

**Career Technical Education (CTE)
2-Year Mini-Review**

Deadline: April 13, 2015 (midnight)

Send by e-mail to the Program Review Co-Chair, slillard@valleycollege.edu

Our current efficacy cycle for full review is every four years. However, in order to comply with Title 5 regulations, CTE programs are required to review their programs every two years. To meet this requirement, but also not to over-burden these programs, we have instituted a mini-review between the full efficacy cycles (that is, 2 years following the most recent efficacy report). Your program will be assigned a review team, consisting of Program Review members, who will work with you and provide feedback on your documents as you work through the process. Feel free to call on them or the committee co-chairs at any time.

This review is not designed to be comprehensive, but rather, it is expected to be a 2-year **update** since the last full efficacy report. Specifically, this update should address the following five program components:

1. Purpose, 2. Demand, 3. Quality, 4. External Issues, 5. 2-Year Plan.

Instructions:

For each of the five sections:

1. Mark the checkbox that best identifies where the program stands.
2. Provide a brief supporting narrative. Within each section there are examples related to that particular area, which could serve to help describe your program status. It is not necessary to address every item listed; these are included as possible examples. If you have other relevant information pertaining to a given area, then you are encouraged to include that as well.

The purpose of this report is a mid-term update in order to comply with Title 5, therefore, the page length should be in the range of 2 – 3 pages. The boxes for each section are expandable; take the space needed for each section. Keep in mind that this report is an **update** of the previous 2 years, rather than a comprehensive analysis.

CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM TWO-YEAR REVIEW

Date: [Click here to enter text.](#)

College: San Bernardino Valley College

Program: CIT

1. Purpose of this Program

No Changes in Purpose
in the Last Two Years

☒

Minor Changes in Purpose
in the Last Two Years

☐☐

Significantly Changed Purpose
In the Last Two Years

☐☐

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include description, mission, target population, etc.)

There is no change to the purpose of the program over the past two years.

2. Demand for this Program

Low Demand

☐☐

Adequate Demand
for our Students

☒☐

High Demand

☐

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include labor market data, advisory input, etc.)

The scheduling has remained consistent with an appropriate number of sections offered in terms of student demand. One trend that has been observed is that the enrollment in CIT 100 is declining while the enrollment in CIT 101 is growing. The schedule has been adjusted to decrease the number of CIT 100 sections while simultaneously increasing the number of CIT 101 sections offered.

3. Quality of this Program

Needs Significant
Improvement

☐☐

Meets Student Needs

☒☐

Highest Quality

☐

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include core indicators, student outcomes, partnerships, certificates, degrees, articulation, faculty qualifications, diversity, grants, equipment, etc.)

The CIT faculty has completed a major update to the program motivated by recommendations from the Advisory Committee to reduce the amount of time that it takes for students to complete programs and to align courses with recommendations outlined within the ICT C-ID degree and course descriptions.

4. External Issues

Not Consistent with
External Issues

☐☐

Complies with External Issues

☒

Benefits From and Contributes
to External Issues

☐☐

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include legislation, CCCC mandates, Perkins, CTE transition, CalWORKs, WIOA, Career Ladders, etc.)

CIT course content are aligned with recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), the Computer and Telecommunications Industry Association (CompTIA), Cisco Systems, Microsoft, Linux Professional Institute (LPI), EC Council, National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST), US Department of Homeland Security, National Security Agency (NSA), Internal Society of Computer Forensic Examiners.

5. Cost of this Program

Expenditures Exceed Income <input type="checkbox"/>	Income Covers Expenditures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Income Exceeds Expenditures <input type="checkbox"/>
(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include enrollment/FTES generated & in-kind contributions of time/resources minus salaries/equipment/supplies, etc.)		
There have been no changes in the cost of the program.		

6. Two-Year Plan

Need Significant Changes And/or Increased Resources to Continue <input type="checkbox"/>	On Track for Next Two Years <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Significant Growth Anticipated <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	---

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include recommendations, project future trends, personnel and equipment needs, etc.)

The majority of course updates and creation of new certificates are now complete through the SBVC curriculum process. The Digital Forensics courses are the last two courses and certificate in the SBVC approval process. The courses rein the process of being approved by the Sate Chancellor's Office and the certificates are moving through the regional approval process. Over the next two years these should be all complete and rolled into the regular CIT course and certificate offerings.

Signatures:

Administrator

Date

Faculty

Date

Advisory Committee Member

Date