

**Program Efficacy Report
Spring 2015**

Committee Reevaluation—February 19, 2016

Name of Department: Welding

Efficacy Team: Sheri Lillard, Diane Dusick, Kay Weiss

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

Although the department faced an incredible drop in FTES, they provided sufficient rationale, including their expectation that this drop is temporary due to major changes in their curriculum. The department faces one major concern regarding funding of their simulators.

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 cited that improvement in PLO/SLO evaluation and faculty dialogues and encourages the department to continue with those dialogues. The department’s analysis of productivity is clear, and there is a plan in place to address the deficiencies. The department’s accomplishments and challenges meet the rubric.

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:</p> <p>The program actually reflects the campus well, with the exception of women, which is an underrepresented population in the industry, as well. However, they do have plans in place to address the lack of female students in the department. This plan should be monitored for progress.</p> <p><u>Meets</u></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>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:</p> <p>The fall 2014/spring 2015 course schedule does not match the explanation that "All welding classes are taught in three formats: day classes, evening classes and weekend classes." However, courses are taught day/evening/weekend.</p> <p>The plan to add welding simulators is excellent, though funding this plan may be difficult. Until funding is found for these simulators, the program leaders may search for other options to address the problems.</p> <p><u>Meets.</u></p>		
Part II: Student Success		
Data demonstrating achievement of instructional or service success	<i>Program does not provide an adequate analysis of the data provided with respect to relevant program data.</i>	<i>Program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals. If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.</i>

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:

The report indicates “the down-turn of enrollment, retention, and success was due to the necessity of cutting half of the sections offered (which included a stacked 13 credit course), reduction of faculty, and adding of prerequisites to develop a clear entry and exit to the program. The department reports that this down-turn is temporary. This will need to be monitored.

Meets

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 report does include evidence of data collection, but does not include evidence of “evaluation, and reflection/feedback, and describe how the SLOs are being used to improve student learning” SLO data collection will be housed in the SLO cloud, and the department has created a planned rotation for SLO assessment. Maps have been created for PLOs and Institutional Core Competencies.

NOT MET

Committee remarks—February 19, 2016: The committee acknowledges the progress toward PLO/SLO evaluation and discussions among the faculty and encourage the department to continue moving in that direction—addressing PLO/SLO evaluations in relation to industry employment and expectations.

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

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 is not currently at an “acceptable level”, but a plan is in place to correct the “severe drop in WSCH per FTEF”. It is unclear how this plan will evolve, as there is a very low maximum cap, based on lab space and safety issues.

DOES NOT MEET

Committee remarks—February 19, 2016: The committee viewed this explanation as adequate considering the renovation difficulties. For the next program efficacy cycle, the department is encouraged to provide a more detailed analysis of productivity concerns.

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>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: All courses are current; because the A.S. is a terminal degree, transfer is not relevant. The report notes a mistake in the catalog that must be revised. <u>MEETS</u></p>		
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 <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></p>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:</p> <p>The report discusses that “California has the second highest amount of welding jobs in the nation with 25,030 welders. The average wage per hour is currently \$20.45 and the average annual salary is \$42,540.00.” The report also indicates a possibility of students acquiring bachelors and masters degrees.</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>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: The program identifies, as strengths/accomplishments, hiring of part-time faculty with unique skill-sets, partnerships, and updated equipment. There is no narrative regarding how strengths are incorporated into planning.</p> <p><u>DOES NOT MEET</u></p> <p><i>Committee remarks—February 19, 2016: The committee commends the department on the partnership and emergence of a stronger advisory board to assist in planning that strengthens the curriculum and links to the industry.</i></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>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:</p> <p>The report does not discuss the need for expensive simulators and that this funding may be difficult to find. <u>DOES NOT MEET</u></p> <p><i>Committee remarks—February 19, 2016: The committee consensus is that the challenges were identified adequately and that the department has a plan to address the need and use for the simulators.</i></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>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: The program has established partnerships with local employers. It has expressed desire for updated facilities, which may be addressed with a new tech building.</p> <p><u>MEETS</u></p>		

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>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback (N/A if there were no “Does not Meets” in the previous efficacy review):</p> <p>No previous “Does Not Meet”</p>	