**Section I – Accomplishments and Status of 2013 Program Review Report**

1. **Last Year’s Initiatives**

*Instructions: Answer the following questions:*

* Provide a brief status of initiatives created last year that did not require funding. Include an explanation of what changes occurred.
* AST1301: Astronomy Lab Roof Access for Star Observation Study. The goal was 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. Status: Discussions with other astronomy instructors in the district resulted in a decision to instead consider only ground-based observing locations on campus. This helped lead to the development of new initiative, PHYS1502 discussed further below.
* Initiatives requiring funding

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.

* PHYS1301: Initiative combined with Physics Program for a new FTF in Astronomy/Physics. The requested position was to replace retiring professor, Dr. Steve Quon (May 2014). Status: Dr. Hugh O’Neill joined the department in January 2015. The department now has 2 FTF plus a number of PTF enabling the Physics/Astronomy Department to have a stable Astronomy program with the ability to meet growing demand for astronomy courses. Students have already benefitted from having a common instructor for Elementary Astronomy lecture and Lab classes as well as having increased campus access to a FTF member.
1. **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.*

**Section II - Description**

1. **Description of Program/Department**

The strong emphasis in physics on fundamental concepts and problem solving makes it one of the most versatile majors available. The Physics major provides the basis for careers in applied physics and in interdisciplinary areas such as astronomy, biophysics, environmental science, oceanography, and scientific instrumentation.

 **Degrees/Certificates**

The program’s courses are designed to articulate to UC and CSU for transfer students. No degrees or certificates are awarded.

1. **Program/Department Significant Events (Strengths and Successes), and Accomplishments**
* What has changed over the past year (i.e. faculty, degrees/certificates, curriculum, etc.)?

After 23 years with Ventura College, Dr. Steve Quon retired in May of 2014. Dr. Hugh O’Neill was hired as his FTF replacement and began teaching in January of 2015. Dr. Jeffrey Wood was elected to the position of Department Chair on 8/15/2014 and Professor Michelle Millea is serving as assistant-chair.

* What is impacting the program now?

Enrollment in astronomy courses has been relatively steady over the last three years which has required the extensive use of PT faculty since the retirement of the FT astronomy instructor in 2012. The astronomy program is currently being reviewed within the department and undergoing significant changes to enhance its effectiveness.

1. **2013-2014 Estimated Costs/Gainful Employment – for Certificates of Achievement ONLY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Cost** |  | **Cost** |  | **Cost** |  | **Cost** |
| Enrollment Fees |  | Enrollment Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| Books/Supplies |  | Books/Supplies |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | Total |  | Total |  | Total |  |

1. **Criteria Used for Admission**

Open admission with no pre-requisites.

1. **College Vision**

Ventura College will be a beacon of learning—a source of inspiration and guidance—for our students and community.

1. **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 their learning experience, we serve a highly diverse student body by providing innovative 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.

1. **College Guiding Principles**

Guiding Principles: At Ventura College we believe that students come first and all else follows.  We strive to create a campus environment that fosters collaboration, communication, and mutual respect.  We are committed to these Guiding Principles in all that we do:

* Embrace the strength of diversity
* Listen with intensity and compassion
* Communicate with integrity and patience
* Design student-centered solutions
* Spark self-confidence and a sense of discovery
* Pursue our vision and goals with passion
1. **Organizational Structure**

*Instructions: Fill-in the appropriate information below.*

**College President:** Greg Gillespie

 **Executive Vice President:** Patrick Jefferson

 **Dean:** Dan Kumpf

 **Department Chair(s)**: Jeffrey Wood

 **Faculty/Staff**:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Jeffrey Wood** |
| Classification | Professor |
| Year Hired  | 2013 |
| Years of Work-Related Experience | 9 |
| Degrees/Credentials | B.S., Ph.D. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Hugh O’Neill** |
| Classification | Professor |
| Year Hired  | 2015 |
| Years of Work-Related Experience | 2 |
| Degrees/Credentials | B.S., M.A., Ph.D. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **W. Steve Quon** |
| Classification | Professor (Part-Time) |
| Year Hired  | 1991 |
| Years of Work-Related Experience | 23 |
| Degrees/Credentials | B.S., M.A., Ph.D. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Colin Terry** |
| Classification | Professor (Part-Time) |
| Year Hired  | 1987 |
| Years of Work-Related Experience | 27 |
| Degrees/Credentials | M.S., PhD |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **William Barber** |
| Classification | Instructor (Part-Time) |
| Year Hired  | 2008 |
| Years of Work-Related Experience | 7 |
| Degrees/Credentials | B.S., M.S., PhD |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Dale Synnes** |
| Classification | Instructor (Part-Time) |
| Year Hired  | 2009 |
| Years of Work-Related Experience | 21 |
| Degrees/Credentials | B.S., M.S. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Orlando Warren** |
| Classification | Instructor (Part-Time) |
| Year Hired  | 2011 |
| Years of Work-Related Experience | 3 |
| Degrees/Credentials | B.S., M.S. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Hadi Darejeh** |
| Classification | Instructor (Part-Time) |
| Year Hired  | 2014 |
| Years of Work-Related Experience | 10 |
| Degrees/Credentials | B.S. (EE), M.S. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Pooja Gupta** |
| Classification | Instructor (Part-Time) |
| Year Hired  | 2015 |
| Years of Work-Related Experience | 0.5 |
| Degrees/Credentials | B.S., M.S., PhD |

**Section III – Data and Analysis**

1. **SLO Data**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below.*

* Provide highlights of what you learned last year in your assessments and discussions.

Lab students are more engaged/effective in the learning process when lab experiments include relevant applications.

* Provide highlights of some of the changes made as a result of the assessments and discussions.

A new, more accessible textbook has been adopted.

* How did the changes affect student learning – or how do you anticipate that they will?

We anticipate that implementing this change will be reflected in improved performance toward target goals.

* 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.

Purchase eight telescopes for AST V01L Labs. This would provide one telescope for each 3-4 student lab group, allowing each student to have adequate interaction with the equipment to meet learning objectives. Please see initiative PHYS1502 in section V.

* 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.

Evaluation and Redesign of Astronomy Laboratory Activities. Please see initiative AST1501 in Section V.

* Comment on the status of your SLO rotational plan, mapping, and other TracDat work.

The 5-year rotation plan was designed and initiated in the Fall of 2013. Fall semesters are scheduled for heaviest evaluation with the Spring semesters being lighter to allow for catch up and follow through of initiatives. Consultation with the SLO committee chair in December of 2014 confirmed that the Astronomy program’s SLO structure probably contains too many CSLOs and ISLOs, and is too ambitious at this point in time. We will work with the SLO chair to streamline our process to reduce the analysis and reporting complexity. This will be combined with other TracDat maintenance and initiative closure catchup work that needs to be completed before the end of FY15.

1. **Performance Data**
2. **Retention – Program and Course**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below. 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. The overall retention score for Astronomy in FY14 was 87% which is in line with the 2014 College retention of 85%. It appears to be appropriate to compare astronomy to the college average since the demographics for the major groups are within 4% of the college’s three year average.
* In looking at your program’s retention rate over the past three years, is there a trend? If so, explain. The program retention scores show an increasing trend from 82% in FY11 to 87% in FY14. The cause of the increase is uncertain, but may be due to the introduction of new PT faculty as noted in last year’s program review.
* 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?

As may be seen in the table below, astronomy retention rates for FY14 show a 4% difference between the two major ethnic groups, Hispanics and Whites of 85% and 89% respectively. Both of these exceed the colleges overall rates of 84% and 86% for Hispanic and White, respectively.

FY14 Retention for Overall Astronomy vs. College Retention (%) by Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Hispanic | White | Afr Amer | Asian | Filipino |  Am Indian |
| College | 84 | 86 | 81 | 90 | 88 | 86 |
| Astronomy | 85 | 89 | 64 | 100 | 89 | 88 |

The enrollment numbers in astronomy for the remaining ethnic groups (shaded boxes in tables) are too low at present to establish meaningful trends, however the performance in these groups will continue to be monitored. For example, the retention of African Americans in astronomy is 17% lower than the college’s average, but this was not the case in FY13 so is most likely a temporary fluctuation.

FY14 Retention for Astronomy Courses vs. Overall College Retention (%) by Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Hispanic | White | Afr Amer | Asian | Filipino |  Am Ind |
| College | 84 | 86 | 81 | 90 | 88 | 86 |
| AST V01 | 85 | 88 | 65 | 100 | 88 | 83 |
| AST V01L | 90 | 90 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

The disaggregated retention data do not show significant consistent divergence patterns between the two main ethnic groups.

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

The aggregated retention rates are in line with those of the college for ethnicity, gender, and, age.

* 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.

Evaluation and Redesign of Astronomy Laboratory Activities. Evaluate the existing astronomy laboratory experiments and objectives, identify areas for improvement, and redesign activities as appropriate. See

1. **Success – Program and Course**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below. 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 overall success score for astronomy in FY14 was 74% which is in line with the 2014 College success score of 72%. As noted above in the retention discussion, it is appropriate to compare astronomy to the college average since the demographics for the major groups are within 4% of the college’s three year averages.

* In looking at your program’s success rate over the past three years, is there a trend?

The program success scores show an increasing trend from 54% in FY11 to 74% in FY14. The cause of the increase is uncertain, but may be due to the introduction of new PT faculty as noted in the retention discussion above.

* 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?

Disaggregated astronomy success rates have values similar to those for the college, especially for the two major ethnic groups, Hispanics and Whites (see table below).

FY14 Success for Astronomy Courses vs. Overall College Success (%) by Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Hispanic | White | Afr Amer | Asian | Filipino |  Am Indian |
| College | 69 | 76 | 63 | 80 | 78 | 75 |
| Astronomy | 69 | 79 | 56 | 96 | 89 | 81 |

The enrollment numbers in astronomy for the remaining ethnic groups (shaded boxes in tables) are too low at present to establish meaningful trends, however the performance in these groups will continue to be monitored.

FY14 Success for Astronomy Courses vs. Overall College Success (%) by Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Hispanic | White | Afr Amer | Asian | Filipino |  Am Ind |
| College | 69 | 76 | 63 | 80 | 78 | 75 |
| AST V01 | 67 | 78 | 57 | 95 | 88 | 75 |
| AST V01L | 82 | 82 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

The disaggregated success data do not show any consistent divergence patterns between the two main ethnic groups (Hispanics and Whites) beyond that representative of the college as a whole.

* Do your success rates at the program and college level meet your expectations? Are there areas that need improvement?

The aggregated success rates are in line with those of the college for ethnicity, gender, and, age. No areas needing improvement at this time.

* 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.

The astronomy program should continue to receive significant attention through the SLO process and program review so that it may continue to develop in size and effectiveness according to its evolving potential at VC. The addition of more telescopes to support the astronomy labs would be a significant step toward this goal. This is addressed in Initiative PHYS1502.

1. **Program Completion – for “Programs” with Degrees/Certificates Only (N/A)**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below. 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?
1. **Operating Data**
2. **Demographics - Program and Course**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below. 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 FY11 astronomy had 43% and 40% Hispanic and Whites, respectively. In FY14 the percentages had changed to 41% and 44% Hispanic and Whites, respectively. The numbers show little demographic change over this period. Astronomy gender enrollment in FY2014 puts females at 54% and males at 45%. This mirrors the College gender enrollment in FY2014 of 53% 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.

* Is there a need to diversify the program in terms of age, gender or ethnicity?

At this point there is no dominance of Hispanic enrollment over Whites, and the ethnic proportions simply reflect the changing demographics of the student body.

* 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.

Organizations such as MESA and SHPE provide scholarships to underrepresented students, such as females in science. So, maintaining support of these organizations is appropriate and important.

1. **Budget**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below. 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.

There have been no significant changes in the non-staffing budget areas during the past three years.

* 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.

X Program members have reviewed the budget data.

☐ No comments or requests to make about the budget.

1. **Productivity – Program and Course**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below. 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?

The overall astronomy productivity level for FY14 was 718 which exceeds the college productivity goal of 530. It is important to note that the district goal of 550 for all courses does not take into account important differences in enrollment limits between lecture and laboratory classes. Astronomy lab courses are limited to enrollment between 24 and 32 (depending upon the course), to encourage opportunities for each student to have sufficient opportunities for hands-on interaction with equipment, and also so that the instructor can adequately supervise students and maintain a safe environment.

In order to establish more appropriate productivity goals for laboratory courses, it would be necessary to analyze enrollment patterns over several semesters for the various laboratory courses (including geology, chemistry, biology, etc.). This could be done by analysis of the historical data base (Institutional Research).

85% of the astronomy courses offered in FY14 had productivity scores equal to or greater than the District goal of 550, and 100% of these exceeded the goal. The lowest productivity classes were the labs AST V01L which scored between 95% and 98% of the district goal.

* 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?

The enrollment/productivity ratios for the program as a whole exceeded expectations and appear to be stable.

* 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?)
* What initiative(s) would 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.
1. **Resources**
2. **Faculty**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below.*

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

Over the last four years the College FTEF Annual Totals decreased by 26% from 782 to 580. Similarly, the Astronomy Total FTEF also decreased, but only by 17% from 1.50 to 1.25.

Figure 1. Comparison of annual Total Assignments for all college faculty and Astronomy faculty over the last four years.

* *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?*

Over the past two years, the department has experienced the retirement of one FT faculty and the hiring of two new FT faculty. Despite these changes, the average (Total) Astronomy FTEF value has been relatively steady and increased only slightly from 1.20 to 1.25 over the past two years. During the times when only one FT faculty member was present, the gaps were filled with PT faculty. Consequently, there are semesters where the PTF were utilized extensively during this time period so the PT FTEF values range from 0.42 to 1.10 FTEF.

* *Does your area have difficulty finding hourly instructors?*

Yes, finding qualified, reliable PTF is difficult.

* *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.* N/A
1. **Classified Staff**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below.*

* *Have there been changes in the number of classified staff in the program/department over the last three years?*

Yes.

* *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.*

There was no physics/astronomy lab technician during Summer Session 2013, but the technician contract was extended from 10 months to 12 to cover the summer session period starting in 2014.

1. **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.*

The inventory list has been reviewed and appears to be mostly complete, but some items cannot be found on the list that should be there (optical table components in the optics room for example) or may not be listed because they are too small (or that do not have inventory tags).

The Astronomy Program is making the following equipment related request:

Telescopes for Astronomy Labs (High Priority). Purchase eight telescopes for AST V01L Labs. This would provide one telescope for each 3-4 student lab group, allowing each student to have adequate interaction with the equipment to meet learning objectives. Cost: $5391 (see initiative PHYS1502).

1. **Facilities or other Resource Requests**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below.*

* *Is your program/department making any other requests for resources, including for facilities?*

Installation of Physical Vapor Deposition System (Low Priority). Provide electrical power and plumbing for donated physical vapor deposition system. For telescope mirrors and optical films. Cost: estimated $500 (see initiative PHYS1507).

* *Initiatives are 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.*
1. **Combined Initiatives**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below.*

* *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.*

No.

1. **Other Program/Department Data**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below.*

* *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?*

No.

* *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**

1. **Other Program Goals** (None)

*Instructions: Answer the questions below.*

* 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? Such goals may include:
	+ Innovation
	+ Legislation
	+ Regulations
	+ Industry Standards
	+ New Technology
	+ Professional Development
	+ Advisory Committee Recommendations
* If so, please explain and enter it as an initiative with more detail in Section V.

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

*\*Service Areas – Skip this section.*

*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) resources 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?

23/26

* What does that score mean to you?

The astronomy program is vibrant and stable. Areas of opportunity (addressed by the initiatives below) have potential to further improve student success.

**Section V – Findings and Initiatives**

1. **Findings**

*Instructions: Please list your general finding(s) below. We did not do this step last year. General findings can have one or multiple initiatives. Every program/department needs one or multiple general findings as a result of analysis from student learning outcomes, institutional data or non-institutional data.*

* Finding #1 - Student performance in astronomy improves with smaller laboratory groups and increased interaction with equipment.

*This finding aligns with the College’s Educational Master Plan Goal 1*

* Finding #2 - Student performance in astronomy improves when they engage in activities that they perceive are “relevant.”

*This finding aligns with the College’s Educational Master Plan Goal 1, 2, 3.*

Findings → Link to VC Educational Master Plan Goal(s) → Link to District Strategic Goal(s)

1. **Initiatives (Non-Staffing Initiatives)**

*Instructions: Please list your old and new initiatives below. Maintain initiative numbers from prior program reviews if any are being carried forward into this New Year. Deans/division offices will put the information onto the initiatives charts. Every program/department needs initiatives that do not require resources.*

*Link the Initiative(s): Link the initiatives with a finding. Findings link to one or multiple VC Educational Master Plan goals and VCCCD Strategic Goals. We did not do this last year. Copy and paste one or multiple goals below to each initiative.*

VC Educational Master Plan Goals

* Educational Master Plan Goal #1 - Continuously improve educational programs and services to meet student, community, and workforce development needs. Aligns with District Strategic Goal 1 (increase access and student success).
* VC Educational Master Plan Goal #2 - Provide students with information and access to diverse and comprehensive support services that lead to their success. Aligns with District Strategic Goal 1 (increase access and student success).
* VC Educational Master Plan Goal #3 - Partner with local and regional organizations to achieve mutual goals and strengthen the College, the community, and the area’s economic vitality. Aligns with District Strategic Goal 2 (partner more effectively to meet community needs).
* VC Educational Master Plan Goal #4 - Continuously enhance institutional operations and effectiveness. Aligns with District Goal 3 (promote effective use of organizational resources)
* VC Educational Master Plan Goal #5 - Implement the Ventura College East Campus educational plan. Aligns with District Goals 1, 2 and 3 (increase access and student success, partner more effectively to meet community needs, and promote effective use of organizational resources)

Initiative(s) link to a Finding → Link to VC Educational Master Plan Goal(s) → Link to District Strategic Goal(s)

**R** = Required – mandated or unavoidable needs – only put in if pre-approved by EVP or VP (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

**Initiative Title:** Telescopes for Astronomy Labs

**Initiative ID:** PHYS1502

**Links to Finding:** Finding #01 - Overall student performance in astronomy improves with smaller laboratory groups and increased interaction with equipment.

This finding aligns with the College’s Educational Master Plan Goal 1.

**Initiative Finding Link**: ASTF1501

**Initiative Action:** Purchase eight telescopes for AST V01L Labs.

Timeline: 2014 - 2015

**Expected Benefits**: This would provide one telescope for each 3-4 student lab group, allowing each student to have adequate interaction with the equipment to meet learning objectives. The department currently has only two telescopes for each 24-32 student lab, which is inadequate for each student to learn how to independently setup and use a telescope.

Funding Resource Category: Equipment-non computer

Estimated Cost: $5391

Ranking: H

**Initiative Title:** Installation of Physical Vapor Deposition System

**Initiative ID:** PHYS1507

**Links to Finding:** Finding #02 – Individual student performance in astronomy improves when students are given the opportunity to perform activities that are “relevant.”

*This finding aligns with the College’s Educational Master Plan Goal 1, 2, 3*

**Initiative Finding Link**: ASTF1502

**Initiative Action:** Provide electrical power and plumbing for donated physical vapor deposition system. For telescope mirrors and optical films.

Timeline: 2014 - 2015

**Expected Benefits**: High vacuum metal evaporation system. Suitable for thin, nanoscale film deposition, telescope mirror coating, optical films, and potential student research projects in microelectronics.

Funding Resource Category: Facilities Funds

Estimated Cost: $500

Ranking: L

**Initiative Title:** Evaluation and Redesign of Astronomy Laboratory Activities

**Initiative ID:** AST1501

**Links to Finding:** Finding #02 – Individual student performance in astronomy improves when students are given the opportunity to perform activities that are “relevant.”

*This finding aligns with the College’s Educational Master Plan Goal 1, 2, 3*

**Initiative Finding Link**: ASTF1502

**Initiative Action:** Evaluate the existing astronomy laboratory experiments and objectives, identify areas for improvement, and redesign activities as appropriate.

Timeline: 2014 - 2015

**Expected Benefits**: Most of the current laboratory activities and reports are based upon use of computer software. Additional activities that engage students in a wider variety of skills will result in more effective learning and achievement of the course objectives.

Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed

Estimated Cost: $0

Ranking: L

**Section VI – Process Assessment**

*Instructions: Answer the questions below.*

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

The website and all communications (presentations, emails, and meetings with the division dean) have provided valuable information, instructions, and helpful suggestions. The separation of staffing and non-staffing initiatives seems to have made the process better by allowing chairs to focus upon and complete the smaller, more manageable pieces of the review documentation.

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

It would be extremely helpful to have department specific program review data available in a spreadsheet or workbook form, (such as Excel). This would facilitate powerful analyses of the data including the ready creation of plots and charts which is currently not practical.

1. **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:** Astronomy

**Preparer:** Jeffrey Wood

**Dates met (include email discussions):**

12/5/14 (Dept. meeting), 12/17/14 (Stephan Lovstadt), 12/19/14 (Gary Goodman), 1/16/15 (Hugh O’Neill), 1/23/15 (Jeffrey Molony), 1/27/15 (William Barber), 1/28/15 (Colin Terry).

**List of Faculty who participated in the program Review Process:**

Jeffrey Wood, Hugh O’Neill. Via SLOs: Colin Terry, Jeffrey Molony, William Barber, Stephan Lovestedt, Gary Goodman.

**Preparer Verification:**

Jeffrey Wood, Chair Department of Physics and Astronomy

⊠ 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. *The dean may also provide comments (optional):*

**Program Review Process Map**

Appendix A

**I . Status report and accomplishments from prior year**

**o**

**III(a). Data**

1. **Review**
2. **Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **A. SLO’s**
 | 1. **B. Success**
 | 1. **C. Operating**
 | 1. **D. Resources**
 | 1. **E. Other**
 |
|  | * **Retention**
 | * **Demographic**
 | * **Faculty**
 |  **Data** |
|  | * **Success**
 | * **Budget**
 | * **Classified Staff**
 |  |
|  | * **Completion**
 | * **Enrollment/Productivity**
 | * **Inventory**
 |  |
|  |  |  | * **Facilities or other Resource Requests**
 |  |
|  |  |  | * **Combined Initiatives**
 |  |

**II. Description**

**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)**

**VII. Verification of review**

**VI. Process assessment**

**V. Summary of initiatives and requests**

**Minority reports if any**

Appendix B

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.*

|  |
| --- |
| 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.  |
| **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@vcccd.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@vcccd.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@vcccd.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. |

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.*

|  |
| --- |
| 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. |
| **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. |

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]](#footnote-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]](#footnote-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 |
|  |  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 rate** [[3]](#footnote-3) |  |
|  |  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 rate** [[4]](#footnote-4)  |  |
|  |  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. |  |
|  |  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. | 2 |
|  |  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.  |  |

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 for the Astronomy program was 23/26. Astronomy scored well in all categories except for certain Course Completion Rates and an agreed on Productivity Rate where scores were at or slightly less than District Goals.

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

**Appendix D**

**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]](#footnote-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]](#footnote-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. |  |
|  |  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 and/or “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 rate** [[7]](#footnote-7)  |  |
|  |  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 rate** [[8]](#footnote-8) |  |
|  |  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.” |  |
|  |  |  |
| **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 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.  |  |

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

**APPEAL FORM**

Appendix-E

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. You will be notified of your time to present.**

1. Enrollment demand is determined by the ability to fill classes. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Productivity rate is defined as **WSCH/FTEF** as determined by the program faculty at the college. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
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.” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Enrollment demand is determined by the ability to fill classes. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Productivity rate is defined as **WSCH/FTEF** as determined by the program faculty at the college. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
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.” [↑](#footnote-ref-8)