

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

**Name of Department:** Human Services

**Efficacy Team:** Tim Hosford, Kay Dee Yarbrough, Jose Recinos

**Overall Recommendation:**

Continuation       Conditional       Probation

**Rationale for Overall Recommendation:** The program seems to be well on track for the next efficacy review, with a clear sense of purpose and high demand. It awards a high number of certificates and degrees in the face of limited resources, which is to be commended.

The team does have concerns regarding the presentation, or lack thereof, of concrete data in certain key areas. Additionally, previous DNM were not fully addressed, and gaps in the response matched the pattern of incomplete presentation of the data requested by the committee. While the scope of the two-year review is more limited than the four-year reports, the team highly recommends that the data discussed in the below sections is **clearly presented** and **analyzed** in the coming four-year report.

**1. Purpose of this Program:**  Meets       Does Not Meet

**Efficacy Team Response:** The document describes a strong and focused mission, and demonstrates an awareness of how it supports the college mission and the community as a whole. However, there is a lack of a clear ‘Mission Statement.’

A concrete mission statement, distinct from that of the colleges, is recommended. The document also references a ‘founder’. The team believes more clarity here is warranted.

**2. Demand for this Program:**  Meets       Does Not Meet

**Efficacy Team Response:** By presenting up to date data from their SWP application, the document makes the case that demand is on the high side of adequate. The document also states that they continuously evaluate these metrics in their planning.

The team recommends that the program detail potential paths to employment for AA/Certificate graduates as supporting evidence for demand.

**3. Quality of this Program:**  Meets       Does Not Meet

**Efficacy Team Response:** The program includes 4 certificates, an AA degree, and a broad network of part-time faculty. It asserts consistent completion rates though the exact numbers are absent, and success rates of 84.7%. The document also presents various trainings, fairs, and meetings. Some details and description of these events would be helpful.

The program has also tripled the number of community partnerships. The team

recommends that examples of these partnerships be detailed, and enumerated, in the four-year report.

**4. External Issues:**  Meets       Does Not Meet

**Efficacy Team Response:** The document provides a detailed list of the external issues and entities that it interacts with. The program shows that it is on top of potential changes and opportunities.

**5. Cost of this Program:**  Meets       Does Not Meet

**Efficacy Team Response:** The document uses this section to describe many aspects of the program that would be an excellent response to Section 3, but are out of place and unhelpful in analyzing the cost of the program. The program's breadth of accomplishments given the stretched resources is commendable. However, the document lacks the WSCH/FTEF ratio, or a presentation of the former retention and success numbers that would allow the committee to gauge the cost efficiency of the program. The ratio of FT to adjunct faculty would also be a useful data point for this section, as well as a list of faculty commitments that necessitate such a high number of adjunct support.

**6. Two-Year Plan:**  Meets       Does Not Meet

**Efficacy Team Response:** The program plans to pursue additional FT and PT faculty and keep up with industry and market standards. The document also states that the program is looking at the creation of additional certificates and courses. It would be helpful to have a more detailed plan of how it intends to accomplish both at the same time given the programs stretched resources, as described in section 5.

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

**Efficacy Team Response:** The 'Access' section of the previous DNM has no response. Under student success, there is detailed discussion of how some classes are retained or integrated, but it doesn't seem to directly answer the concerns of the committee, nor does it provide the data the committee found lacking in regards to the PLO's and SLO's.