



Philosophy 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

Sandy Hajas, LRC Supervisor, ext. 6179

Kathy Scott, Dean-Institutional Effectiveness, ext. 6468



Due October 7, 2013



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

Section I – Accomplishments and Status of 2012 Program Review Report

A. Last Year's Initiatives

Instructions:

- The Philosophy Department had two initiatives last year that did not require funding: the creation of an AA degree and the creation of an honors course for Philosophy V01 (Introduction). Neither initiative was accomplished last year. The AA degree specifications required approval by the state of California and the honors program was dropped due to a lack of support for its creation. Even with both initiatives left incomplete our program overall was still able to achieve a retention rate of 86% and a success rate of 70%.
- The two initiatives that required funding last year were the request for more extra large classrooms and the request for an improvement in technical/clerical staff to expedite the program review process. In the first case, the request for more extra large classrooms, even though this request was only partly accomplished overall WSCH numbers for the department were (696) well above the college average (650). As for the second initiative, technical/clerical staff, this initiative was left unfulfilled due to State budgetary challenges.

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

- A major accomplishment of the Philosophy department is that it raised its student success rate in FY 13 from 67% (FY 12) to 70%. The Philosophy department in FY 13 is currently (86% retention and 70% success) in line with the college's retention and success (86% and 71% respectively) numbers.

Section II - Description

A. Description of Program/Department

Philosophy is the foundation of higher education since Plato's Academy, the first college in Western civilization. The goal of the philosophy program is to introduce students to a broad range of philosophical issues, topics, and traditions. The discipline also incorporates the study of the major world religions from both the West and the East. The methods of careful reasoning, philosophical analysis and constructive dialogue are applied to questions that concern all who seek to understand themselves, the reality of the world, the meaning and purpose of life and the way to make wise and moral choices. The subject is taught primarily as a contribution to students' overall liberal arts education. Students majoring in Philosophy generally transfer to four-year institutions to pursue a bachelor's degree and continue their education into Masters or Doctoral degrees. Graduates are prepared to enter further studies in various disciplines, including philosophy, business, law, journalism and religious studies. Graduates with a bachelor's degree in philosophy have employment opportunities in areas including administration and management, business, law, government, journalism, publishing and writing.

Degrees/Certificates

Program's courses are designed to articulate to UC and CSU for transfer students.



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

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

Instructions:

- In the past year, Philosophy V08 Zen Buddhism has improved from a one unit survey course to, Philosophy V09 Zen Buddhism, a three unit more rigorous UC/CSU transferable course. Also, it has, in one year, seen its WSCH score (645) almost reach that of the college average (650). The philosophy department overall has been very successful. Its courses in general have exceeded the college's WSCH numbers and the department has improved its retention and success numbers in FY 13.
- The issue that continues to impact the philosophy department is the lack of extra large classes and classrooms. The lowering of classroom caps, last year, caused the program to struggle to maintain its WSCH numbers. For the department to maintain or increase its current productivity (WSCH level) more extra large classrooms and class enrollments are required.

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

	Cost		Cost		Cost		Cost
Enrollment Fees	N/A	Enrollment Fees	N/A		N/A		N/A
Books/Supplies	N/A	Books/Supplies	N/A		N/A		N/A
Total	N/A	Total	N/A	Total	N/A	Total	N/A

D. Criteria Used for Admission

Philosophy does not currently have an Associate of Arts degree.

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.



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

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: Dr. Gwendolyn Lewis-Huddleston

Department Chair: Ronald Mules

Faculty/Staff:

Name	Bortolin, Kevin
Classification	Assistant Professor
Year Hired	2011
Years of Work-Related Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	B.A., M.A.

Name	Mules, Ronald
Classification	Assistant Professor
Year Hired	2011
Years of Work-Related Experience	
Degrees/Credentials	B.A., M.A.

Section IIIa – Data and Analysis

A. SLO Data

Instructions:

- Last year's SLO data for most philosophy courses meet or exceeded the targets the Philosophy department set, that is 70% or greater will perform at 70% or C level in assessments. The only course that did not meet this target was PHIL V01 introduction which performed at 68% in assessment. After discussions with department members both full-time and part-time it was decided that more research needed to be done to understand the reasons for current percentage level. One factor which the department anticipates will improve the overall success in PHIL V01 is the Title V Velocity grant. Since this grant focuses on Hispanic students and their success rate, which is currently 67%, it is felt that improvement in this area will be seen in SLO data and the overall success rate. The department has organized itself to more accurately collect SLO data by inputting all SLOs into TracDat, completing its five year rotational plan, and mapping its SLOs to the college's ISLOs.



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

B. Performance Data

1. Retention – Program and Course

Instructions:

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

- The Philosophy department as a whole meets exactly the college's overall retention score of 86%.
- The trend of the Philosophy department's retention rate is 86%. This is in direct alignment with the college's three year average retention rate of 86%. This suggests that the Philosophy department has overall worked hard to retain students and promote success.
- Examining the disaggregated data for Philosophy V01 by ethnicity shows lower retention rates for Hispanic students. Hispanic students in FY13 retained at 84% and succeeded at 65% in Philosophy V01. Compare this to White students who retained at 85% and succeeded at 71% and we see Hispanic student are 1% behind in retention and 6% behind in success. A trend that may play into these numbers is that from FY10 to FY 13 the Hispanic student population of the philosophy department increase from 35% FY 10 to 48% FY 13. While the White student population decreased from 43% FY 10 to 37% FY 13. Does this increase in the Hispanic student population mean that the department should be more aware of second language learner issues? Does it mean that the department should change its method of disseminating information? These questions and the gaps in retention and success are currently being studied and will be hopefully addressed by the Title V Velocidad grant. The grant's Supplemental Instruction Program may be a contributing factor to closing the gap in these retention and success rates. Additional study is required to determine the effect of the Velocidad grant on future retention and success for Hispanic students.
- The Philosophy program as a whole has, in the last three years, maintained a retention rate of 86%. This overall number does meet the expectations of the program by continuing to be in line with the college's average. The area most in need further study is the improvement of retention for Hispanic students and that will be addressed by the Velocidad grant.
- The department is currently working to create an associate of arts transfer degree for philosophy. This initiative the department believes will improve retention and success rates by enhancing student focus.

2. Success – Program and Course

Instructions:

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

- The Philosophy department success rate overall for 2013 was 70% which is very close to the college's rate of 71%. The Philosophy department serves a large and diverse group of students which makes the comparison of the department's success rate to the college as a whole appropriate in this case.
- In examining the department's success rate from FY11 to FY13 years we see improvement. The Philosophy has gone from a 67% success rate in FYs 11&12 to an increased success rate of 70% in FY13. While it is too early to say there is a trend in success rates. It can be said that a move toward improving success rates did take place in FY13. Now with the awareness of success rates for Hispanic students and the Velocidad grant more improvement may be likely. Further study is required.
- From FY 10 to FY 13 the Hispanic student body has increased by 13%, from 35% to 48%; White students, over the same time period, have dropped 7%, from 43% to 36%; all while other ethnic groups have remained fairly constant. The rise in the Hispanic population could be a factor in assessing the success rate in the Philosophy department. The gap between the college's retention rate and the rate for Hispanics in the Philosophy department's V01 course (College 86% / 71% and V01 84% / 65%) requires further study. This is precisely what the Title V Velocidad grant and its Supplemental Instruction Program are attempting to accomplish.
- The success rates for students as a whole, in the Philosophy program, do meet expectations, but the rates for Hispanic students do not. Improvement in Hispanic retention rates requires implementation of the Title V grant and study of the grant's effectiveness.
- The department is currently working to create an associate of arts transfer degree for philosophy. This initiative the department believes will improve retention and success rates by enhancing student focus.



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

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

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?

- Currently the Philosophy department does not have a degree or certificate program, but is working to create a transfer associates arts degree. Regardless of a degree or certificate program, the Philosophy department remains a vital and important department in the overall transfer goals of students. Philosophy courses fill essentially important requirements in: general education for both CSU & UC and the fulfillment of transfer degrees or certificates for other programs campus wide. In addition, Philosophy has consistently, year after year, achieved WSCH goals far above the college average of 650.

C. Operating Data

1. Demographics - Program and Course

Instructions:

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

- Since FY10 the Hispanic student body, in the Philosophy department, has increased by 13%, the White student body has dropped by 7%, and the other ethnic groups have remained fairly constant. In FY 13 the College was 51% Hispanic making us a majority Hispanic serving institution. The rise in the Hispanic population will become a factor in assessing the success rates for not only the Philosophy department but the College as a whole.
- In FY 2013 the demographics of the philosophy courses were 48% Hispanic, 36 % White, 3% Asian, 3% African American, 1% Pacific Islander, 4% Filipino, 1% Native American, 4% Other, and 50% Male and Female. In general the demographics of the Philosophy department follow the college's FY13 numbers. The only differences being Hispanics, philosophy 48% and the college 51%; Whites, philosophy 36% and the college 32%; and Male/Female, philosophy 50/50 and the college 54% and 46% respectively. The overall trend in philosophy has been an increase in Hispanic students, a decrease in white students, and an increase in female students from FY10 to FY 13.
- *Currently there is no need to diversify the courses.*

2. Budget

Instructions:

- The major budget change in the Philosophy department is the hiring of two full-time faculty members in FY 11. This has greatly improved the department and enhanced student learning.

Program members have reviewed the budget data.

No comments or requests to make about the budget



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

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? 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.

- The Philosophy department's WSCH scores are continually in excess of the district goal of 650. In fact, the department courses on average are 8% above the district WSCH level. The only course that does not meet the WSCH of 650 is Philosophy V05 Critical Thinking. This course does not meet the WSCH numbers due to only one section being offered each semester and the overall difficulty of the subject matter. When you compare the Philosophy department's annual WSCH number of 696 to the College's annual WSCH of 530 the Philosophy department's annual WSCH is 31% higher than the College's.
- To continue the high performance level (WSCH) of the Philosophy department requires more extra large classrooms to accommodate enrollment demands. To improve the performance of Philosophy V05 the WSCH should be reduce to the college average of 530.
- The initiative required to maintain the high productivity (WSCH) of the department is more extra large classrooms to continue to fulfill student demand.

D. Resources

1. Faculty

Instructions:

- The FTEF for the Philosophy department for full-time faculty is 44% and 48% for part-time faculty. If you compare this to the College's FTEF for full-time faculty 42% and part-time faculty 55% you see that the Philosophy department FTEF is quite similar to the College's. Overall the Philosophy department has seen a leveling off of part-time FTEF due to the hiring of two full-time instructors in FY11.
- *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?* FTEF changes in the last three years where caused by the hiring of two new full-time faculty members and the budget challenges of the State of California.
- *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?* Masters degree or higher in philosophy or the meeting of the California State standards for equivalency.
- *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. No, new contract members will be requested at this time.*

2. Classified Staff

Instructions:

- *Have there been changes in the number of classified staff in the program/department over the last three years?* N/A. The Philosophy department does not have any classified staff.
- *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.*



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

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.

- No requests at this time.

4. Facilities or other Resource Requests

Instructions:

- No requests at this time.

5. Combined Initiatives

Instructions:

- N/A

E. Other Program/Department Data

Instructions:

- N/A

Section IIIb – Other Program Goals and Initiatives

A. Other Program Goals

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:

- N/A

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*
- *What does that score mean to you? The Philosophy program as a whole is doing very well and will continue to do so as long as extra large classes are available to meet student demand.*



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

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

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



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

- A. Initiative:** Extra large classes or classrooms
Initiative ID: PHIL V01
Link to Data: See the WSCH productivity numbers
Expected Benefits: Increased productivity and WSCH score
Goal: Will increase student access (WSCH), retention and success numbers
Performance Indicator: An increase in student success for PHIL V01 overall by 3% and success for Hispanic students by 5%
Timeline: 2015-2016
Funding Resource Category: Hourly Instruction Funds
Ranking: H
- B. Initiative:** Associate of Arts Transfer degree
Initiative ID: PHIL V01
Link to Data: See retention and success numbers
Expected Benefits: Increase in retention and success numbers.
Goal: Increase in retention and success numbers and transfers to UC & CSU.
Performance Indicator: An increase in student success for PHIL V01 and the department overall by at least 3%.
Timeline: 2015-2016
Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed
Ranking: M
- 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](#)



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

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?

Overall the program review process was assisted by the bullet pointed questions enabling the author of program review to answer each section of the report more effectively.

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

One of the ways that program review could be improved is by providing the data for each section in the actual report itself. In particular, the data for each section should be more focused on especially important areas of analysis in that section, i.e. data on Hispanic students for the past three years should be provided (chart or graph) right next to the college's data for the same students and time period. This would provide more accurate and insightful analysis of issues regarding retention and success in various departments/programs.

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: Philosophy Department

Preparer: Ronald Mules

Dates met (include email discussions): N/A

List of Faculty who participated in the program Review Process: Ronald Mules

Preparer Verification: I verify that this program document was completed in accordance with the program review process.

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



Philosophy 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.



Philosophy 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.



Philosophy 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.	
	A "2" would indicate that the program is partially supported with regards to dedicated class / lab space, supplies and equipment	2
	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.	4
	A "3" would indicate that a program is at 90% or greater of its productivity rate.	

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.



Philosophy 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."	4
	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."	
	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."	2
	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.



Philosophy 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:

The Philosophy program as a whole is doing very well and will continue to do so as long as extra large classes are available to meet student demand. The department is tied closely to the GE requirements for both UC & CSUs which keeps it in high demand by the student body.

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 |



Philosophy 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.	
	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.	
	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.



Philosophy Program Review

2013-2014

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."



Philosophy 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



Philosophy 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.