <p><i>Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.</i></p>	<p><i>Program demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.</i></p> <p><i>Program has plans to further implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.</i></p>
--	--	--

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

The analysis covers all three areas with specifics. The technology discussion covers smart classrooms and online delivery of courses. The partnership maintained by the program are specifically mentioned and given context. It does seem that the maintenance of a lot of these partnerships does fall on the chair. Finally, there are specific examples of the program’s benefits to the campus climate.

Part VI: Previous Does Not Meets Categories	
<p><i>Program does not show that previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.</i></p>	<p><i>Program describes how previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.</i></p>

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback (N/A if there were no “Does not Meets” in the previous efficacy review): Meets

Ideally, the previous “does not meets” should have been itemized, followed by some discussion of how the current document addresses those deficits. However, the current document is quite thorough and by implication addresses those issues. In addition, this area is new and might need clearer instructions in the future.