

# Strategic Initiative Section Report

**Biology:**

**Date: 10-25-2019**

- 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review Biology

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

## Biology

### Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20

#### 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review Biology

Courses	% Students Exceed	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A	Total

Assessment tables have been sent to Dean Steve Waller as an attachemnt.

### Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

#### 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review Biology

#### Plan-Describe the process used to assess the courses for this program:

Assessment tools used by the BC Biology Department include multiple-choice questions, short answers, fill-in responses, and Pre/Post-test comparisons. Faculty review their class data and compare their data with other faculty within their discipline. Typically, faculty will collaborate and discuss how the particular SLO could be presented more effectively. Previous strategies include, incorporating in-class review/discussion questions in an attempt to reinforce the material with practical application.

#### Reflect-Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program

Strengths;

- Most students meet SLO standards
- Most courses have assessment data entered into eLumen

Weaknesses

- Several Physics courses do not have any data entered in eLumen

**Dialogue-Explain when, or how often, discipline faculty meet to discuss the assessment process (e.g., planning, data collection, and results) for this program (e.g., department meeting).**

Faculty within each program meets at least twice per semester to discuss the planning of which SLO(s) will be assessed, how they will be assessed. Faculty then meet at the end of the semester to review and submit data into eLumen.

# Strategic Initiative Section Report

**Computer Science (BC):**

**Date: 10-25-2019**

- 2019-2020 Computer Science (AS-T) Instructional Annual Update Program Review

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

## Computer Science (BC)

### Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20

#### 2019-2020 Computer Science (AS-T) Instructional Annual Update Program Review

Courses	% Students Exceed	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A	Total
COMP B11	57.29	17.71	19.79	5.21	100
COMP B12					
COMP B13					
COMP B14					
MATH B6A	31.65	25.32	20.89	22.15	100
MATH B6B	36.61	25.89	29.46	8.04	100
PHYS B4A					
PHYS B4B					

Data is missing for the blank area in the table above.

### Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

#### 2019-2020 Computer Science (AS-T) Instructional Annual Update Program Review

#### Plan-Describe the process used to assess the courses for this program:

For the four core courses in this degree which are located in the Business Management and Information Technology Department, the full-time faculty assess the SLO from the SLO Assessment Plan. The faculty selects the outcomes to assess, performs the assessment, and reports the results in e-Lumen. We are not aware of the process in the Mathematics and Physics Department.

**Reflect-Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program**

Since a lot of the data is missing, the validity of this analysis is weak. For the one Computer Science class for which there is data, the percent of students who meet or exceed expectations is 75%. But, with addition of the Math classes, the value falls to about 65%.

**Dialogue-Explain when, or how often, discipline faculty meet to discuss the assessment process (e.g., planning, data collection, and results) for this program (e.g., department meeting).**

The faculty of the Business Management and Information Technology Department meet as often as it is required. There is no official meeting time for the discussion of assessment, but faculty meet throughout the year at least once with the assessment committee member to discuss the input procedures for assessment data.

# Strategic Initiative Section Report

**Economics:**

**Date: 10-25-2019**

- 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review Economics

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

## Economics

### Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20

#### 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review Economics

Courses	% Students Exceed	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A	Total
Economics B1	10.11%	63.54%	17.87	8.48%	100%
Economics B2	8.75%	71.87%	17.02%	2.36%	100%

### Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

#### 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review Economics

#### Plan-Describe the process used to assess the courses for this program:

The Economics Program maintains a SLO pattern for assessment and rotates through it each term, to be sure that all SLOs are evaluated within the 6 year cycle.

As part of this process, the instructors develop questions that are deemed appropriate measures of success in demonstrating competency in each SLO, and these questions/prompts are administered during the semester.

The results are evaluated, and then reflected upon in order to determine next steps- as to any possible need to modify instruction to better enable student success in SLO attainment.

Our program is somewhat unique, in that the majority of the courses required by the TMC are not within our program. As such, we also depend upon the success of students in courses such as Math and Business, yet we have no right to investigate the practices of colleagues in other programs, as that leads down a rabbit hole into a new universe of meddling in each other's affairs across campus.

As a result, we have not provided SLO data for other programs- as they are not within our control, or oversight. In the same way that our program shouldn't be evaluating and critiquing the performance of the athletic department, or of the success rates of the theater department.

**Reflect-Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program**

The program has consistently met the fundamental goal of our program of an SLO success rate of 70% or higher, which is a strength. This year the success rate was above 80% for Economics B2, which is significantly higher than 70%. While meeting the target, Economics B1 did lag behind Economics B2, and is an area where improvement is possible. This may be related to the fact that there are more students who take ECON B1, and ECON B2 tends to be taken later in a student's ed plan, which would correlate to their having already demonstrated success as a student in previous terms.

The Economics Program cannot provide any context about what is happening in other programs. That is the purview of other departments to analyze and explain the strengths and weaknesses. Just as the Economics Program is not willing to critique any committee's internal functioning on campus, as that is the purview of said program, and their administrative leads, to evaluate and critique.

**Dialogue-Explain when, or how often, discipline faculty meet to discuss the assessment process (e.g., planning, data collection, and results) for this program (e.g., department meeting).**

Discipline faculty meet at department meeting at least once a semester to discuss the assessment process in general terms. Further communications occurs more frequently via email exchanges, and via the two members visiting each other's office. The great thing about having a program of two members is that one of us can walk over to the other's office to discuss the assessment process, or any other program business, whenever necessity indicates we should do so.

This is easier to accomplish than the coordination required to get all 22 FT members of the faculty in all three of the programs within the Social Science Department.

However, at the full meetings, the general guidelines are presented, with general expectations. At program-specific meetings, we meet to further discuss the specifics of SLO assessment on an ongoing basis, that is no less than once per semester, and sometimes four times a month- either in person or via email.

# Strategic Initiative Section Report

**Education:****Date: 10-25-2019**

- 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review Education

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

## Education

### Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20

#### 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review Education

Courses	% Students Exceed	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A	Total
BIOL B11	6.91	53.62	24.63	14.85	100
CHDV B21	60	16.36	20	3.64	100
COMM B1	33.42	48.49	10.03	8.07	100
EDUC B24	38.33	48.33	1.67	11.67	100
ENGL B1A	24.51	30.43	28.06	17	100
ENGL B1B	15	64.17	.83	20	100
ERSC B10	64.71	0	17.65	17.65	100
ERSC B10L	0	0	0	0	0
HIST B1	35.18	37.94	15.36	11.52	100
HIST B17A	25.59	43.7	10.24	20.47	100
HIST B18	31.96	48.71	10.05	9.28	100
GEOG B5	9.03	82.58	7.74	.65	100
ENGL B3	0	0	0	0	0
PHIL B9	31.37	15.69	27.45	25.49	100
ART B1	47.45	19.39	15.82	17.35	100
MUSC B22	34.13	42.95	22.92	0	100
THEA B20	0	0	0	0	0
COMP B2	0	0	0	0	0
MATH B4A	4.69	28.91	64.06	2.34	100
PHSC B12	0	0	0	0	0
POLS B1	35.83	12.08	27.92	24.17	100

Done!

## Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

### 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review Education

#### **Plan-Describe the process used to assess the courses for this program:**

The plan is to assess the courses for this program by reviewing the outcome data for each course listed to determine if the success rates are adequate for students to progress toward the AD-T degree in a timely manner.

#### **Reflect-Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program**

A strength for this program is that most of the courses of the degree are general education courses that are offered consistently in multiple campuses. Another strength is that the degree is fully articulated with CSUB's liberal studies program the number of sections for the Intro course EDUC B24 has tripled since we became a new department

There are several weaknesses with this program of the outcome data reported for the required and recommended courses five courses are missing outcome data so we cannot determine the success rate in those five courses (ERSC B10L, ENGL B3, THEA B29, COMP B2, PHSC B12). Also, 8 of the courses in the program are below 70% success rates according to the assessment data provided ( BIOL B11, ENGL B1A, ERSC B10, HIST B17a, PHIL B9, ART B1, MATH B4a, POLC B1). also there are not enough sections of some of the required courses to accommodate the students in this pathway (GEOG B5, PHIL B9, ERSC B10, BIOL B11).

Not all courses have SLO reports. It was difficult to make a comprehensive review.

#### **Dialogue-Explain when, or how often, discipline faculty meet to discuss the assessment process (e.g., planning, data collection, and results) for this program (e.g., department meeting).**

Since the department was founded the faculty have met monthly to discuss the assessment process and data collection.

All, but one of the courses in the degree are housed outside of the department. The one course within the department, EDUC B24, belonged to a different department until less than a year ago. We are developing a process to ensure that EDUC B24 SLOs are evaluated in a timely fashion and in accordance with local requirements.

Good!



# Strategic Initiative Section Report

**Electronics Technology:**

**Date: 10-25-2019**

- Electronics Technology 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

## Electronics Technology

### Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20

#### Electronics Technology 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review

Courses	% Students Exceed	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A	Total
ELET B1a	15.45	46.78	35.19	2.58	
ELET B1b (new course; 1 SLO assessed)	9.09	90.91	0	0	
ELET B3 (previously B5)	62.16	20.72	13.51	3.6	
ELET B4	76.79	16.07	7.14	0	
ELET B55a	15.38	52.56	32.05	0	
ELET B56	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
ELET B58	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
ELET B61	48.48	30.3	21.21	0	
ELET B62	44.44	33.33	22.22	0	
ELET B70	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

### Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

#### Electronics Technology 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review

#### Plan-Describe the process used to assess the courses for this program:

One of the challenges of academic freedom is that each instructor chooses what he/she considers "exceeds", "meets", and "doesn't meet" expectations. Some consider percentages on exams or other assessment methods as a determining factor (e.g. 80% or greater is exceeding, 70-79% is meeting, below 70% is "doesn't meet." Others use "A" exam grades as exceeding, B and C as meeting, and D and F as "doesn't meet." Therefore, different courses appear more successful than

others which is not a valid conclusion based upon limited SLO data and varied interpretation of what the ratings actually mean.

We have discussed this challenge as a program, and have not reached consensus regarding standardizing ratings between courses, and methods of assessment of our courses. The concern is that standardizing these things will show a marked decline in assessment results for some classes, while other classes would show a marked increase in assessment results - both categories showing change when no actual change other than data reporting and rating changes actually occurred.

The general process we use is to determine which assessments we already perform (tests, practical, lab grading, etc.) demonstrate achievement for a particular SLO, and this process continued until each of the SLO's were covered by assessment data. We always try for objective measures, rather than subjective ones. We also strive to create uniform assessments for each section of each course. For example, all instructors of the course use the same exams and lab activities. The only variable is if the instructor allows a note card and/or formula sheet used by students when they take the exams. We were told those decisions were part of academic freedom and if an instructor wishes to do so while others object to the practice, we cannot prohibit them from their own choice.

Several of us who are fluent with Canvas are hoping to better utilize the features of Canvas to automate and improve the assessment process.

### **Reflect-Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program**

The obvious issue is that assessment data in eLumen did not include assessment done before eLumen was adopted. Additionally, there are courses where zero assessment data is available at this point. Some courses only had one SLO assessed, so overall results were not complete to the point where a meaningful conclusion could be drawn.

We strongly feel that at this time, and for the reasons given above, SLO assessment data is of very limited use when compared to our instructor's professional experience and the anecdotal evidence of how their classes are doing through observation and evaluating test and lab results (such as topic and/or question analysis and accuracy of lab answers.)

To reiterate, we cannot determine program strengths and weaknesses using SLO assessment data at this point.

One thing that has been meaningful is non-SLO-assessment data such as student demographics and "retention"/"success" rates. **Our online students (the lecture portion of the classes operated in hybrid format) is 1% greater in retention and 10% higher in success compared to the traditional format.** When we switched to hybrid classes, the worry was that retention and success would show a marked decline until students were accustomed to the format. Last year was the first year of hybrid format implementation, and already it has shown a marked improvement in success rates. Certain students have complained about the active nature of the hybrid class, rather than the passive in-class lecture environment, but success and retention data does not indicate the hybrid format is inferior to the face-to-face lecture.

**Dialogue-Explain when, or how often, discipline faculty meet to discuss the assessment process (e.g., planning, data collection, and results) for this program (e.g., department meeting).**

We have met on a more or less monthly basis this past year for all program-level discussions. As mentioned previously, SLO assessment methods and results interpretation have not reached levels of consensus to standardize these things among faculty and courses.

# Strategic Initiative Section Report

**Engineering:**

**Date: 10-25-2019**

- Engineering 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

## Engineering

### Assessment Report (Part 1 the Assessment Table) 2019-20

#### Engineering 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review

Courses	% Students Exceed	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A	Total
ENGR B17L	25	55	10	10	100
ENGR B40	0	0	0	0	100
ENGR B24	84	10	4	2	100
ENGR B20	61	22	17	0	100
ENGR B36	57	21	19	2	100
ENGR B37	57	43	0	0	100
ENGR B45	55	32	10	3	100
ENGR B47	32	62	5	0	100
ENGR B17	49	39	8	3	100

### Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2019-20

#### Engineering 2019-2020 Instructional Annual Update Program Review

**Plan-Describe the process used to assess the courses for this program:**

Assessment in courses in ENGR courses falls almost entirely into four categories: (1) exams (2) group projects and (3) lab reports. These traditional categories cover the broad range of SLOs. ENGR faculty meet throughout the semester to evaluate student success on these categories and the effectiveness of these tools to measure success on SLOs.

**Reflect-Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program**

We see the weakness of the program as some courses having a significant percent of students (>15%) not meeting expectations on assessed SLOs. The two courses with this problem were ENGR B36, which is a rigorous course that often ends up being a significant jump from prior courses in terms of depth and problem-solving. We are not surprised by this issue and will continue to add to supplemental resources to attempt to address this. The other course with this issue is ENGR B20, which is a new offering and thus is still undergoing development. Additionally, it was a low-enrollment course, which means the small sample size may be misleading. Lastly, it differs in content as it is programming-based, rather than relying that on the MATH skills used in other ENGR courses.

**Dialogue-Explain when, or how often, discipline faculty meet to discuss the assessment process (e.g., planning, data collection, and results) for this program (e.g., department meeting).**

ENGR faculty typically meet every other week to discuss general program details. Assessment process is discussed often at these meetings.