

**Career Education Program Two-Year Review
Team Efficacy Report
Spring 2019**

Name of Department: Corrections

Efficacy Team: Christie Gabriel, Botra Moeung, Paula Ferri-Milligan

Overall Recommendation:

Continuation Conditional Probation

Rationale for Overall Recommendation:

Although the program presents a clear purpose, the remainder of the responses are incomplete and do not adequately address the program's status. Local demand for the program was not clearly discussed. SLO data is provided in the document but is not analyzed. The program does not address any external issues. But this is where state initiatives, labor market data, [CTE – Perkins IV Core Indicator Data](#), etc. could be discussed. The decreased enrollment/FTES has been a concern for some time, yet no plan was put in place to increase these. A two-year plan was not presented nor were responses to the does not meets from the last efficacy review.

The program refers to the “new faculty member” who will be hired in the fall 2019 semester as addressing issues that need to be addressed. It is unfortunate that the current review of the program lacks reflection and planning that might assist that faculty member in the task.

1. Purpose of this Program: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

Although this section was extremely brief, it did address the purpose of the program, which has not changed in the last two years and identifies providing “students with the legal, ethical and educational background necessary to pursue a career in a corrections-related field.”

2. Demand for this Program: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

Local demand for the program was not clearly discussed. A decline in enrollment and FTEF does not equate to a lower labor market demand. An EDD link that was provided does show a 9.4% decline for the state of California, but if drilled down to [San Bernardino County](#), and there is actually a predicted increase of 9.6% from 2014-2024. Even if the 9.4% decrease in the state was the focus, there is no discussion as to how this will affect the program's already declining enrollment. The SLO data is provided in the document, but should be in section 3. However, no analysis of the data is made.

3. Quality of this Program: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

The SLO measures in section 2 should be added to this section to show the program's quality. No analysis of the data is made. The program acknowledges the “significant drop” in the number of sections assessed for SLOs, but does not offer an explanation other than it will be addressed by

the new faculty member who will join the college in fall 2019. Success and retention measures, award attainment, partnerships, and faculty professional development would help this section.

4. External Issues: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

This section was not completed. This is where state initiatives, labor market data, [CTE – Perkins IV Core Indicator Data](#), etc. could be discussed.

5. Cost of this Program: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

The decreased enrollment/FTES has been a concern for some time, yet no plan was put in place to increase these. The program again addresses the hiring of a new faculty member in the fall 2019 semester to replace the full-time faculty member who will be retiring spring 2019 as the reason for the lack of discussion here. No cost analysis of the program is provided, and it mentions the “hope” that the new faculty member will increase outreach, make stronger connections to corrections agencies in order to recover enrollment and productivity.

6. Two-Year Plan: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

This section was not completed.

7. Progress on Previous Does Not Meets: Meets Does Not Meet

Efficacy Team Response:

The response sections were not completed.