

**Program Efficacy Report
Spring 2016**

Name of Department: DSPS

Efficacy Team: Nori Sogomonian, Anna Tolstova, Joel Lamore

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): CONTINUATION

The DSPS program is an important program serving our disabled students. The document shows the program to be productively meeting the needs of its students and maintaining compliance to regulations, though it is challenged with rising student need and funding shortfalls. The program maintains an impressive network of partnerships, and outreach efforts have had tangible effect on balancing demographics and increasing students served by the program. There were some deficiencies in quantifying that patterns of service are actually meeting student need and that the program supports student success. In part, weak organization in the document contributes to the apparent, and at times actual, gaps in the evidence. In addition, it will be critical that the program complete a 3-year review of its SLOs for its courses as soon as 3 years' worth of SLO evaluations have been collected.

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: MEETS		
<p>The program provides a clear discussion and analysis of its demographic data, and it seems clear the program is doing well in serving our diverse student population. The report addresses all demographics, though in most cases there is close alignment, with the exception of Hispanics. Though the percentage of Hispanic students served by the program has risen since 2008-2011 data, because the percentage of Hispanics in the general campus population has risen more quickly, there remains a gap (of 13%). The program discusses this well and describes outreach programs designed to remedy this discrepancy.</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>
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: DOES NOT MEET		
<p>The program provides evidence of a comprehensive pattern of service, though usage data is weak or missing. The program discusses the complex pattern of service in detail, though the evaluation team would have appreciated if this info had been more logically organized – as a public document, readability and presentation of key information first is not a small consideration. The hours of operation, for instance, is discussed last when it is likely to be the first information a reader would want to know. There is information on both office hours and alternative delivery methods. Discussions of assistive technology, the wide range of services to those with differing needs, its three educational assistance courses, interfaces with area high schools and community programs, and intake processes are concise but informative. The main deficit, which is not a trivial one, is lack of clear usage data for office hours, alternate delivery methods and services. Data about high school and community groups, enrollment info for courses, and numbers relating to usage of services (like aids and counselors), and intake, all would quantify that there is demand, and that it is being adequately met, for these services.</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: DOES NOT MEET		
<p>The EMP muddles Program Goals and Challenges/Opportunities, with the program goals scattered across both; it made assessing the program's progress on those goals for this part more difficult that it should have been. There are two goals listed in the Program Goals area. One of the stated goals, increasing enrollment in the program's courses is touched on in this area, but there is no discussion of progress on that goal. The other goal, increasing enrollment from feeder high schools is not addressed here (though it is discussed in other areas of the document). In the Challenges and Opportunities area of the EMP, most of the items are goals (or at least are clearly articulated as goals). None are discussed in this area.</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>
--	---	---

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program has developed and is regularly assessing its SAOs. The 3-year evaluation was done, though there are elements of it that are weak. The Evidence of Dialog section notes a one-month period (specific meeting dates would have been more precise) that the dialog took place in, but the nature of this dialog is unclear. The description of the focus of the dialog is general. Though the process of 3-year evaluations is still developing, it will be critical in future documents to be much more specific about evidence of dialog and its results.

The SLOs for the three educational assistance courses are not included in this area, but at the end. At the last efficacy review, it was noted that the SLOs for the courses were not included. The SLOs and evaluations should have been in this area and referenced at the end. The SLO evaluations are for Fall 2014 only. In addition, there is no evidence that the SLOs have gone through a 3-year evaluation since the SLOs were only written in May of 2014. Program Review will expect clear 3-year reviews for all these courses by the next efficacy review for this program.

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>
----------------------------	---	--

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program has a clear and appropriate mission which aligns with the college mission. The table with the programs partnerships, however, is misplaced and would have been better located in Part V.

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>
---------------------	--	---

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

Though there are perhaps gaps in the analysis of productivity, the program provides enough information on key measures such as staffing, response time, satisfaction, grievances (none currently), etc. which all seem to indicate the program is productive at an acceptable level, and in fact has made clear progress in these areas. It would have been useful to indicate numbers of students served by counselors (which might be measured in many different ways in order to quantify counselor load in some clear way). The program also notes that improvements in response time and other measures will be threatened as lack of funding are forcing the loss of several DSPS adjunct counselors.

Relevance, Currency, Articulation	<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>
--	---	--

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program is currently in content review for their 3 courses; the courses were due for content review this March. Though the courses might have gone through in advance of the deadline, the program explains that the instructor position for those courses had been vacant for 3 years. The courses are highly relevant to the student population the program serves. The courses have no articulation implications.

Part IV: Planning

Trends	<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>
---------------	---	--

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program identifies two trends: greater number of deaf/hard-of-hearing students and the associated costs of supporting their needs. The discussion is clear and contains information on program planning for these, and this does seem to be the most critical of trends. However, the review team wondered if that was the one and only relevant trend the program faces. There are discussions in other parts of the document that suggested that there were other trends – technology, legislation, for instance.

Accomplishments	<i>The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.</i>	<i>The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.</i>
------------------------	--	--

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program discusses a number of accomplishments, including high school outreach, an increase in students served, maintenance of Title V and ADA compliance, as well as workshops. In a few cases, the planning discussion is a bit brief, or only implied. In general, though, the program has relevant accomplishments that are addressed in planning.

Weaknesses/challenges	<i>The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.</i>	<i>The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.</i>
------------------------------	--	--

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

Aligning with the discussion in the trends area, the program discusses the challenge of supporting the deaf/hard-of-hearing students with ASL interpreters and captioning services. The program has asked for more support and has shifted (where feasible) resources/funding to supporting growing numbers of deaf/hard-of-hearing students. In addition, the loss of some part-time counselors noted in the productivity area is discussed. On both issues, there is evidence of planning, though often only short-term planning as the program is challenged by emergent needs that make long-term planning difficult.

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 demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.</i>
	<i>Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, 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 program demonstrates it incorporates the technology and partnerships strategic initiatives. The program summarized the extensive use of adaptive technologies, including some much needed updates. The program provided an extensive list of partnerships (in another area of the document, but referenced here). The review team wondered, however, if the program engaged in improving the campus climate – improving the campus climate for disabled students seems a certainty, but also in supporting a diversity of ability on our campus. We might recommend the program consider discussing their contribution to campus climate in future efficacy reports.

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): MEETS

The program addresses the lack of SLOs for its educational assistance courses in the last efficacy document by including those SLOs and their evaluations.