

**Program Efficacy Report
Spring 2016**

Name of Department: Culinary Arts

Efficacy Team: Wallace Johnson (Lead), Diane Dusick, and Christie Gabriel-Millette

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): Conditional

Overall Recommendation: The program is currently meeting the needs of the institution as demonstrated by the responses to the questions and the document's evidence of critical self-study in most areas. Information in a few areas is insufficient and/or incorrectly analyzed. The program should update the report in one year's time.

The department needs to address the does not meet categories and submit a revised report to the Program Review Committee by October 14, 2016, that gives direction to the program and improves program viability as it moves forward. If the report does not adequately address the does not meet categories, the department will receive probational status.

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>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet The data interpretation does not match the data in the report. In the EMP One Sheet, the assessment of the enrollment numbers is incorrect; the numbers have not increased from 13-14 to 14-15. Also, the interpretation of why FTEF increased is incorrect. Add a comment on how the increased FTEF is what caused the decreased WSCH per FTEF. The program does NOT have a higher population of Hispanics than the campus average, as mentioned; it's actually 12 percentage points lower. There is NOT 6% fewer Caucasians than the campus average, rather, less than 0.5 percentage points. African American enrollment is actually 9.2 percentage points higher than the campus, not 3% as mentioned. This lower number in the Hispanic population should be discussed, especially because Hispanics make up the majority of the service industry.		
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. The data reveals that the overhaul of Culinary Arts curriculum has been successful. Students are able to complete certificates and degrees relevant to their course of study. The addition of a one-year program for certificate completion will increase the number of certificates awarded. During the latest curriculum cycle, Culinary Arts added math pre-requisites and English advisories that should increase student success rates.		
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>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:</p> <p>Meets. Student success and retention shows steady growth. Student success has risen from a low of 73% in 2010-11 to 85% in 2014-15. Retention has grown from 80% in 2010-11 to 97% in 2014-15</p>		
Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes	<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>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:</p> <p>Meets. This program has made progress on SLOs; however, some SLOs need to be re-evaluated and re-written to align with PLOs. There is evidence this is underway.</p>		
Part III: Institutional Effectiveness		
Mission and Purpose	<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>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback:</p> <p>Meets. This program's mission is well connected to the mission of the College.</p>		
Productivity	<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>

<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet The data are not interpreted correctly, but due to the nature of the program (lab courses), a productivity measure of 525 is not realistic. Neither a drop in enrollment nor an increase in FTEF is presented as the reason for the productivity measure decline. Stating that more adjunct instructors vs full-time instructors will cause reduced continuity of the program and student success does not show how this is true.</p>		
<p>Relevance, Currency, Articulation</p>	<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: Meets. There is evidence from the addition of pre-requisites to the curriculum that this program is continually monitoring industry standards and modifying curriculum accordingly.</p>		
<p>Part IV: Planning</p>		
<p>Trends</p>	<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: Does not meet This section is very brief and does not address the many trends that should be discussed here, such as labor market data and the connection with enrollment, recruitment, etc. The term “Gastronomy” is not defined in the context of the program. There is no elaboration on this at all. If class enrollments are down, how have they grown out of their facility, and what is the plan for facilities related matters?</p>		
<p>Accomplishments</p>	<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: Meets. This program does an excellent job of placing students in gainful employment and is considering adding a certificate to better serve student demand.</p>		
<p>Weaknesses/challenges</p>	<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: Meets. The program chair acknowledges the challenges of being the only full-time member of the faculty for the program and having to modify curriculum, recruit students, coordinate adjunct faculty, meet with an advisory committee, schedule course offerings, and analyze student learning outcomes.</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.

Use of technology and campus climate initiatives are touched on, but potential for partnerships with community organizations, local businesses, adult schools, high schools, etc. are not fully discussed. More detailed plans on implementation are missing. There is mention of partnerships for the Catering (CULART 020) course.

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