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## 1. Executive Summary

## A. Program History/Description

The Foreign Language department offers proficiency-based instruction in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in these languages: Spanish, German, Chinese, and Japanese. The study of each language includes vocabulary, grammar, syntax, pronunciation, and cultural and historical understanding. Intermediate-level courses include a literature component. Courses combine classroom lectures, guided practice, and language activities with individual work conducted online.

Foreign language courses satisfy general education requirements for the associate degree and lower division transfer and can be used to fulfill some of the requirements for the associate degree major in Language Arts.
Courses in Spanish are offered in the day and evening; Spanish 127-Spanish Civilization is offered online. Courses in French, German, Chinese, and Japanese are offered primarily in the evening (French was last offered in Fall 2009.) Students in the Study Abroad program in Spain take Spanish courses up to the most advanced level as well as a course in Spanish civilization.

## B. Strengths/Effective Practices

The FL department integrates innovative and interactive instructional practices and includes current technology as appropriate. For example, some faculty use Skype to conduct international interviews with native speakers. Faculty also use document projectors to display realia and texts. Some faculty use Blackboard to support instruction and grading.

The department and faculty are flexible and proactive; course content and course offerings reflect changes in the international political, social, and economic climate. An example is the creation of Chinese 101 and 102. Because of budget constraints, Chinese will be offered instead of French.

All courses are ADA compliant. Faculty have developed SLO's for all Foreign Language courses. Faculty are dedicated to the ongoing success of the program and maintain currency in the field by actively participating in ongoing continuing professional education, educational seminars and focus groups.
C. Weaknesses/Lessons Learned

The FL department offers only one section each term for heritage Spanish speakers. The departmental website needs regular development and maintenance. Because of limited demand and budget constraints, we do not offer second year/ intermediate level foreign language classes (other than 210 and 211 Spanish for Heritage Speakers). Faculty development funding is inadequate to support the level of professional development required to ensure student success. Teaching of foreign languages is a fast-developing discipline that requires regular engagement of faculty in the field.

## D. Recommendations/Next Steps

Explore offering an online version of the current heritage speakers course.

Continue work developing and maintaining departmental website. Explore reinstituting second year Spanish courses in order to provide continuity in language studies. Explore the possibility of offering first year Spanish for heritage speakers. Explore the possibility of adding a prerequisite of ENGL 099 to 101 and 102 courses.

2. Faculty<br>Full-Time Faculty<br>Afzali, Ana<br>Colville, Linda<br>Garate, Elisabeth<br>McGarry, Anna

## Adjunct Faculty

Cloughly, Cecilia
Daves-Schnieder, Lida
Desmond, Yae
Jennings, Sanae
Blynn-Avanosian, Sylvia
Fleishcer, Beatriz
Garcia, Victor

## 3. Program description

The Foreign Languages Department offers proficiency-based instruction in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in these languages: Spanish, German, Chinese, and Japanese. The study of each language includes vocabulary, grammar, syntax, pronunciation, and cultural and historical understanding. Intermediate level courses include a literature component. Courses combine classroom lectures, guided practice, and language activities with individual work conducted online.

## 4. Program Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives of the Foreign Languages Program are:
a) Provide second language skills and cultural knowledge.
b) Prepare students to enter the job market.
c) Provide courses required to complete an associate degree.
d) Provide transfer credit to four-year colleges and universities.
e) Provide classes for enrichment and upgrading of skills.

## 5. List and Review of Degrees, Certificates, and Awards

The Foreign Language program contributes to the Associate in Arts Degree: Language Arts and the Associate in Arts Degree: Liberal Arts.

## 6. List of Industry-Based Standard Certificates and Licenses

Not applicable

## 7. Advisory Committee or Council

Not applicable

## 8. Program Student Learning Outcomes

Communicate (write, speak, listen, read) in the target language, analyze literary texts, be conversant about the target language cultures, and demonstrate scholarly behavior in all campus interactions.

The Foreign Languages Program has adopted the Institutional General Education Competencies of Citrus College (as approved by Steering December 8, 2008). General education competencies serve as a common set of core curricular components identified and defined by faculty. Student learning outcomes are behaviors based on these competencies.

Any student transferring, completing a degree or certificate from Citrus College, must demonstrate effectively assessed awareness, understanding, knowledge, skills, and abilities in the selected competencies.
Students completing courses in the Foreign Languages Program will have acquired the following competencies:

1) Communication (personal expression and information acquisition)

Communicate (write, speak, listen, read) in the target language
2) Computation

N/A
3) Creative, Critical, and Analytical Thinking, and Information Competency Analyze literary texts
4) Community/Global Consciousness and Responsibility

Be conversant about the target language cultures and demonstrate scholarly behavior in all campus interactions.
5) Technology
6) Discipline / (Subject Area Specific Content Material)

## 9. Curriculum Review and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

The Foreign Languages Program has adopted the Institutional General Education Competencies of Citrus College (as approved by Steering December 8, 2008). General education competencies serve as a common set of core curricular components identified and defined by faculty. Student learning outcomes are behaviors based on these competencies.

## Curriculum/ SLO Assessment Map: FL (SPAN, JPN, GER, CHIN)

|  | CC 1(a): Communicate (write, speak, listen, read) | CC 3(a) : critically analyze and respond to texts | CC 4(a): demonstrate knowledge about target language culture | CC 4(b): demonstrate scholarly behavior in all class interactions. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course Applicability Key: T=Transfer, D= Degree, C= Certificate, S= Skill Award SLO Key: I=Introduced, D=Developed, M=Mastered |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CC 1(a) | CC 3(a) | CC 4(a) | CC 4(b) | Date of Assessment |
| SPAN 101-Spanish I (5 Units) <br> Applicability-TD Last Offered- Fall 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | 1 |  | I | I | SP12 |
| SPAN 102-Spanish II (5 Units) Applicability-TD Last Offered- Fall 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | D |  | D | D | SP12 |
| SPAN 201-Spanish III (5 Units) Applicability-TD Last Offered- Spring 2011 (Study Abroad Only), Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | D | 1 | D | D | SP12 |
| SPAN 202-Spanish IV (5 Units) Applicability-TD Last Offered- Spring 2011 (Study Abroad Only), Last Curriculum Date: Fall 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | D | D | D | D | SP12 |
| SPAN 127-Spanish Civilization (3 Units) (cross-listed as HIST 127) <br> Applicability-TD Last Offered- Fall 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 (no date on course outline) |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | I | I | D | D | SP12 |
| SPAN 210-Rdng/Comp Spkrs Span I (5 Units) <br> Applicability-TD Last Offered- Fall 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | D | I | D | D | SP12 |
| SPAN 211-Rdng/Comp Spkrs Span II (5 Units) Applicability-TD Last Offered- Spring 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | D | D | D | D | SP12 |


| GER 101-German I (5 Units) <br> Applicability-TD Last Offered- Fall 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SLO 1 | 1 |  | I | I | SP12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GER 102-German II (5 Units) Applicability-TD Last Offered- Fall 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | D |  | D | D | SP12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GER 201-German III (5 Units) <br> Applicability-TD Last Offered- Fall 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | D | I | D | D | SP12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GER 202-German IV (5 Units) <br> Applicability-TD Last Offered- Fall 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | D | D | D | D | SP12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JPN 101-Japanese I (5 Units) Applicability-TD Last Offered- Fall 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | 1 |  | I | I | SP12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JPN 102-Japanese II (5 Units) Applicability-TD Last Offered- Spring 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | D |  | D | D | SP12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHIN 101-Chinese I (5 Units) <br> Applicability-TD Last Offered- Fall 2011, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | I |  | 1 | I | SP12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHIN 102-Chinese II (5 Units) <br> Applicability-TD Last Offered- To Be Offered 1st Time in Spring 2012, Last Curriculum Date: Fall 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO 1 | D |  | D | D | SP12 |

## 10. Review of previous recommendations

Mission:
In order to be current and consistent in this field of study, the name for the Foreign Languages department should be changed to Modern Languages department (MLNG). --Response: No action taken; not recommended at this time.

Explore the potential of expanding the course offerings to include the teaching of other languages such as Chinese, Sign language, and Arabic courses at Citrus College.
--Response: Created Chinese 101 and 102; other languages on hold due to statewide apportionment reductions.

Research the feasibility of changing the French, German and Japanese courses to five unit classes.
--Response: French, German, and Japanese courses revised to be taught as 5.0 unit courses.

Research the impact of a 16 -week semester in the Foreign Languages program. --Response: No longer a goal with campus-wide move to a 16-week term for Spring/Fall and an 8-week term for Winter/Summer intercessions.

Explore the potential of increasing our course offerings of more conversation courses and/or literature.
--Response: Based on need, SPAN/HIST 127 was created to fill a curricular gap in history and culture; other offerings are on hold due to statewide apportionment reductions.

Consider the possibility of offering upper level French, German, Japanese, and Spanish courses.
--Response: Due to budgetary constraints, the French program is currently inactive, German offers 101 and then 102, 201, and 202 as a combined class, Japanese offers 101 and 102 levels, and Spanish higher levels are also inactive.

Investigate the possibility of obtaining a grant to write Spanish placement exams. --Response: No longer recommended.

Create a Spanish major to support comprehensive program.
--Response: No action taken due to budgetary constraints but remains for future consideration.

Explore the possibility of developing an internship program which would allow students to work in Spanish language businesses and social/governmental agencies. --Response: No action taken due to budgetary constraints but remains for future consideration.

Need:

Create a Spanish degree to support a comprehensive program of study. --Response: No action taken due the Department's limitation in being able to offer upper level Language and Literature courses due to budgetary constraints but remains for future consideration.

Quality:
This department has considerable potential for growth: new degree program; additional languages; additional language, literature, and culture courses. Allocate more classroom space as needed.
--Response: Chinese was added in Fall 2010. As the budget situation improves, the faculty will work to restore and grow the program and expect the need for an additional classroom to remain.

Increase pool of qualified adjunct faculty.
--Response: No longer recommended due to schedule reductions.
Secure stable annual funding to support professional development.
--Response: No action because current budgetary constraints limit this goal.
Create a faculty stipend and/or release time that would allow for one of the tenured Spanish instructors to assist the administrator to develop and maintain the academic quality of the Citrus study abroad program in Spain.
--Response: No action, but as the budget situation improves, pursue this issue with the Study Abroad Supervisor and the Dean in charge of Study Abroad.

Explore the possibility of creating a mentor program for adjunct faculty. --Response: As the budget situation improves, create a faculty lead position to work with adjunct faculty.

Explore the possibility of creating an engaging Foreign Languages website to promote interest and enrollment in language courses at Citrus College.
--Response: Complete: Work in progress with Jolie in TeCS to update and improve website.

Create a more challenging lab program to supplement the lab manuals that accompany beginning and intermediate language texts.
--Response: No longer recommended because on-campus arranged lab hours were eliminated.

Feasibility:
Faculty should be included in planning for new and expanded program facilities. (e.g. redevelopment of EDC language lab.)
--Response: No longer recommended. Although an ongoing concern, with the elimination of on-campus lab hours arranged, no specific action is recommended.

Develop a Spanish and/or Modern Languages major.
--Response: No action has been taken, but this is an option on which the faculty will make a recommendation as the statewide budget allows and the Department is able to offer upper level courses.

Faculty should consider offering distance education and/or hybrid courses.
--Response: Complete. Created SPAN/HIST 127 which can be offered as DE or Hybrid as well as revisions to Span 210 \& 211 for traditional, DE, or Hybrid offering.

In order to strengthen enrollment in intermediate courses and create a foundation for a Spanish major, consider offering Spanish 201/202 courses concurrently.
--Response: No action has been taken, but this may be offered when the budget situation improves.

Study the possibility of hiring a full-time faculty member to teach a combination of subjects: French/German, French/Japanese, German/ESL, etc.
--Response: No action has been taken because sections were reduced due to budget reductions.

Faculty will maintain ongoing communication with Counselors in order to insure proper placement of students in the sequence of courses.
--Response: Faculty members in the Foreign Languages Department meet regularly with the Counselors to insure proper placement of students.

Work with district high schools to better articulate language courses and to foster communication and cooperation.
--Response: Faculty have not taken action on this recommendation.
Continue to work toward paralleling the structure of French, German, and Japanese courses with Spanish from 4.0 to 5.0 units.
--Response: French, German, and Japanese courses revised to be taught as 5.0 unit courses; SLO's updated.

Compliance:
After the recent change from 4 to 5 units in Spanish courses, revise course outlines to improve articulation of objectives. Accomplish during the 2006/2007academic year. --Response: Course outlines have been revised and updated.

## 11. Evaluation Criteria - Mission

## Current status

The Foreign Languages program provides language instruction in four languages: Spanish, German, Chinese, and Japanese. Courses in Spanish and German address skills at four levels of proficiency: beginning; high-beginning; intermediate; and highintermediate. In Chinese and Japanese, courses address skills at two levels of proficiency: beginning and high-beginning. The program serves a broad cross-section of the student body by preparing students to communicate in a foreign language and learn about and appreciate cultural differences. All courses are transferrable to CSU and UC systems.

## Commendations

a. The Foreign Languages program conforms with the district's mission in the following ways:
--Provides general, lower division coursework leading to an associate degree in the arts and general education.
--Prepares students to transfer to universities and/or provides general, lower division coursework leading to an associate degree.
--Provides programs, opportunities, curriculum for students to develop a global perspective.
--The study abroad program in Salamanca, Spain advances cultural and personal enrichment programs for students.
b. The foreign languages program reflects the diversity of the college.

The students in the Foreign Language Program are from culturally diverse groups. The department is sensitive to the various needs of the diverse student population and it offers distance education and night classes as needed.

The college gender distribution is $53 \%$ female vs. $44 \%$ male; the foreign languages distribution is close: $56 \%$ female vs. $41 \%$ male.

With respect to age distribution, the only category that differs by more than $5 \%$ is the 20-24 age group. The campus percentage is $42.3 \%$ vs. the foreign languages department at $47.2 \%$. This difference may be attributed to the fact that many students take foreign language courses for transfer purposes. The 20-24 age group is the typical category of transfer students.

With respect to ethnic distribution, the only category that has a salient difference (more than 3\%) from the campus is the Hispanic/Latino group. One reason for this could be that the department offers 2 courses for heritage speakers of Spanish. Another reason is that all Spanish courses tend to attract Hispanic/Latino students.
c. The Foreign Languages Program advances three of the institutional core competencies by offering a wide variety of courses that stress communication skills, critical/analytical thinking and global consciousness and academic responsibility.
d. The Japanese and German success rates meet or exceed state averages. However, the Spanish success rate in Fall 2009 was $64 \%$, which is $4 \%$ lower than the state average and $8 \%$ lower than the college average. The foreign language faculty are concerned about this gap and have made recommendations to address the problem.
e. The Foreign Languages Program has integrated technology into the the program and monitors and updates technology as necessary to remain current with the needs of the constantly changing international world.

## Recommendations

a. Research course data to better understand the reasons for lower than state average success rates. Include the results of the detailed analysis (which could include instructor success and retention rates) in the next annual program review. The analysis will inform next steps needed to make improvements.

## 12. Evaluation Criteria - Need

## Current status

Foreign language skills are essential to students' personal, academic, and professional success. Foreign language courses fulfill core general education transfer requirements and typically fill within the first week of registration. Students transferring to a CSU or UC must successfully complete one or two semesters of foreign language. Moreover, all foreign language courses offered are transferrable to CSU and UC.

Courses of Spanish for Heritage Speakers are in high demand.
Intermediate level courses are in high demand

## Commendations

a. Foreign language courses directly support the core competencies of the district. The competencies primarily addressed are:

Communication
Creative, critical, and analytical thinking
Competencies secondarily addressed are:
Community/global consciousness and responsibility
b. The program fill rate 14 days prior to the beginning of the Fall 2011 semester was $100 \%$. Compared to the college fill rate of $86 \%$ for the same period, the ongoing need for the program appears strong.
c. Courses are offered throughout the day, evening.
d. Courses are offered via distance education and for study abroad.

## Recommendations

a. Explore offering online and or hybrid courses to accommodate the need of more Heritage Speaker courses.
b. To accommodate the need for a comprehensive Spanish program, pursue offering intermediate Spanish courses.

## 13. Evaluation Criteria - Quality

## Current status

The Foreign Languages Program gives students theoretical and practical experience consistent with the core competencies of the district. From this foundation, students develop competencies in communication, critical and analytical thinking, and community responsibility.

Courses are offered in the disciplines of Spanish, German, Japanese, and Chinese. Because of changes in the world political landscape, there is an increasing demand for Arabic. Many California community colleges offer American Sign Language, a discipline particularly attractive to students who might otherwise be reticent about taking a foreign language class.

The Spanish program offers a course (SPAN/HIST 127) focused on the culture and of Spain. The majority of our hispanic students are of Latin American descent, but the program does not offer a course focused on the culture and history of Latin America.

## Commendations

a. Lecture units are consistent with the CSUGE, UCE, AND IGETC transfer requirements.
b. The disciplines of Spanish, German, Japanese, and Chinese are consistent with the same disciplines offered at CSU and UC.
c. A prerequisite validation has been reviewed and approved by the curriculum committee since the last program review.
d. All course outlines have been reviewed and updated since the previous program review and all have requisite SLOs.
e. The program has program level SLOs in place.
f. SLO course and program assesment analysis and discussion will take place during the Fall 2012 semester.

## Recommendations

a. Add courses for Arabic, American Sign Language, and explore the feasibility of Italian.
b. Develop a Latin American culture and history course that can be cross-listed in Spanish and History.
c. Pursue the development of a foreign languages major.

## 14. Evaluation Criteria - Feasibility

## Current status

The Foreign Languages Program gives students theoretical and practical experience consistent with the core competencies of the district. From this foundation, students develop competencies in communication, critical and analytical thinking, and community responsibility.

Because faculty use active learning strategies in a rich multi-media environment, classroom technology is inadequate to support remote control of the LCD projector.

## Commendations

a. The Library, the Transfer Center and the Learning Center staff all strongly support student success in Foreign Language courses.
b. The Distance Education Office strongly supports the Foreign Language faculty; however, faculty are now required to do more to manage their course websites.
c. Library staff is supportive of student research assignments.
d. The Learning Center tutorial services offers high quality help that is vital to student success.
e. The Transfer Center offers high quality help that is vital to student success.
f. The Distance Education staff is very supportive and their help is vital to student success.
g. Lecture units are consistent with the CSUGE, UC and IGETC transfer requirements.
h. All course outlines have been reviewed and updated since the previous program review and all have SLOs.
i. The program has program level SLOs in place.
j. The Department will complete SLO assessment during the Fall 2012.
k. All full time and part time faculty meet state minimum qualifications for Foreign Language courses.

## Recommendations

a. Staff development funding should be approved to fund participation in regional, national and international foreign language conferences (regardless weather a faculty member is presenting a paper or just attending it).
b. In order to support faculty engagement in course and program SLO assessment the college should develop a user friendly data review system that makes SLO
data available to faculty for reflection and program development.
c. Purchase webcams and remote/wireless presentation slide advancers to allow greater mobility for the teacher.

## 15. Evaluation Criteria - Compliance

## Current status

The Foreign Languages program faculty works diligently to offer schedules that fit the varying needs of a diverse student body. The department offers courses during the day and evenings as well as courses delivered in the study abroad program. While campus equipment and library resources are adequate and meet the basic needs of the program, specific instructional equipment (listed in previous recommendations) is needed to allow for the active learning strategies used by the faculty.

All courses are transferable to UC and CSU systems. Courses within the program are instructed by full-time and adjunct faculty members who possess an academic background that meets the minimum qualifications to teach in the discipline.

## Commendations

a. Course requisites meet Federal, state and District requirements.
b. Course outlines of record meet state, district and federal regulations for content.
c. All course outlines have been updated and reviewed on Curricunet.

## Recommendations

a. Complete course and program SLO assessment by Fall 2012.

## 16．Recommendations

| Rank | Description of recommendation （actions or behaviors to be completed） | Responsible person（s） | Target Date | Personnel | Facilities | Equip．／ Software | Supplies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Explore offering online and or hybrid courses to accommodate the need of more Heritage Speaker courses． | Afzali | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Spring } \\ & 2012 \end{aligned}$ | 区 | $\square$ | 【 | 【 |
| 2 | Purchase webcams and remote／wireless presentation slide advancers to allow greater mobility for the teacher． | Afzali | Fall 2012 | $\square$ | $\square$ | 【 | 【 |
| 3 | Research course data to better understand the reasons for lower than state average success rates．Include the results of the detailed analysis（which could include instructor success and retention rates）in the next annual program review． The analysis will inform next steps needed to make improvements． | Afzali | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Spring } \\ & 2012 \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 4 | To accommodate the need for a comprehensive Spanish program，pursue offering intermediate Spanish courses． |  |  | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 5 | Add courses for Arabic， American Sign Language， and explore the feasibility of Italian． | Garate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spring } \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 6 | Pursue the development of a foreign languages major | McGarry | Spring $2014$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| 7 | Staff development funding should be approved to fund participation in regional， national and international foreign language conferences （regardless weather a faculty member is presenting a paper or just attending it）． | Lee |  | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| 8 | In order to support faculty engagement in course and program SLO assessment the college should develop a | Lee |  | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |


|  | user friendly data review <br> system that makes SLO data <br> available to faculty for <br> reflection and program <br> development. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Comments

## 17. Budget Recommendations

Resources are needed in the following areas:
Certificated Personnel (FNIC)

| Position | Discuss impact on goals / SLOs | Impact $\diamond$ | Priority $\ddagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N/A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Classified Personnel

| Position | Discuss impact on goals / SLOs | Impact $\diamond$ | Priority $\ddagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Facilities

| Facilities / repairs or <br> modifications needed | Discuss impact on goals / SLOs | Bldg/ <br> Room | Impact $\diamond$ | Priority $\ddagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sound proof LB 106 and <br> 108 to avoid sound <br> interference from <br> adjacent classroooms | Improve delivery of course content <br> and minimize sound interference <br> from other rooms | LB 106 <br> and 108 | Q,F | 2,3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Computers / Software (Tecs)

| Item | Discuss impact on goals / SLOs | Cost | Impact $\diamond$ | Priority $\ddagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Install Skype in LB <br> 108 | Improve SLOs be allowing for <br> collaborative teaching with speaker of <br> other languages in other countries. | 0 | Q,F | 2.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Equipment

| Item | Discuss impact on goals / SLOs | Cost | Impact $\diamond$ | Priority $\ddagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Blueray machine in LB <br> 106 and 108 | Improve delivery of course content. | $\$ 400$ | Q,F | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Supplies (Division)

| Item | Discuss impact on goals / SLOs | Cost | Impact $\diamond$ | Priority $\ddagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Additional information:

[^0]
## Attachment A: Key Performance Indicator data pages

|  | Key Performance Indicators | Fall04 | Fall05 | Fall06 | Fall07 | Fall08 | Fall09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 |
| Program Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Majors (total) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | New Majors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Courses Offered | 7.0 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 16.0 | 11.0 | 10.0 |
| 4 | Sections Offered | 25.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 24.0 | 22.0 |
| 5 | Morning Secions | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 10.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| 6 | Afternoon Sections | 7.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 |
| 7 | Evening Sections | 10.0 | 13.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 |
| 8 | Arranged Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Weekend Sections |  |  |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| 10 | Short Term Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | DistanceEd Full-Term Sections |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 12 | DistanceEd Short-Term Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Enrollment | 665 | 683 | 582 | 528 | 576 | 626 |
| 14 | Weekly Student Contact hours (WSCH) | 3133.4 | 3683.8 | 3115.0 | 2298.0 | 3709.0 | 3478.9 |
| 15 | Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) | 107.4 | 126.3 | 106.8 | 70.9 | 114.5 | 107.4 |
| Program Resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) | 7.8 | 10.2 | 9.9 | 8.1 | 9.7 | 7.9 |
| 17 | Credit Reimbursement Rate | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2,922.3 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \$ 3,259.7 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,476.3 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,668.2 \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,834.4 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \$ 3,834.4 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |
| Program Operation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | WSCH/FTEF | 402.7 | 361.9 | 316.2 | 283.0 | 383.2 | 440.4 |
| 19 | FTES/FTEF | 13.8 | 12.4 | 10.8 | 8.7 | 11.8 | 13.6 |
| 20 | Fill Rate at Census | 87.5 | 79.5 | 67.8 | 72.6 | 74.3 | 84.2 |
| Program Success |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | Course Retention | 86.3 | 81.1 | 87.3 | 89.4 | 91.5 | 90.3 |
| 22 | Course Success | 61.5 | 53.0 | 61.0 | 64.0 | 61.5 | 63.6 |


|  | Key Performance Indicators |  |  |  | Winter08 | Winter09 | Winter10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | Year $2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Year } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 |
|  | Program Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Majors (total) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | New Majors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Courses Offered |  |  |  | 4.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 |
| 4 | Sections Offered |  |  |  | 6.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| 5 | Morning Secions |  |  |  | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| 6 | Afternoon Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Evening Sections |  |  |  | 3.0 | 1.0 |  |
| 8 | Arranged Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Weekend Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Short Term Sections |  |  |  | 6.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 |
| 11 | DistanceEd Full-Term Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | DistanceEd Short-Term Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Enrollment |  |  |  | 129 | 101 | 53 |
| 14 | Weekly Student Contact hours (WSCH) |  |  |  | 630.3 | 560.0 | 293.6 |
| 15 | Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) |  |  |  | 19.5 | 17.3 | 9.1 |
|  | Program Resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) |  |  |  | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.7 |
| 17 | Credit Reimbursement Rate |  |  |  | \$3,668.28 | \$3,834.46 | \$3,834.46 |
|  | Program Operation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | WSCH/FTEF |  |  |  | 337.1 | 466.7 | 396.8 |
| 19 | FTES/FTEF |  |  |  | 10.4 | 14.4 | 12.2 |
| 20 | Fill Rate at Census |  |  |  | 62.8 | 85.8 | 81.7 |
|  | Program Success |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | Course Retention |  |  |  | 86.8 | 93.1 | 92.5 |
| 22 | Course Success |  |  |  | 70.5 | 79.2 | 81.1 |


|  | Key Performance Indicators | Spring05 | Spring06 | Spring07 | Spring08 | Spring09 | Spring10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 |
| Program Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Majors (total) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | New Majors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Courses Offered | 12.0 | 15.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 | 13.0 |
| 4 | Sections Offered | 31.0 | 32.0 | 30.0 | 34.0 | 31.0 | 25.0 |
| 5 | Morning Secions | 8.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 11.0 | 8.0 | 7.0 |
| 6 | Afternoon Sections | 13.0 | 12.0 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 11.0 |
| 7 | Evening Sections | 10.0 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 6.0 |
| 8 | Arranged Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Weekend Sections |  |  |  | 1.0 |  |  |
| 10 | Short Term Sections | 4.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| 11 | DistanceEd Full-Term Sections |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 12 | DistanceEd Short-Term Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Enrollment | 792 | 669 | 604 | 606 | 644 | 573 |
| 14 | Weekly Student Contact hours (WSCH) | 3689.6 | 3543.2 | 3188.8 | 3060.6 | 3988.4 | 3159.7 |
| 15 | Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) | 126.5 | 121.5 | 109.3 | 94.4 | 123.1 | 97.5 |
| Program Resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) | 9.6 | 10.8 | 10.1 | 11.3 | 12.0 | 7.8 |
| 17 | Credit Reimbursement Rate | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2,922.3 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,259.7 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,476.3 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,668.2 \\ 8 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,834.4 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,834.4 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Program Operation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | WSCH/FTEF | 384.7 | 328.4 | 315.4 | 270.4 | 331.3 | 405.1 |
| 19 | FTES/FTEF | 13.2 | 11.3 | 10.8 | 8.3 | 10.2 | 12.5 |
| 20 | Fill Rate at Census | 82.7 | 71.8 | 67.9 | 65.6 | 68.0 | 79.5 |
| Program Success |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | Course Retention | 85.6 | 84.8 | 83.8 | 92.6 | 91.1 | 93.5 |
| 22 | Course Success | 64.4 | 62.2 | 60.1 | 66.3 | 63.0 | 71.6 |


|  | Key Performance Indicators | Summer0 <br> 4 | Summer0 <br> 5 | Summer0 <br> 6 | Summer0 $7$ | Summer0 <br> 8 | Summer0 $9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 |
| Program Access |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Majors (total) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | New Majors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Courses Offered | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| 4 | Sections Offered | 6.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 7.0 | 4.0 |
| 5 | Morning Secions | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| 6 | Afternoon Sections | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 |  |
| 7 | Evening Sections | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |  |
| 8 | Arranged Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Weekend Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Short Term Sections | 6.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 7.0 | 4.0 |
| 11 | DistanceEd Full-Term Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | DistanceEd Short-Term Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Enrollment | 137 | 212 | 196 | 222 | 180 | 116 |
| 14 | Weekly Student Contact hours (WSCH) | 675.8 | 809.7 | 909.1 | 1045.0 | 1038.3 | 697.1 |
| 15 | Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) | 23.2 | 27.8 | 31.2 | 35.8 | 32.0 | 21.5 |
| Program Resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) | 1.9 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 1.3 |
| 17 | Credit Reimbursement Rate | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2,922.3 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,259.7 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,476.3 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \$ 3,668.2 \\ 8 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,834.4 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,834.4 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Program Operation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | WSCH/FTEF | 348.3 | 283.1 | 359.3 | 364.1 | 465.6 | 524.1 |
| 19 | FTES/FTEF | 11.9 | 9.7 | 12.3 | 12.5 | 14.4 | 16.2 |
| 20 | Fill Rate at Census | 76.0 | 124.1 | 125.4 | 74.4 | 86.2 | 94.2 |
| Program Success |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | Course Retention | 92.7 | 91.5 | 91.3 | 89.6 | 100.0 | 96.6 |
| 22 | Course Success | 80.3 | 75.5 | 73.0 | 73.9 | 88.3 | 72.4 |


|  |  | 04-05 |  | 05-06 |  | 06-07 |  | 07-08 |  | 08-09 |  | 09-10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Year1 |  | Year2 |  | Year3 |  | Year4 |  | Year5 |  | Year6 |  |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FL | Female | 882 | 61.2\% | 816 | 59.0\% | 658 | 54.3\% | 757 | 56.5\% | 734 | 53.9\% | 714 | 56.4\% |
| FL | Male | 560 | 38.8\% | 567 | 41.0\% | 553 | 45.7\% | 567 | 42.3\% | 578 | 42.5\% | 520 | 41.1\% |
| FL | Missing |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 1.1\% | 49 | 3.6\% | 32 | 2.5\% |
| FL | Total | 1442 | 100.0\% | 1383 | 100.0\% | 1211 | 100.0\% | 1339 | 100.0\% | 1361 | 100.0\% | 1266 | 100.0\% |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FL | 19 or younger | 489 | 33.9\% | 487 | 35.2\% | 425 | 35.1\% | 513 | 38.3\% | 518 | 38.1\% | 457 | 36.1\% |
| FL | 20-24 | 640 | 44.4\% | 571 | 41.3\% | 544 | 44.9\% | 557 | 41.6\% | 630 | 46.3\% | 598 | 47.2\% |
| FL | 25-29 | 145 | 10.1\% | 137 | 9.9\% | 114 | 9.4\% | 112 | 8.4\% | 96 | 7.1\% | 106 | 8.4\% |
| FL | 30-34 | 56 | 3.9\% | 60 | 4.3\% | 38 | 3.1\% | 44 | 3.3\% | 42 | 3.1\% | 37 | 2.9\% |
| FL | 35-39 | 40 | 2.8\% | 40 | 2.9\% | 28 | 2.3\% | 32 | 2.4\% | 26 | 1.9\% | 23 | 1.8\% |
| FL | 40-49 | 43 | 3.0\% | 58 | 4.2\% | 36 | 3.0\% | 44 | 3.3\% | 27 | 2.0\% | 29 | 2.3\% |
| FL | 50 and above | 28 | 1.9\% | 30 | 2.2\% | 25 | 2.1\% | 34 | 2.5\% | 20 | 1.5\% | 16 | 1.3\% |
| FL | Missing | 1 | 0.1\% |  |  | 1 | 0.1\% | 3 | 0.2\% | 2 | 0.1\% |  |  |
| FL | Total | 1442 | 100.0\% | 1383 | 100.0\% | 1211 | 100.0\% | 1339 | 100.0\% | 1361 | 100.0\% | 1266 | 100.0\% |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FL | Asian <br> Black or African | 220 | 15.3\% | 200 | 14.5\% | 199 | 16.4\% | 179 | 13.4\% | 147 | 10.8\% | 66 | 5.2\% |
| FL | American | 57 | 4.0\% | 65 | 4.7\% | 56 | 4.6\% | 68 | 5.1\% | 61 | 4.5\% | 44 | 3.5\% |
| FL | Hispanic/Latino | 620 | 43.0\% | 583 | 42.2\% | 493 | 40.7\% | 501 | 37.4\% | 597 | 43.9\% | 466 | 36.8\% |
| FL | American Indian or Alaska Native Native Hawaiian or | 16 | 1.1\% | 14 | 1.0\% | 12 | 1.0\% | 16 | 1.2\% | 11 | 0.8\% | 2 | 0.2\% |
| FL | Other Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 0.5\% | 7 | 0.5\% | 1 | 0.1\% |
| FL | White | 441 | 30.6\% | 427 | 30.9\% | 359 | 29.6\% | 396 | 29.6\% | 267 | 19.6\% | 222 | 17.5\% |
| FL | Two or More Races |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 0.6\% |
|  | Unknown/Non- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FL | Respondent | 88 | 6.1\% | 94 | 6.8\% | 92 | 7.6\% | 172 | 12.8\% | 271 | 19.9\% | 458 | 36.2\% |
| FL | Total | 1442 | 100.0\% | 1383 | 100.0\% | 1211 | 100.0\% | 1339 | 100.0\% | 1361 | 100.0\% | 1266 | 100.0\% |
| Educational Goal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FL | Degree \& Transfer | 670 | 46.5\% | 626 | 45.3\% | 539 | 44.5\% | 177 | 13.2\% | 342 | 25.1\% | 463 | 36.6\% |
| FL | Transfer | 424 | 29.4\% | 386 | 27.9\% | 364 | 30.1\% | 77 | 5.8\% | 110 | 8.1\% | 131 | 10.3\% |
| FL | AA/AS | 53 | 3.7\% | 64 | 4.6\% | 57 | 4.7\% | 132 | 9.9\% | 221 | 16.2\% | 191 | 15.1\% |
| FL | License | 47 | 3.3\% | 51 | 3.7\% | 28 | 2.3\% | 7 | 0.5\% | 17 | 1.2\% | 9 | 0.7\% |
| FL | Certificate | 50 | 3.5\% | 45 | 3.3\% | 39 | 3.2\% | 7 | 0.5\% | 7 | 0.5\% | 13 | 1.0\% |
| FL | Job Skills | 36 | 2.5\% | 38 | 2.7\% | 26 | 2.1\% | 44 | 3.3\% | 59 | 4.3\% | 52 | 4.1\% |
| FL | Basic Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65 | 4.9\% | 94 | 6.9\% | 39 | 3.1\% |
| FL | Personal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 | 2.1\% |
| FL | Undecided |  |  |  |  |  |  | 110 | 8.2\% | 144 | 10.6\% | 177 | 14.0\% |
| FL | Not Reported | 162 | 11.2\% | 173 | 12.5\% | 158 | 13.0\% | 720 | 53.8\% | 367 | 27.0\% | 164 | 13.0\% |
| FL | Total | 1442 | 100.0\% | 1383 | 100.0\% | 1211 | 100.0\% | 1339 | 100.0\% | 1361 | 100.0\% | 1266 | 100.0\% |


|  | Key Performance Indicators | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Year1 | Year2 | Year3 | Year4 | Year5 | Year6 |
|  | Program Resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | Revenue: FTES*Reimbursement Rate | \$745,757.01 | \$888,531.75 | \$869,085.00 | \$802,913.13 | \$1,066,133.26 | \$899,295.90 |
| 24 | Total District Adopted Program Budget | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | 608,787 |
| 25 | Support Personnel (wage without benefit, 2200 and 2400 in budget) | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | N/A |
| 26 | Supplies (4300 in budget) | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | 1,615 |
| 27 | Cost | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | NO DATA | 675,922 |  |
| 28 | Total FTES for the year | 255.37 | 272.58 | 250 | 218.88 | 278.04 | 234.53 |
| 29 | Cost per FTES |  |  |  |  | 2,431.02 |  |
|  | Degrees and Certificates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | Degree: Language Arts | 52 | 46 | 35 | 36 | 35 | 47 |
| 31 | Certificates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Skill Awards |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | Licenses (reported by department) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Career Technical Education Programs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | VTEA Grant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | Industry Contributions to Program Resources |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | Available Jobs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | Attach one copy of the three most recent College Core Indicator Information forms for each of the appropriate TOP codes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | Please include "Student Satisfaction" and "Employer Satisfaction" in the program review write-up. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | Labor market data |  |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    $\diamond$ Impact:
    $\mathbf{M}=$ Mission: Does program meet the District's mission and established core competencies? Does program reflect the District's diversity?
    $\mathbf{N}=$ Need: How is program addressing needs based on labor market data, enrollment, articulation, advisory committee, regional agreements, etc.?
    $\mathbf{Q}=$ Quality: Are lecture/lab unit values appropriate? Have the course outlines been reviewed / updated regularly? Are disciplines appropriate? Is faculty development adequate? Does program support State and District emphasis on critical thinking, problem solving and written expression? Does program meet stated objectives in the form of SLOs? Are course pre-requisites and co-requisites validated?
    F = Feasibility: Are facilities, equipment, and library resources adequate? Are evening programs and services adequate? Are course offerings frequent enough for students to make adequate progress in both day and evening programs? Does the program have adequate communication with \& support from Counseling?
    $\mathbf{C}=$ Compliance: Do course requisites meet Federal, State \& District requirements? Do the course outlines meet state, district \& federal regulations for content? Do vocational programs have regular advisory meetings?
    $\ddagger$ Priority: (Note: When discussing priority, consider the following and address in Column 2)
    A. Is this goal mandated by law, rule, or district policy?
    B. Is this goal essential to program success?
    C. Is this goal necessary to maintain / improve program student learning outcomes?

