

Program Efficacy Report Spring 2013

Name of Department: EOPS/CARE

Efficacy Team: David Smith and Joel Lamore

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): Conditional

The EOPS/CARE efficacy report demonstrates that the program is viable and serves its students adequately. There was good evidence the program is effective in providing Access and in utilizing Technology, maintaining important internal and external Partnerships, and contributing to the Campus Climate. However, there were significant deficiencies. The analysis of Student Success was inadequate, lacking analysis of program goals of retention and increasing transfer (and misplacing the data on those issues in another area). There was no evidence provided that SLOs have been assessed or used by the program to improve. Finally, the reviewers note that the writing in the report was sometimes a weakness, with grammatical errors occasionally interfering with clarity or meaning.

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>The demographic data is analyzed sufficiently. The slight over-representation of Hispanics (versus campus) and the lower participation by Whites (versus campus) are discussed. The program brought in demographic data from the census of City of San Bernardino to show that the program numbers matched the city's numbers for the Hispanic demographic. However, many of our students come from other communities (and data from them would have been interesting). Nonetheless, it may show that the college demographic levels are not the full story. More importantly, the analysis discusses outreach both internally (Student Services, for example) and externally (to high schools and community organizations) to insure access to its programs reflect the population.</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 program provided information on hours, online availability (of workshops and announcements), counselor availability (for appointments and walk-ins), etc. This pattern seems to enable the program to serve both day and evening students, and with the online capabilities on their Blackboard site, students can get at least some services and information 24/7. It also noted some of the Title 5 requirements that shapes their program's pattern of service. Information and analysis on the current pattern and whether there were times when demand was especially high (outside periods like registration) or low would have been useful as it would indicate the program was tracking demand and thus be in a position to adapt to make the program even more effective at providing these services.

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: Does Not Meet

There is good coverage of the range of services offered by the program to support student success. However, it does not discuss program goals or progress on those goals. The goals noted by the program in the EMP were to increase retention and transfer. There is no information in the main text, and there is no supplemental data, to indicate that the program has data that tracks its participants on these two measures (or related measures). This seems a pretty vital way of measuring the program's success. There is some information which is misplaced in the productivity part of the report that discusses grades, retention and persistence (but not transfer rates). Though some of that analysis would be pertinent here, the misplacement and the different context for its use (productivity) was seen as real deficit to the reviewers.

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: Does Not Meet

The program merely lists SLOs. There is no discussion of when or how often they have been assessed, if the assessments are on schedule, whether the SLOs have been discussed by the faculty and staff, or how SLOs have been used to improve any element of the program.

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's mission clearly aligns to the college mission by supporting the educational program and our diverse learners. Though the program is clearly designed to insure diversity, the discussion the program provided to show that its mission aligns with the college's does not mention this explicitly, which would have been stronger.

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

Data is provided to demonstrate the program productivity, including number of students served, scheduling, and outreach efforts. For students served, a variety of statistics were provided including counselor contacts, new students added, and usage of several of its support methods (like computer check-out and parking permits). In addition, data was provided comparing EOPS/CARE at SBVC, RCC and Chaffey along with some contextual information. The program compared favorably. As noted above, there is some irrelevant data here about retention, persistence and grades of participants which should have been in the student success part of the report with appropriate and relevant analysis for that use.

Relevance, Currency, Articulation

The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.

Out of date course(s) that are not launched into CurricuNet by Oct. 1 may result in an overall recommendation no higher than Conditional.

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.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

The program has no curriculum. It notes that the catalog information is correct.

Part IV: Planning

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.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

Four important and relevant trends are identified and analysis discusses the impact or implications of those trends. The information on the planning for these is at times sketchy. It is clear, however, that the program is planning with these in mind, but the specifics on those plans are not covered.

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

Several accomplishments and strengths were described, but there was no information on how the program considered these in 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

This was perhaps the clearest section in the report. Challenges were listed and described, and plans were laid out to address those challenges. Challenges included the need for continuation of Priority Registration for program students as well as budget related class reductions and staffing cuts. In addition, the increase in students returning to college for retraining was noted as an external challenge. The planning analyses included multiple strategies the program is pursuing to address the challenges.

Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate

	<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

Another well-organized section of the report, the program addressed all three areas. It is clear that EOPS has actively used technology to inform and provide access to its services, but also give the students access to technology itself (loaning laptops to students, for example). Campus Climate was addressed, including the work of the EOPS club. A long list of vital partnerships included some information about each partnership. Partnerships included many internal partners (with various tutoring services, for example) and external ones (other educational institutions, such as CSUSB and the local high school districts).

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): Does Not Meet

The previous “does not meets” are listed, but there is no specific information about how the current document addresses the deficits noted in the previous review cycle. As a new part of the program efficacy form, it is possible that the instructions need to be clearer. If the current document had scored “meets” in the categories listed as “does not meet” in the previous document, the reviewers would have been prepared to accept that the deficiencies had been address by implication. However, areas of Student Success and Planning sections have again received “does not meet” which indicates that those deficiencies have not be address.