

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Chemistry:**Date: 10-22-2020**

- 2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Chemistry

Sorted by: Program

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

Chemistry

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Chemistry

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
Chemistry B1A	26.84%	43.38%	29.41%	0.37%
Chemistry B1B	70.59%	19.61%	3.92%	5.88%
Chemistry B30A				
Chemistry B30B	45.83%	41.67%	12.5%	0%
Math B6A	20.83%	41.67%	30.56%	6.94%
Math B6B	23.53%	17.65%	17.65%	41.18%
Phys B4A	30.29%	43.91%	19.8%	6%
Phys B4B	35.34%	4.56%	21.71%	1.39%

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Chemistry

PLAN:

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

We have assessed at least a few outcomes each year for each chemistry course through our 6 year assessment plan. It is recognized that this represents only a partial reflection of our students' success in the program's courses at any given point in time.

It has been discussed and decided that for now (until our munchies are satisfied) we will continue with this approach.

REFLECT:

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

The data reflects an ongoing trend present for years--that being that across the board for our students people are being reasonably successful (roughly 70% or better overall). Weaknesses in the analysis come from various courses having only a few of the whole set of SLOs being assessed any given year, but as the results are pretty consistent from year to year the interpretation stands for all SLOs assessed recently.

Any comments about the few scores above ~80% from the outside reflect a lack of understanding about the abilities of our students to think and process the way scientists do--something that takes years to develop, and which some students simply don't want to address for various reasons. We strive to be inclusive of the wide diversity encountered and will continue to examine more ways to work with this diversity. We do not see this a a weakness but rather a challenge!

REFINE:

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

The faculty are continually adapting and altering the the pedagical approach and laboratory curriculum for the the course with the goal of improving instruction; however, pointing to evidence that definitively shows improvement remains illusive. The faculty that teach CHEM B1A have submitted a course revision with revised SLOs for CHEM B1A to better surmount this hurdle. A weakness that was mentioned above in the reflection was that the whole set of SLOs are not being assessed in any given year. The instruments for assessing the SLOs (test questions) also change even when the same SLO is assessed several years later and this is in part due to the wording of the current SLOs and interpretation of collective notes kept by the group of instructional faculty that regularly teach CHEM B1A. Individual SLOs that had been written as mulitple parts were revised to one outcome that is assessible. We plan to better curate and test the SLO instruments so as to ensure better reliability in the instruments and increase the utility of the instrument.

DIALOGUE:

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

This is done by informal (face-to-face small gathering) and formal (departmental meetings) at least once a school year. See the process question above for other details of possible interest.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

English for Multilingual Stdts:

Date: 10-22-2020

- 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review EMLS

Sorted by: Program

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

English for Multilingual Stdts

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review EMLS

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
EMLS B50	30%	35%	15%	20%
EMLS B51	0%	0%	0%	0%
EMLS B52	100%	0%	0%	0%
EMLS B60	14.29%	57.14%	7.14%	21.43%
EMLS B61	0%	0%	0%	0%
EMLS B62	58.33%	33.33%	0%	8.33%
EMLS B70	0%	0%	0%	0%
EMLS B71	0%	0%	0%	0%
EMLS B72	0%	0%	0%	0%
EMLS B50 NC	63.64%	18.18%	0%	18.18%
EMLS 52 NC	80%	20%	0%	0%
EMLS B1 NC	0%	0%	0%	0%
EMLS B61 NC	0%	0%	0%	0%
EMLS B60 NC	37.5%	25%	18.75%	18.75%
EMLS B62 NC	80%	20%	0%	0%
EMLS B70 NC	66.67%	0%	0%	33.33%
EMLS B75 NC	0%	0%	0%	0%
EMLS B71 NC	0%	0%	0%	0%
EMLS B72 NC	0%	0%	0%	0%

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review EMLS

PLAN:

Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.

(see examples)

The EMLS Department is aware of the importance of and responsibility for regular assessment of student learning as well as the six-year assessment schedule. This is discussed at department meetings and informally. Most of the department performs formal assessments independently in the spring semester. The department uses exams, writing assignments, book reports, presentations, pronunciation activities, and other tools to assess courses.

REFLECT:

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

(see examples)

The overall percentage of students who exceeded expectations was 45.5. The overall percentage of students who met expectations was 30.68. Only 7.98% of our assessed students did not meet expectations. However, there was no data for 15.91% of them. Overall, this suggests that students are achieving the target CSLOs. There are a number of courses that have no assessment data. There are many potential reasons for this, including the possibility that courses were not offered or that they were taught by adjunct faculty who never submitted assessment data.

REFINE:

Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.

(see examples)

While CSLOs are required to be assessed every six years, assessing more frequently is considered a best practice. Because we are a small department and not all of our courses are offered each semester, the department chair will encourage faculty to consider assessing more frequently than once per year in order to procure more data. In addition, the EMLS department made significant revisions to CSLOs in 2020-2021 and these new CSLOs are part of a course revision that is pending approval. The new CSLOs are rewritten for clarity and the overall number is reduced. The smaller number of CSLOs will encourage faculty to assess more frequently.

DIALOGUE:

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

(see examples)

The EMLS department meets at least two times per semester and communicates regularly through email, texts, phone calls, and Zoom. The department chair provides a reminder to complete assessments, but that is typically the extent of assessment planning and discussion. We do informally discuss challenges to student achievement, but these discussions are not currently formalized in any way. One reason for this is that the department has undergone major transitions in recent years, partially as a result from AB 705, that have been a higher priority for discussion.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Industrial Drawing:

Date: 10-22-2020

- 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Industrial Drawing

Sorted by: Program

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

Industrial Drawing

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Industrial Drawing

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
No data available for 2019-2020				

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Industrial Drawing

PLAN:

Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.

(see examples)

The SLO assessments in these courses are a combination of formative and summative assessments. We meet formally and casually to discuss assessments, SLO progress, and changes to the curriculum.

All of our instructors now use common assessments for classes that have more than one section (INDR 12, 20a), facilitated by the Canvas LMI.

REFLECT:

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

(see examples)

Based on historical data, the program is strong, with success rates ranging between 69 and 87 percent.

The introductory course and intermediate courses have the lowest pass rates at 70% and 69% respectively.

As students progress into advanced and specialized courses, the success levels increase, which may indicate a greater interest and intrinsic motivation to pass.

REFINE:

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

Because we share instructional facilities, faculty meet informally on nearly a daily basis. We are all actively involved in program improvement, sharing resources, assignments, activities, and exams. the Canvas LMI has increased the availability of resources for our group and created consistency across the program.

This year, because of COVID precautions, we have moved to email and Zoom meetings. These meetings have allowed us to create more assignments and continuity between classes.

DIALOGUE:

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

SLO assessments were not completed in the spring semester of 2020 due to COVID and the transition to online learning.

All of our staff have transitioned to a fully-online environment and we have had to collaborate as we have prepared for this year. Additionally, faculty have made themselves more accessible during virtual office hours and by phone for assistance to students.

An emphasis will be put onto SLO assessment this fall and spring in an effort to identify strengths and weaknesses as we hav had to transition to an exclusively online environment for instruction.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Physical Education:

Date: 10-22-2020

• 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review
Health/PE/Kinesiology

Sorted by: Program

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

Physical Education

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Health/PE/Kinesiology

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
PHED B14 - BASEBALL				
PHED B JD- JAZZ DANCE				
PHED B10 - FOOTBALL				
PHED B23M - MENS SOCCER				
PHED B11 - MENS BASKETBALL	100%	0%	0%	
PHED B25B - BEACH VOLLEYBALL				
PHED B12 - TRACK AND FIELD	100%	0%	0%	
PHED B13 - TENNIS	23.53%	58.82%	11.76%	5.88%
PHED B15 - CHEER				
PHED B16 - MENS GOLF				
PHED B17 - CROSS COUNTRY				
PHED B20 -				
PHED SC - BEGINNING SOCCER				
PHED B23 - WOMENS SOCCER				
PHED B24 - WOMENS GOLF				
PHED B6T - BEGINNING TENNIS	47.06%	52.94%	0%	
PHED B25 - VOLLEYBALL				
PHED B6V - BEGINNING VOLLEYBALL	47.41%	41.38%	11.21%	

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
PHED B28 - WOMENS BASKETBALL	100%	0%	0%	
PHED B29 - SOFTBALL				
PHED B6WT - WEIGHT TRAINING				
PHED B2SB - BEGINNING SWIMMING	82.46%	10.53%	7.02%	
PHED B32 - SHAPE UP				
PHED B33 - SWIMMING	100%	0%	0%	
PHED B34C - INTERCOLLEGIATE CONDITIONING				
PHED B34WT - INTERCOLLEGIATE WEIGHT TRAINING	100%	0%	0%	
PHED B36 - CPR AND FIRST AID	85.66%	0%	14.34%	
PHED B39A - CARE AND PREVENTION OF ATHLETIC INJURIES	0%	83.59%	16.41%	
PHED B3ADP - ADAPTIVE PHYSICAL EDUCATION				
PHED B42 - INTRODUCTION TO KINESIOLOGY				
PHED B6A - ARCHERY				
PHED B39B - ADVANCED ATHLETIC TRAINING				
PHED B6BB - BEGINNING BASKETBALL	34.48%	51.72%	13.79%	
PHED B6BLB - BEGINNING BALLET				
PHED B6FCX - FITNESS CENTER	66.67%	33.33%	0%	
PHED B6G - BEGINNING GOLF				
HLED B1 - PRINCIPLES OF HEALTH EDUCATION	54.2%	33.15%	9.9%	

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Health/PE/Kinesiology

PLAN:

Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.

(see examples)

Discipline faculty will assess all SLO's for Kinesiology, Health, & Athletic courses associated with the AA-T Kinesiology once each year. Faculty assigned to teach Interecollegiate courses will assess all SLO's in their sections once a year, during their competition season.

REFLECT:

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

(see examples)

Based on the SLO performance data, students taking Health and Kinesiology courses, either meet or exceed standards on all SLO's. The one weakness however, stems from having adjuncts as the only instructor of records on certain sections. Adjuncts are not required by adjunct to complete assessments. Therefore, gathering data on those sections taught by adjuncts is a challenge.

REFINE:

Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.

(see examples)

As a department we are happy with the SLO assessment data; however, faculty members who teach the same or a similar courses will continue to collaborate and streamline best practices when it comes to assessing SLO's.

DIALOGUE:

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

(see examples)

At the end of each academic year (May) and at times through out each semester at Department Meetings discipline faculty members meet by subject areas to discuss planning, data collection, and results.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Registered Nursing:

Date: 10-22-2020

- 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Registered Nursing

Sorted by: Program

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

Registered Nursing

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Registered Nursing

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
Nurs B40	4.29%	93.14%	1.14%	1.43%
Nurs B41	0%	78.12%	1.56%	20.31%
Nurs B42	79.85%	2.24%	1%	16.92%
Nurs B43	4.11%	74.79%	1.1%	20%
Nurs B44	0%	98.61%	0%	1.39%
Nurs B45	10.91%	58.18%	21.82%	9.09%
Nurs B46	9.14%	86.29%	4.57%	0%
Nurs B47	2.54%	73.65%	2.22%	21.59%
Nurs B48	0%	98.97%	1.03%	0%
Nurs B49	0%	0%	0%	0%

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Registered Nursing

PLAN:

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

All courses required for the Registered Nursing Program are mapped to the program learning outcomes, allowing for assessment of the program when course outcomes are assessed. The faculty has chosen to complete assessments for all 5 CSLOs, for each course, at least once a year. All CSLOs have been leveled from semester to semester to ensure growth and development of knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes of the registered nursing student. Various tools, including exams, skills testing, patient care planning, and individual assignments are used to assess course outcomes. For consistency the faculty use the same tools to assess CSLOs each year. Annual assessments allow faculty to consistently evaluate outcomes to ensure each student cohort is prepared to successfully pass their national exams and enter the workforce as entry level

nurses. During program review cycle the PLO data will be reviewed and action plans will be developed to ensure PLO results are improving.

REFLECT:

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

As can be seen from the assessment table, the Registered Nursing Program consistently meets or exceeds the college 70% benchmark. The exception is the Nurs B49 course that did not complete assessments during the 2019-2020 academic year. Meeting course CSLOs and consequently PLOs, is just one of many ways that the program evaluates it's expected outcomes. The program is also expected to meet the standards of the Board of Registered Nursing (BRN), including national licensure, attrition, and on-time completion rates. In the last several years, the program has consistently met or exceeded BRN expectations. The national licensure pass rates have been 95% or higher, attrition (students leaving the program and not returning) has been less than 15%, and on-time completion has consistently been 75% or higher. In Fall 2018, the program began admitting students using a Multi-Criteria Ranking Tool. The Spring 2020 cohort was the first class to graduate who had been admitted using this new tool and the early statistics, using only this class, show a significant improvement in both the attrition and on-time completion rates. The Spring 2020 class had a 7% attrition and an 87% on-time completion rate. The LVN-RN Program continues to be a challenge and weakness, as these students are much less prepared for the rigors of the program. NURS B45 is the only course that is specific to the LVN to RN Program students. They have traditionally struggled while in the program and had lower licensure pass rates, higher attrition, and lower on-time completion rates. This trend is reflected in their failure to meet course and program SLOs. 22% of the LVN to RN Program students in NURS B45 did not meet the SLOs for the course. In the same academic year, only 60% of those same students completed their program on-time.

REFINE:

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

The assessment results and the program's evaluation tools have demonstrated that the Registered Nursing Program is a consistently strong program that graduate excellent entry level nurses. However, the program has been consistently strong because the faculty believe in the value of assessment and responding to these indicators of student learning. In an effort to continue improving the program the faculty will:

1. Continue to assess CSLOs for every course on an annual basis. Although, one course was not assessed this last year, this is not the norm and we will work to have 100% compliance annually.
2. Continue to meet as a faculty monthly and discuss program issues that affect CSLOs and other program evaluation components.
3. Develop a method for determining student's readiness for the LVN-RN program which includes
 1. A type of Multi-Criteria Tool
 2. Placement testing so that the student is placed in the appropriate level of the RNP

DIALOGUE:

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

The nursing department meets at least 2 times a month during RN Faculty Council and Curriculum Review Committee meetings. The program reviews outcomes at these meetings and at various times throughout the semester through reports that are either prepared by the department for the BRN, our regulating agency, or reports sent to the program. In the BRN Annual Survey we are asked to report various aspects of the program, including, student numbers and demographics, faculty (including adjunct faculty) numbers and demographics, numbers of DSPS students and types of disabilities, numbers of Veterans, clinical site issues, employment rates and types of employment, program graduation, attrition, and on-time completion rates. As these are being reported, the program/faculty have an opportunity to review these various aspects of the program and make changes/improvements as needed. Lastly, the program works collaboratively with our Advisory Board, consisting of our community health care partners and the nursing department of CSUB. The purpose of these meetings is to identify any needs or concerns of the schools and/or the community partners and then work collaboratively to meet the needs of both the schools and healthcare facilities. These meetings are held 2 times per year with subcommittees meeting as needed.