

## **Program Efficacy Report Spring 2015**

**Name of Department:** Math

**Efficacy Team:** Kenny Melancon, Joel Lamore

**Overall Recommendation (include rationale):** Continuance

The committee recommends Continuance as the Math department has met, if sometimes quite weakly, most of the areas of review (with three Does Not Meets). And it is clear the department, its programs and courses are solid. However, the report as a whole is weak – too often issues are described and not fully analyzed, and even more often there are odd gaps: the lack of any mention of their AS for Transfer degree being a primary example. Because 13 faculty members are listed as being consulted for the report, it is disappointing there seem so many gaps and weak analyses. In addition, the work on PLOs should be more advanced at this point, and future efficacy reports will likely be far stricter in that area.

Strategic Initiative	Institutional Expectations	
	Does Not Meet	Meets
<b>Part I: Access</b>		
<b>Demographics</b>	<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>	<p><i>The program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the demographic data and provides an interpretation in response to any identified variance.</i></p> <p><i>If warranted, discuss the plans or activities that are in place to recruit and retain underserved populations.</i></p>
<b>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS</b> <p>The Math department does a good job explaining demographics, which are at or near parity with campus population. In future, however, some discussion of maintaining such access and discussion of some outreach (which they mention briefly elsewhere) would confirm department is not being passive about the parity.</p>		
<b>Pattern of Service</b>	<i>The program's pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.</i>	<p><i>The program provides <u>evidence</u> that the pattern of service or instruction meets student needs.</i></p> <p><i>If warranted, plans or activities are in place to meet a broader range of needs.</i></p>
<b>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS</b> <p>With a wide range of courses at different times and formats, the department's pattern of service for courses seems adequate. However, some analysis of how classes fill for these options would more strongly show that the current pattern ideally serves the students. Some analysis and strategic thought is demonstrated by mention of new courses being explored, but more detail as to reasons would have been useful.</p>		
<b>Part II: Student Success</b>		
<b>Data demonstrating achievement of instructional or service success</b>	<i>Program does not provide an adequate analysis of the data provided with respect to relevant program data.</i>	<p><i>Program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals.</i></p> <p><i>If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.</i></p>
<b>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: DOES NOT MEET</b> <p>This should be a major area of analysis, especially as Math is an academic program. However, beyond some description of the success rates and degrees awarded, there is little discussion in this area. The deficits begin with important elements left out: no discussion of retention or connection to department goals. In addition, there is little analysis. In the paragraph about the increasing degrees awarded, it notes outreach efforts to high schools. But there is no mention of the AS-T degree, which would seem central to both attracting those to the degree and increasing transfer. Additionally, Supplemental Instruction and the Success Center get mentioned, but no analysis of how they are used or any measure of their impact. Finally, in the supplemental data section, though there is mention of the need for certain classes to serve STEM majors, there is no real data. In addition, since job market info is readily available, it seems more than an oversight not have included that information.</p>		

<b>Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes</b>	<i>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.</i>	<i>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.</i>
<b>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: DOES NOT MEET</b>  While the department might be construed to minimally meet the requirements in this area in that they have SLOs, done some assessment and had some faculty discussions, and there has been some revision of SLOs as well (and an example is included to document that), nevertheless, there are a number of significant weaknesses. First, the SLO graphic dropped in is not the correct graphic – instead of the SLO assessment grid, they have a screen shot of the VPI’s list of math SLO files. This lacks info about the SLOs and their assessment. In addition, though they have PLOs, they have not yet mapped to courses (this seems a pretty basic thing to have done by now). In addition, the narrative seems to indicate some confusion about PLO mapping. And though this may be outside what the committee is able to comment on, the transfer and employment PLOs seem outside what can be academically assessed and thus not recommended as program outcomes. Finally, in terms of the core competencies, there is a statement that CCs are considered when revising SLOs; since there is no example, it is unclear how this is happening.		
<b>Part III: Institutional Effectiveness</b>		
<b>Mission and Purpose</b>	<i>The program does not have a mission, or it does not clearly link with the institutional mission.</i>	<i>The program has a mission, and it links clearly with the institutional mission.</i>
<b>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS</b>  The math program does have a mission statement which aligns with college mission. The explanation is included is clear, if brief.		
<b>Productivity</b>	<i>The data does not show an acceptable level of productivity for the program, or the issue of productivity is not adequately addressed.</i>	<i>The data shows the program is productive at an acceptable level.</i>
<b>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: WEAK MEETS</b>  Though there is some coverage of FTES, FTE and WSCH to show it is at adequate levels, it is mostly descriptive and not analytic in nature. The causes of the numbers are mostly unexplained, though by implication it is likely budget issues were partially responsible. No other factors are considered.		
<b>Relevance, Currency, Articulation</b>	<i>The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.</i>  <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>	<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>
<b>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS</b>  The curriculum of the math courses is all up to date. The catalog currency is discussed, and an explanation is provided for courses listed in catalog but not recently offered.		

Part IV: Planning		
<b>Trends</b>	<i>The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.</i>	<i>The program <u>identifies and describes</u> major trends in the field. Program addresses how trends will affect enrollment and planning. Provide data or research from the field for support.</i>
<b>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: DOES NOT MEET</b>  The only trend identified is the demand for math courses to serve STEM, and the analysis is adequate, with discussion of changes in course offerings (including accelerated, short term courses). While STEM is the “800 pound gorilla” of trends for the program, the lack of any other trends identified and analyzed is inadequate. Undoubtedly, there are other important trends affecting the department, its courses and students because they are trends affecting all departments: budget, enrollment, transfer, pedagogical change, the TMC and transfer degree, etc. In addition, the report mentions things elsewhere that indicate other trends. The creation of a Business Calculus and Finite Math course mentioned elsewhere must be in response to outside trends – what are they?. Planning is a key element for programs, and it seems like this program has not thought through this element of planning in a comprehensive way. Because this area was one of the previous DNMs, it is disappointing that the discussion in this area was not more thorough and comprehensive.		
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<i>The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.</i>	<i>The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.</i>
<b>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS</b>  The math department has documented its accomplishments and strengths adequately, though perhaps incompletely. The discussion about their pre-assessment workshops lacks any results on assessment or other success. The item explaining the increase in number of degrees does not integrate the AS-T into the discussion.		
<b>Weaknesses/challenges</b>	<i>The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.</i>	<i>The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.</i>
<b>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS</b>  The math department describes two challenges: need for more full-time faculty and problems related to growth. Both are clearly described, though the department’s planning for these is somewhat weak. The shortage of space in the Success Center and lack of offices and classrooms for SIs and workshops is noted, though not at all quantified.		
Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate		
	<i>Program does not demonstrate that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.</i>  <i>Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.</i>	<i>Program demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.</i>  <i>Program has plans to further implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.</i>

**Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS**

The Math department has kept up to date with technology by offering hybrid classes and utilizing course management systems and continues to search out new products that supports student success. The technology discussion is the strongest one with the most detail. The Math department has partnered with CSUSB and is involved in the AB86 work. And the department contributes to campus climate by serving STEM and presentation like Men in Mathematics. In general, more information could have been provided for almost every item discussed.

**Part VI: Previous Does Not Meets Categories**

*Program does not show that previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.*

*Program describes how previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.*

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

While the 3 previous DNMs are noted and which page of the current document contains the evidence provided to address them, a sentence or two about how the referenced evidence will address the issue would have been valuable. The previous DNM on trends has not be fully remedied.