2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Architecture:

Date: 10-22-2020

- 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Architecture

Sorted by: Program

SI Section Templates: Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

Architecture

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Architecture

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
ARCH B55	48.48%	42.42%	9.09%	0%

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Architecture

PLAN:
Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.
(see examples)

Because of the COVID interruption to normal school year, the program did not compelte SLO reviews for its classes.
We have made it a priority to assess SLOs this year.

REFLECT:
Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.
(see examples)

Because of the COVID interruption to normal school year, the program did not compelte SLO reviews for its classes.
We have made it a priority to assess SLOs this year.

REFINE:
Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.
(see examples)

Because of the COVID interruption to normal school year, the program did not compelte SLO reviews for its classes.
We have made it a priority to assess SLOs this year.

Because of the COVID interruption to normal school year, the program did not compelte SLO reviews for its classes.
We have made it a priority to assess SLOs this year.

DIALOGUE:
Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.). (see examples)

Because of the COVID interruption to normal school year, the program did not compelte SLO reviews for its classes.
We have made it a priority to assess SLOs this year.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Crop Science:	**Date: 10-22-2020**

• 2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Agriculture Crop Science

Sorted by: Program

SI Section Templates: Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

Crop Science

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Agriculture Crop Science

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
CRPS B1		62.5%	29.38%	8.12%
CRPS B2		91.67%	5.56%	2.78%
CRPS B3	0%	0%	0%	0%
CRPS B4	0%	0%	0%	0%
CRPS B5	0%	0%	0%	0%
SOIL B1	0%	0%	0%	0%
ORNH B4	0%	0%	0%	0%
AGRI B1	0%	0%	0%	0%
AGBS B2	0%	0%	0%	0%
CHEM B2A	0%	0%	0%	0%
MATH B22	16.96%	33.93%	40.18%	8.93%

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Agriculture Crop Science

PLAN:
Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.
(see examples)

At the end of each semester, the results of all lab, test, and quiz questions are compiled and assignmed to a specific SLO for the course. The success rate for each SLO is determined by calculating the percentage of students in each course that correctly answered the questions related to each SLO for the course. A score of 70% or better was considered meeting the expectations for the SLO.

REFLECT:
Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.
(see examples)

CRPS B1 students did not meet SLO expectation in the fall of 2019. This result was similar to that of fall 2018, so it is not a "glitch" in the data. However, it has only occurred in the last two years of teaching the course. In general, the grades have been slowly dropping over the past five years and have now reached the point where students do not meet the 70% expectation rate. I believe the reason for this is that the course only has two major exams, a midterm and final, and the points for those exams make up about 70% of the grade for the course. The course was designed this way because it is a hybrid course with face-to-face testing and students "liked' the idea of coming to campus as little as possible. However, students do not study the required amount of time for the exams, even though they take practice tests containing similar questions throughout the semester. I know this because I always ask the students how much they study for each exam after I post their grades. The average is only about two hours for the midterm and an hour for the final.

Also, only 34% of all students met expectations for Math B22. Statistics is an important subject for our Plant Science students. I have no idea why the success rate is low for that course.

REFINE:
Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.
(see examples)

Because of COVID -19, there are no closed book exams this semester. I have told the students that they need to keep all of the materials (lectures, practice tests, lab assignments) that they will need to take the exams and have them "handy" when they take the exams, either as electronic files or as hard copies. We will see how they do with this type of testing.

However, in the long run after COVID, I plan to have four exams a semester like I do in my other courses. Maybe by having more exams with less material to study for each exam, the students will be more apt to study the required amount of time. It seems to be working in my other courses. However, my other courses were all face-to-face where it is easier to motivate students to study.

DIALOGUE:
Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.).
(see examples)

We have monrthly department meetings where we discuss assessment planning on a regular basis. Within each discipline, we regularly communicate concerning issues regarding assessment. As the "Assessment Representative" for the department, I make sure that the instructors know the necessity and methods involved in PARR on course CSLOs.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Food Science Technology:

  • 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Food Science Technology

SI Section Templates: Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

Date: 10-22-2020

 Sorted by: Program

Food Science Technology

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Food Science Technology

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
No assessment data - new program				

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Food Science Technology

PLAN:
Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.
(see examples)

This is a new program so the assessment data is being created and will not be available until data is collected at the required time.
Assessment tools used by the Food Science and Technology program include multiple\choice questions, short answers, fill\in responses, and Pre/Post test comparisons. It also includes laboratory data analysis techniques to assess understanding of the course SLOs. Post assessment data is discussed as a class and individul format depending on the needs of the students.

REFLECT:
Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.
(see examples)

Because this is a new program, there is no data to make any conclusions at this time.

REFINE:
Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above. (see examples)

As the program is being implemented and more data is collected, faculty will analyze the strength and weeknesses of the performance data and make adjustments as needed in the format of the assessment and/or the implementation of the assessment.

DIALOGUE:
Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.). (see examples)

Currently there is only 1 faculty member implementing assessments for this program. The planning is ongoing on a daily basis as the program is growing and being developed.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Japanese:

    • 2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Japanese

SI Section Templates: Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

Date: 10-22-2020

Sorted by: Program

Japanese

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Japanese

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
No assessment				

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Japanese

PLAN:
Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.
(see examples)

Without a full-time faculty member for the program, it is difficult to ensure that data is accurately represented. However, we do assess speaking, reading, writing, and cultural knowledge consistently.

Japanese is on a 3 year cycle review with the first two years for completing assessessments on all of the SLOS and the last year doing a review. For this reason this last year there was no assessment required or done.

Gender - No big differnce between genders

	Retention Rate	Success Rate
Female	82 %	63 %
Male	81 %	60 %

Ethnicity - High retention rate in Black/African Amrican, but lower success rate. HIspanic has the lowest success rate since Japanese can be their third language.

	Retention Rate	Success Rate

American Indian Alaska Native	100 %	100 %
Asian/Hawaian Other pacific Islander	89 %	81 %
Black/African American	90 %	64 %
Hispanic/Latino	79 %	55 %
2 or more	82 %	64 %
Unknown	100 %	77 %
White	81 %	66 %

Age - 17 or younger and 45-54 have higher success, while 18-22 has the lowest success rate. We need to target first-time college students to provide available services on campus to ensure their success.

	Retention Rate	**Success Rate**
17 or younger	87 %	68 %
18-22	81 %	58 %
23-25	79 %	62 %
26-34	85 %	66 %
35-44	90 %	67 %
45-54	88 %	71 %
55 or older	100 %	0 %

REFLECT:
Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.
(see examples)

Data is not available through tableau at this time. Our past assessments show that we are doing well in all areas and achieving our goals of students meeting or exceeding the performance at a 70% level with the exception of the SLO #2 - Kanji Quiz (L.13-18) where there is approximately 50% success.

REFINE:
Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above. (see examples)

1. Common assessments will be created for all SLOs so that we can better chart the achievements of our students.
2. More focus on Kanji, as a written script, needs to be focused on beginning in Japanese 1.
3. Because of the drop in success since we moved from 5 units to 4 units in each class - this will need to be reviewed to limit the material that is taught at each level rather than expect students to learn the same content in less time.

DIALOGUE:
Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.). (see examples)

Without a full time instructor - planning for the department is left to the chair and volunteer work by adjuncts which is not required. This is being addressed by the dean who is seeking funds to reimburse adjuncts for their time for this particular duty that currently is not required of the adjuncts.