Program Efficacy Report
Spring 2015

Committee Reevaluation—February 19, 2016

Name of Department: Business Administration

Efficacy Team: Denise Knight, David Smith, Kay Weiss

Overall Recommendation (include rationale):

Conditional

The committee feels that the program has demonstrated strengths and should be commended for its successes. However, the following omissions have placed this program on "Conditional" status. There is no EMP Narrative included in the document and previous "does not meet" areas are listed, but not addressed. The program demographics and patterns of service require additional analysis and Student Success requires an analysis of the data relative to the department's goals. A more substantial analysis of the data and its relationship to departmental goals is required.

The Program Review Committee reevaluated the "does not meet" revisions and voted to change the initial rating of "conditional" to CONTINUATION on February 19, 2016. The committee's remarks are noted in this document. The committee indicated that the department analyzed the program's demographic data. It also provided analysis of its patterns of service and the way that they meet student needs. The department has linked to a developed EMP narrative and analyzed and adjusted the certificates to provide students with a shorter time frame in which to complete them.

Strategic Initiative	Institutional Expectations	
	Does Not Meet	**Meets**
Part I: Access		
Demographics	*The program does not provide an appropriate analysis regarding identified differences in the program's population compared to that of the general population*	*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.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:

The department provides an explanation of the data, though not an analysis. The department states that as one population increases as a percentage (in this case, African-American) other populations must decrease. There is no analysis as to why this may have happened. Did the department actively recruit African-American students in order to address a previously identified under-representation? Did this happen by chance?

<mark>Does not meet</mark>

Committee Remarks—February 19, 2016: The department included a brief analysis of the data, addressing the mirroring of the existing community with the Business Administration population.

Pattern of Service	*The program's pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.*	*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.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:

The pattern of service is not addressed. The program offers degrees and certificates, and it awards quite a few each year, per the EMP. In a later section of the document, an explanation regarding increasing online/hybrid offerings is presented – this should occur here.

There is no evidence that the pattern of instruction is meeting student needs.

<mark>Does not meet</mark>

Committee Remarks—February 19, 2016: The department provided an adequate discussion. The department offers online and/or hybrid courses, day and evening sections, one-day a week options, and 8/12/14/18 week formats to appeal to a variety of student needs.

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 <u>analysis</u> of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals.* *If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:

The department has reported strong success, retention and productivity (which is supported by the EMP), It has grown, substantially, over the past several years. The missing narrative of the EMP may have included goals, but none are referenced in this document. The document provides good external data regarding employment rates and partnerships.

<mark>**Does not meet**</mark>

Committee Remarks—February 19, 2016: The department provided an adequate discussion. The department has linked to a developed EMP narrative. The department has analyzed and adjusted the certificates to provide students with a shorter time frame in which to complete them.

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:

The program states that all offered courses have been assessed. The program noted lower success rates in online/hybrid courses and is working on strategies to improve in these areas.

The program has identified Program Level Outcomes and has developed proposed assessment methods. Program level outcomes have been tied to course outcomes, potentially simplifying the process.

Courses have been mapped to institutional core competencies.

<mark>**Meets**</mark> **– demonstration of regular, ongoing analysis of PLOs will be required 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:
The program has a mission that supports the college mission

<mark>**Meets**</mark>

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:
The program has grown in terms of FTES and numbers of degrees and certificates awarded. The EMP shows a productivity figure of 527 (above the goal of 525), though this number has been in a steady decline since the 10-11 year. No explanation of this decline is provided. There is no reference to fill rates within classes.

<mark>**Meets**</mark> **– but further monitoring is necessary**

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:
Curriculum is up to date and articulation is complete. The catalog has been updated with appropriate changes through the curriculum review process

<mark>Meets</mark>

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:
The program identifies several potential partners from local business and industry which want to see more of their employees participating in the program. The department recognizes that this will necessitate additional on-line offerings and is working to update curriculum to make this happen. They have developed several certificates in response to employer need.

<mark>Meets</mark>

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:
The department has identified several accomplishments and used those accomplishments to develop stronger partnerships.

<mark>Meets</mark>

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:

The department identifies its biggest challenge being the availability of quality part-time faculty needed to increase face-to-face offerings. It is working on creating more hybrid classes to ease this some.

<mark>Meets</mark>

Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate		

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

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:
The department has established many partnerships with 4-year institutions as well as local business.

==**Meets**==

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):

The prior report weaknesses are listed, but improvements are not addressed in this section. Some of the same weaknesses reappear (analysis of pattern of service.) The accomplishments and weakness/challenges sections of the current document meet the current rubric standard

==**Does not meet**==

Committee Remarks—February 19, 2016: The department has provided a more extensive discussion regarding its weaknesses and identifies plans to strengthen those areas.