

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

1. Program/Department Description

1A. Description

The WEL program offers numerous training options. Students can enroll into process- specific courses such as shielded metal arc-welding, flux-core arc-welding, gas metal arc-welding, or gas tungsten arc-welding to acquire skill sets on ferrous and non-ferrous metals. Students can complete a two-year Associate of Science degree which commonly leads to supervisor and shop management opportunities. Ventura College WEL students are prepared for a wide range of manufacturing metal fabrication-related positions such as certified welder, quality-control inspection, project designers, and various levels of supervision and business ownership.

Degrees/Certificates

Program’s courses are designed to articulate to UC and CSU for transfer students.
 A.S. Welding Technology
 Certificate of Achievement
 American Welding Society weld certification

1B. 2012-2013 Estimated Costs (Certificate of Achievement ONLY)

Required for Gainful Employment regulations.

Students are required to purchase welding/safety gear. This consists of protective clothing, work boots , protective eye gear , welding hood, welding gloves. These items are purchased at the beginning of the introduction class and are used for the advanced classes also. Prices vary depending of quality/supplier. Generally \$150 and up.

	Cost		Cost		Cost		Cost
Enrollment Fees		Enrollment Fees					
Books/Supplies		Books/Supplies					
Total		Total		Total		Total	

1C. Criteria Used for Admission

No prerequisite required for introduction to welding. Prerequisite(s) required for advanced classes

1D. College Vision

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

1E. College Mission

Ventura College, one of the oldest comprehensive community colleges in California, provides a positive and accessible learning environment that is responsive to the needs of a highly diverse

Welding Program Review **2012-2013**

student body through a varied selection of disciplines, learning approaches and teaching methods including traditional classroom instruction, distance education, experiential learning, and co-curricular activities. It offers courses in basic skills; programs for students seeking an associate degree, certificate or license for job placement and advancement; curricula for

students planning to transfer; and training programs to meet worker and employee needs. It is a leader in providing instruction and support for students with disabilities. With its commitment to workforce development in support of the State and region's economic viability, Ventura College takes pride in creating transfer, career technical and continuing education opportunities that promote success, develop students to their full potential, create lifelong learners, enhance personal growth and life enrichment and foster positive values for successful living and membership in a multicultural society. The College is committed to continual assessment of learning outcomes in order to maintain high quality courses and programs. Originally landscaped to be an arboretum, the College has a beautiful, park-like campus that serves as a vital community resource.

1F. 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

1G. Program/Department Significant Events (Strengths and Successes)

This program gives students a marketable skill who may otherwise not have an opportunity to gain a college education. The program also helps the business community by supplying a pool of skilled personnel.

Welding Program Review
2012-2013

K. Organizational Structure

President: Robin Calote

Executive Vice President: Ramiro Sanchez

Assistant Dean: Kathleen Schrader

Department Chair: Casey Mansfield

Instructors and Staff

Name	Michael Clark
Classification	Faculty/Professor
Year Hired	2004
Years of Work-Related Experience	33
Degrees/Credentials	Certified Welder ,Certified Welding Inspector, Certified Welding Educator

Welding Program Review

2012-2013

2. Performance Expectations

2A. Student Learning Outcomes

2A1. **2012-2013** - Institutional Student Learning Outcomes

1. Communication - written, oral and visual
2. Reasoning - scientific and quantitative
3. Critical thinking and problem solving
4. Information literacy
5. Personal/community awareness and academic/career responsibilities

2A2. **2012-2013** - Program Level Student Learning Outcomes *For programs/departments offering degrees and/or certificates*

1. Set up equipment and perform basic welding processes.
2. Read and interpret blueprint drawings commonly used in welding fabrication.
3. Understand basic metallurgy and material selection used in welding

2A3. **2012-2013** - Course Level Student Learning Outcomes

Attached to program review (See appendices).

2B. **2012-2013** Student SUCCESS Outcomes

1. The program will increase its retention rate from the average of the **program's** prior three-year retention rate. The retention rate is the number of students who finish a term with any grade other than W or DR divided by the number of students at census.
2. The program will increase its retention rate from the average of the **college's** prior three-year retention rate. The retention rate is the number of students who finish a term with any grade other than W or DR divided by the number of students at census.

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

3. The program will increase the student success rates from the average of the **program's** prior three-year success rates. The student success rate is the percentage of students who receive a grade of c or better.
4. The program will increase the student success rates from the average of the **college's** prior three-year success rates. The student success rate is the percentage of students who receive a grade of C or better.
5. Students will complete the program earning certificates and/or degrees.

2C. 2012-2013 Program OPERATING Outcomes

1. The program will maintain WSCH/FTEF above the 525 goal set by the district.
2. Inventory of instructional equipment is functional, current, and otherwise adequate to maintain a quality-learning environment. Inventory of all equipment over \$200 will be maintained and a replacement schedule will be developed. Service contracts for equipment over \$5,000 will be budgeted if funds are available.

2D. Mapping of Student Learning Outcomes - Refer to TracDat

3. Operating Information

3A. Productivity Terminology Table

Sections	A credit or non-credit class. Does not include not-for-credit classes (community education).
Census	Number of students enrolled at census (typically the 4 th week of class for fall and spring).
FTES	Full Time Equivalent Students A student in the classroom 15 hours/week for 35 weeks (or two semesters) = 525 student contact hours. 525 student contact hours = 1 FTES. Example: 400 student contact hours = $400/525 = 0.762$ FTES. The State apportionment process and District allocation model both use FTES as the primary funding criterion.
FTEF	Full Time Equivalent Faculty A faculty member teaching 15 units for two semesters (30 units for the year) = 1 FTE. Example: a 6 unit assignment = $6/30 = 0.20$ FTEF (annual). The college also computes semester FTEF by changing the denominator to 15 units. However, in the program review data, all FTE is annual. FTEF includes both Full-Time Faculty and Part-Time Faculty. FTEF in this program review includes faculty assigned to teach extra large sections (XL)

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

	Faculty). This deviates from the prior practice of not including these assignments as part of FTEF. However, it is necessary to account for these assignments to properly represent faculty productivity and associated costs.
Cross Listed FTEF	FTEF is assigned to all faculty teaching cross-listed sections. The FTEF assignment is proportional to the number of students enrolled at census. This deviates from the practice of assigning load only to the primary section. It is necessary to account for these cross-listed assignments to properly represent faculty productivity and associated costs.
XL FTE	Extra Large FTE: This is the calculated assignment for faculty assigned to extra large sections (greater than 60 census enrollments).The current practice is not to assign FTE. Example: if census>60, 50% of the section FTE assignment for each additional group of 25 (additional tiers).
WSCH	Weekly Student Contact Hours The term "WSCH" is used as a total for weekly student contact hours AND as the ratio of the total WSCH divided by assigned FTEF. Example: 20 sections of 40 students at census enrolled for 3 hours per week taught by 4.00 FTEF faculty. $(20 \times 40 \times 3) = 2,400$ WSCH / 4.00 FTEF = 600 WSCH/FTEF.
WSCH to FTES	Using the example above: $2,400$ WSCH x 35 weeks = 84,000 student contact hours = $84,000 / 525 = 160$ FTES (see FTES definition). Simplified Formulas: $FTES = WSCH/15$ or $WSCH = FTES \times 15$
District Goal	Program WSCH ratio goal. WSCH/FTEF The District goal was set in 2006 to recognize the differences in program productivity.

3B: Student Success Terminology

Census	Number of students enrolled at Census (typically the 4 th week of class for fall and spring). Census enrollment is used to compute WSCH and FTES for funding purposes.
Retain	Students completing the class with any grade other than W or DR divided by Census Example: 40 students enrolled, 5 students dropped prior to census,35 students were enrolled at census, 25 students completed the class with a grade other than W or DR: Retention Rate = $25/35 = 71\%$
Success	Students completing the class with grades A, B, C, CR or P divided by Census Excludes students with grades D, F, or NC.

Program specific data was provided in Section 3 for all programs last year. This year, please refer to the data sources available

at http://www.venturacollege.edu/faculty_staff/academic_resources/program_review.shtml

In addition, the 2011-2012 program review documents will provide examples of last year's data and interpretations.

3C: 2012 - 2013 Please provide program interpretation for the following:

Welding Program Review

2012-2013

3C1: Interpretation of the Program Budget Information

The material budget for the program has not increased in at least a decade. IT remains at \$7k per fiscal year. The cost of consumables have increased . Acetylene gas has gone up, price of steel has gone up, welding rods have doubled in price. The number of students served has also increased. Based on our current class schedule there is approximately 1350 student lab hours per year. This allows approximately \$5 per hour from our material budget. We have been offsetting the cost to operate by utilizing a material fee and monetary and material donations. It has been increasingly difficult to maintain quality instruction.

The data suggests that the budget has remained constant. The cost of instructional supplies has gone up. I requested permanent additional funding for instructional supplies. The final program initiative priority rating (page 14) suggests an increase of \$7000. I cannot confirm that the funds are available at this time.

Also, I am in need of an instructional assistant to help maintain safety and curriculum standards. The budget shows that a classified staff is being paid from the welding program's budget in the amount of \$ 41781. The welding program does not have a classified personnel at this time. The program will benefit with the addition of a classified assistant. This is a safety issue. The lab consists of many enclosed single occupancy stations. This restricts the ability for the instructor the oversee the student safety. Students are using dangerous and technical equipment. Also the lab footprint has increased with the addition of an outside yard. This also impacts the safety issue.

3C2: Interpretation of the Program Inventory Information

The inventory list contains items purchased after the remodel of the facility. It could be updated by including the items obtained prior to the remodel.

3C3: Interpretation of the Program Productivity Information

The welding program has set a maximum student capacity in each class. This was based on the need for a safe learning environment, student to instructor ratio and the number of stations available for students. Typical student capacities are as follows: introduction- 20. Advanced classes-30. Fabrication -20. Because of the limited number of students in each class the district WSCH of 525 is very difficult to exceed. That being said, the program has been maintaining a high percentile of the district goal.

Welding Program Review

2012-2013

3C4: Interpretation of the Program Course Productivity Information

3C5: Interpretation of Program Retention, Student Success, and Grade Distribution

The student retention rate, success rate and employment rate could be increased by increasing the weld certifications offered to the students. Written material and equipment needed to achieve this goal.

3C6: Interpretation of the Program Completion Information

The majority of students in the program work toward a welding certification offered by the private sector(American Welding Society) This data is not tracked by the district. Some students pursue a college degree.

3C7: Interpretation of the Program Demographic Information

The data suggests a need to reach out to the female and minority population. The majority of the enrollment is Hispanic and white males.

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

4. Performance Assessment

4A1: 2012-2013 Institutional Level Student Learning Outcomes

Institutional Level Student Learning Outcome 1	Performance Indicators
Communication	
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Institutional Level Student Learning Outcome 2	Performance Indicators
Reasoning – Scientific and Quantitative	
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Institutional Level Student Learning Outcome 3	Performance Indicators
Critical Thinking and problem solving	

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

Operating Information
Analysis – Assessment

Institutional Level Student Learning Outcome 4	Performance Indicators
Information Literacy	
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Institutional Level Student Learning Outcome 5	Performance Indicators
Personal/community awareness and academic / career responsibilities	
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

4A2: 2012-2013 Program Level Student Learning Outcomes - *For programs/departments offering degrees and/or certificates*

Program-Level Student Learning Outcome 1	Performance Indicators
Set up equipment and perform basic welding	Written tests, practical demonstrations

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

processes.	
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Program-Level Student Learning Outcome 2	Performance Indicators
Read and interpret blueprint drawings commonly used in welding fabrication.	Written tests, practical demonstrations
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Program-Level Student Learning Outcome 3	Performance Indicators
	Written tests, practical demonstrations
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Program-Level Student Learning Outcome 4	Performance Indicators
Operating Information	

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

Analysis – Assessment

Program-Level Student Learning Outcome 5	Performance Indicators

Operating Information

--

Analysis – Assessment

--

4A3: 2012-2013 **Course Level Student Learning Outcomes - Refer to TracDat**

4B: 2012-2013 **Student Success Outcomes**

Student Success Outcome 1	Performance Indicators
<p>The program will increase its retention rate from the average of the program's prior three-year retention rate. The retention rate is the number of students who finish a term with any grade other than W or DR divided by the number of students at census.</p>	<p>The program will increase the retention rate by 2% or more above the average of the program's retention rate for the prior three years.</p>

Operating Information

--

Analysis – Assessment

--

Student Success Outcome 2	Performance Indicators
<p>The program will increase the student success rates from the average of the program's prior three-year success rates. The student success rate is the</p>	<p>The program will increase student success rate by 2% or more above the program's average student success rate for the prior three years.</p>

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

percentage of students at census who receive a grade of C or better.	
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

4C. 2012-2013 Program Operating Outcomes

Program Operating Outcome 1	Performance Indicators
The program will maintain WSCH/FTEF above the 525 goal set by the district.	The program will exceed the efficiency goal of 525 set by the district by 2%.
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Program Operating Outcome 2	Performance Indicators
Inventory of instructional equipment is functional, current, and otherwise adequate to maintain a quality-learning environment. Inventory of all equipment over \$200 will be maintained and a replacement schedule will be developed. Service contracts for equipment over \$5000 will be budgeted if funds are available.	A current inventory of all equipment in the program will be maintained. Equipment having a value over \$5000 will have a service contract. A schedule for service life and replacement of outdated equipment will reflect the total cost of ownership.
Operating Information	
Analysis – Assessment	

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

4D. Program Review Rubrics for Instructional Programs

Academic Programs

Point Value	Element	Score
Up to 6	Enrollment demand	
Up to 6	Sufficient resources to support the program (ability to find qualified instructors; financial resources; equipment; space)	
Up to 4	Agreed-upon productivity rate	
Up to 4	Retention rate	
Up to 3	Success rate (passing with C or higher)	
Up to 3	Ongoing and active participation in SLO assessment process	
Total Points	Interpretation	
22 – 26	Program is current and vibrant with no further action recommendation	
18 – 21	Recommendation to attempt to strengthen the program	
Below 18	Recommendation to consider discontinuation of the program	

TOTAL

CTE Programs

Point Value	Element	Score
Up to 6	Enrollment demand	6
Up to 6	Sufficient resources to support the program (ability to find qualified instructors; financial resources; equipment; space)	3
Up to 6	Program success (degree / certificate / proficiency award completion over 4 year period)	3
Up to 4	Agreed-upon productivity rate	4
Up to 4	Retention rate	4
Up to 4	Employment outlook for graduates / job market relevance	3
Up to 3	Success rate (passing with C or higher)	4
Up to 3	Ongoing and active participation in SLO assessment process	2
Total Points	Interpretation	
31 - 36	Program is current and vibrant with no further action recommendation	
25 - 30	Recommendation to attempt to strengthen the program	
Below 25	Recommendation to consider discontinuation of the program	

Welding Program Review

2012-2013

5. Findings

2012-2013 - FINDINGS

Finding 1: the program is funding a classified assistant but does not have an assistant. Please see 3C1

Finding 2: program could benefit from increasing weld certifications offered to students

Finding 3: program is in need of increased operating budget

6. Initiatives

1: the program is funding a classified assistant but does not have an assistant. Request for a classified assistant

2: Updated welding code books are needed (\$5000.00)

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

3: Need access to lathe and mill for weld inspection and certification (possible acquisition from manufacturing lab)

4: equipment needed to finish oxy/acetylene welding stations.

5: request for computer operated plasma cutting equipment approx. \$22000.00

6: Meet Perkins Core Indicators in regards to student recruitment, retention, completion and workforce employment, especially for special population and non-traditional students. No cost

6A: 2011-2012 - Initiatives

NONE

2011 - 2012 FINAL Program Initiative Priority Ratings

Line Number	Division Code	Program	Category	Program Priority (0, 1, 2, 3,....)	Division Priority (R,H,M,L)	Committee Priority (R, H, M, L)	College Priority (R, H, M, L)	Initiative ID	Initiative ID	Initiative Title	Resource Description	Resource Category	Estimated Cost	Adjusted Cost	Accumulated Costs	Full Time or Part Time
1	36	Welding	Budget	1	H		H	WELD 12-01	WELD1201	Increase materials supply budget	need additional material funding for daily operations	7	7,000	7,000	7,000	
2	36	Welding	Personnel	2	M		M	WELD 12-02	WELD1202	additional classified staff	additional part-time classified staff needed for lab	2	8,000	8,000	15,000	
3	36	Welding	Facilities	3	R	H	H	WELD 12-03	WELD1203	outside lab area	outside yard needs to be permanently constructed	5	40,000	40,000	55,000	
4	36	Welding	Technology	4	L	L	L	WELD 12-04	WELD1204	AWS certification code books	additional code books need to be purchased for curriculum	3	3,000	-	55,000	
5	36	Welding	Technology	5	L	M	M	WELD 12-05	WELD1205	virtual welder	training aid	3	55,000	55,000	110,000	

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

6B: 2012-2013 INITIATIVES

Initiative ID should be consistent. For example:
2011-2012 identified initiatives - ART1201, ART1202, etc.
2012-2013 identified initiatives - ART1301, ART1302, etc.

Initiative 1 Request classified staff assistant

Initiative

Links to Finding

Benefits -

Request for Resources

Funding Sources

No new resources are required (use existing resources)	
Requires additional general funds for personnel, supplies or services (includes maintenance contracts)	
Requires computer equipment funds (hardware and software)	
Requires college equipment funds (other than computer related)	
Requires college facilities funds	
Requires other resources (grants, etc.)	

Initiative 2: request for welding code books

Initiative 3: request for a lathe and mill for weld inspection/ certification

Initiative 4: request for computer operated plasma cutting equipment

Welding Program Review

2012-2013

6C: 2012-2013 Program Initiative Priority Ratings

Program	Finding Number	Category	Program Priority (R, H, M, L)	Division Priority (R,H,M,L)	Committee Priority (R, H, M, L)	College Priority (H, M, L)	Initiative ID	Initiative Title	Resource Description	Estimated Cost

Welding Program Review **2012-2013**

6D: PRIORITIZATIONS OF INITIATIVES WILL TAKE PLACE AT THE PROGRAM, DIVISION, COMMITTEE, AND COLLEGE LEVELS:

Program/Department Level Initiative Prioritization

All initiatives will first be prioritized by the program/department staff. Prioritize the initiatives using the **RHML** priority levels defined below.

Division Level Initiative Prioritization

The program initiatives within a division will be consolidated into division spreadsheets. The dean may include additional division-wide initiatives. All initiatives will then be prioritized using the **RHML** priority levels defined below.

Committee Level Initiative Prioritization

The division's spreadsheets will be prioritized by the appropriate college-wide committees (staffing, technology, equipment, facilities) using the **RHML** priority levels defined below.

College Level Initiative Prioritization

Dean's will present the consolidated prioritized initiatives to the College Planning Council. The College Planning Council will then prioritize the initiatives using the **RHML** priority levels defined below.

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 (personnel, equipment, etc.)

M: Medium – approximately 1/3 of the total program/department/division's initiatives by resource category (personnel, equipment, etc.)

L: Low – approximately 1/3 of the total program/department/division's initiatives by resource category (personnel, equipment, etc.)

Welding Program Review 2012-2013

7. Process Assessment and Appeal

7A. Purpose of Process Assessment

The purpose of program review assessment is to evaluate the process for continual improvement. The process is required for accreditation and your input is very important to us as we strive to improve.

7B. 2012 - 2013 ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Did you complete the program review process last year, and if so, did you identify program initiatives?

- 2a. Were the identified initiatives implemented?

- 2b. Did the initiatives make a difference?

3. If you appealed or presented a minority opinion for the program review process last year, what was the result?

4. How have the changes in the program review process worked for your area?

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

7C. Appeals

After the program review process is complete, your program has the right to appeal the ranking of initiatives.

If you choose to appeal, please complete the appropriate form 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.