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: Inspection Technology

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.)

There has been no change in program purpose in the last two years and the program mission statement has remained the same.

"The SBVC Inspection program trains students in code enforcement standards, regulations, and procedures to remedy existence of and to prevent the development of dangerous, substandard or unsanitary buildings and promote excellence within the profession to improve inspection services."

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.)

There continues to be adequate demand for our students. The Strong Workforce Program data tool for LMI (demand) shows an estimated regional increase in construction and building inspectors by 7.9% for the years 2017-2022. This is an estimated total 156 jobs that need to be filled annually.

The Strong Workforce Program data tool for supply of graduating students from the community colleges showed that the latest 3 year average of students graduating from construction inspection programs is only 23 students per year

This demonstrates that the program is needed and that there is an estimated 133 unfilled jobs in the construction inspection field each year in the Dessert region alone.

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.)

The quality of the program is continuing to improve. This is indicated by the data on the most recent EMP: for the 2017-18 year success was at 80%, retention at 98%, duplicated enrollment increased from 105 for 2016-17 to 166 for 2017-18, and the efficiency (WSCH per FTEF) has improved from 225 for the 2016-17 year to 277 for the 2017-18 year.

As mentioned on the previous efficacy review for the program and the previous do not meets below, outdated curriculum was affecting the quality of the program. The curriculum has since been updated and approved. The updated curriculum will be offered starting 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, CCCCO mandates, Perkins, CTE transition, CalWORKs, WIOA, Career Ladders, etc.)

The main external issue the program faces is trying to stay aligned with the industry requirements. In this case, these requirements include the California Building Codes, the International Building Codes and the International Code Council.

The curriculum, SLOs, and PLOs have been recently updated and approved to meet these requirements and these updates will officially be offered to the students starting Fall 2019.

However, building codes are updated every few years. This is a challenge to the program as it takes a minimum of one full year to make a change to the curriculum. The program will continue to ensure that any future code updates are incorporated into the curriculum as soon as they happen. This will help make sure that students graduating from the program have been adequately trained in up to date requirements.

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 Inspection technology program does not have a budget. This is not a problem most of the time as the courses offered are lecture only. This means there is not a significant need for a regular budget. The program does however require an updated set of code books approximately every 5 years. When these codes need to be updated, the program applies for the funds as part of the program review needs assessment process. This has been successful on previous needs assessments. The program will continue to apply for a small budget augmentation as a part of the program review needs assessment when it is required to stay up to date with industry required code updates.

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 lass full efficacy review; examples include recommendations, project future trends, personnel and equipment needs, etc.)

The Inspection program is on track with the current plan of updating the program. Curriculum, SLOs, and PLOs were out of date and in need of review. The updates have been submitted and approved. The updated curriculum will be officially offered Fall 2019.

As a part of the updates, several new courses have been approved. The program is in the process of recruiting additional adjuncts specialized in these areas. Inspection is a very specialized field. It is therefore important to the success of the updated curriculum that faculty experienced and qualified in the specific course content are chosen to teach each course. One additional adjunct faculty has already been recruited and the program will continue to work with applicable industry partners to continue to search for the best possible candidates.

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?

Committee Comment for revised remediation report—spring 2018: The remediation report did not address the does not meet categories adequately. The department will need to address those categories more thoroughly. Below are the categories:

The SLO's and PLOs were assessed; however, there was no analysis of the little data that was provided.

Response:

The Inspection program has not yet been provided with a document from the program review committee with a reason/explanation of the do not meets extended for the remediation report.

This is what was submitted 3-19-18 for the remediation report: "The SLOs and PLOs have, as was noted, been assessed. However, there has been little emphasis on the importance of the use/analysis of this data. I cannot find any indication that this data has ever been emphasized or properly analyzed. This has, I think, been caused by the historical (and continuing) trend of the division assigning the faculty chair position for the Inspection program to the faculty chair and full-time faculty of the Welding program. This cheats the inspection program from the necessary support as the faculty chair is not a subject matter expert for the program. That being said. . . Relying on the expertise of the Inspection faculty, I have begun the conversation about the SLO and PLO data so that they can better report when submitting their data. The faculty were simply reporting to meet the requirement that all SLOs must be reported with no idea of how that data will eventually be used/assessed.

Below are some of the 3 year reports for the Inspection program. The number of students who met the SLOs is high ranging from 86.02% - 93.26%. This number indicates that the program is doing well and has an acceptable number of students demonstrating the ability to meet the SLOs by the end of the course(s).

The primary department goal is updating the curriculum SLOs/PLOs. This is vital to meet the requirements for offering the program to our students and also more closely working with the industry. For example, please take note of the first SLO below "entry level employment in the building inspection field as an inspector of residential, commercial or code enforcement areas". While this is a really good goal, we have no way of actually tracking this and yet the reporting shows that 93.26% of our students met this. The other concern is if there is really over an 86% of the students always passing the SLOs/PLOs there might be some indication that the rigor of the program is not what it should be. This analysis is being used to update the curriculum and SLOs/PLOs to ensure that regulatory requirements and the needs of the students are met."

It would be helpful if the committee would provide an explanation for the do not meet for the above narrative.

New update: New SLOs and PLOs have been written and approved and will be offered starting Fall 2019. Although data from these SLO/PLO updates are not yet available, the program's goal is to produce data that allows for better analysis for the health of the program by aligning with the industry code requirements that need to be met in order for our students to get jobs. This will also provide a clear picture of where the program is at in regard to quality of instruction, student success, etc. . . and build a better platform for determining department goals and areas of focus when requesting additional resources.

The discussion regarding productivity is minimal and does not provide evidence of productivity at an acceptable level. The productivity measure is at its lowest in six years, 206. The FTEF is equivalent to what it was in 2012-13, but the enrollment has dropped to nearly half of what it was in 2012-13 with the 366 same number of sections, 7. This is thought to have occurred because of the economy and housing market, but there is no evidence of this. Plans to increase enrollment are increased outreach, improved marketing and possibly adding weekend and online classes. The out of date curriculum with regard to codes negatively impacts this program in comparison to other colleges. SBVC has the least number of students in comparison to Norco and COD, the other two area colleges offering this program. Updated codes were purchased but will not be implemented until fall 2017.

Response:

The Inspection program has not yet been provided with a document from the program review committee with a reason/explanation of the do not meets extended for the remediation report.

This is what was submitted 3-19-18 for the remediation report: ""The productivity measure is at its lowest in six years". This cannot be denied. There was however no attempt to blame this on the "economy and housing market" as stated by the committee. The original report said "There has also been some improvement in the building/construction industry as the economy continues to improve. This improvement helps to explain the increase in the FTES". What I was trying to express was that the enrollment and FTES do show a very slight increase which hopefully indicates that the program is stabilizing even though the WSCH per FTEF (productivity measure) is the lowest it has been in the last 6 years. With the lack of appropriate updates to the curriculum the improvement in the economy is the only thing I can think of that would cause the program to begin to stabilize. I do question the committees decision to provide a do not meet for this section as it was clearly not read thoroughly.

The reason that was stated in the original review to explain the lowest productivity in six years is the out of date curriculum.

Since then:

The curriculum updates were submitted by the deadline of October 1st 2017. The faculty chair and faculty spent and approximate combined 45 hours working on the updates. SLOs were inadvertently overlooked and the curriculum has still not been approved which will place the updated curriculum in the SBVC Catalog for the fall 2019 year. The SLOs have since been written and submitted to the curriculum committee and the curriculum is therefore beginning to move forward but the school does not allow for curriculum updates to be offered half way through the school year. The updated Inspection curriculum and SLOs/PLOs will without a doubt be offered fall 2019."

It would be helpful if the committee would provide an explanation for the do not meet for the above narrative.

New update: With the improved communication within the department, curriculum officially approved, and SLO/PLOs updated, the productivity has improved significantly. The latest EMP for the program show that the efficiency (WSCH per FTEF) for the program is at the highest level for all the years of data represented. For 2016-17 year the WSCH per FTEF was 225 and for the 2017-18 year it went up to 277. The enrollment has also steadily increased each year for the last 3 years. The FTEF went up by just 0.4 for the 2017-18 year from the 2016-17 year. This a minimal amount and nonconsequential when considering the significant improvement in the WSCH per FTEF.

There is no evidence that the curriculum process is up to date. The last course content review was in 2009, so all courses are overdue and have not yet been launched into Curricunet. The faculty chair of this program does not teach Inspection Technology and has also been assigned to chair two other programs, despite being a new faculty member. Much work needs to be done to collaborate with the part-time faculty to update the curriculum and codes/inspection requirements.

Response:

The Inspection program has not yet been provided with a document from the program review committee with a reason/explanation of the do not meets extended for the remediation report.

The committees statement above "The last course content review was in 2009, so all courses are overdue and have not yet been launched into Curricunet" does not acknowledge the updated narrative that was submitted 3-19-18 for the remediation report: "The curriculum updates were submitted by the deadline of October 1st 2017. The faculty chair and faculty spent and approximate combined 45 hours working on the updates. SLOs were inadvertently overlooked and the curriculum has still not been approved which will place the updated curriculum in the SBVC Catalog for the fall 2019 year. The SLOs have since been written and submitted to the curriculum committee and the curriculum is therefore beginning to move forward but the school does not allow for curriculum updates to be offered half way through the school year. The updated Inspection curriculum and SLOs/PLOs will without a doubt be offered fall 2019."

It would be helpful if the committee would provide an explanation for the do not meet for the above narrative especially when it is stated above by the committee that "all courses are overdue and have not yet been launched into Curricunet". The courses were launched into Curricunet and that was explained in the Remediation report.

New update: The curriculum had already been submitted by the October 1st 2017 deadline. The SLOs and PLOs were since updated and both the curriculum, SLOs and PLOs were all approved and will be officially offered Fall 2019. This means that all of the Inspection Technology curriculum is up to date with the required course content review. There are just 3 courses that the system shows as out of date: INSPEC 010B, INSPEC 011B, INSPEC 024D, and INPSEC 025D. These are not being updated. They are in the process of being deleted and are no longer offered.

The Program does not demonstrate how it incorporates technology, merely mentions that it uses it. For campus climate, departmental meetings would be sufficient but only if they are held regularly and with people of all campus constituencies. Perhaps a bit more discussion on the outcomes of these meetings and/or a link to minutes would be a better 'demonstration' rather than just mentioning that meetings occur. Having faculty members who work for local businesses may increase partnerships with these businesses and code enforcement in the local industry, but partnerships with K-12's, adult schools, local organizations, and universities was not mentioned, even as a plan to implement in the future. So, neither technology, campus climate, nor partnerships demonstrated how they are incorporated into the program.

Response:

The Inspection program has not yet been provided with a document from the program review committee with a reason/explanation of the do not meets extended for the remediation report.

This is what was submitted 3-19-18 for the remediation report: "Without a full time faculty in the program it is difficult to fully incorporate strategic initiatives into the planning for the program. I was assigned to the faculty chair position after only 1 semester as a full time faculty and was not made aware of many of the problems that the Inspection program faces until I was sent the documents for the efficacy review. This made it extremely difficult to try and explain some of these areas.

I have been trying to hold regularly scheduled departmental meetings and this has helped significantly with the "campus climate" of the program. At first, there was some resistance to holding meetings because the faculty felt that they had always, in the past, been a waste of their time. We have been able to work through this which has developed a sense of team work. The adjunct faculty who teach the inspection courses had never understood what SLOs/PLOs are, had never seen the EMP for the program, had never heard of program review or efficacy review, had never been consulted about curriculum updates, and, from what I can discern, never received much support from the faculty chair who has never been a subject matter expert in Inspection Technology.

The department meetings that have been held have mostly focused on the curriculum updates. The faculty are (or recently) all inspectors working in the industry and provide valuable information, advice, and recommendations for positive and needed updates to the program. Several meetings have included students who work in the construction industry. This has provided feedback for the program and possible update suggestions from students affected.

Several other department meetings have focused on agenda items that include: preparing a syllabus; finding the curriculum in CurricUNET, Core Objectives, SLOs/PLOs, grading, using the SLO cloud etc. .

The adjunct faculty who teach the classes are the biggest asset the program has. They provide many years of knowledge in the industry and are the link between the program and the industry. One of the faculty also serves as the Vice President of the local chapter of the ICC (International Code Council). Because of this, the local ICC chapter acts as the advisory for the program and is the catalyst for ensuring that all of the updates that have been submitted into the curriculum are up to date with the industry standards. We are continuing to strengthen the partnership between the SBVC Inspection Technology program and the ICC and this should also help as we plan to strengthen partnerships with other schools and organizations. We are also working on starting conversations with other colleges in our region that also have Inspection Technology programs to try and align the curriculums as much as possible to benefit students in the entire region."

New Update: The program is continuing to rely on the knowledge and experience of the faculty to provide the recommendations for Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate.

The technology available to the program is minimal. This includes computers and projectors that don't always work. The program is continuing to advocate for improved technology especially in the new Applied Technology building that is being planned since the passing of Measure CC.

For partnerships/campus climate, as mentioned above, the program works with the local International Code Council (ICC) chapter. The local ICC chapter also acts as the industry advisory for the program. This is a valuable industry partnership that helps provide feedback for the program and also provides a channel by which students can get jobs. The program also has plans to work with several program on campus including HVAC and Electricity/Electronics to provide the inspection students opportunities to perform inspections during the other program's lab. This would provide learning experiences for the inspection students by giving them actual systems to inspect and also provide a learning opportunity for the students having their work inspected by allowing them to experience what it is like to work with an inspector on a job. The program will also continue to advocate for improved support from the SBVC marketing and public relations to ensure that high school and middle school partnerships are a focus when marketing and outreach is done.

Signatures:

Administrator	3-18-2019 Date
Faculty	3-18-19 Date
Advisory Committee Member	3-18-19 Date