Instructional Annual Program Review Update Form

BACKGROUND:

Program Review (PR) is an integral part of the campus planning process. As programs and areas monitor their progress on the current comprehensive four-year program review, changes in need and scope can be expected. This PR Update Form is designed to outline and request modifications to the current program review that occur between comprehensive four-year review cycles, as needed.

Examples of a requested change include new information such as action plans, outcomes modifications, personnel changes, technology needs, and capital expenditures requirements. As programs and areas monitor their progress on the previous comprehensive four-year program review, the form provides the basis to suggest a change in plans and processes to improve student success and institutional effectiveness.

DIRECTIONS:

This form shall be completed annually by ALL instructional programs.

- All instructional programs must submit their Annual Program Review Update Form to their dean or manager by Monday, March 6.
- All deans or managers will forward the completed form to the Program Review Committee Chair by Monday, March 13.

SUBMISSION:

Program: Counseling

Division: Counseling & Student Development and Student Support Services_____

Date: 2/10/2023_____

[x] We have reviewed our most recent self-study and **have not identified** any significant changes that necessitate resource requests for the upcoming academic year. *(Complete only pages 1 and 2)*

[ ] We have reviewed our most recent self-study and **have identified** significant changes that necessitate additional resource requests, which are attached in our submission. *(Complete the entire form)*

Program Signature(s): *Elsa Perez*   Printed Name: <u>Elsa Perez</u>

                                                                          Jennifer LaBounty

PPRC Endorsement: Yes [ ]   No [ ]

Revised 01/27/2023

Part 1: Review of Data

Institution Set Standards (ISS)

1. Use the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) to review your course completion and success rates and provide a comparison to the Institution Set Standards for course completion and success rates.

   > You can access your program's ISS here: ISS Documents; Alternately, if you have access to Tableau, you can access the data here: Tableau ISS Data.

   The institutional set standard for campus course completion and success rates are as follows:

Course Success Institution-Set Standard		Completion (Retention) Institution-Set Standard	
Below Standard:	Less than 61.2%	**Below Standard:**	Less than 74.5%
Warning:	Between 61.2% and 64.6%	**Warning:**	Between 74.5% and 78.6%
+:	Above 64.6%	**+:**	Above 78.6%

   As a result, counseling CSLOs are at 80% or above indicating the courses are exceeding the institutional set standards for course success and completion.

   However, African American students are meeting expectations at 69.53%. Though this exceeds course success standards it does not meet the completion standards. This is concerning and the faculty strive to promote student success and completion in all ethnic groups. Although the majority of the CSLO data shows positive results as students are meeting the expectations for CSLOs, Counseling and Student Development are having discussions on improving the existing gaps. Annual review of the CSLO attainment data will lead to discussion, including a closer examination of how CSLOs are being assessed by faculty. Perhaps the method of assessment may need to change based on student needs. For example, if high-stakes tests are determining proficiency in the CSLO, perhaps the method of assessment could be altered to aid the student in learning the content, but also meeting the CSLO expectation.

   In comparing the SLO Performance Report and the Equity Analysis, there appears to be essential data that needs to be addressed. The results do show a disproportionate analysis impact with some categories included from the campus wide Student Equity Plan. Black/African American students had a significantly lower rate of course completion at 78.7% and course success rate at 48.8%., in comparison to other categories. However, their CSLO attainment rate is higher than the success rate, at 69.53%. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Island students show a completion rate at 76.3% and for course success, a rate of 58.8%. However, their CSLO attainment rate indicates a higher rate, at 91.94%. All other categories have an adequate course completion and success completion rate. This data specifies that students in most of the categories are learning the material and attaining the CSLO, but other factors are at play having a direct impact on course completion and course success. Faculty suspect that the CSLO attainment rate is higher in most cases across the categories for various factors. Faculty believe that the pandemic impacted student lives on various levels, including health, family, socioeconomics, transitioning to an online environment, etc. Faculty also contributes the gap in course success in comparison to the minimal gap in CSLO attainment to students' lack of college success strategies, including, poor time management, inadequate study habits, lack of motivation, and more. As such, the division is participating in the campus-wide Guided Pathways initiative, and several faculty are invested in the Instructional Success Team for Counseling and Student Development and from Student Support Services to address such concerns. Faculty in these divisions will be highly encouraged to participate in

professional learning through staff development and outside organizations to expand knowledge and learn strategies to close the CSLO attainment gap, and to ensure all groups, especially the underrepresented and minority groups achieve success in meeting CSLO expectations and successful course completion.

2. If your program meets or exceeds the standard for completion and success, to what do you attribute your success? If your program does not meet this standard, please examine the possible reasons, and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate.

"The PRPC, along with the Institutional Integrity Committee, also voted to take a hiatus on programs completing the ISLO analysis in Part 1: Review of Data. Problems with ISLO data collection have made it impossible for programs to get the information they need in a timely manner to do meaningful ISLO assessment. IIC, PRPC, OIE and the SLOA committee are all working to fix this issue for next year's annual updates, but for this year, programs should leave that portion of their annual update blank. On the attached form, this section is grey to indicate it is on hiatus this year. Programs should still do the ISS section in the review of data."

Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs)--Do Not Complete Spring 2023

All programs will compare their CSLO attainment to the Global Awareness ISLO.

1. Describe your program's participation in assessment of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO's). Specifically, how does your CSLO attainment, for the courses that are mapped to the Global Awareness ISLO, compare to Fullerton College's ISLO attainment?
2. Does the SLO data show significant achievement gaps among demographic groups in your program? If so, where are the gaps and what steps can your program take to shrink them? If not, to what do you attribute your success in minimizing the achievement gap?

Part 2: Additional Resource Request Reasoning and Support

Request Justification (Note: Expand all areas as needed to support your resource request)

Briefly summarize your new / modified resource request. Is it imperative that this resource request be processed now rather than during the next comprehensive program review?

The greatest obstacle to increasing counseling capacity is stable funding. A majority of full-time counseling faculty have been hired over the last decade with SSSP (Student Success and Support Program) funds and some general funds. Moreover, all adjunct counselors have been hired and maintained through SSSP funds. Unfortunately, the SSSP funding was drastically cut for the Counseling Department when SSSP, Basic Skills, and Equity combined into the Student Equity and Achievement Program (SEA). In fact, the Counseling Department is experiencing a $900,000 reduction for 2022-2023. It is imperative that the campus and district provide more stable funding to increase counseling capacity, so students have access to counseling appointments and a greater likelihood of completing their goals.

1. If the Resource Request is personnel-related, include support and associated details/data in support of this request.
2. How will this additional resource allocation specifically enhance your program's services, activities, processes, etc. to continue or improve student learning and achievement?
3. How will this resource enhance your area or program? Have you considered the College Mission or Strategic Initiatives, physical/organizational restructuring, and or your program's goals for improvement, as stated in your last program review?

Provide any additional information that supports your request in the space below. Expand as necessary.

Part 3: Resource Request Funding

Directions:
- Complete and submit this section ONLY if you have a NEW resource request
- Each NEW resource request must include the associated justification (Page 3).
- Complete as many resource requests, as necessary. Support each resource request with appropriate and relevant detail (Page 3).

Submission:

Requested by:_____Email:_____Phone: _____

Division:_____Department:_____Total Requested $:_____

This request is intended as an update to a previously submitted program review. List and provide the cost to implement this request. Describe equipment location and include a description of additional space or maintenance, if needed.

Type of Resource	Requested Dollar Amount	Potential Funding Source
Personnel:		
Facilities		
Equipment		
Supplies		
Computer Hardware		
Computer Software		
Training		
Other		
Total Requested Amount:		

Approval:

Dean: Signature/Approval:_____   Date: ___3.10.23_____

Rank (if appropriate):   Dean Priority Ranking: _____ of _____