

Institutional Program Review—2018-2019
Program Efficacy Phase: Career Technical Education (CTE)
Two-Year Mini-Review
DUE: Monday, March 18, 2019 by NOON

Send by e-mail to the Program Review Co-Chairs:

Paula Ferri-Milligan pferri@sbccd.cc.ca.us
Wallace Johnson wjohnson@sbccd.cc.ca.us

Our current efficacy cycle for full review is every four years. However, in order to comply with Title 5 regulations, CTE programs are required to review their programs every two years. To meet this requirement, but also not to over-burden these programs, we have instituted a mini-review between the full efficacy cycles (that is, two years following the most recent efficacy report).

This review is not designed to be comprehensive, but rather, it is expected to be a two-year **update** since the last full efficacy report. Specifically, this update should address the following seven program components:

1. Purpose
2. Demand
3. Quality
4. External Issues
5. Cost
6. Two-Year Plan
7. Deficiencies

Draft forms should be written early so that your review team can work with you at the small-group workshops:

Friday, February 22 from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. in NH-222
Friday, March 1 from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. in B-204

Instructions:

For each of the seven sections:

1. Mark the checkbox that best identifies where the program stands.
2. Provide a brief supporting narrative. Within each section there are examples related to that particular area, which could serve to help describe your program status. It is not necessary to address every item listed; these are included as possible examples. If you have other relevant information pertaining to a given area, then you are encouraged to include that as well.
3. **Scan the documents—with signatures.**
4. **Do NOT change the file name**

Final documents are due to the Committee co-chairs (Paula Ferri-Milligan at pferri@sbccd.cc.ca.us and Wallace Johnson at wjohnson@sbccd.cc.ca.us) by **NOON on Monday, March 18, 2019**.

The purpose of this report is a mid-term update in order to comply with Title 5; therefore, the length should be ***no more than five pages***. The boxes for each section are expandable; take the space needed for each section. Keep in mind that this report is an **update** of the previous two years rather than a comprehensive analysis.

CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM TWO-YEAR REVIEW

Date: March 18, 2019

College: San Bernardino Valley College

Program: Corrections

1. Purpose of this Program

No Changes in Purpose
in the Last Two Years

Minor Changes in Purpose
in the Last Two Years

Significantly Changed Purpose
In the Last Two Years

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include description, mission, target population, etc.)

The corrections department strives to provide our students with the legal, ethical and educational background necessary to pursue a career in a corrections-related field.

2. Demand for this Program

Low Demand

Adequate Demand
for our Students

High Demand

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include labor market data, advisory input, etc.)

Duplicated Enrollment

2013-14: 225

2014-15: 236

2015-16: 148

2015-16: 134

2017-18: 110

WSCH/FTF

2013-14: 562

2014-15: 590

2015-16: 370

2015-16: 337

2017-18: 236

Assessment:

FTES is continuing a downward trend since the 15-16 school year with a corresponding drop in WSCH per FTEF. The division dean has been unable to ascertain the reasons for these precipitous declines in enrollment and productivity.

However major outreach efforts are planned with local agencies and major law enforcement Recruitment days on campus are in the planning stages- including presentations and booths featuring representatives from the California Department of Corrections and the San Bernardino County Probation Department.

Student success has remained constant, and student retention increased to a rate of 94%.

Data from 2017-18 EMP
FTES

2013-14: 22.50
2014-15: 23.60
2015-16: 14.80
2016-17: 13.47
2017-18: 11.03

Mean FTES = 17.08

Success

2013-14: 74%
2014-15: 69%
2015-16: 74%
2016-17: 69%
2017-18: 68%

Mean Success % = 70.80

Analysis: These success rates are neither too high nor too low for an academic program. Typically one wants to success rates to correlate with >70 passing, <70 not passing.

Retention

2013-14: 94%
2014-15: 86%
2015-16: 86%
2016-17: 84%
2017-18: 94%

Mean Retention % = 88.80

Analysis:

These retention rates are excellent for an open enrollment community college. Many students cannot complete courses due to life events beyond the control of a member of the faculty. The retention rate for the department of Administration of Justice exceeds the retention for the College by 14.9 %.
(88.8 % compared to 73.9 %) (Data from California Community College Scorecard for SBVC).

Job demand for this field is projected to decline by 9.4 % by 2026.

<https://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/databrowsing/occExplorerQSDetails.asp?menuChoice=&socCode=333012&occByTraProg=true&location=0601000000>

From the SLO Cloud:

#	SLO Statement	# of Students Assessed	# of Students who Met SLO	% of Students who Met SLO
1	Apply knowledge and skills required in securing and maintaining employment.	839	682	81.29%
2	Compare and contrast the differences between probation and parole.	129	111	86.05%
3	Differentiate and identify control techniques in crisis situations within the correctional setting.	105	95	90.48%
4	Distinguish the responsibilities and liabilities of the laws governing a correctional officer.	79	63	79.75%
5	Assess the legal framework within the incarceration process.	210	190	90.48%
6	Compare prison gang membership both inside and outside the facility.	117	96	82.05%
7	Choose to further personal interests by completing the requirements for an	839	682	81.29%

Administration of Justice degree or developing skills as a crime scene investigator.

8 N/A

3. Quality of this Program

Needs Significant Improvement

Meets Student Needs

Highest Quality

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include core indicators, student outcomes, partnerships, certificates, degrees, articulation, faculty qualifications, diversity, grants, equipment, etc.)

From the SLO Cloud:

Semester	Department	Sections Offered	Sections Assessed	%
FA17	ADJUS	13	13	100%
SP18	ADJUS	13	12	92%
FA18	ADJUS	14	10	71%
FA17	CORREC	4	4	100%
SP18	CORREC	3	3	100%
FA19	CORREC	3	2	67%

Corrections has had a significant drop in the number of sections assessed for student learning outcomes. At this time the dean does not know the explanation for this decline, however this will be addressed when the new faculty member who will be the defacto chair joins the College for Fall 2019.

4. External Issues

Not Consistent with
External Issues

Complies with External Issues

Benefits From and Contributes
to External Issues

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include legislation, CCCCCO mandates, Perkins, CTE transition, CalWORKs, WIOA, Career Ladders, etc.)

There are no known external issues at this time.

5. Cost of this Program

Expenditures
Exceed Income

Income Covers
Expenditures

Income Exceeds
Expenditures

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include enrollment/FTES generated & in-kind contributions of time/resources minus salaries/equipment/supplies, etc.)

The decreasing enrollment and low productivity are major concerns for this program. It is hoped that a new full-time faculty member, increased outreach, and stronger connections to corrections agencies can help this program recover enrollment and productivity.

6. Two-Year Plan

Need Significant Changes
And/or Increased Resources
to Continue

On Track for
Next Two Years

Significant Growth
Anticipated

(Provide update since last full efficacy review; examples include recommendations, project future trends, personnel and equipment needs, etc.)

7. Progress on Previous Does Not Meets

No Progress

On Track for
Next Two Years

Significant Progress

What steps are being taken to address previous deficiencies as identified on the previous full efficacy review?

Institutional Expectations: The primary reason that this section warrants a "does not meet" rating is that the department should include the program-level SLO Summary Evaluation Form document and summary discussion. While there is a rather robust discussion of course-level SLOs, program-level SLOs are not presented or analyzed.

Future efficacy documents should incorporate both course- and program-level SLOs. At the course level, the department provides ample analysis of enrollment trends, student retention, and student success. As with many programs, the continued economic growth at the state and federal level has compelled potential and erstwhile students to forgo or delay their education and directly enter or remain within the workforce. As a means to address recent enrollment declines, the department has modified course schedules and enhanced the diversity of its faculty. It anticipates increased enrollment, as for-profit colleges have been on the wane. Supplemental data are utilized in a most effective manner to justify and forecast current and future enrollment, completion, and employment trends. The department makes a concerted effort to assess SLOs for each course every semester and these data are discussed at annual industry advisory group meetings. Course SLOs have been consistently reviewed and revised, as have course curriculum and scheduling, based upon course and program SLO results. The department is encouraged to include the Program SLO Summary Evaluation Form, or excerpts from it, in future efficacy documents.

Response:

Institutional Expectations: The primary reason why this section warrants a “does not meet” rating is that the department should discuss more proactive mechanisms to combat the significant decline in enrollment and efficiency, as well as plans to expand marketing and recruitment. Although this section is thoughtful, hopeful, and optimistic, more concrete and proactive plans to address productivity should be articulated. The department has a mission that clearly links with the college mission. Specific examples clearly reinforce this linkage. Department productivity is analyzed in a thoughtful manner. The author provides potential reasons for fluctuations in enrollment and efficiency, including the recent decline from 2014-15 to 2015-16. Circumstances beyond the department’s control, including contracting and expanding job markets, are articulated within this section (and recent closures of for-profit colleges are discussed in other sections). However, more proactive means to resist future enrollment declines should be articulated. 131 Informal student polling and anecdotal evidence have compelled the department to increase its presence at local career fairs, redesign its brochure, and modify its schedule in order to better accommodate student needs. Perhaps the department could apply for enhanced funding for marketing and recruitment purposes through the Program Review, Perkins, Strong Workforce, and related processes. The review team is certainly sympathetic to the plight of this single-fulltime-faculty department and suggests that the department request additional full-time faculty during future Program Review Needs Assessment cycles. Curriculum is up to date through 2020, and CORREC 101: Introduction to Corrections has C-ID approval. All Corrections courses articulate with the CSU system, but do not appear to articulate (fully) with the UC system. This could be clarified by utilizing the table provided within the efficacy report section. All courses appear to be relevant and current to the mission of the program, as clarified within this and previous sections.

Response:

Signatures:

Administrator

Date

Faculty

Date

Advisory Committee Member

Date