

Program Efficacy Report Spring 2014

Name of Department: Student Health Services

Efficacy Team: Laura Cross, Romana Pires, Joel Lamore

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): Continuation

All areas met expectations. In most areas, the pertinent data was clearly laid out and analysis was good, displaying a program that is efficient and self-aware. Though there were some weaknesses in “patterns of service” area as well as “mission” area, both those areas still met minimum expectations. In part, minor organizational problems were the cause – information more relevant to one area sometimes appeared in another and was not then repeated (or sufficiently recapped) in the most pertinent area.

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 program discusses and analyzes all elements of demographic data, with all variances (which are generally small) from college demographics explained. The main variance is gender; those small but significant variances in service are well explained by the female population’s greater interest in family planning services as well as general tendency of males to seek medical services less frequently. Program also noted that presentations to the students generally include specific note of services to male students, so there is planning and outreach to mitigate the imbalance.</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

Good and thorough descriptions of times and types of services. Hours of service and staffing were correlated with student needs as indicated by service patterns and surveys. Types of services were likewise correlated with student needs as indicated by patterns of student contact and surveys. The limitations of the program were also noted: non-operation after hours and on non-class days, focus on non-emergency medical needs, etc. The description noted web resources and Kognito, but the committee wondered how students found out about these and whether there was data on their usage by students; this lack of info was the clear weakness in this area. Some data on this was in another area, but data should have been in this section (with analysis).

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 way in which Student Health Services supports student success is both direct and indirect, and both are a little difficult to document. Nonetheless, the program has articulated their program's contribution to student success adequately. First, they have an impact on student health itself, though since it is difficult to measure prevention, it is understandable that only data relating to preventative education is included. They also provide information on the impact that physical and mental ailments can have on student success, which their program treats. Thus they support the student's academic success. All three of the program's goals on the EMP are addressed.

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

Excellent coverage of SAOs. The executive summary of the program's SAO was included along with additional commentary. The summary included the SAOs, assessment and outcomes. However, the embedded pdf of the NCHA-II Spring 2013 was not a working link (it was merely the icon). Nonetheless, the relevant data from that document was used or referred to clearly throughout the executive summary.

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 statement was stated and correlates well with institutional mission statement. However, the area which is to explain how the purpose relates to college mission notes some irrelevant information and a fairly brief and general explanation. The most pertinent info to support this is actually a paragraph that appears in the "patterns of service" area (first paragraph of last section) where it seems somewhat out of place. While the committee did not feel this organizational issue required a "does not meet" determination, future reviews should more carefully place the analysis correctly.

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		
<p>Despite the program acknowledging that productivity for the program can be difficult to quantify (for instance, time per student can vary widely depending on needs), the program actually provided decent data and analysis. Number of contacts over a 3 ½ year period for RN, nurse practitioner, and counselor were provided. An enumeration of health education services and programs was provided, along with attendance or participation numbers. In addition, satisfaction survey data was included.</p>		
Relevance, Currency, Articulation	<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>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: N/A		
Part IV: Planning		
Trends	<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>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS		
<p>The program identified many significant trends garnered from internal and external sources: increasing need for mental health services, higher reproductive health services costs, greater stress felt by students, and changes in the Student Success Act. In addition, the Affordable Care Act effects were also considered. Planning related to each of these was briefly addressed – all of these issues have been noted throughout the document in depth, so the brevity here is understandable.</p>		
Accomplishments	<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>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS		
<p>Good and thorough enumeration of program accomplishments and strengths, and a better than average analysis of planning relating to them. The planning, which is clearly ongoing, included some nicely concrete examples.</p>		
Weaknesses/challenges	<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>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS		
<p>Clear rundown of challenges, from retaining staff, managing workload given student demands, management of staff, and need for permanent secretary and clerk. Planning follows logically (and realistically) from those challenges.</p>		
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

Very good accounting of all three areas: technology, partnerships and campus climate. In technology area, a diverse set of technologies are incorporated into the program: electronic medical records, clinical tech as well as use of the web. They note plans for use of Facebook and other methods of reaching students in the future. The partnership area is comprehensive and impressive, with good detail on activities, outcomes and time frames. Though planning element is at times implied, a bit more on planning aspect of partnerships would have been useful.

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): N/A