

Sierra College



Program Review 2016-17

Table of Contents

Part 1: Executive Summary	3
Part 2: Evaluations	
I. Recommendations	19
II. Resource Request Chart	20
III. Program Review Evaluations	
Anthropology	21
Astronomy	23
CalWorks	25
Career Connections	27
Computer Information Systems	29
Community Education	31
Disabled Student Programs and Services	33
Engineering	36
Extended Opportunities Programs and Services	38
English as a Second Language	41
Fire Technology	44
Ghidotti	46
History	48
International Students	50
Kinesiology	52
LGBT Studies	54
Mechatronics	57
Physics	59
Psychology	62
Sociology	64
Transfer Center	66
Welding	68
Part 3: Appendices	
Appendix 1: Committee Membership 2016-17	70
Appendix 2: Score Distribution	71
Appendix 3: Program Review Rubric Instruction	72
Program Review Rubric Student Services	76

Part 1: Program Review Executive Summary: 2016-17

Background and Process:

- *The Program Review Committee:* The Program Review Committee, a committee of the Academic Senate, represents the Senate's interest in promoting program quality and improvement and engages in a systematic evaluation of instructional and student service programs performance as an element of strategic planning and resource allocation. During the year, the committee oversees Program Review for instructional and students services, reviews its own processes, and plans for the next years' cycle. Although the committee represents the Academic Senate, its members include classified and management staff, since all units share an interest in its evaluations and recommendations. The committee has spaces for nine faculty members, five managers, and two classified employees although the numbers have shifted occasionally:
 - For 2016-17, the committee lost two faculty members and replaced one management member. The committee still needs to add at least one classified employee. Scheduling issues have limited the number of meetings and make it difficult to reach a quorum of faculty members. In most cases, this was insignificant; the committee only occasionally takes actions that fit within Brown Act rules. Because the committee members communicate through Canvas, the class management system, the scheduling issues rarely impede the committee's central work.
 - Scheduling issues somewhat delayed completion of the committee's evaluations and the completion of this report. These delays should have or will have had no effect on the role of Program Review in planning and resource allocation.
- *Program Review Participants, 2016-17:* After the first program review in Summer 2009, each identified program is scheduled for program review every three years, starting in 2010-11. Unless a program has been deferred or excused or is new, all identified programs will have gone through the cycle twice; this year's programs are starting the third iteration of the cycle. This year 22 departments and programs have so far submitted reviews; one delayed report from the 2016-17 appears in this year's report. Three programs have received extensions related to program or work issues; the Library report was deferred because the management structure is changing and the coordinators/managers of the report: these changes would probably not appear in this years report. Four programs listed separately in the quilt appear aggregated in the Kinesiology report.
- *Process:*
 - To integrate Program Review with the process for strategic planning and resource allocation incorporated in 2012-13, the Committee developed a schedule mirroring the previous years, with the goal of submitting the report in April 2017, May at the latest. In response to the Accrediting Commission's recommendations and the suggestions of the Outcomes Committee, the Program Review Committee has substantially revised its templates and rubrics to reflect the centrality of outcomes assessments in the District's planning and deliberation. This year, the Committee continued to revise the substance and

language of several questions or criteria to eliminate some repetition, provide more explicit directions, and focus on evaluation and analysis in all sections.

Apart from minor editing the committee made the following changes:

- Altered the questions for “Currency” and “Effectiveness” in the Student Services form. The new questions a) reflect the fact that SSOs (student services outcomes) may be a more useful criterion for success than traditional SLO’s, although these still factor in the report; and b) stress analysis of the programs’ self-evaluation and improvement related to the criteria developed by the program.
 - Updated the questions in the “Relevancy” section of the Student Services form, by including the new College mission statement and district goals and focusing the questions on the ways in which the department/program serves these goals. Based on the results (see below) this question elicited a form of outcome analysis appropriate to the programs.
 - Revised the first questions of the “Relevance” section to clarify that the responses should address the program’s alignment with the College mission and District ISLOs.
 - Eliminated all language in the “Currency” section suggesting that some programs may not engage in program review or curriculum development. The questions now focus on Curriculum development and analysis as well as analysis of outcomes assessments and their effect on program curriculum development (as well as faculty involvement in professional developments or activities of various kinds).
 - Eliminated some remaining redundancies in sections 1 and 4, added more references to equity to the assessment questions, and eliminated some redundancies in the conclusion. See the later discussion for an evaluation of these changes.
- For 2016-17 the committee followed the same general schedule as in previous years:
 - August-September, 2016: Contact departments up for review and supply updated information regarding the process.
 - September-October, 2016: Revise templates and rubrics
 - October-November, 2016: Hold group workshops and individual meetings with department chairs and coordinators, whoever is coordinating the report. One or two additional meetings took place in January.
 - February-March/April, 2017: February 15 was the due date for the report; most reports arrived within a few days of the deadline. The committee met once shortly after the due date to set the time for the main evaluation meeting, on March 14.
 - April-May, 2017: Chair completes and submits the report to the Academic Senate and Strategic Council.
 - The committee followed the same general procedures as in previous years for evaluating the program reviews, with some changes to accommodate the difficulties in finding effective meeting times:

- The chair divided the committee into four groups of three or four, with the chair as general coordinator and participant in each group as needed.
- The group members met in person or communicated through the online course system to explore the results of their preliminary evaluations, compare notes and scores, and adjust their own interpretations based on these results. The entire committee met on March 14, as noted above, to establish or re-establish norms for the reviews. This year, like last, the review teams generally shared an understanding of the criteria, a result of the committee's increasing expertise: with one exception, all members had served for at least one year on the committee.
- The chair reviewed all of the reports after the individual review teams had reviewed their results, revised the reports, and uploaded the drafts to the class management site.
- The chair subsequently edits the evaluations, regularizing their structure and making minor adjustments to the scores. The chair will distribute the individual reports to each department along with a brief explanation and review of the results.

General Results:

Evaluation criteria: As noted above, each program review received:

- A score based on a revised rubric reflecting the new questions
- Extensive commentary implicitly or explicitly incorporating the language of the rubric.
- A summary evaluation of each program and the Program Review, broken into three parts reflecting the nature of the report
- A recommendation to PARAC (Planning and Resource Allocation Committee).

As in previous years, this year's report categorizes the scores according to the relationship between scores and commentary rather than the numbers alone: the rubric provides holistic terms for scoring and for the written commentary and evaluations. By definition, these categories themselves are inevitably somewhat arbitrary; the difference between the scores is often less significant (as a score) than the differences within one of the criteria, like development of assessment and evaluation of SLOs or analysis of the data from the Department Statistical Review (DSR).

General observations: The reviews this year continued the trend the committee had noticed in the previous four years; the reports were generally strong, often exceptional, indicating as noted last year "that programs are increasingly familiar with and fully engaged not only in Program Review but also in the assessment and planning addressed in the report."

Scores: Although the scores may seem superfluous, they also provide a rough comparison from one year to the next, after noting that the reports have changed each year along with the planning processes of the District. This year's average for all programs is essentially the same as last year's, while the range was even more exaggerated: a majority of programs,

fourteen, received scores of 70 or above. The remainder received scores in the 50s or 60s. Given the results, the general scoring categories (e.g., “adequate”) seem superfluous and are not included below; all of the scores were adequate, at least, and an adequate report provides enough information to evaluate the program. The strong and exceptional scores indicate that the department has provided extensive detail and focused analysis of the detail; comparatively lower scores usually indicated either some limits in analysis or problems of clarity—misplaced or unclear data or narrative descriptions. Most departments seem to have systematized their assessment and planning and have benefited from increasingly detailed and focused statistical information. All departments provided useful data and analysis, and the majority clearly, to quote last year’s report, “dedicated considerable time and thought to the reports, provided generally sufficient data, engaged in perceptive and thoughtful analysis of the results, and demonstrated their commitment to ongoing analysis of their programs in light of students success and student needs.” All of these responses are captured directly or indirectly in the summary comments found in each evaluation. Again, see the discussion below for more commentary.

Here are the general numerical results in terms of the categories reflecting the relationship between the numerical results and the extended commentary in the evaluations:

- Score distribution:
 - 50-59—2
 - 60-69—6
 - 70-77—14

Medians and Means: The first number is the median, fictive in some cases, the second the mean or average; the second score represents the average for 2015-16:

- Ancillary (72.5; 72.5) (57.5; 57.7)
- Instructional: (71; 68.4) (69.5; 65.1)
- Student Services: (70; 68.2) (69; 69)
- General Average: (70.5; 68.4) (69; 64.8)

In brief, the range of scores shows that few programs struggled to provide the data and analysis required by program review, particularly those associated with Accreditation demands and the revised questions: analyzing the use of SLOs, tying resource requests to evaluation, including SLOs and SSOs, and addressing alignment with the District’s mission and goals. This level of success, mirroring previous years may be related a) to the greater lead-time and additional time provided by the schedule; b) to the new template and the revised questions described above, particularly the inclusion of SSO’s in the student service evaluations; but most likely c) to the departments’ increasing engagement in planning. One other general result is worth noting; the equity goals of the District depend heavily on traditional success data. Some departments, reflecting this concern, provided extensive analysis of the DSR (Department Statistical Report), more extensive equity data (when available), and described major program changes related to these concerns; at the same time, this analysis was less fully developed in a number of the reports. The deciding factor may be the degree to which equity concerns are central to the individual program’s role:

granting that equity is a central concern, it means something different to an instructional program (Physics, for example) than to a program like EOPS. This suggests that the committee may need to amplify these questions for the next set of reports. Please see subsequent discussions for more detail.

Conclusions: As described in last year's report, "The committee's comments are probably more valuable than the scores in assisting the department to find ways to assess and evaluate its curriculum and services or to present effectively the work they have already done. Given their origin and their meaning, the scores may have the greatest value as an independent response to the department's or program's own reviews and self-evaluations." See subsequent discussions for more detail.

Recommendations to PARAC: More significant for strategic planning are the recommendation to PARAC and the commentary explaining this recommendation, usually when the recommendation calls for some action or particular attention. The template allows for the three recommendations described below, with the numbers for each category (see Section 2 of the complete report for specific results):

- *Critical Attention Needed:* All of the programs receiving this recommendation fulfill the College mission in a number of ways and fulfill it well in the circumstances. In these cases, however, the program faces resource limits of some kind, or immediate, essential resource needs, is engaged in the challenge of redesigning or revising a program in response to changing conditions of the community, or may require recommitment from the College.
 - 1 department/program
- *Opportunity Identified:* The program is essentially stable but ideally would either expand or acquire resources a) to meet a clear district need or b) to realize its potential for increased service to the community. The review has effectively identified potential areas for growth or improvement consistent with this recommendation. The relatively small number of programs receiving this recommendation may reflect the dynamic nature of program development, the relationship of these recommendations to strategic planning, or the impact of decisions in the Community College system as whole, from the restructuring of basic skills, for example, to programs like the Strong Workforce Initiative.
 - 3 departments/programs
- *No attention needed to sustain program, or Stable:* Although the department/program could benefit from additional people, more space, or new equipment, in the near future it can sustain its services or course/program offerings even if it receives no additional resources apart from standard replacements or upgrades.
 - 18 departments/programs

Analysis and Observations: A quick look at the templates and rubrics will show that the four scored criteria in the evaluation (Relevance, Currency, Effectiveness, and Thoroughness) and one non-scored section (Planning) address different issues, sometimes substantially different, and ask for different kinds of analysis. The summative comments consequently address three elements of each report related to the criteria or divisions in the

template and rubric: the effectiveness of the program, the quality of its analysis, and its success in linking resource planning and the evaluation. For clarity, this summary analysis follows the pattern of the evaluations, with the summative comments, the Committee's evaluation of the process and its results, reserved for the last section.

Relevance: This section asks each program a) to describe its relationship to the District mission, b) to describe the part it plays in meeting District goals and its success in meeting those goals, and c) to provide any other data and information revealing its value to the college.

1. *General Observations:* Although no department or program had any difficulty in establishing the value of the relationship to the District mission or its goals or in noting its participation in a range of school and community activities, the comments from the evaluators noted that programs in some cases needed to describe these relationships in more specific terms even if the relationship between programs and goals seems self-evident. (This direction is partly driven by Accreditation standards). Instructional programs offered a significant number of majors and certificates. The anecdotal descriptions again revealed the dedication of the programs to students, other staff, and the community at large. For example, as noted last year, several programs explored equity goals in their evaluations in this section, indicating their centrality of the District's re-engineering goals to the programs' descriptions of their goals. Similarly, a number of instructional and student service programs described their participation in a range of campus and community activities supporting the college mission and goals. This participation may be not readily be evaluated by standard metrics, although individual programs could develop or have developed ways to track the reach and impact of these activities.
2. *Validation/support, Instructional Programs:* As was in previous years, although some departments offered extensive data and analysis concerning graduation, transfer, job placement, or success on credentials examinations, the analysis was sometimes perfunctory or limited, even in strong reports, to logical suppositions (e.g., there were few degrees awarded because the major is relatively new). In general, CTE or partial CTE programs like Applied Art and Design or Human Development often have no difficulty in substantiating some elements of the claims since they can track success on state required performance tests, or other external and internal measurements of program success. At the same time, placement data seems hard to come by or requires more investigation; if the College could find a way to track this kind of information, it would augment the departments' evaluation and review. Other instructional programs, transfer programs in particular, have access to more extensive and precise data; the reports would benefit from exploration of the available information. At the same time, data regarding the role of particular departments or programs in supporting transfer seems elusive. The proof for these claims is often limited to inferences derived from the numbers of students who take a given transfer course, or from the number of students who transfer, declare for transfer, or complete transfer degrees (overall transfer numbers are available from CSU).

Suggested actions: The committee may want to work with the Research Office a) to

determine what kinds of data might be available and what data would be most relevant and b) to redesign the questions to reflect whatever happens to be available.

The committee may want to emphasize equity and other success goals in this section as well as in sections “Currency” and “Effectiveness”; these goals are increasingly central to departments’ planning and assessment.

3. *Validation/support, Student Services and Ancillary Programs:* Programs had little difficulty in analyzing the data and in determining what data described the program’s success; all programs effectively if occasionally inferentially described their relationship to the mission and goals of the College and demonstrated how their contact with students helped them meet these goals. If a program acts under a stringent set of mandates, the committee in any case cannot use one criterion, compliance with mandates, to evaluate a program’s relevance unless the mandate has constrained or altered the program’s ability to help the District meet its goals.

Suggested actions: The committee may revisit this criterion to determine what kinds of analysis and support would best reflect the departments’ roles and success in meeting the college’s missions and goals and provide evidence of its success in general in meeting these goals.

Currency: This section asks each program to: a) to describe its assessments and evaluations of SLOs and PLOs, where relevant; as noted above, the new template for Student Services asks for analysis of SSOs and/or SLOs, whichever seems most relevant; b) to analyze curriculum developments for instructional programs and innovation in improvement for student services and ancillary programs, and c) to describe and analyze staff participation in activities leading to professional and academic currency. The questions focus on describing, analyzing, and evaluating the relationship of outcomes assessments and program development, including the possibility that no direct relationship emerged from the process.

1. *General Observations:* All instructional departments have updated curricula apart from instances in which they are rewriting their programs to meet current needs. Similarly, all student service or ancillary programs engage in ongoing program assessments and redesigns related to their evaluation of SSOs and other data. SLO and/or SSO development and assessment are central to assessment and planning for most departments. All instructional departments have defined and assessed outcomes in courses and programs following a cycle or schedule appropriate to the program. All programs claim to have evaluated the results and in some cases have subsequently revised curriculum or instruction. At the same time, as noted last year, the reviews often drew few if any connections between these activities and program planning and development. Similarly, although almost all departments and programs would provide extensive lists of outcomes, present the plan for assessment, or note that curricular or other actions had emerged from discussions, the committee often saw little specific evidence of these claims (this evidence would include discussions of at least some specific changes—or non-changes—undertaken in response to specific results). The

changes in the template have led to more thorough responses, in general, but the committee once again focused its evaluations on the material presented, reserving the issue for further discussion and analysis (see discussion below).

Although the revisions in the template addressed equity issues, only occasionally did a clear relationship emerge associating outcomes assessment with any evaluation of the program's equity concerns (where these were addressed or where they are relevant). This suggests that equity decisions emerge from analysis of traditional DSR data, and that any outcomes assessments will follow the development of new programs and student support.

Faculty in all programs engage in a range of activities related to program development, professional currency, shared government, and other College or community activities, assertions supported by extensive lists of these actions. The committee would welcome more analysis of a one to a few examples demonstrate their effect on program development, instruction, or other professional obligations.

Suggested action: Revise the question on professional development to reflect the concerns noted above.

2. *Commentary/validation, Instructional Programs:* All instructional programs had clearly established SLOs; almost all programs had assessed outcomes on schedule and had evaluated the results. Other programs were entering their third cycles of assessment. Most programs presented their assessment cycle plans in the report or shared them indirectly through other means. Some departments provided a narrative description of the process and some of its results, while some merely noted that the process exists and that they had assessed some outcomes and acted upon them. Other departments mentioned the number of outcomes, assessments, and evaluations, but supplied no data or narrative. At the same time the responses of the departments and programs indicated their commitment to the process

This general consistency likely has emerged for two obvious reasons: the continuing commitment of the College to outcomes assessments and reviews at all levels, despite other concerns, and changes in the template, described above. Variations in the responses still exist and in some cases are inevitable depending on the nature of the program and its role in transfer, career training, or student success. Outcomes measurements in some courses or majors resist clear descriptions or evaluation (e.g., programs that depend heavily on objective tests—where the assessment essentially recapitulates the results on tests) while other programs build their curricula to meet specific external guidelines: transfer course curricula and objectives track equivalent courses at CSU or UC, while CTE courses necessarily respond to rapid changes in the job market and the skills required for success and create and modify outcomes constantly.

As was true last year, all programs had fully updated curricula within the last six years, although some programs were in the process of developing new courses and programs

(e.g., ESL). All departments used this year's report to explain the process and reasoning that led to significant revisions in curriculum or course offerings.

Suggested actions: Revise the questions/prompts to clarify the analytical and narrative focus of the Curriculum and SLO sections.

3. *Commentary/validation, Student Services and Ancillary Programs:* As noted above, the inclusion of SSOs in the template significantly strengthened the outcomes section of the report. Programs remained committed to defining and measuring SLOs but could also focus their analysis on their success in assessing and revising their activities. For example, EOPS could focus on their efforts to improve intake and service, describe their contributions to student success, and explore their goals for student self-sufficiency (an SLO) without distorting the description of their work and its focus. Although the committee would like to take credit for the change, it simply incorporated ongoing revisions to Student Services assessments and evaluations. Although much of this evidence is anecdotal, the use of quantitative data for programs like Career Connections and the DSPS indicates that students clearly benefit from the services provided by each program. (See additional discussions in the general comments below)

Program Effectiveness: This section asks for analysis of success in terms of a set of statistical measures and other kinds of evaluative data; it also asks for analysis of current program planning in light of the data. The ask departments and programs to describe and analyze the relationship between outcomes assessments and their evaluation of student success, program vitality, and planning when this connection is central to the process; the questions also refer to t equity data, where these applied:

- *General observations:* The comments from last year's report also apply to this years: "All programs demonstrated a commitment to maintaining and enhancing the quality of their programs: revising curriculum for currency or to meet student needs (or both); providing necessary and efficient service for students and support for instruction; expanding and deepening the connections between Sierra College and the community. Each program demonstrated a deep and unshakeable commitment to their students." Most programs mentioned a variety of constraints under which they operate; in some cases, the constraints inhibited the programs' abilities to support student success on the scale that would meet demand for the services or courses they provide. Programs receiving categorical funds have received increases earmarked for student success and retention; this increase is welcome but still falls short of demand.
- *Validation/support, Instructional Programs:* Departments had variable success in substantiating these claims through an analysis of the Department Statistical Review (DSR) provided by the Research Office. This year, like last, most departments successfully analyzed the DSR data and its significance. Still, as was true last year, some departments would also have trouble in one or another of the following ways:
 - Explaining the data or showing the application of past data, or exploring its implications, including significant variances from District averages.
 - Linking the data to planning or using the data to support program planning or claims for resources.

- Defining the role of outcomes assessment in evaluation and planning when evidence also exists or when the department has at least noted that outcomes assessments are central to curricular and other program developments.
- Few departments or programs explored equity questions although the statistics are broken down or “disaggregated” by demographic categories. The analysis of this data may lead to evaluation of programs and program offerings in light of equity goals.

Suggested actions: Although the template clearly focuses on data analysis, the prompts, particularly for question 1 (retention and success) could be revised to strengthen the focus on equity and/or R4S goals within the larger analysis of student/program success.

- *Validation/support, Student Services and Ancillary programs:* Student Services and Ancillary programs in general succeeded in evaluating their services or contributions to the college in measurable terms. Each program or department effectively developed its own criteria (where standardized data was not available) and described the process for revision/improvement related to these evaluations. Most programs provide a range of quantitative data demonstrating the impact of the program on student agency and success.

Program Planning: The comment from previous reports is still relevant, with one significant modification: “Most departments suffer from a variety of constraints: insufficient staff, aging or limited equipment, and inadequate classroom space. Most departments linked their plans to program needs—e.g., the need for another instructor for the development of a major or space to accommodate new program developments—and often were able to relate these needs to assessments of student or program success, in particular for service programs where strained resources directly and obviously affect student access. In general, however, departments still have difficulty tying resource requests to specific needs identified by the program’s self-assessment, in particular its outcomes assessments and measurements of student success. This difficulty has less to do with the actual assessments than with their meaning.”

Previous commentaries in the Program Review report have addressed this issue in light of the Accrediting Commission’s recommendation that the College systematically incorporate outcomes assessments into its resource allocation process. Last year and this, the College’s R4S project (“reengineering”) has raised new questions, as have a number of program developments serving equity students (a valuable goal), since these are based almost entirely on traditional success data rather than outcomes assessments per se. This year, the Strong Work Force Initiative adds yet another imperative which may scrap any systematic attempt to link the program review evaluation to program planning; obviously, each program needs to justify its applications for grants, but these often focus on alignment of the curriculum with the suggestions of the regional committees and a range of economic information. Data will drive the requests, but not outcomes data traditionally construed; DSR data may be more relevant. At the same time, the results of these efforts are not directly related to the District’s planning process except—and this is significant—any grant

money represents one less need that the District will have to meet. Similarly, because Student Service programs receive categorical funding, the review has no immediate relationship to the District's yearly allocations and plays no role in the reports submitted to the State or other agencies overseeing the grants (the data and analysis can be used in these categorical funding requests or reports). On the other hand, the District may eventually be responsible for staff salaries if the categorical funds diminish or disappear; the review still has value for tracking program performance within the District.

This year, most instructional departments checked off a box indicating that course or program outcomes or other learning assessments had played a role in resource requests; despite the check marks, the fact remains that most requests, inevitably, respond to immediate needs for program maintenance, growth, other developments, or program survival. When departments cited student success or "outcomes" as a reason for program development, the claim usually referred to the inferential (and reasonable) demand for additional space, faculty, and/or equipment: e.g., without new computers students will achieve none of the outcomes of redesigned courses—the outcome can't be assessed at all. Outcomes assessments and evaluations therefore play an indirect role, or depend on likely results of equipment or staffing shortfalls. Or, for another example, Physics obviously has lab equipment—course outlines call for lab activities—but the equipment may degrade or not allow for new approaches to the subject; the conditions are not yet catastrophic, but may be, even if the outcomes assessments validate the courses and instructional methods.

Conclusion: The issues described above stem from the inherent difficulties in justifying resource needs in terms of what are essentially instructional and learning assessments. Given the Accreditation standards, departments and programs need to explore these connections in light of the Accreditation standards, which mandate the central inclusion of outcomes in strategic and resource planning. And the program review analysis of these requests partly satisfies that need, even when the results suggest that the connection remains tenuous between outcomes assessments and resource planning. At the same time, a variety of activities from R4S to Strong Work Force Initiative have altered the patterns. To note just two possibilities: a) Programs may add or delete courses based on the new pathways and traditional measures of success explored in "Effectiveness" (described above) and this analysis would dominate planning and resource requests. And b) The district may have to take potential resource allocations into account, depending on the duration of the various grants received by individual departments and the district.

On the other hand, outcomes assessments in the traditional sense may have little to do with the evaluations guiding these decisions, but they may have a great deal to do with the reports that programs would submit to renew or augment the grant. Again, presenting a thorough analysis of outcomes assessments, even to indicate explain why no actions were taken, can only enhance the review regardless of its role in resource planning and allocation.

The Role of Curriculum Review: If the Commission and the District both want to evaluate resource requests and planning in light of program or course outcomes, the District's goals or missions, and/or immediate needs, then Program Review may play a clear—and non-

evaluative role—in the process. Although the committee has no direct role in designing the District’s system for strategic planning and resource allocation, it can call attention to trends in the District and provide information outlining the basis for resource requests. To strengthen this role, the Committee has already:

- Created a simple chart presenting the basis for resource requests in each years report, without commenting on the specific requests or their value. The chart provides a quick view of the reasons given for resource requests, noting when departments have tied these requests to outcomes assessments or other measurements of student success. The Accreditation Steering Committee recommended this addition.
- Strengthened the evaluation of Section 4 by calling attention to specific resource needs substantiated in the reports and by using the recommendations to suggest which programs need or should receive additional attention in resource allocations.
- Revised the templates to clarify the relationship between resource requests and the department/ program’s complete review and analysis, making clear in the instructions that the goal is to link resources requests to specific goals and to relate these goals to student success as defined in the report.

Suggested action: Further revise the templates to reflect new developments in District planning and program development.

Summary Conclusions:

The following comments follow the structure of the three part final comments leading to the recommendation:

Program Quality/Effectiveness: The previous year’s comments still apply to this year: Although the goal of Program Review is the objective analysis of programs based on objective data, the Committee was continually impressed and gratified by the dedication of staff, by their devotion to their programs and the students they serve, by the high quality of their work, and by their ability to perform as well as they do in the face of constant demands on their resources and time. All of the reports take note of this fact; the scores at least partly reflect it. A number of data points also support these claims, of course, and many departments presented a thorough and often sophisticated evaluation of their program in terms of the DSR data and their evaluation of outcomes assessments and fully tied their resource requests to this analysis. In some cases, however, although less often than in previous years, the Committee’s ability to evaluate the program was hampered by the absence of objective supporting data: scores for effectiveness may in some cases be lower than they should be. See the analysis above for suggested actions.

Program Review/Assessment: Despite the comments above, all programs presented for the most part adequate to strong support for their claims and conclusions and demonstrated a commitment to effective planning. SLOs and assessment of DSR data in general presented an insignificant stumbling block for programs in this year’s program reviews. At the same time, instructional programs continued in some cases to have difficulty in evaluating the DSR data or in providing this evaluation to the committee. This is understandable for a

number of reasons: the difficulty in accounting for moving averages in student success and retention or developing effective comparisons for assessing the success totals for their own programs relative to similar programs--or the problem of establishing criteria that would help to explore the reasons for changes in enrollment—or even in determining how the data elements are at all relevant to the evaluation. This analysis will become even more significant given the new goals of the District. The augmented DSR information helped to elicit more complete responses regarding equity goals, but not as extensively as the committee hoped would be the case.

Analysis of SLOs was stronger this year than last, but the results may remain problematic as departments develop assessments that actually reflect the objectives of their programs and offer effective data regarding student performance—or that determine the measurements by which to assess the outcomes. Departments sometimes withheld specific data in the report, making the evaluation of the data problematic and subjective. The addition of SSOs as a criterion for evaluation improved the focus and development of Student Services reports while also clarifying the presentation and evaluation of SLOs relevant to individual departments and programs.

Other data, like professional currency or numbers of degrees, often remained unconnected to the overall assessment of each program although a number of this year's reports effectively described the relationship between professional activity and program development.

See the discussions above for suggested actions.

Outcomes Assessments and Evaluation: All instructional departments have developed a schedule for outcomes assessments, while most student services programs have established outcomes and created assessments in the last three years for SLOs and SSOs. Most departments described the process and some conclusions in the report; some have used the results to help guide curriculum and other program planning; some departments participate in a robust pattern of assessment and evaluation patterned after the model set out in the Accreditation standards; other departments make no particular use of SLOs beyond gathering and assessing the data in instructional terms. This variation may have less to do with resistance (although that is still likely) and more to do with the nature of the program, the objectives designed for courses or student knowledge, and the degree to which the department subject requires constant change or redefinition. So, for example, new courses in Applied Art and Design may require outcomes assessments in ways that an established History course might not; the assessments in this case would possibly to focus on changes in the course outline or schedule if these changes would help to increase student performance. Despite the increase in useful information, it is often still difficult for the evaluators to see the relationship between outcomes assessments and program success, to determine exactly how the outcomes assessment played a role in department activities, or even how Program Review leads to improved instruction, greater students success, or more finely calibrated planning.

This question is particularly significant given recent developments in the expansion of student support and the creation of Pathways to transfer, degrees, and certificates, with a particular focus on targeted student populations. How will these programs be evaluated; what roles will departments have in evaluating their own contributions to the program and how will outcomes assessments guide these developments? To quote last year's report: "These questions or uncertainties may have less to do with the assessment process itself and more to do with the difficulty of conveying briefly, in a report, what a department has done or plans to do. Or it may be that the difficulty arises from the complexities of conducting a statistically based evaluation: for example, a meaningful test requires more than one administration; if a prompt or process needs to be revised, than any program changes need to wait for the new, revised assessment to run its cycle; even the obvious solutions—a pre and post test—may not apply for Sophomore level courses in some disciplines. This will become increasingly difficult given the fact that most of the new programs require immediate validation."

Therefore, as noted last year, because the process is time consuming, properly undertaken, and may yield limited immediate results, most assessments described in the report offer what is essentially a snapshot of results for one or more particular outcomes at a particular time, and the results only become meaningful in conjunction with other kinds of program analysis.

Assuming that these issues are resolved, and even if they remain problematic, the results lead essentially to more study and discussion. The point is less to question outcomes analysis, which is currently mandated in any case, but to suggest that the greatest value lies in exactly these discussions—including why something always seems to work—as part of professional growth and development. This would be true for the new or revised programs that emerge in the next year. To quote from last year's report: "As far as the committee could tell from the reviews, most departments that engaged in extensive outcomes assessment already had an ongoing tradition of close collaboration among colleagues. Some departments that have reluctantly adopted outcomes also have a long and successful history of program collaboration and success; what seems to matter the most is the department's internal and external conversations regarding curriculum and students needs. Even if the outcomes assessment process in itself may not do much that could not be achieved by other means (and has been achieved), it makes sense to use the outcomes assessments as an element in the department's ongoing conversation and, when it applies, on the planning emerging from the results of those conversations. "

These reflections lead to the following suggestions regarding the process of writing and reviewing the next set of Program Reviews.

- a) In addition to the specific suggested actions described above, Committee will review the process and the templates to see how to acquire the information it needs while also relieving some of the burden of writing the report. The process takes up a great deal of time when everyone in charge of the reports is already burdened by a variety of responsibilities. The committee this year revised the templates to eliminate some redundancies and to more clearly reflect the goals

of the Committee, Senate, and District in conducting Program Review. It would make sense to continue the process. The structure of the report reflects a different context; the Committee will review the form to see if it makes sense to tweak the existing forms once more or, with the Senate's approval, to substantially revise the form if not the data and the process.

- b) Departments should analyze the relationship between outcomes and other data, including the limits of the analysis.
- c) In describing their own processes, departments may provide models for other departments to follow (although the one template exists for all instructional programs, one for Student Services, other aspects of the process vary widely).
- d) Programs will continue to need help from the Senate and Research in providing expanded DSR research data (this is already in progress). It would be helpful to determine if other data, like job placement or transfer success at four-year college, could become available for department use.
- e) The Committee will continue to evaluate the information it requires and clarify its role in the program review as a whole. The Committee will also review the value of the data that it supplies to programs as they write their reviews.

Planning and Resource requests: The discussion above addresses this issue. Although this section is unevaluated for scoring purposes, the requirements from the Accrediting Commission have made it more central to the reviews. This year's analysis reflects that change; the committee added more commentary regarding some of the resource recommendations, particularly in cases where "stability" might be misleading (even if it meets the criteria). As noted above, and in the suggestions, the committee will continue to evaluate this section of the report, revise it as needed, and provide more guidance for departments in developing their plans and resource requests. To quote last year's report: "Although the Program Review should assist allocation and planning by providing additional direction and insight for departments in developing their yearly and three year plans, and plays a role in the development of faculty hiring priorities, the ways in which the reports and results are included in the strategic planning process itself and in resource allocation may need to be clarified."

Conclusions:

- Sierra College offers strong programs, created, sustained, and improved by dedicated faculty, classified, and management staff; these claims are increasingly supported by effectively developed and presented objective and measurable data as well as by observations and experience.
- The thorough and insightful reviews of the vast majority of programs, and the scores and evaluative comments suggest that most programs use the reviews to accurately assess and evaluate their success. Inevitably, almost all reports assume some of the quality of an application for resources or recognition. This tendency is appropriate, given the relationship of Program Review to strategic planning; this goal in no way undermines the validity of the reports; most departments describe the challenges they face and the actions they have taken to meet them, implicitly

and explicitly incorporating the review into their own cycle of assessment and planning.

- As discussed at great length above, some issues still exist in for programs in analyzing or utilizing SLOs or clarifying their significance in gauging student success.
- To fulfill the role of the reviews in strategic planning, the committee will review the recommendations to PARAC to evaluate their effectiveness in describing the condition of departments and their needs.
- The Committee will assess its own work in the coming year, with the following goals:
 - a. Continuing to assist programs in assessing program data and using the assessment to drive resource requests; the fall workshops remain the ideal way to provide this service.
 - b. Evaluating the program review process, including its templates, review documents, rubrics, and scoring to strengthen the analysis of resource requests in terms outcomes evaluation.
 - c. Reviewing the alignment of Program Review and updated or new Accreditation Standards
 - d. As part of a-c, taking into account the time constraints of departments and programs, assuring that the process and materials make review less intimidating and more useful to department's own assessment and to the goals of the District.
 - i. Finding ways to reduce the size of the reports without sacrificing essential information (see discussion above)
 - e. With the Academic Senate, reviewing the scope of programs and activities covered by Program Review.
 - f. Conducting surveys of the process, evaluating the results, and revising the process as appropriate.

Part 2: Evaluations

I: Recommendations

Key:

Program Type: A (Ancillary), S (Student Services), I (Instructional)
Recommendations (see general comments above): C (Critical Attention Needed), O (Opportunity Identified), S (Stable: No Resource or other Attention Required)
An asterisk indicates that the recommendation comes with additional comments.

(I) Anthropology	S
(I) Astronomy*	S
(S) CalWorks	S
(S) Career Connections*	S
(I) Computer Information Systems*	S
(A) Community Education	S
(S) Disabled Student Programs and Services*	C
(I) Engineering	S
(S) Extended Opportunity Programs and Services*	S
(I) English as a Second Language*	O
(I) Fire Technology*	S
(A) Ghidotti	S
(I) History	S
(S) International Students*	S
(I) Kinesiology	S
(I) LGBTQ Studies	S
(I) Mechatronics	S
(I) Physics	S
(I) Psychology	O
(I) Sociology	S
(S) Transfer Center*	S
(I) Welding*	O

II. Resource Request Chart

Dept	Function/ Role	Maintenance	Development	Growth	Safety	Outcomes	Other Success Measures	No Requests
Anthro								X
Astr	X	X	X	X	X	X		
CalW				X				
Career		X		X				
CIS	X		X	X	X	X	X	
CommEd								X
DSPS		X		X				
Engr		X	X	X		X	X	
EOPS	X	X	X	X	X	X		
ESL	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Fire	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Ghid	X							X
Hist	X					X		
IntStu			X	X		X		
Kin	X	X	X	X	X			
LGBT								X
Mech	X			X				
Phys	X			X				
Psych	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Soc	X		X	X				
Transfer	X			X		X		
Weld	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

III: Program Review Evaluations

Anthropology Evaluation

Program/Department: Anthropology Evaluation team: Team 1
Chair/Department Contact: Jennifer Molina-Stidger

- 1. Relevancy (15): 15
- 2. Currency (30): 28
- 3. Effectiveness (30): 26
- 4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 74

1. Relevancy: Report explains clear relevance of the program to transfer (UC & CSU), Nursing, GE and equity. Although the department claims to have the only course “that specifically addresses the history and culture of Native Americans,” it does share that honor with HIST 25, Native American History. Nevertheless, Anthropology as a subject is central to the diversity; faculty are fully involved in equity efforts as well, as indicated by the development of a number of courses addressing Native American culture. It is noted that the Anthropology ADT is a viable option for Anthropology majors and that Anthropology courses are chosen by many transferring students, both major and non-major. The department faculty’s extensive involvement with clubs, campus events, Maker Faire, connections with the community, professional contributions to the field and Sierra’s shared governance are commendable.

2. Currency: Curriculum is up-to-date and additional work was completed to address changes in the field and other relevant areas, including additional courses regarding the Native American population and culture. The department has embraced the SLO process and uses it to drive pedagogical and curricular changes. The division of SLO duties that both support the process but alleviate overburdening of part-timers is an innovative and appreciated approach—a possible best practice for all departments to consider. The inclusion of student comments in the program review provides a compelling message about the department’s approach and addressing student interests.

3. Effectiveness: Retention and success rates meet or exceed District averages. A significant change in online numbers was achieved in 15-16—there was a missed opportunity to explain/explore what changes led to those results. Underrepresented population statistics were reviewed and the department indicated a commitment to connecting students to on-campus services and resources that can support all students’ success. Enrollment numbers were presented; all sites are served and online offerings are in place. Productivity has been consistent and regularly above the District average. Clear plans

were detailed for addressing goals identified during the outcomes assessment process. Examples of student-centered approaches by the faculty were discussed. The interesting example of using Canvas “Chat” for exam reviews stood out in particular.

4. Thoroughness: The report is thorough; claims are strongly supported by evidence and analysis.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: No significant resource requests were proposed beyond a request for more regular maintenance through facilities. An additional faculty member was requested based on a stated over-enrollment of certain courses but fill rates at 96%, although high, do not indicate at or above capacity numbers. Providing section-specific enrollment or wait-list numbers may have helped support that assertion. A note was made on the difficulty of hiring qualified instructors with no proposed plan to develop or increase recruitment efforts. Some ideas about finding/sharing other larger facilities were included and worthy of investigation.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: The program is meeting and often exceeding most metrics; the report detailed significant connection to campus and community beyond the classroom. The department reported on significant collaboration among the faculty around curricular and program assessment and planning. Their primary role in serving transfer students was strongly presented.
- Report evaluation summary: The report was well written and documented. The inclusion of student comments was an appreciated detail in showing the culture of the department. The program’s enthusiastic embrace of the SLO process was refreshing; the report provided a clear description of the way that SLO assessment has contributed to the continual improvement of the program
- Analysis of resource requests: No significant resources were requested. While a faculty request was mentioned, it was not formalized in the report. The need to explore options for larger classroom spaces to accommodate current and potential student needs should be explored.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments:

Astronomy Evaluation

Program/Department: Astronomy
Chair/Department Contact: David Dunn

Evaluation team: Team 3

1. Relevancy (15): 12

2. Currency (30): 20

3. Effectiveness (30): 22

4. Thoroughness (5): 4

TOTAL: 58

1. Relevancy: The department primary role is to provide lab science GE for transfer students and/or students working for an AA, AS or ADT. The department has active in the community, promoting relations with local schools and other community organizations through the planetarium, involvement in Natural History Museum programs, and the astronomy club. More specific analysis and data (where available) would support the (true) assertions regarding the program's benefits to students.

2. Currency: The department provides curriculum currency through Spring 2014 (100%). The SLO review documents the SLO process within Astronomy but provides little specific analysis about the results of the assessment or the relationship between the assessments and program/curriculum planning. Based on the documentation, the Astronomy department is measuring all sections for all courses but needs to explore some examples of what they have learned from these assessments. Astronomy faculty are engaged in professional development both on campus and in the broader professional community.

3. Effectiveness: The department's retention, success, and productivity numbers meet or exceed district averages. At the same time, the analysis of these numbers is relatively superficial; incorporating some of the data and analysis supporting the explanations of the results would be worthwhile. An analysis of disaggregated student success data would be beneficial as well; for example, how does Astronomy determine that their primary enrollments are from non-science majors.

4. Thoroughness: The Program review touches on the primary topics and shows the department in adequate condition to meet its current mission. Some analysis could be more thoroughly developed

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: While resources seem adequate for Astronomy to meet its current mission, there seems to be some frustration about an inability to expand offerings and create an AA or ADT. The limiting factor, as

the department notes with some frustration, is its lack of an IA; the IA would provide necessary support for additional courses and ensure proper custody and maintenance of equipment. There is also concern that with the retirement of Dave Kenyon there will be inadequate full-time faculty to grow the program. Resource requests are tied to growth or program maintenance, not specifically to outcomes or related analysis.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: Astronomy fills a valuable role in providing a lab science for students who may not be science majors. The department also fulfills an ongoing role in community relations, providing a range of educational activities for the College and local community.
- Report evaluation summary: The report provides a clear look at the program and its culture. Some descriptions or claims would benefit from more extensive analysis.
- Analysis of resource requests: Astronomy is facing some difficulties from a lack of resources and recent or upcoming retirements. With its current resources, the program is likely to remain effective, but it will require additional resources to grow, expand offerings, and provide an AA/ADT.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: Despite the recommendation, the Committee recognizes that Astronomy is facing the problem of aging or limited resources and the difficulties that accompany retirement of full-time faculty. The department should plan for the major, detailing what courses would be required and analyzing the benefits of the potential program for students and the College.

CalWorks Evaluation

Program/Department: CalWorks Evaluation team: Team 1
Chair/Department Contact: Karin McGuire

1. Relevancy (15): 13
2. Currency (30): 25
3. Effectiveness (30): 22
4. Thoroughness (5): 3

TOTAL: 63

1. Relevancy: CalWorks is a categorically funded program serving students who are parents and receiving financial assistance from the county. The program supports the Sierra College mission by making educational pathways available to students who may otherwise not be able to reach these goals. While the number of students who receive CalWorks services has decreased in the past two years with the uptick in the economy (i.e. fewer students receiving cash-aid in the county), the program offers a wide range of counseling services and access to financial aid for approximately 138 to 190 students each semester. It should be noted that this office relies on county referrals and cannot do outside recruiting to increase their numbers. The report demonstrates the program's relevancy and clearly fulfills an important need for our at-risk parent students. The report effectively analyzes the program's role in fulfilling the strategic goals of the College and in meeting student needs.
2. Currency: The report indicates that the program makes an effort for continuous improvement, specifically with regards to ensuring students are prepared for and attending their mandatory counseling appointments. Their efforts to implement appointment reminder calls, document checklists and mid-term check-ins by staff have helped reduce the no show rate and increased the level of preparedness of students when they attend their appointment. The program review provides analysis of SSOA's and the actions taken as a result of these assessments. The list of professional development for the lead counselor is extensive; the workshops, trainings, and conferences clearly contribute to the effective provision of service to CalWorks students. An analysis of the relationship of these activities to SAOs would amplify this relationship.
3. Effectiveness: Despite the fact that more than half of CalWorks students are single parents and one third are ESL students, retention and success rates closely follow that of Sierra College's general population, trailing by just a few percentage points. These results are a significant indicator of effectiveness. The number of CalWorks students served has decreased since 2014 from 250 students to 138 in 2016. The authors attribute

this drop to the considerable decrease in cash aid recipients overall. They cannot recruit students so evidence of effectiveness is best supported by other factors such as appointment attendance rates and retention/success percentages. Plans for change or growth were briefly noted, although these requests only address effectiveness in general terms—the ability of the program to provide sufficient (or ideal) service to students.

4. Thoroughness: Report would benefit from further analysis of some data to support success, underline the challenges or make a case for plans for staff/resources such as adding a part-time job developer.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The program is successful working with what it has. A concern was raised about serving the small population at NCC and proposed resources such as webcam equipment could help solve this issue. More explanation of future resource needs for off-campus job creation and a 50% IA are needed. The ability to develop and provide off campus options for employment subsidized by CalWorks was also noted. While this idea sounds like an important opportunity, it needed further elaboration (Do we have a shortage of on campus employment or how would this be more beneficial?).

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: The program is meeting the needs of the CalWorks population at Rocklin, but has concerns about serving the smaller population at NCC. Success and retention data show that these students, despite significant financial, language and personal barriers, do as well or even exceed general population performance. It should be noted that the number of students participating in the program has dropped significantly which is a reflection of the overall reduction in cash aid recipients in the county.
- Report evaluation summary: Report adequately demonstrates relevance and effectiveness, but would benefit from further analysis and explanation of data and the inclusion of Service Area Outcomes.
- Analysis of resource requests: Resources appear to be sufficient for now. It would be helpful to learn more about how the job developer role could positively impact the program and benefit students.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Career Connections Evaluation

Program/Department: Career Connections Evaluation team: PR Committee
Chair/Department Contact: Brook Oliver, Sheila Dobbin

1. Relevancy (15): 15
2. Currency (30): 29
3. Effectiveness (30): 25
4. Thoroughness (5): 4

TOTAL: 73

1. Relevancy: Career Connections serves students in a variety of ways, from coordinating a new internship program for RISE students to providing a variety of placement and counseling services. It has developed a number of programs to assist students in making informed career decisions and to connect them with future employers and other mentors. The report effectively describes the program's role in meeting the College's strategic goals and providing a vital service to students. The program's activities will figure centrally in the development of RS4, given its focus on directed study and program planning for careers or transfer.

2. Currency: The program has a clear schedule and system for assessing student service outcomes (SSAO) and has initiated new programs or revised existing programs in response to the results. In the last six years, Career Connections has assessed all outcomes within the established cycle. All SSAO's reflect the role of the program described in the first section of the report; the analysis in this report effectively describes the department's self-assessment and its results.

3. Effectiveness: The program experienced a decline in total contact hours with students, due primarily to the sabbatical of the Coordinator and lead counselor; additional staff and a new location may help to improve the numbers. Productivity is high, as it is for most counseling services; year-to-year data would help to define the trends. The separation of Transfer and Career Counseling (Transfer has its own counselor) should also focus program development. Some analysis of the data would help to clarify or support the analysis of the program's strengths and challenges. In particular, is the number of individual contacts typical or low given the program's goal and its increasingly close relationship to traditional academic counseling.

4. Thoroughness: The report is thorough and impressively detailed in section 1; some analysis in section 3 would support resource requests.

5. Evaluation:

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The department has provided a thorough analysis of the adequacy of its current resources and its possible needs; the department's ability to meet its goals has been and will be affected by R4S developments. Although the program has continued to provide excellent service, the loss in the move to J8 of a dedicated space for presentations and other meetings has hindered the delivery of some services and programs. The one request for space is tied to program growth and maintenance.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: Career Connections has been and continues to be an exemplary program. Its work will only grow more important as R4S continues to unfold.
- Report evaluation summary: The report is thorough, particularly in detailing the range of Career Connection's programs and their continuing effectiveness. Some analysis of student use in section 3 would support the analysis of the program's success and challenges.
- Analysis of resource requests: The one resource request is supported by the entire report and by the description in section 4.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: In making this recommendation, the Committee acknowledges the potential strain in resources faced by any student service program, given current and future developments arising from R4S. State programs and mandates may provide additional resources (as already seems to be the case); the program and others involved in student services will determine other needs and work to coordinate resources. A dedicated space for broad based student programs would be worth given the importance of the program in supporting student pathways.

Computer Information Systems Evaluation

Program/Department: CIS
Chair/Department Contact: Melissa Prizing

Evaluation team: Team 2

1. Relevancy (15): 14
2. Currency (30): 30
3. Effectiveness (30): 25
4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 74

1.Relevancy: The CIS department offers students a wide variety of courses and certificates as well as AA and AS degrees. While the department shows an enrollment increase of less than 15% over the past 3 years the number of awards increased by 61% during the same time period. Extensive data and analysis provides a thorough look at the program's students, their needs, and the focused attention of the program on aligning its course and program offerings with institutional outcomes. Some material could be reserved for section 3.

2. Currency: CIS department is current in the curriculum process with all of its courses updated and approved in Fall 2016. Due to the rapidly changing technology the CIS department continually evaluates and updates courses as new versions of technology become available. In summer 2016 the department revised all course and program outcomes to ensure that students were learning relevant and current information in their course. Starting Spring 2017 faculty will begin assessing the new SLOs. CIS is invested in outcomes assessments and presented an extensive list of actions undertaken as a result of these assessments. Faculty members engage in a wide array of professional development activities, both on and off campus, related to currency, instructional improvement and program development (in conjunction with the advisory committee).

3. Effectiveness: The data provided show that success and retention rates are slightly below District averages. While department retention has remained steady for the past 3 years (83%) the success rate has increased slightly. The program is involved in an intensive reorganization project that is being funded by the Strong Workforce Initiative (SWI). This project will revise the Networking and Security and Tech Support degrees to more closely align with statewide career pathways. The changes that are mandated by this project require that the CIS department undergo tremendous change in a very short period of time. The department sees the SWI funds as an opportunity to institute these programmatic changes.

4. Thoroughness: The review as thorough providing a lot of additional information that discussed the program and how it fits into the district's mission. Some analysis may

provide more information than is necessary, making the analysis less focused than it might otherwise be. At the same time, the report presents a thorough evaluation of its programs.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources:

The review notes that after Spring 17 semester the department will lose 2 full time faculty to retirement and a third who is seeking a sabbatical. They note the availability of part-time instructors will offset the loss. Other needs noted are the loss of a classroom used for drop in labs and replacements for aging projectors in several classrooms. The immediate needs provide the primary justification for the resource requests, particularly in light of the program's plans for development or re-development under the Strong Workforce Initiative.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation: While the CIS program is successful in serving its students, the decision to participate in an intensive reorganization to better provide students with 21st century skill is to be commended.
- Report evaluation summary: This is a strong report supported by data and analysis (see comments above).
- Analysis of resource requests: The CIS is receiving significant funding from SWI to fund its reorganization project. The resources from SWI will refine and redesign and clarify the programs offerings into high wage career paths.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: The program's plans suggest that "Opportunity Identified" or "Critical Attention" would be equally valid suggestions. The participation in the SWI alters the occasion by providing resources that would otherwise need to be provided by the district.

Community Education Evaluation

Program/Department: Community Education Evaluation team: Team 4
Chair/Department Contact: Jill Alcorn

1. Relevancy (15): 15
2. Currency (30): 25
3. Effectiveness (30): 30
4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 75

1. Relevancy: The report does an excellent job of demonstrating its support for the college's mission and the alignment of its instructional program with specific district goals. The report also describes its role in serving both community and student needs.

2. Currency: The program provides above average innovation and continuous improvements and regularly participates in SSAO assessments. The program manager attends regular conferences and meetings while the education staff are encouraged to do the same.

3. Effectiveness: The program's data from student evaluations is strong. Enrollment, while dropping over the past few years, has now leveled off and continues to surpass expenses. Staff continually evaluates the courses and addresses needs on an ongoing basis. Program limitations include possibly losing Allied Health courses as the college takes on these programs for credit.

4. Thoroughness: The review was extremely thorough and concise. (5)

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The program is self-supporting and will look at offering additional skill/career training programs in the future, especially with the medical assistance program moving back to the college. The program funding reserves are also supporting the college's move from Gateway to Vernon Street in June. Staffing level is acceptable but the program would benefit from a permanent front office person; the front office is currently staffed by student workers and turnover is high.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: Community Education is a self-funded program successfully supporting the district goals of life of educational access to a diverse student population not served by traditional instructional programs; courses offer a range of goals from life-long learning, career training (but see commentary above)
- Report evaluation summary: The report is thorough and reflects the program's consistent evaluation of its course offerings and partnerships with the community.
- Analysis of resource requests: Since Community Education is self-funded its analysis is useful primarily for describing its needs and establishing the criteria by which it will determine its priorities.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
- Opportunity Identified
- No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments:

Disabled Students Programs and Services Evaluation

Program/Department: DSPS
Chair/Department Contact: Scott Bramlett

Evaluation team: Team 1

1. Relevancy (15): 10
2. Currency (30): 24
3. Effectiveness (30): 22
4. Thoroughness (5): 4

TOTAL: 60

1. Relevancy: Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) is a federally mandated program. The program provides student counseling services and accommodations for students with disabilities through Disabled Student Services (DSS); assessment, accommodations, and two classes for students with Learning Disabilities (LD) through the Learning Opportunity Center (LOC); and instructional materials in accessible format through Assistive Computer Technology (ACT) and other alternative media (AM) services in compliance with all applicable federal laws and regulations like the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The program demonstrates alignment with the district mission statement by providing students with disabilities appropriate accommodations so that they are held to the same standards as their non-disabled counterparts and becoming fully integrated into the college community. The goals of DSPS align with district goals (1-4). Additionally, the review references spring 2012 and online spring 2014 DSPS student survey and analysis, demonstrating continuous quality improvement. However, analysis of the goals and outcomes as well as the program's alignment with student needs appears to be incomplete (response fields are cut-off and overlap) and is therefore limited in providing support for the review. DSPS demonstrates continuing effort to meet and exceed standards for quality improvement. According to the report, once the new 2016 allocation funding formula is completed, high quality MIS data is expected. The department hopes to analyze student success and retention by disability category as well as other terms of interest.
2. Currency: The report indicates that the program makes an effort for continuous improvement, utilizing student surveys to identify and remedy areas of improvement. In fall 2015, a student survey was used to assess the program, revealing an insufficient number of disabled parking spaces and accessibility issues with some spaces (possible critical need?). Students also wanted more DSPS counselors and better access to information about DSPS. A Student Handbook to DSPS was created in response and, as of 11/2016, is awaiting posting on the Sierra College website, but further follow-up on its progress is needed. Text reminders for appointments have been implemented.

In a fall 2015 student survey, students reported 88.9-96% achievement of SLOs. DSPS created clear and measureable SSAOs focused on customer service, processes for accessing service, observance of policies, and information provided to students. They are to be assessed the next program review cycle. The assessment cycle for summer 2017-fall 2019 is provided, but it is unclear how the cycle aligns with SSAOs and how the relocation of services relates to assessment. The report included a substantial list of activities (attending conferences and workshops, reviewing professional journals, participating in advisory committees and workgroups, for example), but at this point in the report, it is not immediately clear how such contributes to the program except by inference (the staff is fully engaged in improving and promoting its program).

3. Effectiveness: DSPS students comprise 7.3% of the district student headcount (1,890), an increasing number despite declining enrollment district-wide. From 2012/13-2015/16 the retention rate of DSPS students was 2 and 3% lower than non-DSPS students' and success rates of DSPS students are just 2-4% lower, with no changes between groups in 2014/15 and 2015/16. The 2-3% success and retention gap demonstrates the program's effectiveness but the presence of that gap requires further analysis. An above average retention and success rate for both DSPS and non-DSPS students during summer courses is noted but not analyzed. DSPS students earn AA/AS degrees and certificate attainment at a higher rate than non-DSPS students, and the report speculates the lower transfer rates among DSPS students could be remedied with the SSSP, Equity, and R4S Initiatives. Non-discipline general persistence rates of DSPS students were 3-5% higher than for non-DSPS students, though long-term completion rates in Math and English continue to be low: 24-27%, respectively. Despite the extensive data, perhaps because of it, the key issues but the key issues of the e-PAR goals are less fully explored or analyzed than they might be; the report would benefit by addressing the impact of the analysis on the e-PAR goals. For example, there is a greater use of academic support services by all DSPS students, including an increasing number of students utilizing alternate media, but it is not immediately clear in the report which specific groups of increased needs are more costly. The report notes that limited staff is a factor in increasing waitlists and a decline in number of students being tested for LDs. Similarly, although the long-term use of DSPS services by veterans is relatively flat, there was an increase of veterans using DSPS services in 2016; the report acknowledges that the program needs to further refine processes for accessing these students. An additional problem related to resource needs is the incompatibility of MyMath Lab software screen readers, creating a possible issue in ADA compliance.
4. Thoroughness: Although the formatting of the report meant missing information initially, and some data was not present, the report's analysis was thorough and detailed, and evidence was provided to support how effective this program is in identifying and providing students with disabilities equitable access to college courses and the college community. In some instances, the profusion of data made it difficult to analyze and systematize an understanding of the program's needs
5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: This section of the report presents a range of significant needs: additional technology to comply with ADA, new classified staff to improve first contact with students (and record keeping), additional faculty with a specialty in LD. These needs impact equity concerns, the goals of R4S, and legal requirements involving access. Some funding may be available from recent state initiatives, but the variety of needs reflects the growing number of students who seek assistance and the strain on resources to serve them.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: DSPS provides a necessary, legally mandated service to students; the retention and success rates of students speak to the value of the service it provides.
- Report evaluation summary: The report is strongly detailed and presents a clear picture of the challenges facing DSPS. The report would benefit from a clearer organization, as noted elsewhere. For example, it indicates that the impacts are provided in the “Section 4 of this report” (actually section 3) To emphasize how the activities contribute to the program, the impacts would be better addressed immediately after the activities are identified. Some analysis needs to be related more clearly to specific data.
- Analysis of resource requests: See note above

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: This recommendation is based on the analysis above. Despite some issues with the report itself, the program has achieved significant success in promoting success for the increasing population of students who qualifying for DSPS assistance. More resources would a) allow for more outreach so that fewer students fall through the cracks and b) substantially improve the program’s ability to refine and develop the services it provides.

Engineering Evaluation

Program/Department: Engineering
Chair/Department Contact: Phil Pattengale

Evaluation team: Team 2

- 1. Relevancy (15): 15
- 2. Currency (30): 26
- 3. Effectiveness (30): 28
- 4. Thoroughness (5): 4

TOTAL: 73

1.Relevancy: The Engineering department serves two separate sets of students: those seeing to transfer to a four-year university and those interested in an AS or certificate. This dual pathway allows the department to target students focused on an engineering career both as engineers and as an assistants to engineers. Engineering is a very popular major with 628 declared engineering students this year and in spring 2017 increased the number of offerings for ENGR22A to meet increased student demand.

2. Currency: The Engineering department is current in the curriculum process with all engineering courses cleared through curriculum in Fall 2016. The department completed SLO assessments in all its classes and has adhered to the SLO 3-year assessment roadmap. Faculty are in the process of writing new curriculum based on Matlab software. The lack of financial resources for professional development has been mitigated by using their advisory committee and local industry to keep them informed on local trends and business needs.

3. Effectiveness: The data provided shows that retention rate for Engineer is slightly higher than the district's and has remained steady for the last three years at approximately 90%. Success rates range between 61% and 80% with variation between fall and spring semesters. Using SLO data the department found that the reason for this variation in fall semester is ill prepared students. The department is using this information to provide students more support in ENGR 22A. While enrollment trends have been flat, the increased introductory course in Spring 2017 should provide for an upward move in enrollments.

4. Thoroughness: The review was thorough. Anecdotal evidence was offered of the success of Sierra students upon transfer. This review could have benefitted from data from other colleges to support this anecdotal evidence.

Additional Comments:

5. Evaluation:

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The Engineering Department's major concern is maintaining and acquiring adequate technology for a new class incorporating MatLab. A second need is training for faculty/staff. These needs may be met through tech-ed funds or other grants, but the department will continue augmentations to its operating budget.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: The Engineering Department is in high demand but students often enter the program ill prepared for the rigor of this major. The department is seeking to address this issue by using SLO and success / retention data to provide more support to incoming students.
- Report evaluation summary: This report demonstrates relevance and effectiveness, but would benefit from the inclusion data from other colleges regarding success / retention rates.
- Analysis of resource requests: The Engineering department notes that program productivity is limited by available equipment and space. They will continue to seek an increase to their budget that will be used for training and equipment purchasing and maintenance.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments:

Extended Opportunity Programs and Services Evaluation

Program/Department: EOPS
Chair/Department Contact: Susie Le

Evaluation team: Team 2

1. Relevancy (15): 15
2. Currency (30): 26
3. Effectiveness (30): 27
4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 73

5. Relevancy: The Extended Opportunity Programs and Services Program (EOPS) provides enhanced support services to low income and educationally disadvantaged students. The program goal is to improve the persistence, retention, graduation, and transfer rate for this special population. EOPS provides a wide range of support services and also administers two addition programs, Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE) and Cooperating Agencies Foster Youth Educational Support (CAFYES): in 2015-16 the program served 738 students, with 47 transfers, 122 conferred AA/AS degrees, and 258 on the President's Honor Roll). These Programs are categorically funded and governed by the California Code of Regulations. The review provides evidence that clearly demonstrates that the Program aligns with the mission statement: *Sierra College provides an academic environment that is challenging and supportive for students of diverse backgrounds, needs, abilities, and goals with a focus on access, equity, student-centered learning, and achievement.*
2. Currency: The program has worked to improve its application and intake process. It utilized an assessment of a Student Area Outcome (SAO) to spur the creation of a common application and database for its 3 programs. The data show that the new process was more efficient and effective, and as a result EOPS will continue with the common application efforts. The data also show students were "overwhelmed" with services available to them and so EOPS is adjusting how this information is shared with students. Title V regulations require a minimum of training and advisory meetings with which the staff is in compliance. In addition the staff meets with local high school representatives, community and business leaders. The review provided an extensive list of professional development activities in which the faculty and staff have participated, including ongoing training and participation in related areas of shared governance.
3. Effectiveness: Given the educationally vulnerable population this program serves, EOPS has achieved a remarkable degree of effectiveness. The success rates for its participants exceed the District's by 0.6 to 6% depending on the course of study; these numbers reflect a significant increase from a success rate of 54% in 2010. For instance in Transfer Credit Courses, the EOPS student success rate is 78.5% compared to the District 74.1%

value. The number of students served has been increasing over the last 3 years (from 605 in 12/13 to 738 in 15/16) as the state funding is returning to the levels last achieved before the economic turndown. Despite the increased funding, the program still has difficulty in serving the number of eligible students; based on EPOS criteria, 8,534 qualify for the program, but due to the limited staffing levels the program can only serve 6-7%. Staffing reductions have exacerbated these difficulties. Before the turndown there were 5 full-time faculty; now there are 2. Little evidence was provided as to the use of the ePAR process in planning, but given the program's dependency on categorical funding and its dramatic fluctuations, planning does not seem possible. The limitations discussed included the lack of staff and the office space.

4. Thoroughness (evaluation/commentary): The report was thorough and evidence was provided to support how effective this program is in its support of this vulnerable student population.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources:

The review noted a need for additional staff, both faculty and classified. It also noted a need for additional office space. The analysis cited both service metrics and outcomes (broadly construed as student success and self-sufficiency). Since EOPS is self-funding, these needs nominally play no role in budget allocation; regardless, the program clearly and efficiently serves the District's equity and R4S goals.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: The Extended Opportunity Programs and Services Program (EOPS) provides enhanced support services to low income and educationally disadvantaged students. The program serves it students well, increasing the success and retention rates of this vulnerable population. As noted, however, resources limit the number of eligible students who can be served.
- Report evaluation summary: The report was thorough and data was used to demonstrate the programs effectiveness.
- Analysis of resource requests: The report noted that EOPS only serves 6-7% of the eligible students and requested staff and office space to enhance their ability to serve the students in the program.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: As noted, EOPS receives categorical funding for all its staff, equipment, and office space. Additional resources would allow the program to serve even more of its target population, but any decisions in this direction exist outside the District's budget allocation processes.

English as a Second Language Evaluation

Program/Department: ESL
Chair/Department Contact: Marcia Brock

Evaluation team: Group 4

1. Relevancy (15): 10
2. Currency (30): 26
3. Effectiveness (30): 24
4. Thoroughness (5): 3

TOTAL: 63

1. Relevancy: The ESL program is clearly relevant to the overall mission of the college, particularly in supporting students of diverse backgrounds by helping to prepare them to pursue Certificates, Associates Degrees or higher. The program focuses on developing competencies in academic preparedness, grammar and vocabulary, technology, career readiness, history, critical thinking and cultural awareness.

The program provides a compelling description of activities and offerings that align with the goals of promoting diversity, supporting underrepresented students and collaboration with the rest of the programs at the college. Listing the various types of courses was useful in the report, and would have been even more helpful if the course names, levels and descriptions were listed in a matrix for reference in the rest of the report (although some of this information could have been developed and analyzed for section 3 of the report.)

Data provided in the chart shows a remarkable increase since 2015 in the number of students receiving tutoring and working with pass peers since 2015. A description of pass peers and why they are important would assist the reader in drawing conclusions about the relevancy of those metrics. It would also be useful to know if the increase in the number of tutoring hours was correlated with any other improvement in success or retention, especially for the population who received the services.

2. Currency: Currency in curriculum was demonstrated in the report with a compelling list of activities and initiatives including but not limited to an overhaul of the courses, course sequencing, course acceleration models and skills integration. These changes were driven primarily as a response to success and retention rates, and are consistent with the movement to acceleration in skill development courses.

Currency in student learning outcomes was partially described in that faculty meet annually to review assessments and make recommendations for improvement. Some description of the use of these discussions in improvements (or other result) would be beneficial in this

section of the report. The department notes that CSLOs have been completed 100% of the time, but the outcomes of those reports and their impact are not included.

The department faculty are strongly engaged in ESL related activities from attending conferences and training to conducting and attending workshops on campus. Curriculum and planning decisions involve all full-time and some part-time faculty. Some analysis of the impact of these activities would be useful.

3. Effectiveness: The report analyzes 3-year retention and success rates for all ESL students; retention rates are consistent with District averages, while success rates are slightly lower. Success and retention rates for Hispanic-Latino students were both higher than the District average. The report provides analysis of multiple factors affecting success and retention and describes its plan for improving these results, primarily through the curriculum redesign noted above. It is clear from the report the ESL department had done a tremendous amount of work to ensure that it remains effective, and even improves its effectiveness over time. This section of the report did not elaborate on the differences in results, if any, between on-ground and online courses. Some relevant success data regarding ESL performance in sequential English courses could usefully have been incorporated here rather than in Section 4.

Enrollment numbers were listed. The enrollment trends over the past 3 years were described to be in-line with the trends of the district. At the same time, many initiatives are planned to address the decline in enrollment over the past 3 years. Expanding into NCC/ Tahoe Truckee is among the planned improvements to the program. This should increase access for students served by the district as a whole. Marketing efforts are underway to support these planned improvements. Some benchmark data would provide an opportunity to evaluate whether or not these initiatives will provide the results desired at the end of the next program review cycle. The report describes the challenges of non-native English learners. Some of these points addressed trends, while others explained ongoing challenges affecting ESL enrollment. For the information explaining recent trends, it would be helpful to list approximate dates that various regulations or practices were changed so that it is obvious whether or not they describe overall enrollment or the recent enrollment trends.

The program appears to be reasonably productive at 340.8 compared to the district's 460. The cap on class size adequately describes the discrepancy. It would be helpful to include a ratio of productivity to average class cap for both the district and the ESL program for a side-by-side comparison

4. Thoroughness: The report covered all areas in the program review with sufficient and meaningful qualitative description. It is clear to the reader that the ESL program is relevant, current and effective. The strongest area of the report was currency, owing to the monumental changes happening in the department. More description about why the changes are being made would add value to sections 1 and 3. Data was provided in the report in narrative format. In some cases, statistics from the DSR were referenced, but not included. In other cases the data was difficult to interpret, but this could be rectified by ensuring that the data points are clearly defined. More analysis about the data provided would add enhance the quantitative aspect of the report.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: ESL's resource requests arise primarily a) from the current and future inadequacy of existing classrooms and equipment, particularly the need for extensive computer resources for new or redeveloped courses; and b) from the need for staff to perform some of the activities required by the program's complete redesign of its curriculum. Although outcomes are listed, program maintenance, growth, and other success measures drive these requests.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: ESL is an essential program in the district; its continued growth is a sign of the ongoing need for courses that increase the ability of students to negotiate the language and critical thinking demands of college (which require the ability to engage the discourse language of the community). The recent overhaul of curriculum is a sign of the program's dedication and its response to changing conditions and needs, particularly the drive for equity and increased student success as measured by transfer, degrees, and certificates.
- Report evaluation summary: The report is thorough; some data could be relocated in the report, while some analysis could be developed, particularly to explore the origin and development of the newly revised curriculum.
- Analysis of resource requests: As noted, resource requests are tied to maintenance, growth, and student success; the section could more thoroughly explore the relationship between the resource requests and student success (e.g., mobile chairs, although this makes sense)

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: The recommendation "opportunity identified" is a response to ESL's complete overhaul of its curriculum. For acceleration to work, a number of courses will require new resources in technology, classroom space, additional instructional assistance, and increased tutoring. This is an opportunity to support and evaluate an ambitious and worthwhile attempt to help students succeed not only in the next class but also throughout their college careers. The same argument would apply to other programs particularly affected by the same changes if they were up for Program Review.

Fire Technology Evaluation

Program/Department: Fire Technology
Chair/Department Contact: Tim Palmer

Evaluation team: Team 2

1. Relevancy (15): 15
2. Currency (30): 29
3. Effectiveness (30): 28
4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 77

1. Relevancy: The Fire Technology Program provides courses that allow students to gain the skills necessary for fire and emergency service careers, to earn academic certificates of achievement, AA, or AS degrees, and to transfer to other institutes of higher learning. The program is a fully accredited fire academy and the first academy in the state to offer Nationally Accredited Firefighter-1 curriculum. The faculty are active members in the CTE Committee and meet regularly with the Fire Advisory Committee to gain professional input help their program prosper. The review does a superb job of demonstrating alignment with the District Mission and providing evidence in how it meets the community and student needs. It is to be commended for its Board of Governors Exemplary Program honorable mention.
2. Currency: The department's curriculum is current; the department meets monthly with regional Partners to ensure that course curriculum and offerings are meeting industry standards. SLO assessments are updated annually and are directly linked to course delivery improvement. The department staff participates in a wide variety of professional development activities in the field of fire fighting and as well as in statewide educational activities such as the Curriculum Institute, the Northern Fire Technology Summit and Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Institute in 2016, and the 21st Century Skills training in 2017.
3. Effectiveness: The department's DSR data is strong. Its retention and success values (>90% and >80% respectively) are well above District averages. Its enrollment is increasing. Its fill rate is slightly below District average. The department is also exploring dual enrollment with local high schools. The review clearly lays out department plans, particularly with the imminent move to Roseville of its training center. Department faculty members have also been active on the Facility Master Plan Task force with the hope of moving its training center close to the Rocklin campus. Departmental limitations include inadequate facilities and limited budgets. The review notes that the market for its students is "poised for growth".

4. Thoroughness: The review was extremely thorough providing a lot of additional information that discussed the program and how it fits into the district's mission.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources:

The review notes a training facility close to the Rocklin campus as a future resource need. There is a request for an Instructional Assistant, tied to program maintenance, growth, and outcomes/student success.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: Fire Technology is a strong, award-winning program that is providing exemplary service to its students and to the community.
- Report evaluation summary: The report was clear, thorough, and evidence based.
- Analysis of resource requests: The report noted the need of a training center in proximity to the Rocklin Campus.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

Critical Attention Needed

Opportunity Identified

No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: The Fire Tech program goal of developing a training center near the Rocklin campus is worthwhile. We have not noted it as an "opportunity identified" because any decision a) would depend on the District's planning process (in which Fire Technology is already involved), and b) would not be immediately implemented in any case. Fire Technology is currently thriving; a full time IA would benefit the program but is like most other resource needs described by other departments.

Ghidotti Evaluation

Program/Department: Ghidotti
Chair/Department Contact: Jennifer Hurst-Crabb

Evaluation team: Team 3

- 1. Relevancy (15): 13
- 2. Currency (30): 26
- 3. Effectiveness (30): 27
- 4. Thoroughness (5): 4

TOTAL: 70

1. Relevancy: The Ghidotti Early High School program expands the Sierra College mission by creating educational opportunities in Nevada County: students in the program can simultaneously meet high school graduation requirements and four year college entry requirements by taking Sierra College courses. The program serves approximately 160 HS students each year at the Nevada County Campus. The program has developed a new mission statement, notably incorporating students in the process. In addition to the alignment of the Ghidotti and Sierra College missions, the program demonstrates its relevance to the District goals, from increasing access to encouraging critical thinking.

2. Currency: The program demonstrates they are actively measuring student learning and are engaged in professional development activities (department meetings, conferences, college-high school liaison meetings, etc.). Program outcomes meet both high school and college requirements and also include measurements of student preparation for college (e.g., identifying factors that may impede or promote success in college).

3. Effectiveness: Nearly all Ghidotti students complete A-G requirements for UC admission and approximately 50% earn an Associate's degree before graduating. According to the data provided, the majority of Ghidotti students attend small, liberal arts colleges rather than larger CSU or UC options; it would be useful to explore the implications of this development since it seems worth reporting. An analysis of the high success rates would be worthwhile, not only for expanding the program (e.g, what practices have encouraged this success) but for providing insight about success in college courses in general.

4. Thoroughness: The report is thorough, providing a clear and informative look at Ghidotti, its history, and its current performance.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: Although no resources are requested. Ghidotti has no dedicated budget for space or technology; presumably these are provided in general instructional outlays. It may be necessary to provide additional technology resources for the program if a need arises. The current staff seems adequate for program needs.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: The Ghidotti Early High School program offers Nevada County high school students a relatively unique opportunity to take courses on a college campus. Overall the students are highly successful, evidenced by Ghidotti's high ranking in several statewide and national surveys and studies.
- Report evaluation summary: The report is clearly written and thorough; some analysis of results might be beneficial for the program (and in general). The historical background helps to define the program and its success.
- Analysis of resource requests: No resource requests were identified; the program has no budget for technology or other physical resources. The current staff is sufficient for program needs.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments:

History Evaluation

Program/Department: History Evaluation team: Team 3
Chair/Department Contact: Stephanie Lamphere

1. Relevancy (15): 10
2. Currency (30): 22
3. Effectiveness (30): 25
4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 62

1. Relevancy: The department shows a clear link between the district mission and the departments goals. The number of degrees awarded has increased in the period covered by the review; given student choices and the desire to create clear pathways to a degree, the program is eliminating the AA to concentrate on the ADT. The department's role in GE and transfer is equally significant; history courses are popular choices for GE and transfer. The history department faculty are involved in campus life and events, in ongoing research, and in department planning.

2. Currency: The History department succinctly demonstrates its efforts in maintaining currency in curriculum, student learning, and faculty professional development; the department is to be commended for developing and/or revising courses in Native American History and Chicano Studies. The program is following a schedule for assessments and assessment analysis, but the report would benefit from analysis of the implications and results of these discussions. Faculty are involved in a range of professional development activities; although the analysis of the relationship of these activities to program development is limited, the breadth and depth of faculty involvement supports that claim that the faculty members are focused on program development and improvement.

3. Effectiveness: Although the department's DSR numbers meet or exceed the district average, the department has identified a possible problem of disparate impact in retention rates and success: African American and former foster youth success rates are significantly lower than those for the general population. The department is exploring the implications of the data while also developing or pursuing training in working with diverse student populations. Ironically, scheduling developments may have unintentionally impacted non-traditional or equity student populations; the focus on 17A and B—the standard GE courses, may have disparately impacted students in disparately impacted groups. The program is also attempting to solve the problem of under enrollment at Tahoe Truckee. s. Irony noted about scheduling for large classes that displace courses for disparately impacted groups. The department is also concerned about instructors enrolling students over the cap although the reasons for this concern need to be explored and/or elaborated in the report.

4. Thoroughness: The report is clear and effectively provides information about the department. The report would benefit from clarification of some issues (e.g., the problem of over-cap enrollment) and analysis (e.g., the effect of scheduling on equity student groups).

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The department has concerns about the number of full-time faculty who are on interim assignments or who have release time to fill other roles on campus. The department will probably pursue another full-time faculty member; the analysis of this request is indirectly related to the assessment in sections 1-3.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: The History department is one of the mainstays of transfer, GE, and increasingly, acquisition of degrees (ADT for History). Members of the department contribute in a variety of ways to campus life, participate in shared decision-making within the department, and pursue research related to history.
- Report evaluation summary: The report is clearly written and informative; analysis of data would support some of the claims developed in the report.
- Analysis of resource requests: The department would like to hire a full time faculty member, particularly in light of the full time obligation in

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
- Opportunity Identified
- No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments:

International Students Evaluation

Program/Department: International Programs Evaluation team: Team 3
Chair/Department Contact: Alistair Turner

- 1. Relevancy (15): 14
- 2. Currency (30): 26
- 3. Effectiveness (30): 25
- 4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 70

1. Relevancy: The International Program recruits, enrolls, and supports international students, approximately 100 a year; the program includes an intensive two-week orientation. In 2016 and 2017, these efforts expanded to include in country recruitment drives in China, Vietnam, and South China. The program demonstrates a direct connection to the mission and goals of the college, in particular Goals 1 and 2, access and success. As noted in the review, it is difficult to quantify the impacts of a diverse student population on the college environment; conversely there is a direct fiscal impact of having an international program, one reason for the goal of increasing the number of international students, in addition to the goals of diversity and cultural competency.

2. Currency: The International Program engages in local and regional staff development and regularly assesses the impact of program services on student outcomes, particularly the two-week orientation; while students performed well on multiple choice questions related to the outcomes, open-ended questions identified some areas or information that could be augmented (particularly regarding legal issues); the program has revised the orientation to take these results into account. Overall, the program demonstrates that international students, as a group, are generally very successful with above average GPAs and relatively high rates of transfer.

3. Effectiveness: The International Program has grown from 40 students in 1999 to approximately 200 students. As noted previously, these students tend to do very well. The program notes that growing enrollment will require diversifying the student pool as the traditional source of students, Japan, is sending fewer students abroad. Program personnel have made three trips overseas in recent years to improve recruitment efforts.

4. Thoroughness: The report was clear, and informative, providing effective analysis of its role and its success. The historical information also helped to define the role of the program and its goals.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The international program appears to be very stable (but perhaps overworked) for its current load of students. In order to appreciably grow, additional staffing may be required. Resource needs are related to growth, development, and outcomes (when a lack of resources and space limits the ability to offer student support or develop new activities).

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: Program The International Student Program has managed to sustain its current size in recent years despite shrinking enrollment from traditional sources of international students. On average, international students are very successful compared to native students.
- Report evaluation summary: As noted above, the report is thorough and informative, describing one of the District's effective focused student service programs.
- Analysis of resource requests: While the program is stable, resource analysis reveals that opportunities to grow are limited without additional staffing resources.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: As noted above, the program will need additional resources if the master plan supports the goal of enrolling more international students to support diversity, cultural competence, and cultural sophistication. The students also benefit the college financially. All colleges seem to be involved in the same process, suggesting that the District's efforts may need to expand in the future.

Kinesiology Evaluation

Program/Department: Kinesiology
Chair/Department Contact: Darcy Brownell

Evaluation team: Team 3

1. Relevancy (15): 10
2. Currency (30): 26
3. Effectiveness (30): 15
4. Thoroughness (5): 3

TOTAL: 54

1. Relevancy: This department covers several instructional areas (Kinesiology, Recreation Management, and Health education) and Athletics. These programs support the College mission and its goals although the specific relationship of program goals to College goals would amplify the program's value for students, particularly in Recreation Management and Health Education; the connection is more clearly defined for Kinesiology and Athletics. Note that a mislabeling suggests that the review only addresses Kinesiology and Athletics in sections 1A and 1B, but this is not the case. Student success rates for athletes are significantly higher than for the general student population; athletics clearly provides indirect support for other academic goals. This relationship would be worth analyzing (counseling, motivation, or other factors), while a decline in athletic success rates for two of the last three years is worth exploring. Note that this information could appear in section 3, but it is relevant to the role athletics plays in meeting the Mission and goals. While the department serves a large number of students, the number of degrees awarded for each major is relatively small; the report does not address these numbers in section 1 although the analysis of resource limitations in sections 3 and 4 indirectly addresses the question.

2. Currency: All three primary areas of instruction have seen growth in the number of sections offered, while maintaining high rates of course success and retention, including above average success in online courses (Health Education). Kinesiology is modifying the fitness-training curriculum after reviewing student learning outcomes to better align with the ACE exam. FT faculty are involved in Academic Senate and on campus events. Assessment grids for all programs support the claims regarding assessment. Faculty members in all majors/programs within Kinesiology participate in a range of professional activities from continuing education in related fields to department planning and assessment.

3. Effectiveness: This section presents conclusions derived from details contained in the DSRs; based on this information, the department's majors and programs DSR numbers (retention, success, enrollment, and productivity) in general exceed the District's: enrollments are increasing and while some success measures have declined (e.g., Health Education), the general performance is still strong. No or minimal evaluation accompanies

the data although the program notes that facilities issues (lack of a track or lab) may still hinder enrollment or limit the number of majors. Major grants from CTE have alleviated some of the resource limitations, but not all.

4. Thoroughness: The program review describes an effective program that has some limitations and opportunity for expansion. The report would benefit from analysis of the data presented in sections 1 and 3; this would support the department's planning and its requests for additional resources. Some important concerns, like Title IX were not included in the report.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: Kinesiology has opportunity to grow its program with additional resources, such as a track and performance lab. The addition of a track would also help address potential Title IX concerns (although these were not specifically mentioned in this program review).

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: Kinesiology is a vital and growing department, offering students a diverse range of courses and programs; the focus on health and recreation ties all of the programs together (some classes clearly cross over). Courses and programs support the College mission and goals.
- Report evaluation summary: As noted above, the report would benefit from analysis in sections 1 and 3; this analysis would also help to support and clarify the programs' needs for courses and resources of all kinds.
- Analysis of resource requests: Resource requests are indirectly or directly tied to the analysis in the rest of the document, but as noted, this analysis needs to be developed. At the same time, the requests are clearly tied to safety, program maintenance, and program development, or growth.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
- Opportunity Identified
- No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments:

LGBT Studies Evaluation

Program/Department: LGBT Studies
Chair/Department Contact: Johnnie Terry

Evaluation team: Team 4

1. Relevancy (15): 15
2. Currency (30): 25
3. Effectiveness (30): 26
4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 71

1. Relevancy: LGBT Studies offers interdisciplinary coursework that fulfills general education requirements, transfer preparation for similar 4-year university programs, and an associate degree program. The AA degree in LGBT Studies is noteworthy and cutting edge, as there is only one other California Community College offering this degree. The mission of LGBT Studies directly supports that of the district, as students are given the opportunity to examine the ways that orientations and gender identities intersect with various systems in society (race/ethnicity, class, socioeconomics, religion, politics, science, etc.). LGBT Studies is rich with engaging and inclusive curriculum, and through this department, LGBT students have a powerful opportunity to see themselves reflected in their studies, perhaps for the first time in their educational journey. This program also offers career preparation through internships and strong connections with the Sacramento area LGBT community. The department takes the lead in several enriching events and activities on campus, and promotes lifelong learning both through their program curriculum as well as through OLLI offerings.
2. Currency: All LGBT Studies curriculum is up to date. The program has defined and developed outcomes for its two courses and evaluates these outcomes on a two-year cycle. Although specific data on the outcomes and actions taken based on outcomes are not mentioned, the program does assert that their courses continue to rigorously measure and assess through use of SLO's. Still, additional detail on the specific outcomes and their evaluation would support the claims. Department faculty remain current and active in the field, hosting numerous large campus and community presentations, facilitating sessions during Pride Days and at conferences and other events, and through the Department Chair's leadership role on related Sierra College committees.
3. Effectiveness: LGBT Studies average retention (86%) is slightly above district average (85%), while department success (68%) is slightly below district average (72%). The department describes limitations in the ability to gather data on Sierra's LGBT student population, and without this data, the program is understandably hesitant to delve into its success/retention data further. It may be worth exploring the extent to which

outcomes assessments reflect the retention and success data; a non-correlation would confirm that other questions are at issue. In addition, because the department is small, minor schedule changes have resulted in a recent dip in fill rates. Still, the department's average fill rates are above the district average. The department also notes several powerful quotes from students who have been positively impacted and empowered as a result of the LGBT Studies program, providing anecdotal support of the programs commendable effectiveness in contributing to student success and equity.

4. Thoroughness: LGBT Studies program review was thorough and highlighted the unique accomplishments, student benefits and challenges within the department. Explanation was given where opportunities for additional data could have further aided the review.
5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: LGBT Studies is fairly small and is not looking to grow in curriculum, course offerings, or facilities. The department does plan to grow in number of degrees, transfers, internships, and employment connections by increasing advertising and outreach efforts and by meeting with counselors and LGBT community groups.

Additional Comments: The department has expressed a strong interest in gathering LGBT student data in order to examine disproportionate impact data in relation to student success and retention efforts.

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: The LGBT Studies program's cutting edge uniqueness is noteworthy, being only one of three in the state, and only one of 2 to offer an associates degree. This program is commended for its accomplishments in furthering equity efforts and inclusivity at both the campus and community level. LGBT Studies provides students with an opportunity to examine their own identity, to learn about histories and subcultures that have remained invisible to them until now, to experience a sense of community and activism, and to explore pathways into internships, career opportunities, and transfer programs.
- Report evaluation summary: The anecdotal data within the report is very moving and powerful. The quantitative data included only further demonstrates the rigor, health, and success of the program overall. That said, the report might have benefited from additional data or detail regarding outcomes assessments and their relationship to program development or student success (if any). The program also expressed the need for data on Sierra's LGBT student population in order to provide a deeper level of review, evaluation and assessment.
- Analysis of resource requests: At this time, the program is not requesting additional resources.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
- Opportunity Identified
- No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments:

Mechatronics Evaluation

Program/Department: Mechatronics
Chair/Department Contact: Tony Osladil

Evaluation team: Team 1

- 1. Relevancy (15): 12
- 2. Currency (30): 22
- 3. Effectiveness (30): 25
- 4. Thoroughness (5): 4

TOTAL: 63

1. Relevancy: The role of the program in Career and Technical Education is clear as is its connection to current training and hiring needs. While the program reports significant employment outcomes and also the difficulty in finding state or District data, the department missed an opportunity to include the actual list of 80 employers who have hired, which would count as data for the purposes of this report. Connections to ISLOs were clearly stated and well documented, as were accommodations and outreach related to non-traditional and under-represented students. The Partnership with Hacker Lab and CTE outreach initiatives support connections with our community.

2. Currency: On-going assessment as well as participation in the SLO process is noted, as well as incorporating changes as recommended by Advisory Committee feedback. Including a list of Advisory Board members would be a recommended addition to the next report, showing the range of industries/companies as specific data. The chart indicating the outcomes cycle was good to include, but the data presented does not indicate 100% currency: the column titles are missing, but if pulled from the SLO planning 'quilt', in the 6 years/12 semesters on the grid, every CSLO should have been assessed; some are on schedule to be assessed twice while others show no assessments completed or planned. Professional development is described and details connections back to classroom and curricular improvements.

3. Effectiveness: The program's retention and success rates regularly exceed the District averages. There is an unaddressed consistent low success rate for African-American students even though enrollment of this group increased greatly in Spring 2016. It may be valuable for the program to further investigate possible reasons behind this trend. The program serves the entire District through program offerings at Rocklin, Nevada County and Tahoe-Truckee and has not chosen to move any courses to on-line or hybrid format. While the report comments that there are no overall trends in enrollment, the upward fluctuation of AS and Certificates in 2014-15 might benefit from some comments or investigation. The fill rate for the program is below District average; the report mentions increasing outreach efforts to attract more students.

4. Thoroughness: The report addresses the key elements of program review. Although labor market data is not readily available through conventional sources, it would be beneficial for the department to work, possibly with Research, to find their own process for documenting hiring, salaries, etc. With the list of employers that is mentioned and continual feedback from the Advisory Board, some data should be available and could be collected.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The report mentions an upcoming need for computers as well as augmentation of instructional materials to support the hands-on portions of courses. A faculty request has been made and is continuing through the prioritization process. Other staffing levels are labeled as adequate. Requests are tied exclusively to actual and projected growth.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: Mechatronics fills an obvious role in Career & Technical Education as well as in the labor force with its particular skill set. Completers of the program are connected with and hired by employers and employers return to Sierra College to meet hiring needs. There is mention of an unmet need by employers but no data or specifics were provided so it is difficult to determine the size of that issue.
- Report evaluation summary: The report was complete and met requirements. There is a missed opportunity to develop employment data since other sources for this information is difficult to find and/or may not be available.
- Analysis of resource requests: Resource requests included a full-time faculty and an augmented supplies budget in order to grow but no significant unmet needs were mentioned.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
- Opportunity Identified
- No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments:

Physics Evaluation

Program/Department: Physics
Chair/Department Contact: Don Harris

Evaluation team: Team 1

1. Relevancy (15): 14
2. Currency (30): 27
3. Effectiveness (30): 25
4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 71

1. Relevancy: The report demonstrated strong relevance to the mission and ISLOs of the college. The program outcomes (PSLOs) are clearly written and support the ISLOs in the areas of critical thinking and technical competency. It is also noted that the department provides pre-requisite courses for other disciplines, including health care, engineering, and biological and physical sciences. Further evidence reveals that the Physics curriculum serves 5 of the top 10 best college majors and majors that earn the highest salaries as published by Kiplinger in 2016/17. The data showing degrees awarded reveals consistency in overall numbers as well as a slight shift from the Physics AS to the newer Physics transfer degree (ADT). There is an opportunity here to provide more analysis of this shift and develop a potential strategy for increasing the number of transfer degrees, given that most students earning a degree in physics will need to complete a Bachelor's degree, at minimum, for career success.
2. Currency: Program curriculum is 100% up to date and aligns with transfer requirements, including articulation with the UC system. The report indicates that the department is engaged in continuous curriculum review and improvements by citing recent changes implemented due to department research and past program review analysis. While the data indicates the change has not had any significant or positive effect on success or retention rates, the follow up was conducted and discussed. The report would be enhanced further by more extensive analysis or explanation of this result. Additional improvements are under way such as plans to add a Physics/Chemistry combined course for future elementary school teachers. The first cycle of assessment of SLOs across all active courses has been completed. Little detail is provided about the results of this assessment work; it seems that the actions for improvement described above have not necessarily been the result of SLO assessment. While PSLOs are provided, the specific SLOs are not included. It should be noted that faculty have not found the exercise of systematic SLO/assessment to be of particular value to the department although they are committed to continuing as required. The program engages in regular professional discussions and collaboration on pedagogy and practices in department meetings and stays current by attending conferences on physics,

teaching and curriculum development. Examples demonstrate the impact of these activities on curriculum. Professor Calabrese also participates in research at UNR and UC Berkeley. There may be an opportunity to elaborate on how this work has impacted or enhanced the department's work.

3. Effectiveness: DSR data is provided and demonstrates the department is consistently on par with or slightly better than the District averages. One exception is the data on African American and Hispanic students, which shows slightly lower success rates. It is noted that enrollment numbers for these populations are lower overall, which may skew success rates. However, there is an opportunity to address the lower enrollment of underrepresented populations, including females, and strategize efforts to boost the numbers and success rates. Fill rates are strong and classes are now being offered at NCC. While growth has been slow at this campus, a recent change to offer P105 has resulted in a full class and a positive indicator for moving forward. The department is actively engaged in using research to analyze and address needs for change. The report provided current, concrete examples of analysis and planning underway including an investigation of a 12% discrepancy in success rates in P205 between students who had taken P105 and Physics A as the prerequisite course. Student surveys and faculty performance evaluations are among the methods being used to investigate the issues and make necessary changes. Active ePar goals are listed and addressed although there may be an opportunity to elaborate on Goal 1 (Improve Retention and Success Rates) with regards to underserved populations, as suggested earlier in this review. Participation in Dino Days is cited as the primary outreach effort. There are likely additional new opportunities that could be explored (other on or off-campus events). Lab space is noted as a significant limitation to increasing student enrollment. To support this need, the report would benefit from an inclusion of more data and analysis around the growing demand in addition to high fill rates (perhaps the growth of the Physics Transfer degree or cross discipline needs). With the development of Interest Areas (R4S), this may be something to assess at the next program review.
4. Thoroughness: Substantial data provided. A few areas were noted where the report would benefit from more analysis or explanation such as strategies for boosting African American, female and Hispanic enrollment.
5. Evaluation (ungraded):
Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: As with most departments with solid fill rates and relevant courses, additional resources could always be of use. The need for a second lab should be explored as the campus moves to interest areas and career pathways.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: The Physics Program is successful in serving its students and has demonstrated relevance to top transfer degrees and careers. The faculty members responsive to the changing needs of the curriculum and work

- collaboratively to make adjustments.
- Report evaluation summary: Solid report supported by data and analysis. Opportunities to develop plans to increase the shift from Physics degree to Physics Transfer degree and add interdisciplinary courses which may in turn, create further demand (and support) for lab space and new faculty.
 - Analysis of resource requests: The primary request was for a second lab. Further investigation of current and potential student demand is needed to support the request.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

Critical Attention Needed

Opportunity Identified

No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments:

Psychology Evaluation

Program/Department: Psychology
Chair/Department Contact: Brigitte Elder

Evaluation team: Team 4

- 1. Relevancy (15): 15
- 2. Currency (30): 30
- 3. Effectiveness (30): 26
- 4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 76

1. Relevancy: The report effectively describes the alignment of Psychology programs and courses with the college’s mission and goals, and supports its claims with sufficient detail regarding course retention (higher than the district average), AA degrees, and numbers of sections offered (90); the number of AA degrees has increased since the last report. Psychology faculty have been actively involved in promoting diversity, equity, and Title IX compliance in the District.

2. Currency: The review shows that the curriculum is current and demonstrates that the department engages in continuous curriculum planning and CSLO assessments. There are defined and developed outcomes for all courses with a regular cycle for assessment and evaluation. Psychology has developed a new AS-T degree for a more rigorous program and a new course, PSYCH 102, for career exploration. The department recently presented a proposal to CSUS for 2+2 partnership. Faculty are consistently involved in a number of professional activities, including leading instructional skills workshops.

3. Effectiveness: The report shows above average student success: retention at 88% with success rate at 71%. The department has provided an intriguing analysis of the slightly lower rate—that the introductory course’s lack of pre-requisites may be the cause; it would be interesting to substantiate this claim, since it may reflect similar experiences of other departments serving large numbers of transfer/GE students. The online course numbers are comparable to the State averages and there is increased enrollment at Tahoe-Truckee. The program’s success numbers for students targeted in equity programs exceed state averages (and Sierra numbers); despite the data, the Department recognizes the need for additional progress, consistent with the faculty dedication to equity and diversity. EPar requests for lab space and FT instructor were identified in this review.

4. Thoroughness: The report is clear, thorough, and informative

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The program is challenged to support the increased number of students seeking degrees due to a lack of lab space and the need for an additional faculty hire in research methods and statistics.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: Psychology is a vital program, offering highly popular GE courses and an increasingly popular major. Faculty are involved in a wide range of activities, with a particular focus on equity, diversity, and Title IX compliance.
- Report evaluation summary: As noted above, the report is clear and informative. The analysis reveals some opportunities for further research and analysis, but in general the analysis and details support the department's claims.
- Analysis of resource requests: Resource requests are clearly linked to analysis and planning. The resource requests (or potential resource requests) are linked to immediate needs and potential growth; outcomes are noted, primarily as these outcomes require instructors and labs to teach existing courses.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: The recommendation "opportunity identified" is a response to the vitality of the program, its popularity and success, and the danger that for the lack of a full-time hire in research and lab technique and an appropriate lab space, the program may not reach its potential. Psychology is a popular major and these augmentations would help meet demand.

Sociology Evaluation

Program/Department: Sociology
Chair/Department Contact: Megan Seely

Evaluation team: Team 4

1. Relevancy (15): 15

2. Currency (30): 28

3. Effectiveness (30): 27

4. Thoroughness (5): 5

TOTAL: 75

1.Relevancy: The Sociology department offers coursework for general education and for transfer to UC/CSU, in addition to offering an AA-T Sociology degree pattern. The program directly aligns with the district mission and goals; it serves Sierra’s diverse student population in promoting critical thinking and inspiring social change while enabling students to engage in and contribute to the greater community. It also prepares students for degree, transfer and career. The number of degrees awarded since 2011, when it was first offered, has steadily grown from 5 in 2011 to 23 in 2016. The number of students majoring in Sociology has also grown overall, from 83 in 2013 to 139 in Spring 16. Sociology faculty are central to the coordination of several extra-curricular programs like Social Justice Week or Love Your Body Week,” incorporating sociological analysis in the exploration of culture and individual experience.

2. Currency: Sociology is 100% current with their curriculum. The department is in the process of adding two new courses to their offerings, as well as a new Social Justice Studies degree program. The department has defined and developed outcomes for all of its courses and has a consistent cycle for assessment and evaluation. The ISLOs, PSLOs and CLSOs are extensive and thorough. The program faculty stay current through their involvement in several aspects of professional development, including flex, planning and assessment, a shared canvas space, and participation on campus committees and other conferences.

3. Effectiveness: The data provided show that success (75%) and retention (90%) rates are slightly above District averages. Fill rates are very strong at 98% average over 3 years, also above district average. Sociology has a clear plan to grow strategically in number of courses and with a new degree program in Social Justice Studies. There is a constant connection within the program between course/class content and community/campus organizations and activities.

4. Thoroughness: Sociology’s program review was thorough and concise, providing clear supporting data and relevant explanation in each area of review.

5. Evaluation (ungraded):

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The review notes that the department has grown tremendously and has plans for continued growth with the new

degree, and therefore anticipates a need for additional classroom space. Other needs noted include SPSS software in their M-4 classroom, and possibly additional faculty depending on the future reassigned time of current full-time faculty.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: The Sociology department is strong, meeting student demand while also dealing with constraints in space and budget. The program has plans to continue its growth and is committed to providing students opportunities for participation in clubs, events and activities within the campus and larger community. The program's leadership role in recognizing the needs of underrepresented students and in addressing diversity and equity is noteworthy.
- Report evaluation summary: Sociology's program review is commended for providing strong data driven assessments, evaluation, review and planning.
- Analysis of resource requests: While it seems the classroom space has been adequate up until this point, future growth and the addition of the Social Justice Studies degree program may warrant a need for additional classroom space. Resource requests are related to growth and program development, as noted above.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments:

Transfer Center Evaluation

Program/Department: Transfer Evaluation team: PR Committee
Chair/Department Contact: Cherie Mathews

1. Relevancy (15): 14
2. Currency (30): 26
3. Effectiveness (30): 26
4. Thoroughness (5): 4

TOTAL: 70

1. Relevancy: The Transfer Center performs a central role in supporting the strategic goals of the College and providing service to students. As the report describes in detail, the program's activities are partly driven by mandates from Title V, partly by the goal of providing increasingly effective ways of providing students with timely and accurate information about transfer and transfer institutions. The program developed a needs assessment survey; the results reaffirmed the need for individual counseling; this aspect of the report could be moved to section 2, clarifying its implications. It may have been worthwhile for the report to examine the department's essential role in R4S.

2. Currency: The program has moved from measuring SLOs to measuring SSO's (Student Service Outcomes) but has used both measures to pursue new ways to deliver service to students; the department has established a schedule for SSO reviews. The program review includes examples of actions taken in response to both measurements. Program staff members participate in workshops, training, and conferences; this participation supports the goals of the program.

3. Effectiveness: Sierra College continues to be a leader in numbers of students transferring to a 4-year college. The transfer information provided in the report inferentially supports the claims regarding the value of the program, as do the details regarding number of students served by the program and the comparison of Sierra College's Transfer program to the norms/standards of the Community College system.

4. Thoroughness: The report is thorough; some elements could be rearranged for clarity (see the note in section 1 above).

5. Evaluation:

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The transfer program's resource requests (primarily a dedicated space, including computer labs) reflect the analysis in the report. The program faces limits in its ability to provide complete services to students. Students require access to information to make informed decisions, while a dedicated space would allow the transfer program to offer more programs familiarizing students with the transfer process and its demands.

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: The transfer program serves one of the essential missions of the College as mandated by Title V. The program will play a central role in the new programs and procedures developed through R4S
- Report evaluation summary: The report is thorough and provides extensive data. Some information appeared out of place (see comments on section 1 above). The report could more thoroughly explore the relationship of the Transfer Center to developments in R4S—where it can describe these changes—since this relationship may become central to its role.
- Analysis of resource requests: The requests for space and technology related directly to the analysis of the program and its success, including outcomes regarding students’ ability to plan for themselves.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
- Opportunity Identified
- No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: In making this recommendation, the Committee acknowledges the potential strain in resources faced by any student service program, given current and future developments arising from R4S. State programs and mandates may provide additional resources (as already seems to be the case); the program and others involved in student services will determine other needs and work to coordinate resources. A dedicated space for Transfer (in conjunction with Career Connections) would be worth pursuing given the importance of the programs in supporting student pathways.

Welding Evaluation

Program/Department: Welding
Chair/Department Contact: Bill Wenzel

Evaluation team: PR Committee

1. Relevancy (15): 12
2. Currency (30): 21
3. Effectiveness (30): 27
4. Thoroughness (5): 3

TOTAL: 63

1. Relevancy: The Welding program offers an AA and AS degree, a Welding Technology Certificate, and five individual skill certifications in addition to industry licenses (or “welding certifications”). These programs meet a range of industry needs, based on recent data from Forbes and other national reports. The report contains no data on the number of degrees and certificates granted or a look, if possible, at job placement; it is unclear how many students are taking welding for other purposes. The program has sponsored a number of programs and meetings in the field; students have contributed to the campus through projects developed in class.

2. Currency: The program has added four new courses, while other courses are being revised (e.g., Welding 10) or developed in consultation with its advisory panel, primarily to integrate digital technology and related processes. Welding has developed outcomes for all courses reflecting their shared goals (safety, knowledge, and skill development) with additional outcomes for courses incorporating historical or scientific knowledge. The report lacks an exploration of the impact of SLO assessment and did not provide a schedule. Faculty members participate extensively in a range of industry events and workshops; some of these directly pertain to instruction as well as currency.

3. Effectiveness: Welding’s retention, success, and enrollment numbers generally exceed those for the district. The program experienced a minor drop off in enrollment, partly in line with the district, partly the result of a new prerequisite that limited enrollment from previously qualified high school students. The department and counseling have rectified this problem. To increase student success, Welding has developed a system of student mentors and has added courses to assist students’ acceleration through the program. More specific information about recent enrollment would benefit the analysis.

4. Thoroughness: As noted, some information was missing, but the program has presented a generally thoughtful analysis of its programs and its ongoing development and transformation to meet the career and training goals of its students.

5. Evaluation:

Departmental Analysis of Current and Future Resources: The department has demonstrated a clear grasp of the immediate needs of the program and the benefits that additional resources, particularly classified staff and new full time faculty, would have on the program’s continued development. The department’s requests for new staff,

equipment, and space are linked primarily to growth and program maintenance; the link to outcomes is implicit (some outcomes require equipment and staff). The possibilities of Strong Workforce support might

Additional Comments:

Summative Comments:

- Program evaluation summary: Welding is a vital CTE program with dedicated staff and students who are strongly invested in the program. The report indicates that it is strongly positioned to benefit from the Strong Workforce program.
- Report evaluation summary: As noted, some information is missing; the report may also have more thoroughly explored the impact of state initiatives on its planning and resource requests.
- Analysis of resource requests: Requests are clearly related to program maintenance and to possible growth. The relationship of program outcomes to these requests might be more clearly defined.

Recommendations to PARAC

Recommendation:

- Critical Attention Needed
 Opportunity Identified
 No attention needed to sustain program

Additional Comments: This recommendation is essentially retrospective, at least regarding faculty: Welding rated at the top for a new faculty position, a recognition of the possibilities outlined in the report and of the department's own strong record in program development. Additional classified staff would amplify the benefits

Part 3: Appendices

Appendix 1: Program Review Committee Membership, 2016-17

Faculty:

Barry Abrams (Chair)
Kent Fortin
Don Harris
Katie Juras
Brandi McEvoy
Brook Oliver
Rhiannon Porter

Classified:

Open

Management:

Jill Alcorn
Julie Arreguy
Erik Cooper
Lynn Medeiros
Nancy James

Appendix 2: Score Distributions

Score Range (Low to High):

50-59 (2)
 54
 58
 60-69 (6)
 60
 62
 63 (4)
 70-80 (14)
 70 (3)
 71 (2)
 73 (3)
 74 (2)
 75 (2)
 76
 77

Range by Program Type:

<i>Instruction</i>	
54	Ancillary
58	70
62	75
63 (3)	(72.5; 72.5)
71 (2)	Student Services
73	60
74 (2)	63
75	70 (2)
76	73 (2)
77	(70; 68.2)
(71; 68.14) ¹	

General Median and Average (70.5; 68.54)

¹ The first number is the median (fictive in some cases), the second the mean or average.

Appendix 3: Rubrics

Program Review Rubric Instruction – 80 points

1) Relevancy: 15 points

	Inadequate 2 pts.	Limited 5 pts.	Adequate 10 pts.	Strong 13 pts.	Exceptional 15 pts.
1.1 Analysis (15 pts.)	Little or no evidence of specific alignment of program or outcomes with district mission and goals. Analysis of data is insufficient or weak and does not show that program's elements meet student/community needs.	Program is aligned with district mission and goals only in general, non-specific terms. Analysis of data, including outcomes, is underdeveloped and/or connects program's elements to student and community needs only in general terms.	Programs elements, offerings, and outcomes are aligned with district mission and goals. Analysis of data, including outcomes, is satisfactory and shows that program meets student/community needs	Program elements, offerings, and outcomes are specifically aligned with district mission and goals. Analysis of data, including outcomes, is persuasive and shows that program's elements meet student/community needs	Program elements, offerings, and outcomes are specifically aligned with district mission and goals. Analysis of data, including outcomes, is clearly persuasive and shows that program's elements do an exceptional job of meeting student/community needs
<u>1.2 Optional:</u> Additional data specific to the program.					Additional data offered will be factored into the category scores above.

Suggested Data Points for Relevancy, if available:

- Number of degrees/certificates awarded
- Number of courses that support other degrees or certificates (as prerequisite, required course, or optional course in the major or certificate)
- Number of courses required by transfer institutions (for department major or other transfer major)
- Number of students prepared for transfer majors
- Success of prepared majors at transfer institution
- Number of students who choose program course for GE requirement
- Department's specialized role in supporting district strategic goals (i.e. basic skills, CTE pathways, signature programs)
- Department's role in meeting documented community needs (high school outreach, community events, workforce development, etc.)
- Other relevant data

2) Currency: 30 points

Cumulative Score	Inadequate 0-9 pts.	Limited 10-14 pts.	Adequate 15-20 pts.	Strong 21-25 pts.	Exceptional 26-30 pts.
	Inadequate 2 pts. ²	Adequate 6 pts.			Strong 10 pts.

² Because all departments have completed review or are regularly engaged in the required process, the criteria have changed to match the new language in the template for the Program Review report.

2.1 Curriculum and Review (10 pts.) (Instructional Programs)	The report provides little to no evidence of systematic curriculum planning, or provides no description/analysis of its actions.	The department shows evidence of planning for and engagement in curriculum review and planning and/or provides a description/analysis of its actions. ³			The department provides evidence of systematic and continuous engagement in curriculum planning.
	Inadequate 0 pts.	Limited 5 pts.	Adequate 10 pts.		Exceptional 15 pts.
2.2 Student Learning Outcomes (15 pts.)	Program provides no evidence of continuing participation in the SLO process.	Program has defined and developed outcomes for some to most of its courses and has assessed at least one outcome per course in the past year. The department has engaged in limited evaluation or action based on the assessment. The department has provided a list of outcomes and assessment.	Program has defined and developed outcomes for all of its courses, has developed a cycle for its assessment and evaluation, and has assessed at least one outcome per course in the past year. The department has engaged in limited but thorough evaluation of the assessments and has taken action as warranted. The department has provided a list of outcomes and assessments, and provided evidence of the cycle it employs for this assessment.	Program has defined and developed outcomes for all of its courses, has developed a cycle for its assessment and evaluation, and engages in regular systematic assessment. The department has engaged in extensive and thorough evaluation of the assessments and has taken action as warranted. The department has provided a list of outcomes and assessments, and provided evidence of the cycle it employs for this assessment.	
	1 pt.	2 pts.	3 pts.	4 pts.	5 pts.
2.3 Professional Currency (Aspects listed below.) (5 pts.)	Program provides little evidence of active involvement in professional currency and little awareness of the aspects of currency	Program provides limited evidence of active involvement in at least one aspect of professional currency	Program provides some evidence of active involvement in at least one aspect of professional currency	Program provides strong evidence of active involvement in two aspects of professional currency. Program engages in professional discussion and review,	Program provides strong evidence of active involvement in each aspect of professional currency. Program engages in regular,

³ In some cases, departments will only need to review their course every few years (for Curriculum review) or will only develop new courses or revise old ones to reflect program changes. The rubric reflects this possibility by requesting evidence of some process for review/analysis of curriculum, whatever form that may take, and/or any explanation of the results of this process.

				responding to possible changes in pedagogy, standards, and practices.	professional discussion and review, responding to possible changes in pedagogy, standards, and practices.
<u>2.4 Optional:</u> Additional data specific to the program.					Additional data offered will be factored into the category scores above.

Aspects of Professional Currency:

4. Advisory councils are in place and meet regularly. Program responds in a timely manner to recommendations of advisory committee
5. Participation in professional development either on-campus or off-campus
6. Awareness of discipline, technology, industry, and legal standards. Program makes timely implementation of changes due to changes in standards
7. Regular discussion, review, and response to possible changes in pedagogy.

3) Effectiveness: 30 points

Cumulative Score	Inadequate 0-9 pts.	Limited 10-14 pts.	Adequate 15-20 pts.	Strong 21-25pts	Exceptional 26-30 pts.
	Inadequate 2 pts.	Limited 5 pts.	Adequate 9 pts.	Strong 13 pts.	Exceptional 15 pts.
3.1 Evidence of Effectiveness (15 pts.) Inclusion of outcomes assessments and evaluation will depend on the nature of the data and the department's analysis.	Most data and/or data trend elements are below the district average and remain unaddressed.	Mixed comparison of program's data and/or data trends with some elements falling below the district average and remain insufficiently addressed.	Some data and/or data trends are at district average or if program falls below district average in one or more of the data elements, a well-substantiated justification has been provided.	Some data and/or data trends are at district average. Some data is higher than district average. If program falls below district average in one or more of the data elements, a well-substantiated justification has been provided.	All data is higher than district average or, if program falls below district average in one or more of the data elements, a well-substantiated justification has been provided.
	Inadequate 2 pts.	Limited 4 pts.	Adequate 6 pts. ⁴	Strong 8 pts.	Exceptional 10 pts.
3.2 Analysis and Planning (10 pts.) All programs will provide analysis of the link between outcomes assessment and the evaluation of effectiveness, where these apply.	Analysis of program's effectiveness is weak with unclear or vague plans for improvement. ePar plan does not relate to analysis of effectiveness The department discussion does not address relevant outcomes in its evaluation and planning.	Analysis of program's effectiveness indicates reasons for deficits and indicates some plans to make improvements in near term. ePar plan relates to analysis of effectiveness. The department discussion only	Analysis of program's effectiveness indicates program's efforts at maintaining levels. ePar plans are consistent with programs analysis and actions in maintaining effectiveness The department discussion adequately addresses outcomes in its evaluation	Clear analysis of program's effectiveness. Plan for improvement is included. ePar plan accurately reflects analysis and planning.	Clear analysis of program's effectiveness. Plan for improvement is clear and realistic. ePar plan accurately reflects and supports analysis and planning.

⁴ When it applies, departments and programs take labor market trends into account in their analysis of program planning and assessments.

		indirectly or minimally addresses relevant outcomes in its evaluation and planning.	and planning, although the relationship may be implicit.	The department discussion effectively addresses outcomes in its evaluation and planning, integrating the outcomes analysis and planning as appropriate.	
	Inadequate 1 pts.	Limited 2 pts.	Adequate 3 pts.	Strong 4 pts.	Strong 5 pts.
3.3 Limitations and Opportunities (5 pts.)	Limitations and opportunities missing from analysis. Program weaknesses and/or challenges are superficially addressed or are not addressed at all.	Minimal indication of future limitations. Program weaknesses and/or challenges are insufficiently addressed.	Indication of future limitations. Program weaknesses and/or challenges are addressed.	Description of program's future and anticipation of possible limitations and opportunities. Program weaknesses and/or challenges are directly addressed.	Analysis of program's future and anticipation of possible limitations and opportunities. Program weaknesses and/or challenges are fully addressed.
<u>3.4 Optional:</u> Additional data specific to the program.					Additional data offered will be factored into the category scores above.

Thoroughness: 5 points

Inadequate – 1 pt	Limited – 2 pts	Adequate – 3 pts	Strong – 4 pts	Exceptional – 5 pts.
-------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------	----------------------

Suggested Data Points for Relevancy, if available:

- Number of degrees/certificates awarded
- Number of courses that support other degrees or certificates (as prerequisite, required course, or optional course in the major or certificate)
- Number of courses required by transfer institutions (for department major or other transfer major)
- Number of students prepared for transfer majors
- Success of prepared majors at transfer institution
- Number of students who choose program course for GE requirement
- Department's specialized role in supporting district strategic goals (i.e. basic skills, CTE pathways, signature programs)
- Department's role in meeting documented community needs (high school outreach, community events, workforce development, etc.)
- Other relevant data

Program Review Rubric Student Services - 80 points

1) Relevancy: 15 points

	Inadequate 3 pts.	Limited 6 pts.	Adequate 9 pts.	Strong 12 pts.	Exceptional 15 pts.
1.1 Analysis (15 pts.)	Little or no evidence of specific alignment of program and learning outcomes with district mission and goals. Analysis of data is insufficient or weak and does not show that program's elements meet student/community needs.	Program is aligned with district mission and goals only in general, non-specific terms. Analysis of data, including learning outcomes, is underdeveloped and/or connects program's elements to student and community needs only in general terms.	Program elements, offerings, and outcomes are aligned with district mission and goals. Analysis of data, including learning outcomes is satisfactory and shows that program meets student/community needs	Program elements, offerings, and outcomes are specifically aligned with district mission and goals. Analysis of data, including learning outcomes, is persuasive and shows that program's elements meet student/community needs	Program elements, offerings, and outcomes are specifically aligned with district mission and goals. Analysis of data, including learning outcomes, is clearly persuasive and shows that program's elements do an exceptional job of meeting student/community needs
<u>1.2</u> <u>Optional</u> <u>Category:</u> Additional data specific to the program.					Additional data offered will be factored into the category scores above.

2) Currency: 30 points

Cumulative Score	Inadequate 0-9 pts.	Limited 10-14 pts.	Adequate 15-20 pts.	Strong 21-25 pts.	Exceptional 26-30 pts.
	Inadequate 3 pts.	Limited 6 pts.	Adequate 9 pts.	Strong 12 pts.	Exceptional 15 pts.
2.1 Program Innovation or Continuous Improvement (15 pts.)	No or little evidence of innovation or continuous improvement.	Evidence of some innovation or continuous improvement.	Evidence of adequate innovation or continuous improvement.	Evidence of above average innovation or continuous improvement.	Evidence of significant innovation or continuous improvement.
	Inadequate 2 pts.	Limited 5 pts.	Adequate 8 pts.	Exceptional 10 pts.	
2.2 Student Learning Outcomes (10 pts.)	Program has developed outcomes but has not assessed or evaluated these outcomes. The department may need to develop a cycle for assessment and evaluation	Program has defined outcomes in the last year. The department has engaged in limited evaluation or action based on the assessment.	Program has defined and developed program and/or student learning outcomes, has developed a cycle for its assessment and evaluation, and has assessed one or more	Program has defined developed program and/or student learning outcomes for all of its activities, has developed a cycle for its assessment and evaluation, and has assessed the majority or all major outcomes in the past year and has engaged in ongoing assessment in previous years within the cycle. The department has engaged in extensive thorough evaluation of the	

		The department has provided a list of outcomes and a cycle of assessment and evaluation.	outcomes in the past year. The department has engaged in limited but thorough evaluation of the assessments and has taken action as warranted. The department has provided a list of outcomes and assessments, and provided evidence of the cycle it employs for this assessment.	assessments and has taken action as warranted. The department has provided a list of outcomes and assessments, and provided evidence of the cycle it employs for this assessment.	
	1 pts.	2 pts.	3 pts.	4 pts.	5 pts.
2.3 Professional Currency (Aspects listed below.) (5 pts.)	Program provides little evidence of active involvement in professional currency and little awareness of the aspects of currency	Program provides limited evidence of active involvement in at least one aspect of professional currency	Program provides some evidence of active involvement in at least one aspect of professional currency	Program provides strong evidence of active involvement in two aspects of professional currency. Program engages in professional discussion and review, responding to possible changes in pedagogy, standards, and practices.	Program provides strong evidence of active involvement in each aspect of professional currency. Program engages in regular, professional discussion and review, responding to possible changes in pedagogy, standards, and practices.
<u>2.4 Optional Category:</u> Additional data specific to the program.					Additional data offered will be factored into the category scores above.

Aspects of Professional Currency:

8. Participation in professional development either on-campus or off-campus
9. Awareness of discipline, technology, industry, and legal standards. Program makes timely implementation of changes due to changes in standards
10. Regular discussion, review, and response to possible changes in pedagogy and/or delivery of services.

3) Effectiveness: 30 points

Cumulative Score	Inadequate 0-9 pts.	Limited 10-14 pts.	Adequate 15-20 pts.	Strong 21-25 pts.	Exceptional 26-30 pts.
	Inadequate 3 pts.	Limited 6 pts.	Adequate 9 pts.	Strong 12 pts.	Exceptional 15 pts.
a. Evidence of Effectiveness (15 pts.) b. Inclusion of outcomes assessments and evaluation will depend on the nature of the data and the department's	Most data and/or data trend elements are below the district average and remain unaddressed.	Mixed comparison of program's data and/or data trends with some elements falling below the district average and remain insufficiently addressed.	Some data and/or data trends are at district average or if program falls below district average in one or more of the data elements, a well-substantiated justification has been provided.	Some data and/or data trends are at district average. Some data is higher than district average. If program falls below district average in one or more of the data elements, a well-substantiated justification has been provided.	All data is higher than district average or, if program falls below district average in one or more of the data elements, a well-substantiated justification has been provided.
	Inadequate 2 pts.	Limited 4 pts.	Adequate 6 pts.	Strong 8 pts.	Exceptional 10 pts.
3.2 Analysis and Planning (10 pts.) All programs will provide analysis of the link between outcomes assessment and the evaluation of effectiveness, where these apply.	Analysis of program's effectiveness is weak with unclear or vague plans for improvement. ePar plan does not relate to analysis of effectiveness. The department discussion does not address outcomes in its evaluation and planning.	Analysis of program's effectiveness indicates reasons for deficits and indicates some plans to make improvements in near term. ePar plan relates to analysis of effectiveness. The department discussion only indirectly or minimally addresses outcomes in its evaluation and planning.	Analysis of program's effectiveness indicates program's efforts at maintaining levels. ePar plans are consistent with programs analysis and actions in maintaining effectiveness. The department discussion adequately addresses outcomes in its evaluation and planning, although the relationship may be implicit.	Clear analysis of program's effectiveness. Plan for improvement is included. ePar plan accurately reflects analysis and planning. The department discussion effectively addresses outcomes in its evaluation and planning, integrating the outcomes analysis and planning as appropriate.	Clear analysis of program's effectiveness. Plan for improvement is clear and realistic. ePar plan accurately reflects and supports analysis and planning. The department discussion thoroughly addresses outcomes in its evaluation and planning, integrating the outcomes analysis and planning as appropriate.
	Inadequate 1 pts.	Limited 2 pts.	Adequate 3 pts.	Strong 4 pts.	Strong 5 pts.
3.3 Limitations and Opportunities (5 pts.)	Limitations and opportunities missing from analysis. Program weaknesses and/or challenges are superficially addressed or are not addressed at all.	Minimal indication of future limitations. Program weaknesses and/or challenges are insufficiently addressed.	Indication of future limitations. Program weaknesses and/or challenges are addressed.	Description of program's future and anticipation of possible limitations and opportunities. Program weaknesses and/or challenges are directly addressed.	Analysis of program's future and anticipation of possible limitations and opportunities. Program weaknesses and/or challenges are fully addressed.
3.4 <u>Optional Category:</u> Additional data specific to the program.					Additional data offered will be factored into the category scores above.

Thoroughness: 5 points

	Inadequate – 0 pts	Limited – 1 pts	Adequate – 2 pts	Strong – 3 pts	Exceptional – 5 pts.

Suggested Data Points for Relevancy:

- Department’s specialized role in supporting institutional outcomes and/or district strategic goals (i.e. basic skills, CTE pathways, signature programs)
- Department’s role in meeting documented community needs (high school outreach, community events, workforce development, etc.)
- Other relevant data (Quantitative Service Data such as, for example, number of students served, number of applications processed, phone calls answered and turned away.)