Foreign Languages and Sign Language 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

Section I – Accomplishments and Status of 2012 Program Review Report

A. Last Year's Initiatives

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

1) Improve the grading rubric of the SLO assessments to more accurately reflect the course outcomes.
After analyzing the results of the course level SLO assessment summaries, it was determined that the achievement level for the student performance indicator was set too low. The low achievement level resulted in an elevated number of students who performed far above the achievement level and very few students who performed below the achievement level.
 • The achievement level for the student performance indicator will be increased for this semester's SLO assessments.

2) Reduce the district 525 WSCH for the upper-level courses.
After reviewing the data, it is evident that exceeding the district 525 goal is unlikely given that the higher the level of the course the smaller the pool of potential students.
 • The district 525 WSCH remains the same.

*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.*

3) Explore and implement a Spanish placement exam to provide a suggested level placement for students.
 • This initiative was funded and the department is currently piloting the exam for full implementation of the exam starting summer or fall 2014.

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

Last year's Student Success Goal: The program will increase its completion rate from the average of the program's prior three-year retention rate. The completion 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.

No significant changes took place to increase the program's completion rate.

Section II - Description

A. Description of Program/Department
The foreign language courses teach students communication skills in a second language and provide an understanding of the cultures of the target language. All of the foreign language courses provide instruction designed to develop proficiency in aural comprehension, speaking, reading and writing. The beginning level courses introduce basic grammar, vocabulary, communicative functions and culture.

The intermediate level courses continue development of proficiency skills through discussion of films, periodicals, and literary works to increase vocabulary, cultural awareness, and knowledge of linguistic variations.

All of the American Sign Language courses at Ventura College provide instruction in receptive and expressive sign vocabulary, appropriate grammatical and affective facial expressions, syntax, and body modifiers.

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

B. **Program/Department Significant Events (Strengths and Successes), and Accomplishments**
Instructions:
   What has changed over the past year (i.e. faculty, degrees/certificates, curriculum, etc.)?
- Piloting a new Spanish textbook for a new adoption to begin fall 2014.
- Expansion of hybrid sections for intermediate levels of Spanish (V03 and V04) projected for fall 2014 and spring 2015.
   What is impacting the program now?
- Cumbersome pre-requisite challenge process that discourages more proficient language learners and native speakers from enrolling in upper levels of Spanish.
- Reduced number of sections being taught by full-time faculty due to 100% release time for one of the department's faculty members.

C. **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	

D. **Criteria Used for Admission**
Admission into Spanish 02, 03, and 04 is determined by the fulfillment of prerequisites.

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

F. **College Mission**
At Ventura College, we transform students' lives, develop human potential, create an informed citizenry, and serve as the educational and cultural heart of our community. Placing students at the center of the educational experience, we serve a highly diverse

student body by providing quality instruction and student support, focusing on associate degree and certificate completion, transfer, workforce preparation, and basic skills. We are committed to the sustainable continuous improvement of our college and its services.

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

- Student Success
- Respect
- Integrity
- Quality
- Collegiality
- Access

- Innovation
- Diversity
- Service
- Collaboration
- Sustainability
- Continuous Improvement

H. **Organizational Structure**
   President: Greg Gillespie
   Executive Vice President:
   Dean: Tim Harrison
   Department Chair: Tania DeClerck
   Faculty/Staff:

Name	DeClerck, Tania (Dept. Chair)
Classification	Assistant Professor
Year Hired	2008
Years of Work-Related Experience	13 years
Degrees/Credentials	B.A., M.A.

Name	Sandford, Art
Classification	Professor
Year Hired	1991
Years of Work-Related Experience	29 years
Degrees/Credentials	B.A., M.A., Ph.D.

Name	Somoza, Ben
Classification	Assistant Professor
Year Hired	2011
Years of Work-Related Experience	19 years
Degrees/Credentials	B.A., M.A.

Section IIIa – Data and Analysis

A. **SLO Data**
   - Continuing discussion of grading rubric amongst the department

- Continuous improvement of classroom assignments has led to an increase of writing opportunities for students
- SLO assessment rotational calendar has been created and is currently being implemented
- SLO data has been entered and updated in TracDat for all courses in the department

B. **Performance Data**

1. **Retention – Program and Course**
   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.
   -In looking at your program's retention rate over the past three years, is there a trend? If so, explain.

   - The analysis of the French program's student retention rate indicates that for FY13 it was 4% lower than the college average and 5% lower that the college's three-year average. In looking at the French program's retention rate over the past three years, there is no significant change between FY13 and the prior three-year average.

   - The retention rate for German courses indicates that for FY13 it was 9% lower than the college average and 9% lower than the college's three-year average. In looking at the German program's retention rate over the past three years, there has been no change in the retention rate.

   - The retention rate for Italian courses indicates that for FY13 it was 18% lower than the college average and 4% lower than the college's three-year average. In looking at the Italian program's retention rate over the past three years, the retention rate has decreased by 14%.

   - The retention rate for Japanese courses indicates that FY13 was 6% lower than the college average and 3% higher than the college's three-year average. In looking at the Japanese program's retention rate over the past three years, there has been very little change since the retention rate has only decreased by 3%.

   - The retention rate for Sign Language courses indicates that for FY13 it was 6% higher than the college average and 7% higher than the college's three-year average. In looking at the ASL program's retention rate over the past three years, there has been very little change since the retention rate has only decreased by 1%.

   - The analysis of the Spanish program's student retention rate indicates that for FY13 it was 1% lower than the college average and 1% lower than the college's three-year average. In looking at the Spanish program's retention rate over the past three years, there is no significant change between FY13 and the prior three-year average for the Spanish program.

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?

- The FY13 retention rate for Hispanic students taking French courses is equal to the retention rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 78% of Hispanic students were retained in French courses as compared to 78% of White students. However, the retention rate of Hispanic students in French courses indicates that for FY13 it was 8% lower than the college's Hispanic student retention rate.

- The FY13 retention rate for Hispanic students taking German courses is 2% lower than the retention rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 76% of Hispanic students were retained in German courses as compared to 78% of White students. However, the retention rate of Hispanic students in German courses indicates that for FY13 it was 12% lower than the college's Hispanic student retention rate.

- The FY13 retention rate for Hispanic students taking Italian courses is 22% higher than the retention rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 74% of Hispanic students were retained in Italian courses as compared to 52% of White students. However, the retention rate of Hispanic students in Italian courses indicates that for FY13 it was 12% lower than the college's Hispanic student retention rate.

- The FY13 retention rate for Hispanic students taking Japanese courses is 17% lower than the retention rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 68% of Hispanic students were retained in Japanese courses as compared to 85% of White students. The retention rate of Hispanic students in Japanese courses indicates that for FY13 it was 18% lower than the college's Hispanic student retention rate.

- The FY13 retention rate for Hispanic students taking Sign Language courses is 1% higher than the retention rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 94% of Hispanic students were retained in Sign Language courses as compared to 93% of White students. The retention rate of Hispanic students in Sign Language courses indicates that for FY13 it was 8% higher than the college's Hispanic student retention rate.

- The FY13 retention rate for Hispanic students taking Spanish courses is 8% higher than the retention rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 88% of Hispanic students were retained in Spanish courses as compared to 80% of White students. The retention rate of Hispanic students in Spanish courses indicates that for FY13 it was 2% higher than the college's Hispanic student retention rate.

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

- The retention rates for Hispanic students in Italian, Sign Language, and Spanish courses exceed the department's expectations since they are some of the few courses at the college in which Hispanic students surpass White students.

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.

2. **Success – Program and Course**
   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.
   -In looking at your program's success rate over the past three years, is there a trend?

   - The analysis of the French program's student success rate indicates that for FY13 it was 3% higher than the college average and equal to the college's three-year average. In FY13 40% of students in French received A's compared to 32% for the college, 18% received B's compared to 22% for the college, 14% received C's compared to 15% for the college, 2% received D's compared to 5% for the college, and 4% received F's compared to 9% for the college.

   - The analysis of the German program's student success rate indicates that for FY13 it was 11% lower than the college average and 7% lower than the college's three year average. There is very little difference between the college and German program's grade distribution. In FY13 20% of students in German received A's compared to 32% for the college, 23% received B's compared to 22% for the college, 16% received C's compared to 15% for the college, and 10% received F's compared to 9% for the college.

   - The analysis of the Italian program's student success rate indicates that for FY13 it was 11% lower than the college average and 2% higher than the college's three-year average. In FY13 22% of students in Italian received A's compared to 32% for the college; 19% received B's compared to 22% for the college, 19% received C's compared to 15% for the college, and 6% received F's compared to 9% for the college. There is very little difference between the college and Italian program's grade distribution.

   - The analysis of the Japanese program's student success rate indicates that for FY13 it was 9% higher than the college average and 4% higher than the college's three-year average. In FY13 45% of students in Japanese received A's compared to 32% for the college; 21% received B's compared to 22% for the college, 14% received C's compared to 15% for the college, and 0% received F's compared to 9% for the college. As can be seen from these numbers, the students in the Japanese program received more A's and less F's than the college.

   - The analysis of the Sign Language program's student success rate indicates that for FY13 it was 12% higher than the college average and 13% higher than the college's

three year average. The ASL program's grade distribution is higher than the college's grade distribution. In FY13 45% of students in Sign Language received A's compared to 32% for the college, 27% received B's compared to 22% for the college, 10% received C's compared to 15% for the college, and 6% received F's compared to 9% for the college.

- The analysis of the Spanish program's student success rate indicates that for FY13 it was 3% higher than the college average and 6% higher than the college's three year average. The Spanish program's grade distribution is almost equal to the college's grade distribution. In FY13 33% of students in Spanish received A's compared to 32% for the college, 25% received B's compared to 22% for the college, 15% received C's compared to 15% for the college, and 10% received F's compared to 9% for the college.

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?

- The FY13 success rate for Hispanic students taking French courses is 8% lower than the success rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 67% of Hispanic students were successful in French courses as compared to 75% of White students. The success rate of Hispanic students in French courses indicates that for FY13 it was only 1% lower than the college's Hispanic student success rate.

- The FY13 success rate for Hispanic students taking German courses is almost equal to the success rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 58% of Hispanic students were successful in German courses as compared to 59% of White students. However, the success rate of Hispanic students in German courses indicates that for FY13 it was 10% lower than the college's Hispanic student success rate.

- The FY13 success rate for Hispanic students taking Italian courses is 14% higher than the success rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 66% of Hispanic students were successful in Italian courses as compared to 52% of White students. The success rate of Hispanic students in Italian courses indicates that for FY13 it was only 2% lower than the college's Hispanic student success rate.

- The FY13 success rate for Hispanic students taking Japanese courses is 17% lower than the success rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 68% of Hispanic students were successful in Japanese courses as compared to 85% of White students. The success rate of Hispanic students in Japanese courses indicates that for FY13 it was equal to the college's Hispanic student success rate; both rate at 68%.

- The FY13 success rate for Hispanic students taking Sign Language courses is 7% lower than the success rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 80% of Hispanic students were successful in Sign Language courses as compared to 87%

of White students. The success rate of Hispanic students in Sign Language courses indicates that for FY13 it was 12% higher than the college's Hispanic student success rate. The success rate of White students in Sign Language courses indicates that for FY13 it was 12% higher than the college's White student success rate.

- The FY13 success rate for Hispanic students taking Spanish courses is 9% higher than the success rate for White students. The data indicate that for FY13 78% of Hispanic students were successful in Spanish courses as compared to 69% of White students. The success rate of Hispanic students in Spanish courses indicates that for FY13 it was 10% higher than the college's Hispanic student success rate.

Do your success rates at the program and college level meet your expectations? Are there areas that need improvement?
- The success rates for Hispanic students in Italian and Spanish courses exceed the department's expectations since it is one of the few courses in which Hispanic students succeed more than the White students.

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.

- Based on these findings, a potential initiative could be to increase the number of Italian sections offered.
- In looking at the disaggregated data by ethnicity, the Hispanic rate of success in Spanish courses should be higher than 78% and merits further investigation into bringing back Spanish for Heritage Speakers.

3. **Program Completion – for "Programs" with Degrees/Certificates Only**
   Not applicable.

C. **Operating Data**

1. **Demographics - Program and Course**
   Instructions:
   Demographics refer to the students enrolled in the program/course.
   - *What does the data indicate/say about the students enrolled in the program/course? (Provide a **very brief summary**).*
   - *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?*
   - *Is there a need to diversify the program in terms of age, gender or ethnicity?*
   - *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.*

1. Generally speaking, enrollment in Foreign Language classes differs little from overall college enrollments in terms of race/ethnicity, gender and age, with a few exceptions.
2. For the preceding three year period the racial/ethnic make-up of students in FL classes, for the most part, closely mirrors that of the college at large. Some notable exceptions include German, which had only 30% Hispanic enrollment, and Japanese, in which white and Hispanic

enrollments were equal in percentages but had nearly 3 times the college average in Asian student enrollments.

In terms of the age of students there was no significant variation from college averages.

In terms of gender, male students were over-represented in German and Japanese but under-represented in all others (except French in which the numbers were on par with the college. The disparity in male/female enrollment was especially large in Sign Language – only 31% were male versus 46% for the college average, while females made up an average of 69% of the classes.)

3. As mentioned, both German and Japanese seem to attract more male than female students and fewer Hispanic students than is the college average. German, especially, seems to be a niche site for young, white male students. Perhaps more outreach and education as to the value of learning German, especially for students interested in the STEM careers, would be beneficial. By contrast, female enrollment in Sign Language classes is more than double than that of male enrollment on average for the past 3 years and that trend shows no sign of changing for FY 13. Perhaps male students need to be educated on the value of learning to communicate with members of the deaf community and the role of American Sign Language in today's diverse society.

4. Possible initiatives stemming from these findings could include:

- targeted outreach to Hispanic students to encourage greater enrollment in German courses.

- targeted outreach to females students to encourage greater enrollment in both German and Japanese courses.

- targeted outreach to male students to encourage greater enrollment in Sign Language courses.

2. **Budget**

Instructions:

- *Review of summarized budget information is required. The yellow and blue sections of your budget data provide summaries. Detail data is provided if you want to see additional information; however, reviewing the backup data is not required. Check the boxes below if you have no further comments to make.*

- *Have there been any significant changes in the budget over the past three years? Have these changes had a positive or negative effect on student learning? If additional funds are needed, explain why. Initiatives will be required to be noted in more detail in Section V.*

- *(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.

    x No comments or requests to make about the budget

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.

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

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

1. The FY10 through FY12 3-year average productivity ratio for all FL courses is 537.5 – exceeding the target productivity ratio for both our district and college. The FY13 average productivity is also 537.5. We believe our enrollments are strong and that no major modifications in course offerings or in the scheduling of classes are necessary. That said, we have already mentioned the issue of students self-placing in too low of a course level relative to their language capabilities. This "sandbagging" negatively impacts enrollments in intermediate level classes.

D.   Resources

1.   Faculty
Instructions:
- *How does your program/department's Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) compare to the college? (trends and ratios)*
- *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?*
- *Does your area have difficulty finding hourly instructors?*
- *Is the program lacking faculty with a particular specialty?*
- *Are there any specific accreditation requirements for FT faculty?*
- *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.*

For FY13 the FL Department's FT/PT ratio stands at 37% to 63%. Spanish is the only discipline with FT faculty (3), although one FT faculty member is currently released 100%. Our FT/PT ratio is comparable to that of the college as a whole. Over the past three years there have been no significant changes in our FTEF for part and/or full time faculty.

We do have a difficult time finding part-time instructors in German, Italian and Spanish.

We have no plans to request a FT position at this time in any discipline.

2.   Classified Staff
Not applicable.

3.   Inventory
Not applicable.

4. **Facilities or other Resource Requests**
   Not applicable.

5. **Combined Initiatives**
   Not applicable.

E. **Other Program/Department Data**
   Not applicable.

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:

- *Innovation*
- *Legislation*
- *Regulations*
- *Industry Standards*

- *New Technology*
- *Professional Development*
- *Advisory Committee Recommendations*

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

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

What is your score?
- Foreign Language Vitality Score: 21 (See Appendix C)

What does that score mean to you?
- Overall, the Foreign Language department is current and vibrant, but a few adjustments (e.g. increasing the program completion rate) need to be addressed to strengthen the program.

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)* <u>Note:</u> *Your program/department will need to rank its initiatives (1/3 High, 1/3 Medium, 1/3 Low). These initiatives will be further ranked by the division.*

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

A. **Initiative:** - Foreign Language Outreach for Underrepresented
   Initiative ID: FL1401
   Link to Data: Disparities in representation in certain language courses by ethnicity/gender
   Expected Benefits: More demographic diversity in all language courses
   Goal: Course enrollments that more accurately reflect the demographics of the student body.
   Performance Indicator: Enrollment data
   Timeline: 2014-2015
   Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed
   Initiative Description: Targeted outreach efforts to encourage under-represented groups to enroll in language courses
   Costs: $0.00
   Ranking: M

B. **Initiative: Implementation of Spanish language placement instrument**
   Initiative ID: FL 2013 02
   Link to Data: Lower enrollments and fewer sections of intermediate-level Spanish

Expected Benefits: Higher enrollments and more sections of intermediate Spanish
Goal: 1 additional section per semester of intermediate Spanish
Performance Indicator: number of sections
Timeline: 2014-2015
Funding Resource Category: No new resources needed
Initiative Description: Implementation of Spanish language placement instrument
Costs: $0.00
Ranking: H

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?**
- **The format of the form this year is more user friendly. I prefer having the data as a separate file rather than embedded in the Program Review document.**

B. **How would you improve the program review process based on this experience?**
- **More training for all full-time faculty to learn about the program review process, not just the department chairs. This should be a collaborative process amongst a group of faculty from the same department. All of the full-time Foreign Language faculty participated in the Foreign Language program review document, but this should be a standard practice amongst all departments and should be encouraged/organized by the deans. There should also be inter-departmental or inter-division collaboration, so that the program review becomes a living document amongst the college as a whole.**

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: Foreign Language
Preparer: Tania DeClerck, Art Sandford, and Ben Somoza
Dates met (include email discussions): October 7 and 10, 2013
List of Faculty who participated in the program Review Process: Tania DeClerck, Art Sandford, and Ben Somoza

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

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

Foreign Languages and Sign Language Program Review
2013-2014

Program Review Process Map

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

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)**

V.   **Summary of initiatives and requests**
Minority reports if any

VI.   **Process assessment**

VII.   **Verification of review**

16

Foreign Languages and Sign Language 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 <u>NOT</u> 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.

Foreign Languages and Sign Language Program Review
2013-2014

Program Review Resource Initiatives Guidelines
<u>WHAT TO LEAVE IN</u>

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.

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.	
	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.	5
	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.	2
	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.

Foreign Languages and Sign Language 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 rate [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."	
	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."	2 (-1%)
	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]	
	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 (+4%)
	A "2" would indicate that the sum of the program's success rates for the past academic year is within 4 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "1" would indicate that the sum of the program's success rates for the past academic year is within 8 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	
	A "0" would indicate that the sum of the program's success rates for the past academic year is lesser than 8 percentage points of the most recent college-wide course success rate metric found in the annual "VC Institutional Effectiveness Report."	

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

Note rationale on next page.

---

[3] As defined by the RP Group, the course completion rate is the "percentage of students who do not withdraw from class and who receive a valid grade."
[4] As defined by the RP Group, the success rate is "the percentage of students who receive a passing/satisfactory grade" notation of A, B, C, P, IB, or IC.

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:

Overall score: 21 The course completion rate would probably be improved if the cost of Foreign Language textbooks were not so high. The ability to find qualified Foreign Language instructors has caused some of the foreign language classes to be taught by multiple substitute instructors and last minute hires. Hiring needs to happen as soon as the dean's office is informed of a faculty contract rejection.

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

Foreign Languages and Sign Language 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.

	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]	
	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]	
	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."

Foreign Languages and Sign Language 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 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

Foreign Languages and Sign Language 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.