



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Department Chairs,

It is program review time again! Enclosed you will find your program review document that needs to be completed and turned in to your Dean by October 7, 2013. The purpose of program review is for faculty and staff members to evaluate their program's performance based on an analysis of data and to develop initiatives for improvement. Through the creation of initiatives, some requiring resources and some not, programs will establish goals and long-term program plans.

You will see that the document has been simplified in order to provide a more cohesive but functional document that we hope will be easier for your department to complete. You will also find included appendices with helpful information such as the Process Map, What to Leave In and What to Leave Out Guidelines, and the Academic Senate Rubric for Instructional Program Vitality.

Please note that instruction prompts have been provided in italics throughout sections of the document to provide guidance for interpreting data and providing analysis statements. You may remove these instructions as you complete each section. Please use 11 point, Calibri font for consistency.

Areas such as your program/department description and the staffing chart have been pre-populated using information from your last program review document. Please revise as necessary. Please note that you are not required to create initiatives for each area of data. However, programs are required, at a minimum, to create initiatives that do not require resources as every program should have some area (i.e. student success, retention) in which it is trying to improve. And programs, which offer degrees and/or certificates, need to set goals for increasing program completion rates (per direction from the Accrediting Commission).

The last page of the document includes a process verification section where you will note the participants and document the meeting dates. Your Division Dean will also need to electronically verify review prior to submitting the document, so be sure to plan accordingly.

Appendices:

- A-Program Review Process Map-Instructional Programs
- B-What to Leave In and What to Leave Out
- C-Academic Senate Rubric for Instructional Program Vitality-Instructional Academic Programs
- D-Academic Senate Rubric for Instructional Program Vitality-Instructional CTE Programs
- E-Appeal Form

Attachments:

- Data packets for your program/department

WHO TO CALL FOR ASSISTANCE

Budget and Inventory Data:

David Keebler, VP-Administrative Services, ext. 6354

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

Michael Callahan, Institutional Researcher, ext. 6344

Instructional Programs:

Kathy Scott, Dean-Institutional Effectiveness, ext. 6468

Debbie Newcomb, Faculty Facilitator, ext. 6368

Sandy Hajas, LRC Supervisor, ext. 6179

Services:

Susan Bricker, Registrar, ext. 6044



Due October 7, 2013



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Sandy Hajas, LRC Supervisor, ext. 6179

Kathy Scott, Dean-Institutional Effectiveness, ext. 6468



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Section I – Accomplishments and Status of 2012 Program Review Report

A. Last Year's Initiatives

Instructions:

- *Provide a brief status of initiatives created last year that did not require funding. Include an explanation of what changes occurred (i.e. in student learning) as a result of those initiatives.*

The initiatives from last year were:

- 1. Making sure students purchase textbooks at the commencement of the semester, and more use of Early Alert by Instructor*
- 2. Increase use of student cohort study groups*
- 3. Increase use of quizzes to monitor student progress.*

The student success for 2012-2013 was 1/3. The student success for 2013-2014 was 3/3. We believe that this vast improvement was due to the changes made in the initiatives in the last Program Review cycle.

- *Provide a brief status of initiatives created last year that required funding. For those that were funded, what changes occurred (i.e. in student learning) as a result of the initiatives/funding.*

None

B. Updates/accomplishments pertaining to any of the Student Success or Operating Goals from last year's report.

Instructions: Provide any updates/accomplishments pertaining to Student Success or Operating Goals you created last year (see your last year's program review). The goals will not be continued in this same manner, but we want to provide faculty and staff the opportunity to provide any updates/accomplishments that may have taken place since last year.

The student success for 2012-2013 was 1/3. The student success for 2013-2014 was 3/3. We believe that this vast improvement was due to the changes made in the initiatives in the last Program Review cycle. The Astronomy Department is now operating in a vibrant range in contrast to a Needs Improvement Range from the previous year

Section II - Description

A. Description of Program/Department

Astronomers use the principles of physics and mathematics to answer questions about the fundamental nature of the universe and about celestial bodies such as the sun, moon, planets, and stars. They may apply their knowledge to problems in navigation and space flight.

Degrees/Certificates

Program's courses are designed to articulate to UC and CSU for transfer students. No degrees or certificates are awarded.



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

B. Program/Department Significant Events (Strengths and Successes), and Accomplishments

Instructions:

- What has changed over the past year (i.e. faculty, degrees/certificates, curriculum, etc.)?
- What is impacting the program now?

The most significant event from last year was that for the first time in 30 years the astronomy classes were taught exclusively by PTF. Although this may seem cost effective, it makes the astronomy classes vulnerable to abrupt changes in PTF. This will continue to be the case unless a FTF in physics/astronomy is added to the Department.

C. 2013-2014 Estimated Costs/Gainful Employment – for Certificates of Achievement ONLY

N/A

D. Criteria Used for Admission

Open admission with no pre-requisites

E. College Vision

Ventura College will be a model community college known for enhancing the lives and economic futures of its students and the community.

F. College Mission

At Ventura College, we transform students' lives, develop human potential, create an informed citizenry, and serve as the educational and cultural heart of our community. Placing students at the center of the educational experience, we serve a highly diverse student body by providing quality instruction and student support, focusing on associate degree and certificate completion, transfer, workforce preparation, and basic skills. We are committed to the sustainable continuous improvement of our college and its services.

G. College Core Commitments

Ventura College is dedicated to following a set of enduring Core Commitments that shall guide it through changing times and give rise to its Vision, Mission and Goals.

- Student Success
- Respect
- Integrity
- Quality
- Collegiality
- Access
- Innovation
- Diversity
- Service
- Collaboration
- Sustainability
- Continuous Improvement

H. Organizational Structure

President: Greg Gillespie

Executive Vice President:

Dean: Dan Kumpf

Department Chair: Steve Quon

Faculty/Staff:



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Name	Steve Quon
Classification	Professor
Year Hired	1991
Years of Work-Related Experience	22
Degrees/Credentials	B.S., M.A., PhD (Physics)

Name	Wood, Jeffrey
Classification	Professor
Year Hired	2013
Years of Work-Related Experience	5
Degrees/Credentials	B.S., Ph.D.

Name	Colin Terry
Classification	Professor (Part-Time)
Year Hired	1987
Years of Work-Related Experience	26
Degrees/Credentials	M.S., PhD (Physics)

Name	Jeffrey Molony
Classification	Instructor (Part-Time)
Year Hired	2012
Years of Work-Related Experience	10
Degrees/Credentials	M.S. (Physics), PhD (Mathematics)

Name	Orlando Warren
Classification	Instructor (Part-Time)
Year Hired	2011
Years of Work-Related Experience	2
Degrees/Credentials	B.S., M.S. (Physics)

Name	Stephan Lovstedt
Classification	Instructor (Part-Time)
Year Hired	2012
Years of Work-Related Experience	1
Degrees/Credentials	B.S., M.S. (Physics)

Section IIIa – Data and Analysis



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

A. SLO Data

Instructions:

- Provide highlights of what you learned last year in your assessments and discussions.
Astronomy lecture courses are taught live (3 sections) and online (1 section). In addition there are 2 sections of Astronomy lab. These classes are strongly populated due, in a large part, to the fact that astronomy fulfills GE science, and also the popularity of the subject of astronomy among students.
Last academic year the live lecture courses were taught by a new PT staff, Dr. Jeff Molony. Dr. Molony reported that a significant number of the students had not purchased the required textbook even 5 weeks into the semester. This, of course, negatively impacted student performance on exams. On the other hand, both astronomy lab courses achieved targeted SLO goals.
- Provide highlights of some of the changes made as a result of the assessments and discussions.
The initiative that came out of the live lecture finding was for the Instructor to purposefully review the class syllabus early in the semester with the students emphasizing they were required to purchase the textbook immediately in order to take the course. There was a second initiative to encourage cohort study groups to strengthen student learning. It was also proposed as an initiative for the labs to offer extra credit to students to motivate them into thinking more in depth about the subject topics.
- How did the changes affect student learning – or how do you anticipate that they will?
The goal is to improve student success in astronomy lecture course by having them equip themselves with essential learning tools such as textbooks at the outset of the semester. This will be SLO assessed in the current 2013-2014 academic year.
- Based on what you learned, what initiatives requiring resources could you develop (or have you developed) to improve student learning? Explain briefly. Initiatives need to be entered in more detail in Section V.
There are no initiatives requiring resources for Astronomy.
- What are the most significant initiatives not requiring resources you could (or have developed) to improve student learning? Explain briefly. Initiative(s) need to be entered in more detail in Section V.
Students need to start well from the very beginning of the semester, and purchasing required materials right away is at the top of the list. For those students that depend on financial aid to purchase textbooks, there should be increased effort to expedite the financial aid to students before the semester begins. This would require the Instructor to inform students of this requirement prior to the start of the semester.

Also, Astronomy labs could benefit from a campus roof access for classroom evening viewing of the skies.
- Comment on the status of your SLO rotational plan, mapping, and other TracDat work.

The 5-year rotation plan for Astronomy is show below. Course SLO's will be taken during the Fall semesters only through the Fall2014 – Spring 2015 academic year followed by 2 years of



Astronomy Program Review 2013-2014

catchup. Rubrics will be modified as needed through this rotation plan.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
		Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017				
1	ISLO	None		ISLO # 2 REASONING		ISLO #3 Critical Thinking and Problem Solving		None		None					
2	Program (PSLO)	None		None		None		None		None					
3	Course (CSLO)	CSLO #1		CSLO #2		CSLO #3		Catch-up		Catch-up					
4		AST V01 - CSLO #1		AST V01 - CSLO #2 & ISLO #2		AST V01 - CSLO #3 & ISLO #3									
5		AST V01L - CSLO #1		AST V01L - CSLO #2 & ISLO #2		AST V01L - CSLO #3 & ISLO #3									
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															

B. Performance Data

1. Retention – Program and Course

Instructions:

Retention refers to the number/percentage of students completing the class.

- *How does your program's retention rate compare to the college overall? Is comparing it to the college average appropriate or not? Please explain.*

*As seen in the data below, the retention for astronomy has improved from 82% to a FY13 score of 90%. **This score significantly exceeds the College retention score of 86%.** We believe that comparing astronomy with College scores is appropriate because astronomy is offered as a GE science course and therefore is on par with GE College offerings .*



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Astronomy Data (final).pdf - Adobe Reader

File Edit View Window Help

10 (1 of 9) 132%

Tools Sign Comment

Retention and Success by Subject Ventura College

AST Comparative Summary

Fiscal Year	A	B	C	P	CR	D	F	NP	NC	W	Graded	I	Retention	Success
FY10	180	124	154	0	67	142	0	128	795	0	667	84%	458	58%
Distribution %	23%	16%	19%	0%	8%	18%	0%	16%						
FY11	156	89	180	0	90	132	0	140	787	0	647	82%	425	54%
Distribution %	20%	11%	23%	0%	11%	17%	0%	18%						
FY12	144	105	153	2	97	180	2	116	799	1	683	85%	404	51%
Distribution %	18%	13%	19%	0%	12%	23%	0%	15%						
AST Prior Three Year Average	160	106	162	1	85	151	1	128	794	0	666	84%	429	54%
	20%	13%	20%	0%	11%	19%	0%	16%						
FY13	107	214	115	2	26	54	0	55	573	0	518	90%	438	76%
Distribution %	19%	37%	20%	0%	5%	9%	0%	10%						
College Prior Three Year Average	33%	20%	14%	3%	5%	10%	1%	14%				86%		70%
College FY13	32%	22%	15%	3%	5%	9%	1%	14%				86%		71%

5:36 PM
9/25/2013

- In looking at your program's retention rate over the past three years, is there a trend? If so, explain. *The data table above shows a significant increase from a 3 year average of 84% to a FY13 score of 90% which substantially exceeds the FY13 College retention of 86%. We believe that this is due to the rapid enrollment filling to cap which because of the strong interest level of students for this course as a GE science. Also, astronomy is considered a trendy subject for students to study.*
- In looking at the disaggregated data by gender, ethnicity, and age are there gaps in retention for certain groups of students? Also, is the retention going down for certain groups? If there are gaps, what might be done to address them?



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Astronomy Data (final).pdf - Adobe Reader

File Edit View Window Help

12 (3 of 9) 100%

CourseID		A	B	C	P	CR	D	F	NP	NC	W	Graded	Inc	Retention	Success	
AST 191100		107	214	115	2	26	54	0	55	573	0	518	90%	438	76%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	19%	37%	20%	0%	5%	9%	0%	10%							
ASTV01 Elementary Astronomy		71	169	104	1	26	51	0	39	461	0	422	92%	345	75%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	15%	37%	23%	0%	6%	11%	0%	8%							
	Hispanic	22	85	51	0	16	25	0	22	221	0	199	90%	158	71%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	10%	38%	23%	0%	7%	11%	0%	10%							
	White	36	64	31	0	7	14	0	12	164	0	152	93%	131	80%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	22%	39%	19%	0%	4%	9%	0%	7%							
	Afr Amer	6	6	6	0	1	4	0	0	23	0	23	100%	18	78%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	26%	26%	26%	0%	4%	17%	0%	0%							
	Asian	0	4	5	0	0	2	0	2	13	0	11	85%	9	69%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	0%	31%	38%	0%	0%	15%	0%	15%							
	Filipino	1	3	7	1	1	4	0	1	18	0	17	94%	12	67%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	6%	17%	39%	6%	6%	22%	0%	6%							
	Amer Indian	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	6	100%	5	83%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	33%	33%	17%	0%	0%	17%	0%	0%							
	Other	4	5	3	0	1	1	0	2	16	0	14	88%	12	75%	
<i>Distribution %</i>	25%	31%	19%	0%	6%	6%	0%	13%								
ASTV01L Elementary Astronomy		36	45	11	1	0	3	0	16	112	0	96	86%	93	83%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	32%	40%	10%	1%	0%	3%	0%	14%							
	Hispanic	9	22	6	0	0	0	0	7	44	0	37	84%	37	84%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	20%	50%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16%							
	White	22	17	3	1	0	1	0	7	51	0	44	86%	43	84%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	43%	33%	6%	2%	0%	2%	0%	14%							
	Afr Amer	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	100%	3	100%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%							
	Asian	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	4	100%	3	75%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	25%	50%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%							
	Filipino	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3	75%	3	75%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	25%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%							
	Amer Indian	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	100%	0	0%	
	<i>Distribution %</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%							
	Other	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	4	80%	4	80%	
<i>Distribution %</i>	20%	20%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%								



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Astronomy Data (final).pdf - Adobe Reader

File Edit View Window Help

15 (6 of 9) 100%

Tools Sign Comment

Show Tools pane

College FY13 Retention and Success by Course, Ethnicity											Program Review 2013 - 2014		
	A	B	C	PCR	D	F	NP	NC	W	Graded	Inc	Retention	Success
FY13 Distribution %	32%	22%	15%	3%	5%	9%	1%	14%	80,553			86%	71%
Hispanic Distribution %	26%	22%	17%	3%	6%	10%	1%	14%	41,063			86%	68%
White Distribution %	40%	21%	12%	2%	3%	7%	0%	13%	25,846			87%	75%
Afr Amer Distribution %	24%	17%	16%	2%	6%	16%	1%	18%	3,221			82%	59%
Asian Distribution %	41%	22%	12%	4%	4%	5%	0%	11%	2,922			89%	79%
Filipino Distribution %	35%	23%	15%	2%	4%	7%	0%	12%	2,549			88%	76%
Amer Indian Distribution %	35%	22%	13%	3%	4%	8%	0%	14%	1,134			86%	73%
Other Distribution %	35%	21%	13%	3%	4%	9%	0%	14%	3,818			86%	72%

11:17 PM 9/28/2013

By far the largest ethnicity groups are Hispanic (46%) and Whites (38%). It is seen from the data table above that both groups performed admirably with retention scores of 90% and 93% respectively for astronomy lecture. These scores significantly exceed the College retention scores of 86% and 87%, respectively. The astronomy lab scores were a respectable 84% and 86% for Hispanics and Whites, respectively, which is on par with College retention scores.

- Do your retention rates meet your expectations? Are there areas that need improvement?

Astronomy retention rates exceed expectations by a significant margin relative to overall College retention rates. Continued implementation of best practices in instruction and information dissemination should continue uphold the excellent retention scores if not improve them.

- What initiative(s) could you develop based on what you have learned? Explain briefly. Initiatives need to be entered in more detail in Section V.

We recommend that Astronomy continue to be presented to students as an exciting GE science course that intellectually stimulates their thinking as well as fulfill GE requirements. For example, Science Building evening viewing from a roof access, planetarium, or field trips would enhance overall student interest.

2. Success – Program and Course



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Instructions:

Success refers to the number/percentage of students who pass the class with a grade of C or better or a "pass."

- How does your program's success rate compare to the college overall? Is comparing it to the college average appropriate or not? Please explain.

The two data table below shows that astronomy achieved a **FY13 success score of 76%** which is significantly better than the College FY13 success score of 71%. We believe that comparing astronomy with College scores is appropriate because astronomy is offered as a GE science course and therefore is on par with GE College offerings.

Retention and Success by Subject														Ventura College	
AST Comparative Summary															
Fiscal Year	A	B	C	P	CR	D	F	NP	NC	W	Graded	I	Retention	Success	
FY10	180	124	154	0	67	142	0	128	795	0	667	84%	458	58%	
Distribution %	23%	16%	19%	0%	8%	18%	0%	16%							
FY11	156	89	180	0	90	132	0	140	787	0	647	82%	425	54%	
Distribution %	20%	11%	23%	0%	11%	17%	0%	18%							
FY12	144	105	153	2	97	180	2	116	799	1	683	85%	404	51%	
Distribution %	18%	13%	19%	0%	12%	23%	0%	15%							
AST Prior Three Year Average	160	106	162	1	85	151	1	128	794	0	666	84%	429	54%	
	20%	13%	20%	0%	11%	19%	0%	16%							
FY13	107	214	115	2	26	54	0	55	573	0	518	90%	438	76%	
Distribution %	19%	37%	20%	0%	5%	9%	0%	10%							
College Prior Three Year Average	33%	20%	14%	3%	5%	10%	1%	14%				86%		70%	
College FY13	32%	22%	15%	3%	5%	9%	1%	14%				86%		71%	

- In looking at your program's success rate over the past three years, is there a trend?
In looking at the data table above we see a huge improvement in success scores from a previous 3 year average of 54% to a FY13 score of 76%. At this point in time it is uncertain if this is due to a change in Instructor from the previous years to the new PT astronomy instructor, Dr. Jeff Molony.
- In looking at the disaggregated data by gender, ethnicity, and age are there gaps in success for certain groups of students? Also, is the success rate going down for certain groups? If there are gaps, what might be done to address them?



Astronomy Program Review 2013-2014

CourseID		A	B	C	P	CR	D	F	NP	NC	W	Graded	Inc	Retention	Success
AST 191100		107	214	115	2	26	54	0	55	573	0	518	90%	438	76%
	Distribution %	19%	37%	20%	0%	5%	9%	0%	10%						
ASTV01 Elementary Astronomy		71	169	104	1	26	51	0	39	461	0	422	92%	345	75%
	Distribution %	15%	37%	23%	0%	6%	11%	0%	8%						
	Hispanic	22	85	51	0	16	25	0	22	221	0	199	90%	158	71%
	Distribution %	10%	38%	23%	0%	7%	11%	0%	10%						
	White	36	64	31	0	7	14	0	12	164	0	152	93%	131	80%
	Distribution %	22%	39%	19%	0%	4%	9%	0%	7%						
	Afr Amer	6	6	6	0	1	4	0	0	23	0	23	100%	18	78%
	Distribution %	26%	26%	26%	0%	4%	17%	0%	0%						
	Asian	0	4	5	0	0	2	0	2	13	0	11	85%	9	69%
	Distribution %	0%	31%	38%	0%	0%	15%	0%	15%						
	Filipino	1	3	7	1	1	4	0	1	18	0	17	94%	12	67%
	Distribution %	6%	17%	39%	6%	6%	22%	0%	6%						
	Amer Indian	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	6	100%	5	83%
	Distribution %	33%	33%	17%	0%	0%	17%	0%	0%						
Other	4	5	3	0	1	1	0	2	16	0	14	88%	12	75%	
Distribution %	25%	31%	19%	0%	6%	6%	0%	13%							
ASTV01L Elementary Astronomy		36	45	11	1	0	3	0	16	112	0	96	86%	93	83%
	Distribution %	32%	40%	10%	1%	0%	3%	0%	14%						
	Hispanic	9	22	6	0	0	0	0	7	44	0	37	84%	37	84%
	Distribution %	20%	50%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16%						
	White	22	17	3	1	0	1	0	7	51	0	44	86%	43	84%
	Distribution %	43%	33%	6%	2%	0%	2%	0%	14%						
	Afr Amer	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	100%	3	100%
	Distribution %	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%						
	Asian	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	4	100%	3	75%
	Distribution %	25%	50%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%						
	Filipino	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3	75%	3	75%
Distribution %	25%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%							
Amer Indian	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	100%	0	0%	
Distribution %	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%							
Other	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	4	80%	4	80%	
Distribution %	20%	20%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%							

The success rates for Hispanics and Whites were 71% and 80% for astronomy lecture, and 84% for astronomy lab. All of these scores equal or exceed the College FY13 success score of 71%. The reason for the gap between Hispanics and Whites in astronomy lecture may be due to the differences in exposure to science between these two ethnic groups. If so, some measures might be done to supplement the learning for Hispanics such as cohort study groups or field trips.

- Do your success rates at the program and college level meet your expectations? Are there areas that need improvement?
Astronomy success rates met or exceeded expectations by a significant margin relative to overall College success rates. Continued implementation of best practices in instruction and information dissemination should continue uphold the excellent success scores if not improve them.



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

- What initiative(s) could you develop based on what you have learned? Explain briefly. Initiatives need to be entered in more detail in Section V.

We recommend that Astronomy continue to be presented to students as an exciting GE science course that intellectually stimulates their thinking as well as fulfill GE requirements. For example, campus roof top access with a baffled viewing area to minimize stray light for naked eye sky observation, and field trips would enhance overall student interest.

3. Program Completion – for “Programs” with Degrees/Certificates Only (NA)

Instructions:

Completion refers to the number of students in the program receiving degrees and/or certificates. The Executive Team uses these data in creating its annual Planning Parameters. Are the numbers of degrees AND certificates (look at separately) awarded over the last four years increasing, decreasing, or staying about the same?

- In looking at the disaggregated data for completion over the past four years, are there gaps in success for certain groups of students? Also, is the completion rate going down for certain groups? If there are gaps, what might be done to address them?
- Do the completion rates meet your expectations? Why or why not?
- What should be the goal for program completion? NOTE: ACCJC, our accrediting commission, has advised colleges that visiting teams will now be looking for program and institution-set standards for completion.
- What initiative(s) could you develop based on what you have learned? Explain briefly. Initiatives need to be entered in more detail in Section V and need to include a goal/performance indicator (i.e. Program completion will increase by 10% over the next 3 years).
- Programs that have awarded fewer than 12 certificates or degrees over the past four years may be placed on possible discontinuance. If this is the situation for your program, what changes can be made to increase the number? (i.e., Is it possible to combine programs in your area? Does the curriculum need updating?, etc.). In general, what can be done to increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded?

C. Operating Data

1. Demographics - Program and Course

Instructions:

Demographics refer to the students enrolled in the program/course.

- What does the data indicate/say about the students enrolled in the program/course? (Provide a **very brief summary**).
In FY2010 astronomy had 36% and 45% Hispanic and Whites, respectively. In FY2013 these numbers essentially switched to 46% and 38% Hispanic and Whites, respectively. This clearly shows the increasing presence of Hispanics in astronomy. Astronomy gender enrollment in FY2013 puts females evenly split at 49% female and 50% male. This is in contrast to the College gender enrollment in FY2013 of 54% females and 46% males.
- How do your students compare to the college demographics? Is there a significant difference? What trends/changes do you see over the past three years?
The trend of increasing Hispanic enrollment over Whites is mirrored in the college demographics as well (Hispanic 51% to White 32%). This trend has occurred over the past 3 years.
- Is there a need to diversify the program in terms of age, gender or ethnicity?
If the College continues to transform to a more Hispanic student population, we would expect astronomy to do so likewise. This may impact the teaching modality in



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

astronomy. However, before new modalities can be developed there will have to be discussion about the background of Hispanics, areas that they are weaker in, and how the modality has to target the curriculum accreditation targets for successful transfer.

What initiative(s) could you develop based on what you have learned from the data or other information? Explain briefly. Initiatives to be entered in more detail in Section V.

There may be a need to study for example, how Oxnard College which is highly Hispanic populated has dealt with the challenge of teaching scientific curriculum to Hispanic students.

2. **Budget**

Instructions:

- Review of summarized budget information is required. The yellow and blue sections of your budget data provide summaries. Detail data is provided if you want to see additional information; however, reviewing the backup data is not required. Check the boxes below if you have no further comments to make.*
- Have there been any significant changes in the budget over the past three years? Have these changes had a positive or negative effect on student learning? If additional funds are needed, explain why. Initiatives will be required to be noted in more detail in Section V.*

The FTF/FTEF in astronomy went from about 37% in the previous 3 years to 0% in FY13. This was due to the retirement of one of the FTF astronomy/physics positions. The astronomy courses are currently being taught by PTF only.

- (Requests for contract/full time faculty or classified staff should be addressed in the resource section on the next page.)*
- Please check the appropriate box below then provide your summary beginning on the next line.*

Program members have reviewed the budget data.

No comments or requests to make about the budget (*note: a request for 1 additional FTF position in physics & astronomy is being made in the 2013-2014 Physics Program Review*)

3. **Productivity – Program and Course**

Instructions:

Productivity is based on the number of student contact hours that a faculty member teaches per week. The typical productivity factor is 525 (35 students/class x 5 classes x 3 hours per week = 525). Our overall college productivity goal for 2013-2014 is 530. Your analysis here should pertain to the number of students enrolled in your courses as that number relates to the program's productivity goal.

*Are courses filling to the college productivity goal for your program? **Yes** If that goal is inaccurate, what should the program and/or department productivity level be? How many students should be in each course? Are any of the productivity goals at the course level inaccurate? If so, what should they be?*

See the productivity chart included in your data packet to help you determine the appropriate productivity level for your program/courses.

- Do the enrollment/productivity ratios meet your expectations for the program as a whole? Do the enrollment/productivity ratios meet your expectations for individual courses? Why or why not?*
- How can you improve the performance overall or in some courses if they do not meet your expectations? (For example, at the course level, do some courses need to be offered or scheduled differently to try to increase enrollment?)*



Astronomy Program Review 2013-2014

What initiative(s) could you like to develop based on what you have learned? Explain briefly. Initiatives will be required to be noted in more detail in Section V.

Program Review Productivity and WSCH Ratios Report

AST

AST Productivity Measures	FY10	FY11	FY12	3 Yr Avg	FY13	Change
Sections,	13	13	13	13	12	-8%
Census,	819	797	828	815	828	-30%
FTEs,	81	79	82	81	57	-29%
FT Faculty,	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.00	0%
PT Faculty,	0.60	0.60	0.51	0.57	1.10	93%
XL Faculty,	0.45	0.40	0.50	0.45	0.10	-78%
Total Faculty,	1.65	1.60	1.61	1.62	1.20	-26%

AST College WSCH Ratio: WSCH / (FT FTE+PT FTE+XL FTE)

Course	Title	FY10	FY11	FY12	3 Yr Avg	FY13	% Change	Dist Goal	% Goal
ASTV01	Elementary Astronomy,	774	781	757	771	767	-2%	800	96%
ASTV01L	Elementary Astronomy Lab,	585	580	819	645	560	27%	800	70%
Annual WSCH Ratio for AST		740	743	765	750	715			

There are some questions in the productivity goals set by District at the course level. District set the goals at a level 800 for both astronomy lab and lecture. This does not take into account fact that not all students taking lecture take lab. Also lecture enrollment caps at 50 while labs cap at 24 due to lab computer limitations. Therefore, lab productivity goals need to be reviewed given their limitation on space and equipment.

From the preceding Table we see that the overall astronomy productivity level for FY13 was 767 for lecture and 560 for lab giving a combined weighted score of 715. This is to be compared with the District goal of 800 yielding an overall productivity of 89.4%. Although this is a reasonable productivity score, we believe that the score would be higher if the District goal were readjusted for astronomy labs. This would be done by working with the EVP Student Learning Office (Michael Callahan).

Resources

1. Faculty

Instructions:

- How does your program/department's Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) compare to the college? (trends and ratios)



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

From FY10 to FY12 the FTEF stayed level at 1.62. The in FY13 it dropped to 1.2 due to the retirement of a FTF.

- *Have there been any significant changes in (FTEF) for part and/or full time faculty over the last three years? If so, what are the effects of these changes?*

From FY10 to FY12 the PT stayed level at about 0.59. The in FY13 it increased to 1.1 due to PTF instructional backfilling created by the retirement of a FTF.

- *Does your area have difficulty finding hourly instructors?_ **Yes***
- *Is the program lacking faculty with a particular specialty? **No***
- *Are there any specific accreditation requirements for FT faculty? **No***
- *What contract faculty member(s) (if any) will you be requesting based on what you have learned? Explain briefly. Requests need to be entered in more detail in Section V.*

*The FT Physics Department Head plans to take retirement at the end of FY14. This will leave the Physics Department with 1 FT physics faculty who will have completed 1 full year at the College and who will be assuming Departmental duties. This will pose a challenging and somewhat unstable environment because there will be a high reliance on part-time faculty for both physics and astronomy. Based on this transition, **the Physics/Astronomy Department requests the addition of 1 new F/T faculty position in Astronomy/Physics with an emphasis first on Astronomy and second on physics. This request will be made through the Physics Program Review.***

2. Classified Staff

Instructions:

- *Have there been changes in the number of classified staff in the program/department over the last three years?*
- *What has been the effect of decreases/increases in classified staff on the program or department?*
- *What classified positions (if any) will you be requesting based on the data/numbers/changes in program/department? Explain briefly. Requests need to be entered in more detail in Section V.*

3. Inventory

Instructions:

In the last year, a complete inventory has been taken of all college equipment. Detailed inventory lists, by room, are now available for your review. If you are requesting equipment, you need to review the inventory list and explain whether or not it is accurate. If you have any questions pertaining to inventory lists, please contact Dave Keebler.

- *What equipment requests are you making (if any) to ensure that the program/department has functional, current, and otherwise adequate inventory to maintain a quality learning environment? Is the current equipment aging and need replacement or is new equipment needed? Is ongoing maintenance required for some equipment? If so explain. Requests need to be entered in more detail in Section V.*

No requests for equipment are being made.

4. Facilities or other Resource Requests

Instructions:

- *Is your program/department making any other requests for resources, including for facilities?*
- *Initiatives will be entered in more detail in Section V.*
- *Note: Any safety issues need to be reported immediately and not wait for program review. Safety issues may be reported here in addition to being reported to the dean.*

No requests for facilities are being made.

5. Combined Initiatives

Instructions:

Does your program have any combined initiatives that address more than one data element? If so, explain and enter the initiative with more detail in Section V.



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

The Physics/Astronomy Department requests the addition of 1 new F/T faculty position in Astronomy/Physics with an emphasis first on Astronomy and second on physics. This request will be made through the Physics Program Review with no dollar impact on the Astronomy Program Review

D. Other Program/Department Data *NA*

Instructions:

- Does the program/department have any other data from any other source (i.e., program generated, state generated, program accreditation, advisory committee, etc.) that should be reviewed/discussed in this program review?
- What does the data indicate about the students, student performance, or any other aspect of the program?
- What about the data encourages or gives you cause for concern?
- Does the data meet your expectations? Why or why not?
- What initiative(s) could you develop based on what you have learned from the data. Explain briefly. Initiative to be entered in more detail in Section V.
- Provide the data in an attachment or provide an online link.

Section IIIb – Other Program Goals and Initiatives

A. Other Program Goals *None*

Instructions: Aside from the goals determined from looking at specific institutional and program data, are there any other program goals for which you may or may not request funding? If so, please explain and enter it as an initiative with more detail in Section V. Such goals may include:

- Innovation
- Legislation
- Regulations
- Industry Standards
- New Technology
- Professional Development
- Advisory Committee Recommendations

Section IV – Program Vitality (Academic Senate Approved Self-Evaluation)

Instructions:

Complete the Rubric for Instructional Program Vitality (Appendix C or D) created by the Academic Senate. It is a tool for further self-evaluation of your program. This rubric will be used in conjunction with (not in place of) resource requests and provide further input for any programs being considered for program discontinuance. This form must be submitted with your program review document. Answer the following question after completing the rubric:

- What is your score? **24/26**
- What does that score mean to you? **The Astronomy program is currently vibrant**

Section V - Initiatives

Instructions:

Please list your initiatives below, including any you are carrying forward from prior years. Add as many as needed. Deans/division offices will put the information onto the initiatives charts. Every program/department needs initiatives that do not require resources.

Ranking:

The ranking provided below indicated the program/department's ranking. The initiatives will be ranked again later at the division level before going to the appropriate committees (i.e. technology) for additional ranking.

R = Required – mandated or unavoidable needs (litigation, contracts, unsafe to operate conditions, etc.)

H = High – Approximately 1/3 of the total program/department/division's initiatives by resource category

M = Medium – Approximately 1/3 of the total program/department/division's initiative by resource category



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

L = Low – Approximately 1/3 of the total program/department/division's initiatives by resource category

Example:

Initiative: Provide a brief title

Initiative ID: (i.e. CD1301 = Child Development, 2013, first initiative. Maintain initiative numbers from prior program review if any are being carried forward into this new year.)

Link to data (Required): From which area of data is this request associated? Within the category, be specific. (i.e. Success data for a specific course, PSLO #1, . . . , etc.)

Expected Benefits: What benefits to student learning or completion, etc. do you anticipate?

Goal: What do you believe needs to occur? (i.e. raise student success in ____ course)

Performance Indicator: What do you see as a realistic goal? (i.e. a 5% increase in student success)

Timeline: When do you expect to achieve this success within in the next three years? (i.e. by May 2015). These timelines will create a multi-year plan for your program/department. (a drop down menu is provided.)

Funding Source Category: (a drop down menu is provided)

- No new resources
- Additional general funds for hourly instruction, supplies and services (includes maintenance contracts)
- College equipment funds (non computer)
- Technology funds
- Facilities funds
- Staffing resources
- Grant funds

Ranking: (i.e. H) (a drop down menu is provided) Note: Your program/department will need to rank its initiatives (1/3 High, 1/3 Medium, 1/3 Low). These initiatives will be further ranked by the division.

Begin listing your initiatives here, including any you are carrying forward from prior years. Please note that every program/department needs to include initiatives that do not require resources. You may copy and paste this section

A. Initiative: *AST 1301*

Initiative ID: *Astronomy Lab Roof Access for Star Observation Study (Phase I)*

Link to Data: *Section IIIB2*

Expected Benefits: *This would enable astronomy lab instructors to show to students in real time where major star clusters lie, make use of student smart devices such as cell phone apps for sky navigation, and possibly lead to more detailed observations using a Celestron telescope or equivalent.*

Goal: *The goal will be to conduct a study of the feasibility of constructing a star viewing area on the roof of the Science Building with light baffles for Astronomy lab students. The study would include possible locations, safe student access, roof resilience for classroom loading, and costing of light baffling.*

Performance Indicator: *Completion of a Phase I study for the aforementioned which would, depending on study outcomes, be used for a Phase II initiative for 2014-2015 Program Review.*



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Timeline: 2014-2015

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Ranking: M

B. Initiative:

Initiative ID:

Link to Data:

Expected Benefits:

Goal:

Performance Indicator:

Timeline: Click here for options

Funding Resource Category: Click here for options

Ranking: Click here for options

C. Initiative:

Initiative ID:

Link to Data:

Expected Benefits:

Goal:

Performance Indicator:

Timeline: Click here for options

Funding Resource Category: Click here for options

Ranking: Click here for options

D. Initiative:

Initiative ID:

Link to Data:

Expected Benefits:

Goal:

Performance Indicator:

Timeline: Click here for options

Funding Resource Category: Click here for options

Ranking: Click here for options

Section VI – Process Assessment

Instructions: Please answer the following questions:

A. How have the changes in the program review process this year worked for your area?

- 1. The summary of Program Data has speeded up the process significantly by eliminating the necessity of thumbing through unnecessary pages in previous Program Reviews.*
- 2. The questions posed have been more to the point. But, on the other hand, the questions have been more granular such as student retention/success based on ethnicity which leads to more detailed initiatives. Net result: good in the long, long run, however at the cost of generating more work for the departments.*



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

B. How would you improve the program review process based on this experience?

I would suggest trying to streamline the department response form by having more check boxes rather than open-ended narrative responses. Also, have data from previous years presented graphically over a rolling 3-year period. This would more clearly indicate trends, success of rightly chosen initiatives, or lack of success of marginally chosen initiatives.

C. Appeals

After the program review process is complete, your program has the right to appeal the ranking of initiatives (i.e. initiatives that should have been ranked high but were not, initiatives that were ranked high but should not have been), the division's decision to support/not support program discontinuance, or the process (either within the department/program or the division) itself.

If you choose to appeal, please complete the Appeals form (Appendix E) that explains and supports your position. Forms are located at the Program Review VC website.

The appeal will be handled at the next higher level of the program review process.

VII – Submission Verification

Instructions: Please complete the following section:

Program/Department:

Preparer:

Dates met (include email discussions): *9/4/13, 9/5/13 (all e-mails)*

List of Faculty who participated in the program Review Process:

Colin Terry, Dr. Jeff Molony, Dale Synnes, Stephan Lovestedt, Dr. Steve Quon

Preparer Verification: I verify that this program document was completed in accordance with the program review process. *Dr. Steve Quon, Chair, Physics & Astronomy*

Dean Verification: I verify that I have reviewed this program review document and find it complete. Dean may also provide comments (optional):



Program Review Process Map

I. Status report and accomplishments from prior year

II. Description

III(a). Data
1. Review
2. Analysis

A. SLO's	B. Success	C. Operating	D. Resources	E. Other
	▪ Retention	▪ Demographic	▪ Faculty	Data
	▪ Success	▪ Budget	▪ Classified Staff	
	▪ Completion	▪ Enrollment/Productivity	▪ Inventory	
			▪ Facilities or other Resource Requests	
			▪ Combined Initiatives	

III(b). Other program goals and initiatives

(Innovations, regulations, legislation, new technology, industry standards, professional development, or advisory committee recommendations, etc.)

IV. Program vitality-(Academic Senate rubric)

V. Summary of initiatives and requests
Minority reports if any

VI. Process assessment

VII. Verification of review



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Program Review Resource Initiatives Guidelines

WHAT TO LEAVE OUT

The purpose of this document is to clarify what kinds of resource requests should NOT be included in the Program Review Document as initiatives.

<p>The table below summarizes the types of resources that DO NOT need to be included in the Department Plans. The “Who to Contact” column lists who to contact when the resources or services are needed.</p>		
Excluded Items	Who to Contact	Explanation
Safety Issues, including but not limited to broken chairs or desks, etc. that can be resolved through the normal process.	Dean, M&O or Appropriate Office	All safety issues should be immediately reported to the Dean, M&O, or appropriate department.
EAC Accommodations that can be resolved through the normal process.	DSPS and Dean	Any accommodation should have the guidance of the DSPS office.
Routine M&O maintenance & repair (light fixtures not working, holes in walls, locks, cleaning, broken desks or chairs, etc.) that can be resolved through the normal process.	M&O or Division Office	Complete an email request to vcmaintenance@vccd.edu or notify your division office so they can handle for you.
Cyclical Maintenance (painting, flooring, carpet shampooed, windows, etc.) that can be resolved through the normal process.	M&O or Division Office	Complete an email request to vcmaintenance@vccd.edu or notify your division office so they can handle for you.
Classroom technology equipment repairs (projector light bulb out, video screen not working, computer not working, existing software updates) that can be resolved through the normal process.	Campus Technology Center or Division Office	Complete an email request to vchelpdesk@vccd.edu or notify your division office so they can handle for you.
Section Offerings/ Change of classrooms	Dean/Department Chair	Dean will take requests through the enrollment management process.
Substitutes	Dean	Dean will process in accordance with existing guidelines.
Conferences, Meetings, Individual Training	Professional Development Committee	Requests should first be addressed by the PDC and only go through program review if costs cannot be covered.



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Program Review Resource Initiatives Guidelines

WHAT TO LEAVE IN

The purpose of this document is to clarify what kinds of resource requests should be included in the Program Review Document as initiative.

<p>Faculty and Staff from each department will meet as a division to prioritize initiatives resulting from the Program Review process. The initiatives will then go to each respective governance groups such as Staffing Priorities, Technology Committee, Budget Resource Council, etc., for further prioritization. Administrative Council and the Executive Team will develop the final prioritized list and distribute for implementation.</p>		
Included Items	Committee Group	Explanation
Replacement of classroom furniture	Facilities Oversight Group	Only when it is an entire classroom/lab/office at a time or a safety or disability issue that has not been resolve through the normal process.
Upgrade and/or replacement of computer and other technological equipment	Technology Committee	These items will go on to a list for replacement or upgrade per the technology plan.
New Equipment/Furniture/ classroom items (i.e. microscope, etc.)	Budget Resource Council	These items must be approved included in a plan to improve student learning and/or services.
Buildings/Office Space (new renovation, modernization)	Division Dean	The division dean will work with Administrative Council and the Fog Committee to pursue the projects.
New Software	Technology Committee	These items must be approved included in a plan to improve student learning and/or services.
New Faculty Positions	Faculty Staffing Priorities	Requests for new positions will compiled on a list and sent to the FSP committee.
New Classified Positions/or increase in percentage of existing positions.	Classified Staffing Priorities	Requests for classified positions will compiled on a list and sent to the CSP committee.
New Programs/certificates	Curriculum Committee	These program/certificates must be approved by the curriculum committee.
Training and Professional Development above normal	Professional Development/ Budget Resource Council	These are items over and above what the PDC can provide.
Expansion/Conversion to Distance Learning	Dean of Distance Learning and Distance Learning Committee	Requests will be compiled and sent to the committee process for discussion.
Service Agreements	Budget Resource Council	Requests must include justification.
Instructional Materials and Office Supplies/ Advertising/Student Workers/Printing/Duplicating	Budget Resource Council/Dean	These items must include a compelling reason and be above what the normal budget will allow.



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Appendix-C

Rubric for Instructional Program Vitality-Academic (non-CTE)

The purpose of this rubric is to aid a program in thoughtful, meaningful and reflective self-evaluation. This rubric is also a defensible and objective way at looking at program viability and efficacy. This rubric should not be used as the mechanism to justify funding requests or for resource allocation. Lastly, a low score on this rubric does not preclude a program from requesting documented and necessary resource requests in other parts of this program review document.

Academic programs:

Point Value	Element	Score
Up to 6	Enrollment demand ¹	
	A "6" would be the ability to fill 100% of sections prior to the start of the semester.	6
	A "5" would be the ability to fill 95% or greater of class sections prior to the start of the semester for the past two terms.	
	A "4" would be the ability to fill 90% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms.	
	A "3" would be the ability to fill 85% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms.	
	A "2" would be the ability to fill 80% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms.	
	A "1" would be the ability to fill 75% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms.	
	A "0" would be the ability to fill less than 75% of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms.	
Sufficient capital / human resources to maintain the program, as defined by:		
Up to 3	Ability to find qualified instructors	
	A "3" would indicate that no classes have been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors.	3
	A "2" would indicate that rarely but occasionally have classes been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors.	
	A "1" would indicate that a significant number of sections in the past year have been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors.	
	A "0" would indicate that classes are not even scheduled due to the inability to find qualified instructors.	
Up to 3	Financial resources, equipment, space	
	A "3" would indicate that the program is fully supported with regards to dedicated class / lab space, supplies and equipment.	3
	A "2" would indicate that the program is partially supported with regards to dedicated class / lab space, supplies and equipment	
	A "1" would indicate that the program is minimally supported with regards to dedicate class / lab space, supplies and equipment.	
	A "0" would indicate that there is no college support with regards to class / lab space, supplies and equipment.	
Up to 4	Agreed-upon productivity rate ²	
	A "4" would indicate that a program has met or exceeded its productivity rate.	
	A "3" would indicate that a program is at 90% or greater of its productivity rate.	3

¹ Enrollment demand is determined by the ability to fill classes.

² Productivity rate is defined as **WSCH/FTEF** as determined by the program faculty at the college.



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

A "2" would indicate that a program is at 80% or greater of its productivity rate.	
A "1" would indicate that a program is at 70% or greater of its productivity rate.	
A "0" would indicate that a program is at less than 70% of its productivity rate.	

Up to 4	Course completion rate³	
	A "4" would indicate that the program's course completion rate is greater than 5 percentage points or greater than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "3" would indicate the program's course completion rate is equal to or greater than the most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	3
	A "2" would indicate that a program's course completion rate is up to 2 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "1" would indicate that a program's course completion rate is up to 5 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "0" would indicate that a program's course completion rate is greater than 5 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	

Up to 3	Success rate⁴	
	A "3" would indicate that the sum of the program's course success rates for the past academic year is greater than the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	3
	A "2" would indicate that the sum of the program's success rates for the past academic year is within 4 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "1" would indicate that the sum of the program's success rates for the past academic year is within 8 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "0" would indicate that the sum of the program's success rates for the past academic year is lesser than 8 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	

Up to 3	Ongoing and active participation in SLO assessment process	
	A "3" would indicate that all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the programs SLO mapping document found in TracDat have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year.	3
	A "2" would indicate that 95% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program's SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year.	
	A "1" would indicate that 90% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program's SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year.	
	A "0" would indicate than less than 90% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program's SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year.	

Note rationale on next page.

³ As defined by the RP Group, the course completion rate is the "percentage of students who do not withdraw from class and who receive a valid grade."

⁴ As defined by the RP Group, the success rate is "the percentage of students who receive a passing/satisfactory grade" notation of A, B, C, P, IB, or IC.



Astronomy Program Review 2013-2014

In no more than two to three sentences, supply a narrative explanation, rationale or justification for the score you provided, especially for programs with a score of less than 22:

Based on Retention, Success, and Productivity scores, the overall score of Astronomy was 24/26. We believe that the score would have even been higher had the Astronomy lab District retention goal had been more realistically set.

Score interpretation, academic programs:

22-26	Program is current and vibrant with no further action recommended
18-21	Recommendation to attempt to strengthen program
Below 18	Recommendation to consider discontinuation of the program



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Rubric for Instructional Program Vitality-CTE

The purpose of this rubric is to aid a program in thoughtful, meaningful and reflective self-evaluation. This rubric is also a defensible and objective way at looking at program viability and efficacy. This rubric should not be used as the mechanism to justify funding requests or for resource allocation. Lastly, a low score on this rubric does not preclude a program from requesting documented and necessary resource requests in other parts of this program review document.

CTE programs:

Point Value	Element	Score
Up to 6	Enrollment demand / Fill rate ⁵	
	A "6" would be the ability to fill 100% of sections prior to the start of the semester.	
	A "5" would be the ability to fill 95% or greater of class sections prior to the start of the semester for the past two terms.	
	A "4" would be the ability to fill 90% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms.	
	A "3" would be the ability to fill 85% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms.	
	A "2" would be the ability to fill 80% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms.	
	A "1" would be the ability to fill 75% or greater of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms.	
	A "0" would be the ability to fill less than 75% of class sections prior to the start of a semester for the past two terms.	
Up to 3	Sufficient capital / human resources to maintain the program, as defined by:	
	Ability to find qualified instructors	
	A "3" would indicate that no classes have been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors.	
	A "2" would indicate that rarely but occasionally have classes been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors.	
	A "1" would indicate that a significant number of sections in the past year have been canceled due to the inability to find qualified instructors.	
A "0" would indicate that classes are not even scheduled due to the inability to find qualified instructors.		
Up to 3	Financial resources, equipment, space	
	A "3" would indicate that the program is fully supported with regards to dedicated class / lab space, supplies and equipment.	
	A "2" would indicate that the program is partially supported with regards to dedicated class / lab space, supplies and equipment	
	A "1" would indicate that the program is minimally supported with regards to dedicate class / lab space, supplies and equipment.	
	A "0" would indicate that there is no college support with regards to class / lab space, supplies and equipment.	
Up to 4	Agreed-upon productivity rate ⁶	
	A "4" would indicate that a program has met or exceeded its productivity rate.	
	A "3" would indicate that a program is at 90% or greater of its productivity rate.	
	A "2" would indicate that a program is at 80% or greater of its productivity rate.	
	A "1" would indicate that a program is at 70% or greater of its productivity rate.	

⁵ Enrollment demand is determined by the ability to fill classes.

⁶ Productivity rate is defined as **WSCH/FTEF** as determined by the program faculty at the college.



Astronomy Program Review

2013-2014

Appendix-D

A "0" would indicate that a program is at less than 70% of its productivity rate.	
---	--

Up to 3	Program Completion	
	A "3" would indicate that the program has granted 25 or greater combined degrees, certificates and proficiency awards over the past four academic years.	
	A "2" would indicate that the program has granted 20-24 combined degrees, certificates and proficiency awards over the past four academic years.	
	A "1" would indicate that the program has granted 15-19 combined degrees, certificates and proficiency awards over the past four academic years.	
	A "0" would indicate that the program has granted fewer than 14 combined degrees, certificates and proficiency awards over the past four academic years.	

Up to 3	Employment Outlook for Students/Job Market Relevance	
	A "3" would indicate that the employment outlook for students in the program is greater than the projected county-wide employment average for the next three years <u>and/or</u> "leavers" of the program make more money in their jobs based on taking courses at the college (with or without having completed a degree) than had they not taken courses at the college.	
	A "2" would indicate the employment outlook for students in the program is about average with the projected county-wide employment average for the next three years.	
	A "1" would indicate that the employment outlook for students in the program is less than the projected county-wide employment average for the next three years.	
	A "0" would indicate that the employment outlook for students in the program is significantly less than the projected county-wide employment average for the next three years.	

Up to 3	Success rate⁷	
	A "3" would indicate that the sum of the program's course success rates for the past academic year is greater than the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "2" would indicate that the sum of the program's success rates for the past academic year is within 4 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "1" would indicate that the sum of the program's success rates for the past academic year is within 8 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "0" would indicate that the sum of the program's success rates for the past academic year is lesser than 8 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	

Up to 4	Course completion rate⁸	
	A "4" would indicate that the program's course completion rate is greater than 5 percentage points or greater than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "3" would indicate the program's course completion rate is equal to or greater than the most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "2" would indicate that a program's course completion rate is up to 2 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "1" would indicate that a program's course completion rate is up to 5 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "0" would indicate that a program's course completion rate is greater than 5 percentage points less than most recent college-wide course completion rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	

⁷ As defined by the RP Group, the success rate is "the percentage of students who receive a passing/satisfactory grade" notation of A, B, C, P, IB, or IC.

⁸ As defined by the RP Group, the course completion rate is the "percentage of students who do not withdraw from class and who receive a valid grade."



Astronomy Program Review 2013-2014

Up to 3	Ongoing and active participation in SLO assessment process	
	A "3" would indicate that all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the programs SLO mapping document found in TracDat have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year.	
	A "2" would indicate that 95% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program's SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year.	
	A "1" would indicate that 90% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program's SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year.	
	A "0" would indicate that less than 90% of all required courses, programs and institutional level SLOs as indicated by the program's SLO mapping document have been assessed on a regular and robust manner within the past academic year.	

In no more than two to three sentences, supply a narrative explanation, rationale or justification for the score you provided, especially for programs with a score of less than 22:

Score interpretation, academic programs:

- 27-32** Program is current and vibrant with no further action recommended
- 22-26** Recommendation to attempt to strengthen program
- Below 22** Recommendation to consider discontinuation of the program



Astronomy Program Review 2013-2014

APPEAL FORM

(Due to Office of Institutional Effectiveness by November 8)

The program review appeals process is available to any faculty, staff, or administrator who feels strongly that the prioritization of initiatives (i.e. initiatives that were not ranked high but should have been, initiatives that were ranked high but should not have been), the decision to support or not support program discontinuance, or the process followed by the division should be reviewed by the College Planning Council.

Appeal submitted by: (name and program) _____

Date: _____

- Category for appeal:
- Faculty
 - Personnel – Other
 - Equipment- Computer
 - Equipment – Other
 - Facilities
 - Operating Budget
 - Program Discontinuance
 - Other (Please specify)

Briefly explain the process that was used to prioritize the initiative(s) being appealed:

Briefly explain the rationale for asking that the prioritization of an initiative/resource request be changed:

Appeals will be heard by the College Planning Council on November 9, 2011 at its regularly scheduled meeting (3:00 – 5:00 p.m.). You will be notified of your time to present.