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Section 1: Introduction

This Departmental Planning and Program Review Handbook assists Cypress College, faculty, administrators, and staff in the evaluation of instructional programs as prescribed by a range of statutes, guidelines, and resources. The complete and current text of all California statutes, including the California Education Code sections referred to in this document, may be viewed at www.leginfo.ca.gov. The complete and current text of all regulations in the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, including those referred to in this Handbook, may be viewed on the at www.calregs.com. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Guide to Evaluating & Improving Institutions may be viewed at http://www.accjc.org. The commonly referred to "Ten Plus One" responsibilities of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) include making recommendations about program review. These responsibilities can be found in Title 5 of the Administrative Code of California, Section 53200 and at www.asccc.org. The ASCCC also provides white papers and resources related to accreditation, program review, and student learning outcomes. Additional resources can be found in the resource section of this Handbook.

This Handbook provides college faculty and administrators with the following:

- A reference that sets forth the mission, purpose, and parameters of the existing program review process at Cypress College

- A framework that codifies the use of consistent data and documentation for faculty self-studies to evaluate program strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats or challenges (SWOT/SWOC) in achieving student success

- A resource for the regulatory and accrediting requirements to assure uniform practices in program evaluation, including recommendations from the California Community College Chancellor’s Office, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)

- A forum for collecting, addressing, and reporting challenges and best practices for the purpose of sustaining consistent quality improvement throughout the college

- A mechanism for assuring the integration of program review in institutional planning, budget, and resource allocations
Purpose of Program Review

The Department Planning and Program Review process supports the Cypress College and North Orange County Community College District strategic and educational master plans, technology assessments, staff development, and related efforts aimed at assuring quality educational programs, student achievement, and learning. Decision-making processes, including those affecting budgets, resource allocation, hiring of full-time faculty, and competitive internal grant opportunities rely on the program review process and reports as a basis for evaluating resource requests. The review process incorporates the systematic, ongoing evaluation of programs using data on student success, diversity, basic skills, distance education, achievement, curriculum, labor market results, and student learning outcomes to assure currency, relevancy, and innovation. The faculty self-studies, dean reviews, interdisciplinary dialogue, and Program Review Committee (PRC) assessments contribute to the evidence-based evaluation of programs, which are summarized in an annual report to foster institutional effectiveness, appropriate resource allocation, and ongoing quality improvements in student success.

History of Program Review at Cypress College

Cypress College has had a comprehensive instructional program review process, previously known as Instructional Quality Assessment (IQA) Validation, since 1990. The campus added Student Support Services and Campus Support Services Quality Review processes and piloted the two processes in the fall of 2003 and the spring of 2004. In addition, the campus regularly reviewed the effectiveness of the Strategic Plan. At the conclusion of each four-year cycle, a Planning Retreat was held to lay the groundwork for the development of the succeeding plan. Instructional Quality Assessment Validation, Student Support Services Quality Review and Campus Support Services Quality Review quality assurance reports were communicated to appropriate constituencies as part of their self-study processes. Externally, the Public Information Office published some of the more global achievements of the College’s students and faculty (Cypress College 2005 Accreditation Report).

Current Role of Instructional Program Review

Since 2005, the scope of the instructional program review process has expanded to add more meaningful data metrics, more consistent reporting of student learning outcomes, expanded self-studies to address distance education, labor market information, disaggregated subpopulations of students, and qualitative discussions where program representatives share their greatest challenges and accomplishments directly with the Program Review Committee. Annual summaries of these reports are distributed to the entire campus, the North Orange County Community College District, and the Board of Trustees. Copies of the Program Review Committee’s annual reports can be found on the “J Drive.” Each year, the instructional, student support services, and administrative program review committee coordinators meet to review evidence that the institution has provided for adequate human, physical, technology, and financial resources and processes necessary to assure quality and institutional effectiveness.
Diagram of the Quality Review, Planning, and Budget Process

The following diagram illustrates the relationships between major planning, assessment, and implementation activities at Cypress College. The long-range Educational Master Plan serves as a foundational document to inform and shape other campus plans, such as the Matriculation Plan, Student Equity Plan, Technology Plan, Facilities Plan, Strategic Plan, and the Student Services Plan (marked with an * in the diagram). The four-year Strategic Plan is updated on an annual basis as new objectives are identified through the ongoing assessment of institutional effectiveness, curriculum and instructional programs, student services, campus support services, and program review. Priorities for annual planning and budgeting are informed by measures of broad institutional effectiveness, and department or program goals established through cyclical quality review processes.

The Department Planning and Program Review Committee

Program Review is included in the Academic Senate’s "Ten Plus One" responsibilities (as articulated in Title 5, Section 53200), and as such, the Program Review Committee works under the purview of the Academic Senate to review instructional programs and make recommendations as needed to Cypress College and to the North Orange County Community College District. The Program Review Committee (PRC) is comprised of a faculty representative from each division, a counselor, a dean, and an institutional researcher.
Faculty representatives are elected at the division level and serve three-year terms. The PRC chairperson serves a three-year term, and is elected by the Academic Senate with input from the Program Review Committee. Prior service on the Program Review Committee is required to serve as chair. The PRC Chair responsibilities are included in the appendix.

**Program Review Committee’s Mission Statement**

The mission of the Cypress College Department Planning and Program Review Committee is to promote quality instructional programs by facilitating a positive, open, and collaborative exchange of ideas with faculty to evaluate data, resolve challenges, inform resource allocation, verify currency, and to provide suggestions for useful practices that will contribute to institutional effectiveness and student success.

**Two Types of Quality Review**

Instructional programs complete a Department Planning and Program Review self-study (“long form”) every four years on a rotating basis.¹ In addition, as specified in Title 5, Sec. 51022, Career Technical Education (CTE) programs complete an additional two-year (“short-form”) report in the even numbered years. The CTE evaluation is a shorter “check-box” type form that was approved by Academic Senate in the spring of 2013, and was introduced to faculty with a goal of making the additional CTE report process more efficient and less redundant.

**Department Planning and Program Review Self-study (“long-form”)**

All instructional programs prepare a comprehensive self-study every four years. To assure consistency in the data, Institutional Research provides pre-populated data metrics on the program reviews form during the summer before the program’s due-year. The self-studies are due on October 10, to the division deans who review and comment on the self-studies. The final self-study with the dean’s comments is then forwarded to PRC Chair electronically before October 25 of each year. In November, the program coordinators meet with the committee to share highlights about their program’s accomplishments, challenges, and best practices. CTE programs are reviewed in even-numbered years (in addition to their short-form report), and all other instructional programs are reviewed in odd-numbered years.

**CTE Reports (“short-form”)**

In addition to the long form, approximately twenty-four programs identified as Career Technical Education are also required (per Ed Code 78016) to complete CTE Reports (“short forms”) every two years. The CTE program coordinators who are not up for the full program review cycle do not attend meetings with the committee for these interim reports. Like the long forms, the short forms are also due to the division deans by October 10 and to the program review coordinator via email before October 25.

---

¹ In the spring of 2016, the PRC provided program review participants with a survey, soliciting feedback on the process. A recommendation was made to align the CTE long and short form reviews so faculty were not having to do reviews for three consecutive years. The PRC drafted a proposal, which was approved by the Academic Senate and implemented in the fall of 2016, moving from a three- to four-year cycle, with CTE programs evaluated in even numbered years.
Rotation Cycles for Program Review and CTE Reports

Program Review (“long-form”) Four-year Cycle

CYCLE #1: Fall 2016, 2020, 2024 (12 programs)
Accounting
Administration of Justice (New to PR in 2020)
Air Conditioning & Refrigeration
Aviation & Travel Careers
Dental Hygiene
Health Information Technology
Human Services
Journalism (PR hiatus until 2020)
Media Arts Design
Mortuary Science
Photography
Theater Arts

CYCLE #2: Fall 2017, 2021, 2025 (11 programs)
Anthropology
Biology
English
English/Reading
English as a Second Language
Ethnic Studies
Foreign Language
History
Music
Philosophy & Religious Studies
Physical Science

CYCLE #3: Fall 2018, 2022, 2026 (12 programs)
Auto Collision Repair
Auto Technology
Computer Information Systems
Court Reporting
Dental Assisting
Engineering Technology
Geography/GIS
Hotel, Restaurant, and Culinary Arts
Management/Marketing
Nursing
Psychiatric Technology
Radiology Technology / Diagnostic Medical Sonography

CYCLE #4: Fall 2019, 2023, 2027 (11 programs)
Art
Chemistry
Communication Studies
Counseling
Dance
Economics
Mathematics
Physical Education
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology
**CTE Reports (“short-form”) Two-year Cycle**

In addition to the long form, the following CTE (TOP Code) identified programs are required to submit the CTE Report every two years:

- **Business & C.I.S. Division**
  - Accounting
  - Computer Information Systems
  - Court Reporting
  - Marketing (combined w/Management)

- **CTE Division**
  - Air Conditioning & Refrigeration
  - Automotive Technology
  - Automotive Collision Repair
  - Aviation & Travel Careers
  - Hotel, Restaurant, Culinary

- **Fine Arts Division**
  - Journalism
  - Media Arts Design
  - Technical Theater
  - Photography

- **Health Science Division**
  - Dental Assisting
  - Dental Hygiene
  - Diagnostic Medical Sonography
  - Health Information Technology
  - Mortuary Science
  - Registered Nursing
  - Psychiatric Technology
  - Radiologic Technology

- **Science/Engineering/Math Division**
  - Engineering Technology
  - Physical Therapy

- **Social Sciences**
  - Geographic Information Systems
  - Human Services

- **Physical Education**
  - Aerobic Inst. Aquatics, Athletic Coach Certificates
**Timeline for the Program Review and CTE Report Process**

**May:** The PRC Chair emails a notice to the deans with the next cycle of programs that will need to submit reports by October 10. Division deans notify department coordinators of program review.

**Summer:** Institutional Research sends prepopulated PR and CTE forms with key performance data. SLO Coordinator sends instructions for accessing program SLO reports.

**August:** PRC Chair sends deadline reminder email to deans. Programs begin self-study.

**September:** Committee planning meeting on the second Monday of the month

**October 10:** Program coordinators submit the self-studies to their deans for comments.

**October 25:** The final self-studies with the deans’ comments are sent to the PRC Chair.

**November (Mondays 3-5 p.m.):** The PRC reviews the faculty self-studies. Program coordinators meet with the PRC to discuss in an informal dialogue details about their self-study. The committee commends best practices and shares relevant suggestions to address challenges, sharing ideas they have learned from other programs. Bragging is appropriate and encouraged in this forum. If warranted, the committee may also choose advocate on a program’s behalf to assist in the resolution of challenges.

**December:** PRC Chair sends the committee’s feedback to the program presenters. Programs are given the opportunity to respond to the PRC written summaries before the final self-studies are posted on the “J-drive” and summarized in the PRC Annual Report. Any changes or corrections must be submitted to the PRC by the February meeting.

**February:** Committee meets to review the results and prepare findings for the annual report.

**March:** PRC Chair prepares final report for submission to the Academic Senate and EVP.

**April:** The PRC Chair presents the PRC’s Annual Report to the Academic Senate and copies the EVP. Once approved by the Academic Senate, the report is distributed to college faculty and administrators. The final report is posted on the “J-drive.”

**Timeline for Program Review Manual Update**

This manual may be updated as needed, but at a minimum, it should be reviewed and updated every four years by the Program Review Committee and presented to the Academic Senate. The final handbook is posted on the “J-drive” (as a Word document) and the Program Review page of the Cypress College website (as a PDF document).
California Community Colleges Curriculum Recommendations: Program Review Cycle

It is important to note that the four-year cycle for program review adopted by Cypress College is within the current requirements specified by Title 5, the Education Code, and the ACCJC. The Academic Senate for California Community College provides a summary of these guidelines in its California Community College Curriculum resource website. Relevant excerpts about the rationale for establishing program review cycles are noted as follows:

a. *Program and Course Approval Handbook:* “Neither Title 5 nor Education Code specify an exact review cycle for all courses. The fourth edition of the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) states, ‘Colleges are required to periodically review curriculum in a process called ‘program review’ during which the faculty and administrators review the program requirements and course content in consultation with advisory groups’ (page 18). The PCAH continues to say, ‘At present there is no standard model(s) officially recommended for conducting program review in the California Community Colleges system. There is an imperative, however, that every college must conduct an effective review of its instructional programs on a regular basis’ (page 28). However, several separate requirements from Title 5, the Accreditation Standards, and other sources help to establish the most reasonable periodic course review cycle” (Source: http://www.ccccurriculum.net/faq/#A3).

b. *Title 5 section 55003* “states that ‘at least once each six years all prerequisites and corequisites established by the district shall be reviewed, except that prerequisites and corequisites for vocational courses or programs shall be reviewed every two years.’ This statement applies only to the review of prerequisites, not to the entire course or course outline. However, because prerequisite review is most likely to be a feature of the overall review of the course, many colleges apply this six-year maximum review rule not only to prerequisites but also to course review in general” (Source: http://www.ccccurriculum.net/faq/#A3).

c. *Standard IIA.2(e) of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges* states, ‘The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.’ This language does not specify a length for the on-going review cycle. However, because the cycle for the overall accreditation process is six years, and one can safely assume that a college that had not reviewed its curriculum between accreditation processes would not be seen as compliant, a curriculum review cycle of six years or less would be necessary to meet Accreditation Standard IIA.2(e)” (Source: http://www.ccccurriculum.net/faq/#A3).

2 The full resource is available at http://www.ccccurriculum.net
Section 2: The Program Review Self Study

“The most beneficial element of the process is sharing the information with other constituents on campus.”

2016 Survey Respondent

Characteristics of Evidence

“Evidence tells all stakeholders that an institution has investigated its questions and knows something about itself; it knows what it achieves. Good evidence is representative of what is, not just an isolated case, and it is information upon which an institution can take action to improve. It is, in short, relevant, verifiable, representative, and actionable.”

2016 ACCJC Guide to Evaluating & Improving Institutions

Department Planning and Program Review Self-study

At its core, the instructional review process provides faculty with an opportunity to step outside the day-to-day role of teaching to collaborate with peers in evaluating overall program quality and effectiveness. In addition, the self-study provides a means for the assessing data in relation to the institution’s metrics and set standards, and it serves to document evidence of program review and quality educational improvements as a requirement for accreditation.3

The Department Planning and Program Review, commonly referred to as the “long form,” is a comprehensive self-study that documents the evaluation of key performance indicators (KPIs) in relation to a range of data supplied by Institutional Research and other factors coordinated by constituent committees, including the following:

- Curriculum Committee
- Distance Education Committee
- Student Learning Outcomes Committee
- Student Equity Committee
- Basic Skills
- Institutional Effectiveness and Educational Master Plan Committees
- Planning and Budget Committee (PBC)

3 “Accreditation as a system of voluntary, non-governmental, self-regulation, and peer review is unique to American educational institutions. It is a system by which an institution evaluates itself in accordance with standards of good practice regarding mission, goals and objectives; the appropriateness, sufficiency, and utilization of resources; the usefulness, integrity, and effectiveness of its processes; and the extent to which it is achieving its intended student achievement and student learning outcomes, at levels generally acceptable for higher education. It is a process by which accreditors provide students, the public, and each other with assurances of institutional integrity and effectiveness and educational quality” (ACCJC 2016, Guide to Evaluating & Improving Institutions p. 9).
Instructions to Faculty

The Institutional Research Office prepopulates the self-study with statistical data and provides it to those programs undergoing the comprehensive review. Department coordinators collaborate with constituent faculty to evaluate the data as it relates to their program planning goals, budget, and institutional metrics. The program coordinator prepares the self-study draft and submits it to division dean for review. Once the division dean's comments are included, the draft program review document is submitted to the PRC chair for distribution to the committee.

The PRC chair will schedule a meeting for the program coordinator to meet the committee. The purpose of this meeting is to provide an opportunity for dialogue about the self-study, accomplishments, challenges, and best practices. During the meeting, the committee may informally ask questions about areas of concern, make recommendations, or commend best practices. Tips for this meeting are included later in this section.

The PRC chair will follow up with a written summary of the committee's findings to the program coordinator. The program coordinator is invited to make any corrections or changes before the final self-study is uploaded to the “J-drive.” An annual report, summarizing the program review results, challenges, action items, resource allocation issues, and recommendations, is prepared and presented to the Academic Senate and the College in the spring of each year.

Components of the Faculty Prepared Program Review Self-study

The scope of the Department Planning and Program Review self-study continues to evolve as state and federal requirements have increased. In response, institutional researchers at Cypress College have worked to provide readily accessible, consistent, and transparent data access to assist faculty in evaluating key performance indicators, program quality, and student achievement.

The form and a sample self-study are provided in the appendix. The components for the most recent self-study (effective in the fall of 2016), includes the following information and metrics:

**Mission of the Department**
- College Mission Statement
- Department Mission Statement
- Narrative about how the department supports institution

**Trend Data / Department Trends (data supplied by Institutional Research)**
- Five-year Comparison Report, fall and spring semesters, including:
  - Section Count
  - Enrollment
  - Seat Count
  - Fill Rate (courses that are cross-listed may not reflect the correct fill-rates)
  - FTES (full-time equivalent students)
  - FTEF
  - WSCH per FTEF
  - Narrative explanations about trends, challenges, etc.
- Full-time faculty ratio data and narrative
Certificate and Degree Awards (Past 4 years):
  o Associate Degrees
  o Certificates:
    ▪ 6 to 18 units
    ▪ 18 to 30 units
    ▪ 30 to 60 units
  o Total Awards
  o Narrative evaluation about awards
Transfer data and narrative
Success and Retention Rates (Success rates are the percentage of students earning an A, B, C/credit/pass divided by all students listed on the roster at census)
  o Fall to Fall Comparison (2 years)
  o Spring to Spring Comparison (2 years)
  o Department Comparison to Division and College
Distance Education Success Rate Comparison
  o On campus instruction assessment narrative
  o Online/hybrid instruction assessment narrative
Student Equity
  o Achievement gap assessment narrative
Labor Market Data (CTE Only)
  o Job openings
  o Job placement
  o Wages
  o Change in earnings
  o Assessment narrative
Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Assessment
Course SLO Assessment Report (Tracdat CSLO Assessment Report)
  o CSLOs evaluated in the last years
  o Identification of any obstacles
  o CSLO success rates
  o Assessment summary (best practices and challenges)
  o Resources required
Department SLO Assessment Report
Narrative about the changes as a result of SLO assessment
Curriculum Review (Source: Curricunet)
  o New courses and programs planned
  o List courses that have not been revised within the last six years
  o Specify plan for outdated courses (and programs)

---

4 Program SLO Report: There are two reports in the Ad Hoc Report area of TracDat. Only the (summary) Department SLO Assessment Report (or an equivalent summary) should be attached. The Course SLO Assessment Report is lengthy and is intended for department faculty to review and to create action plans. Each division has an SLO representative and the SLO coordinator. The SLO Coordinator has resources to assist faculty in entering SLO information into TracDat and in accessing the Program SLO Report in the AD Hoc section of TracDat. Sarah Jones: sjones@cypresscollege.edu.
Basic Skills Students Needs

- Identification of student support assistance (tutoring, SI, etc.)

Department Objectives (District Strategic Plan)

- Identification and performance of past goals
- Identification of new goals for next 4 years, including fiscal requirements in relationship to the following:
  - District’s Strategic Directions
  - Institutional Learning Outcome Pathway
    - Pathway I (AS degrees, Transfer)
    - Pathway II (CTE Certification)
    - Pathway III (Personal, Academic, Prof. Dev.)
  - Program Learning Outcome

- Objective
  - Person responsible
  - Timeframe
  - Fiscal resources

Identification of Needed Resources and Budget Implications

- Grants and special funding resources available
- Resources needed resources (personnel, equipment, supplies, support)
- Specified dollar amounts and appropriate funding sources
- Consequences of not receiving the funding

Departmental Planning and Program Review Participation

- Department Coordinator
- Participating Faculty

Division Dean Evaluation

- Mission
- Trend Data/Department Trends
- Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
- Curriculum
- Basic Skills
- Departmental Goals
- Identification of Needed Resources and Budget Implications
- Final Approval

Attachments: Department SLO Summary Report
Program Review Tips

Throughout the program review process, be assured that the PRC’s goal is to support faculty and their students in achieving ongoing instructional improvements. The meeting with the committee is informal, intended to foster a robust dialogue. Other than bringing a copy of the self-study, the program coordinator does not need to prepare a formal presentation. The following tips are provided for the faculty representative(s) meeting with the committee:

Confirm the meeting date with the Program Review Chair before October 10
Remember to also email a copy of the report to the Program Review Chair by no later than October 25, and send 12 hard copies of the full report to the PRC chair as well.

Keep it simple
Presenters should review their self-study in advance and be prepared to highlight key findings, within the allotted twenty minutes. The dialogue with the committee is intended to be a collaborative exchange of ideas in an informal setting (no Power Point Presentations). The committee is particularly interested in best practices and/or challenges that may be applicable to other departments as well. Bragging is appropriate and encouraged in this forum. Observations about hardships or issues that may be impacting student success are also welcome and documented for action as warranted in the PRC’s annual report.

Caveat (a note about evidence)
Occasionally, faculty representatives may disagree about the meaning of evidence, data, and research used in evaluating student learning. The PRC welcomes dialogue that may lead to a collective understanding of evidence. Therefore, faculty may comment on statistical data with the understanding that a range of variables may be present and that causal assumptions may not be statistically valid. Faculty are encouraged to view this process as an opportunity to evaluate data, exchange ideas about trends, comment on noteworthy accomplishments, and identify areas of need where the program would benefit from assistance or resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Implementation</th>
<th>Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td>• There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>• Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin. Etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficiency</strong></td>
<td>• Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Results of all program review are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The program review framework is established and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement</strong></td>
<td>• Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Source: ACCJC 2012 Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation. This rubric is not in the 2016 manual, but it is provided here as a reference since the ACCJC expects all colleges to be at the SCQI level. Explanation from the ACCJC 2016 Manual: “The ACCJC Accreditation Standards adopted in 2002 created a significant emphasis on student learning outcomes and assessment, and the use of student learning results in planning and decision-making across the institution. In order to advance institutional development toward fully meeting the practices identified in the Standards, a Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness was promulgated in 2007. That Rubric provided examples of college practice at the awareness, development, proficiency, and continuous quality improvement stages of coming into full compliance with the Standards. Institutions were informed that they would be expected to be at the proficiency level by fall 2012. Over the 2012-2013 academic year, institutions were asked to submit a College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation. After that point, colleges were expected to demonstrate compliance with the Standards in the area of student learning outcomes. By 2014, the Rubric was no longer being used in institutional evaluations; practice across the region had developed to a level where evaluation of student learning outcomes was conducted directly with the Standards, as were the evaluation of planning, program review, and the other elements of academic quality and institutional effectiveness.”
Reference: The Role of Program Review in Improving Institutions

The following excerpt about the role of program review in institutional effectiveness from the ACCJC’s Guide to Evaluating & Improving Institutions (July 2016 edition, p.16) is provided for reference as it pertains to the accreditation Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness.

Standard 1.B.5. & B.6 Institutional Effectiveness

5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery. 
   ▪ Does the college have a program review process in place? Is it cyclical, i.e., does it incorporate systematic, ongoing evaluation of programs and services using data on student learning and achievement, improvement planning, implementation, and re-evaluation? How does college budgeting of resources follow planning? How is planning integrated?
   ▪ To what extent are institutional data and evidence available and used for program review?

6. The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.
   ▪ Does the institution identify significant trends among subpopulations of students and interpret their meaning?
   ▪ Has the institution set performance expectations (key performance indicators) for the subpopulations?
   ▪ How does it judge its achievement of the target outcomes?
   ▪ Is the institution performance satisfactory?
   ▪ What changes have been made or are planned as a result of the analysis of the data?

Reference: ACCJC’s Expectation for Evidence Quality Program Review

Evidence of Quality Program Review (p. 24)

- Program review cycles/timelines
- Policies on curricular review
- Evidence that SLO assessment data are used for institutional self evaluation, planning, and improvement of teaching and learning
- Action taken (improvements) on the basis of program review
- Connection to the budgeting and resource allocation processes impact on institutional effectiveness, educational quality, and student success

Source: http://www.accjc.org/all-commission-publications-policies
Section 3: CTE Two-year Reports

CTE Launchboard

“The CTE LaunchBoard, a statewide data system supported by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and hosted by Cal-PASS Plus, provides data to California community colleges and their feeder K-12 school districts on the effectiveness of CTE programs.”

Overview of the CTE Reporting Requirement

Programs delineated with asterisk in the Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) Codes and listed in Section 1 of this handbook are considered career technical education programs, and are required to conduct reviews every two years. Cypress College has adopted and modified the Los Angeles Orange County Regional Consortium (LAOCRC) Approved Form (provided in this section) to provide faculty with the checkbox format and additional instructions. The form is provided in the appendix of this handbook along with a completed sample form.

Instructions to Faculty

While there are many data resources available to CTE faculty, the Institutional Research Office prepopulates an addendum with statistical data and provides it to CTE programs to assist them in answering the six questions on the CTE form. Department coordinators collaborate with constituent faculty to evaluate the data as it relates to their program planning goals, budget, and institutional metrics. The program coordinator prepares the two-year report and submits it to division dean for review. Once the division dean signs it, the document should be submitted to the PRC chair for distribution to the committee by October 25 during even numbered years.
Components of the CTE Two-year Review

CTE faculty should complete the checkboxes and write a brief narrative to highlight any unique changes in response to the six areas identified on the form.

Program Mission, Goals, Status

Please provide 1 to 3 sentences highlighting any notable changes in mission, goals, or status, etc.

Labor Market Demand for this Program

Visit the CTE Launchboard at [www.calpassplus.org](http://www.calpassplus.org) and evaluate the labor market demand in the Program Snapshots Reports for your program(s). (Request a password using your Cypress email address, which may take a few days to receive). Highlight any notable changes in labor market, wages, advisory input, surveys, enrollment, etc. O*NET or other sources may also be used.

Program Effectiveness: Student Success

Provide 1 to 3 sentences describing how this program is of demonstrated effectiveness, specifically in employment & student success, which may include jobs, certificates, degrees, transfers, SLOs, partnerships, faculty qualifications, diversity, grants, equipment, etc.

External Factors, Duplication of Programs

Provide 1 to 3 sentences explaining how external factors may influence this program, including any duplication of manpower training in the college’s service area, or notable changes in legislation, CCCCCO mandates, Perkins, Tech Prep, CalWORKs, WIA, BOG, etc.

Resources (Budget)

Please provide 1 to 3 sentences highlighting any notable changes in budget, manpower, and resources.

Two-Year Plan

Provide 1 to 3 sentences highlighting notable changes in recommendations; project future trends, personnel and equipment needs, etc.
Reference: Periodic Review of Established Programs

The following excerpt from the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Program and Course Approval Handbook, 5th Edition is provided as reference for the requirement of CTE programs to submit a two-year review.

Title 5, section 55130, authorizes the Chancellor’s Office to review established programs periodically and to terminate approval of a program. The Chancellor’s Office collects information from all colleges on the processes for and/or the results of locally conducted program reviews as required by Title 5, section 51022.

In addition, Education Code section 78016 specifically requires that colleges review the effectiveness of CTE programs every two years. The minimum requirements for this periodic review must demonstrate that the program:

- Continues to meet a documented labor market demand
- Does not represent unnecessary duplication of other manpower training programs in the college’s service area
- Is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students

Review of instructional programs on a regular basis and according to a regular procedure is also mandated by the standards of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Several accrediting standards speak to institutional planning, research, and design of instructional programs; however, the most direct requirement for program review is Standard II A.2 (e):

IIA.2 (e) The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

At present there is no standard model(s) officially recommended for conducting program review in the California community college system. There is an imperative, however, that every college must conduct an effective review of its instructional programs on a regular basis.

Program Goal – Degree or Certificate

Degree and certificate programs may have the following specified program goals:

- Career Technical Education (CTE)
- Transfer
- Career Technical Education (CTE) and Transfer
- Other – Designed to meet community needs
Reference: LAOCRC Approved Periodic Review of Established CTE Programs

This form is provided as a reference for what has been approved at the regional level.

Title 5, section 55130, authorizes the Chancellor's Office to review established programs periodically and to terminate approval of a program. The Chancellor's Office collects information from all colleges on the processes for and/or the results of locally conducted program reviews as required by Title 5, section 51022.

In addition, Education Code section 78016 specifically requires that colleges review the effectiveness of CTE programs every two years. The Los Angeles Orange County Regional Consortium (LAOCRC) has provided guidelines to address the minimum requirements. These guidelines specify that the periodic review must demonstrate that the program:

- Continues to meet a documented labor market demand
- Does not represent unnecessary duplication of other manpower training programs in the college's service area
- Is of demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students

Department Overview

1. State and briefly explain your department's mission and/or goals and indicate how it supports the mission of the college.

2. Select one of the following options pertaining to any changes that have occurred in your program over the past 2 years.

   Significant Changes ☐  Minor Changes ☐  No Changes ☐

   If either significant or minor changes have occurred, please explain:

3. Are there future trends and/or external factors that influence planning within your department and/or specific programs within your department?

   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

   If yes, state major trends and/or external factors and cite reference(s), i.e. labor market data.

4. Check one of the boxes below with regard to your program costs.

   Income Exceeds Expenses ☐  Income Covers Expenses ☐  Expenses Exceed Income ☐

5. Explain any program costs not covered by FTES or WSHC/FTEF such as in kind contributions, equipment, supplies, etc.

6. Explain the quality of this program (e.g. student outcomes, partnerships, certificates, degrees, articulation, diversity grants, equipment, etc.):

Reviewed by Division Dean:

__________________________________________________________

Print name                          Signature

__________________________________________________________

Date
Section 4: Program Review Links to Other College Units and Instructional Processes

Program review could be one of the most powerful and effective tools to shape and reshape a college. When it is linked to budgeting, planning, and other processes to carry out its recommendations, program review can contribute to fair and transparent institutional processes.


(This section is currently under development.)

Program Review and Other College Units and Processes
- Administrative Support Services (Admissions, Financial Aid)
- Budget Processes
- Educational Master Plan, Institutional Effective Plan
- Student Support Services (Writing Center, EOPs, etc.)
- Campus Support Services
- Special Programs

Program Review and Other Instructional Processes
- Basic Skills
- Curriculum Review
- Distance Education
- Student Equity
- Student Learning Outcomes

Program Review and Other Local, State, and Federal Processes
- Accreditation Process
- District Strategic Plan and Scorecards
- State Scorecards and Metrics
- Federal Scorecards and Metrics
Section 5: Resources

Sources Available to Assist Faculty in Program Review

ACCJC Guide to Evaluating & Improving Institutions:

ASCCC Effective Practices Accreditation Guide:
http://www.asccc.org/papers/effective-practices-accreditation-guide-faculty


California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Curriculum and Instruction Unit
http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/CurriculumandInstructionUnit.aspx

CCCC Institutional Effectiveness
http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/InstitutionalEffectiveness.aspx

Data Resources:
CCCC’s Office MIS Data Mart http://datamart.cccco.edu

National Center for Education Statistics (“NCES is the primary federal entity for collecting and analyzing data related to education): http://nces.ed.gov

CCCCO Research Reports (Research, Analysis & Accountability):
http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/TechResearchInfoSys/Research.aspx#For_Policy_Makers

Student Success Scorecard: http://scorecard.cccco.edu/scorecard.aspx

Cal-Pass Plus (A system of data): http://scorecard.cccco.edu/scorecard.aspx

CTE LaunchBoard (California Community College Chancellor’s office statewide data system) http://scorecard.cccco.edu/scorecard.aspx

SLO Related Resources:
ASCCC Resources for SLO Coordinators: http://www.asccc.org/slo-coordinators

WestEd Analysis of SLOs: http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/SLO_report_FINAL.pdf

Using ACCJC guides

(Excerpt from Effective Practices in Accreditation: A Guide for Faculty):
http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/Accreditation_paper.pdf

All colleges in the California Community College System are currently accredited by the ACCJC, which provides multiple guides and handbooks to assist districts to meet the Commission's Standards and to navigate a successful accreditation cycle. The following is a brief explanation of several guides and how they might be useful.

For institutions preparing for a self-evaluation report, also known as the Institutional Self Evaluation Of Educational Quality And Institutional Effectiveness, this handbook provides the basics: the standards, the eligibility requirements colleges must meet prior to making a formal application for accreditation and maintain after a affirmation of accreditation, and the Commission’s policies. This document enumerates those requirements and cross-references them to the standards, including the statutory basis for its policies. Institutions can use this manual as an Accreditation 101 Guide for new faculty involved in accreditation.

Guide to Evaluating Institutions
This guide is essential for an institution preparing to write its Institutional Self Evaluation of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness report. This guide contains questions for each component of the standards that promote discussion at a college regarding how well its processes and execution of those processes support the institution’s ability to meet the standard. These questions are often asked by visiting team members during a site visit, and the guide provides examples of evidence that would be helpful to prove a college meets a standard. Institutions can use this guide and its questions to spur discussion in its committees working on the self-evaluation and to gather information for writing the self-evaluation.

Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation
Organizing the Institutional Self Evaluation of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness report is a daunting task for any college. This manual suggests ways to organize the report, provides samples of necessary forms that must be submitted with the report, and includes precise formatting information. An effective practice is to use this manual to determine ways to organize your college’s decision-making structure to support accreditation standards in order to integrate standards into daily operations at your college.

Guide to Accreditation for Governing Boards
In the last decade, actions of a college’s governing board or board members have played a role in colleges being sanctioned. This guide provided by the ACCJC describes the duties and responsibilities of governing board members in regard to the standards.

Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education
Now more than ever, scrutiny of distance education programs is on the minds of faculty and staff at many colleges. This manual helps institutions understand the Commission’s expectations of distance education and how all areas of the institution’s operations can support an effective distance education program.

Substantive Change Manual
Colleges often find themselves out of compliance with ACCJC requirements for receiving approval prior to making substantial changes to education programs or to the college mission. This manual should be consulted frequently as your institution makes changes to programs to avoid issues during a self-evaluation visit. This manual can be particularly useful when preparing a substantive change report when curriculum changes in a program lead to 50% or more of the program’s courses being offered online.
Additional Data Source Links (TOP, CIP, Sam Codes, Title 5, Ed Code)

- California Education Code [CEC]
  - Title 3, Division 7, Part 48, Chapter 1, Article 1, § 78015-78016.5

- California Code of Regulations [CCR]
  - Title 5 - Education, Division 6 ~ California Community Colleges
  - Chapter 6 ~ Curriculum and Instruction
  - Chapter 7 ~ Special Programs
  - Title 5 Revision Clarification - December 2007

- Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP 2010) ~ Revised June 2012

- College MIS Codes

- Data Element Dictionary
  - CB03 - Course TOP Code
  - CB09 - Course SAM Priority Code
  - CB11 - Course Classification Status
  - CB21 - Course Prior to College Level Rubrics
  - CB22 - Course Noncredit Category

- General Studies Basic Skills/ESL Top Codes

- General Studies Basic Skills/ESL Top Codes ~ Revised November 2009

- Matriculation


- Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) 6th Edition ~ Corrected July 2013

- The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum Reference Guide ~ Spring 2008

- The RP Group Guide to Prerequisite Research

Other Resources

- Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges (ASCCC)
- ASSIST (Statewide Student Transfer Information for California)
- Association of Community & Continuing Education (ACCE)
- Employment Development Department (EDD) ~ Labor Market Information (LMI)
- U.S. Department of Education
Appendices
Appendix A: Student Learning Outcomes ACCJC’s Expectations

The following except from the ACCJC’s Guide to Evaluating & Improving Institutions (Handbook for 2016, p. 10) is provided as a reference for the 2014 SLO expectations.

With the ACCJC Accreditation Standards adopted in 2014, the 2002 Standards principles concerning student learning outcomes were carried forward and clarified. Expectations in the areas of student learning outcomes include the following:

- the institutional goals and objectives include student learning. Operational units of the institution support student learning through these institutional goals and objectives and their related unit goals;
- student learning outcomes are defined and assessed for all instructional programs, student support services and learning support services;

Characteristics of Evidence

- assessment data are used to organize institutional processes, analyze student learning gaps and implement strategies, allocate resources, and continuously evaluate the efficacy of the institution’s efforts to support and improve student learning;
- student learning outcomes results are communicated broadly across the institution and to external audiences, including prospective students, employers, and transfer institutions;
- student learning outcomes results are used by students as they progress through their programs of study and engage in other activities of the institution;
- the discussion of student learning is ongoing at both the institutional and programmatic levels, and is tied to data analysis, program review, planning, resource allocation and other institutional decision-making;
- support and improvement of student learning outcomes are critical factors in institutional innovation and in implementing new processes;
- student learning outcomes are in place for the institution’s courses, programs, certificates and degrees, and are regularly assessed;
- assessment of the students’ attainment of the learning outcomes happens continuously at the course level for adaptation and enhancement of instruction and instructional delivery;
- this assessment can also provide input into curriculum revision and course sequencing;
- program-level assessment of student learning is designed and conducted to ensure the content and methods of instruction meet academic standards and expectations, are current, and support the institution’s mission and goals for student success;
- program-level assessment of student learning also provides information necessary for instruction-wide and institution-wide planning and decision-making; and,
- Information about student learning outcomes assessment results is available at the appropriate levels of granularity for use by programs and across programs, and by the institution as a whole, in analysis and evaluation, planning and decision-making, and for implementing change.
Appendix B: Definition of a Program

The following excerpt from the CCCCCO Program and Curriculum Handbook 5th Edition is provided as a reference.

“An educational program is defined in Title 5, section 55000(g), as "an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education." In practice, however, the Chancellor's Office approves only associate degrees and those credit certificates that community colleges wish to award to students and which will be listed on transcripts. Respectively, all noncredit programs require Chancellor's Office approval.

The types of educational programs that must be submitted to the Chancellor’s Office for approval are the following:

Credit Programs

- Associate Degrees – traditional A.A. or A.S. and A.A.-T/A.S.-T
- Certificates of Achievement that require 18 or more semester units (or 27 or more quarter units)
- Certificates of Achievement that require 12 to fewer than 18 or more semester units (or 18 to fewer than 27 quarter units)

Noncredit Programs

All noncredit programs that receive state funding must be submitted to the Chancellor’s Office for approval. These include course sequences in Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) that lead to:

- Certificates of Competency – in a recognized career field articulated with degree-applicable coursework, completion of an associate degree, or transfer to a baccalaureate institution
- Certificates of Completion – leading to improved employability or job opportunities
- Adult High School Diploma
Appendix C: PRC Chair Qualifications and Responsibilities

The Program Review Committee is an Academic Senate subcommittee coordinated by the Program Review Chair who receives 20% release time and is appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee after consultation with the Program Review Committee. The PRC Chair serves a three-year term with the option of reappointment if no other qualified faculty expresses an interest. The PRC Chair position is open to faculty who meet the following qualifications.

Qualifications:
1. Tenured full-time faculty with program review self-study experience
2. Previous experience serving on the Program Review Committee.
3. Strong verbal and written communication skills.
4. A collaborative disposition vested in working with peers to optimize student learning
5. An understanding of institutional effectiveness metrics and key performance indicators (KPIs).
6. Familiarity with accreditation standards related to instruction, program review and student learning outcomes
7. Willingness and ability to complete the PRC Chair duties outlined below
8. Report writing experience
9. Experience using the SLO tracking system to report SLO assessments
10. Willingness to represent program review as needed in areas such as the Educational Master Plan, the Strategic Directions, Institutional Effectiveness, and Accreditation

Duties and Responsibilities:
1. Communicate with the departments/divisions undergoing Program Review to ensure they understand the self-study requirements
2. Coordinate with IR and the SLO Coordinator to make certain that the prepopulated reports are available to faculty during the summer before the semester begins
3. Provide faculty and committee with guidance, training, and consultation as needed
4. Schedule the committee meetings and submit a facilities request for a conference room
5. Coordinate meetings with the program representative(s) who will share highlights of the department’s self-study with the committee
6. Facilitate a collegial dialogue about challenges, budget or resource needs, and best practices
7. Provide written commendations and recommendations to the departments undergoing self-study—allow faculty time to make corrections and respond to the PRC’s comments before the final draft of the annual report is submitted to the Academic Senate
8. Prepare the annual summary, including the PRC’s commendations and recommendations
9. Submit the annual report to the Academic Senate for any input or changes
10. Share the final report with all faculty, the deans, and the EVP of Instruction
11. Coordinate with Institutional Research to post the annual report on the Cypress College Program Review website
12. Submit the final self-study reports to the Executive Vice President of Instruction and post them on the “J-drive” in the Program Review folder
13. Request faculty representatives from the division deans for vacant committee positions (committee members serve 3-year terms on a rotational basis for continuity)
14. Report to Academic Senate and attend scheduled meetings as needed
15. Consult with the Curriculum Chair as needed
16. Provide a written annual report and to the Academic Senate President, Curriculum Chair, and Executive Vice President of Instruction.
17. Update the manual at least every four-years or as needed
18. Coordinate with Institutional Research to survey the program review participants periodically for anonymous feedback and suggestions to the PRC about the process. Previous survey results can be found in the Program Review folder on the “J-drive”
Appendix D: SAMPLE of a Pre-populated Program Review Self-study
(Examples of completed self-studies can be found on the “J-drive” in the Program Review Folder).

Division: Career Technical Education
Department: Aviation & Travel Careers
Department Coordinator/Director: ___________________________ Date: ________________

Please complete all the areas listed below by October 10 and submit a copy of this form to your Division Dean for completion. After the Division Dean has completed the Administrator portion of the form, submit one (1) electronic copy and twelve (12) hard copies to the Department Planning and Program Review Chair by October 25.

For help completing this form, please contact your Department Planning and Program Review Committee representative, or the Institutional Research and Planning office.

MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT:

Mission statements broadly describe the overall purpose of an organization. As a department, your purpose should support the mission of your division and the college as a whole.

College Mission Statement:
Cypress College enriches students’ lives by providing high quality education for transfer to four-year institutions, associate degrees, career technical education, and certificate coursework, as well as basic skills and opportunities for lifelong learning. The college is committed to promoting student learning and success, embracing diversity, and contributing to both the economic and social development of the surrounding community.

Department Mission Statement:
The Aviation and Travel Careers Department supports the Cypress College’s mission to promote student learning and success by collaborating with the industry and community to provide the most practical, personalized, and value-based instruction available to students seeking to secure or advance an aviation or travel career. The program is also dedicated to enriching society, embracing diversity, addressing the environmental impact of aviation and tourism, and contributing to both the economic and social development of the surrounding community.

1. Describe how your mission statement supports the college’s mission statement. If it does not, please explain why your department’s mission statement differs or provide a revised mission statement. If the mission statement has not been modified since your last program review, you may skip this question.

---

6 http://www.cypresscollege.edu/about/atAGlance/missionVision.aspx
TREND DATA/DEPARTMENT TRENDS:

2. Please evaluate the following five-year trend report provided by Institutional Research and Planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>% Change Fall 2014 to Fall 2015</th>
<th># Change Fall 2014 to Fall 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section Count</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat Count</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill Rate</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCH per FTEF</td>
<td>436.2</td>
<td>453.0</td>
<td>447.0</td>
<td>377.9</td>
<td>316.7</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
<td>-61.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section Count</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat Count</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill Rate</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCH per FTEF</td>
<td>384.0</td>
<td>441.8</td>
<td>419.3</td>
<td>334.7</td>
<td>317.1</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Please comment on any significant changes in the above chart, and the actions taken for improvements:

B. Please review the full-time faculty ratio reported in the fall of each year. If there were any significant staffing issues, reassigned time, or leaves that impacted educational quality or student success, please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Five Year Comparison Report from http://mygateway.nocccd.edu
3. Please evaluate the following degree and certificates table completed by Institutional Research and Planning. If there are other important outcomes for your department, contact Institutional Research and Planning by June 1st to request that data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate in Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline Customer Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Pilot</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Attendant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel/Tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificates: 6 to 18 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation I Private Pilot</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation II Instrument Pilot</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation III Commercial Pilot</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation IV Advanced Pilot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Airline Customer Services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Cruise Line Sales and Operations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Flight Attendant</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Tourism and Conference Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Travel Tourism</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Transportation Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificates: 12 to 18 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Airport Operations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificates: 18 to 30 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Pilot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificates: 30 to 60 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Airline Customer Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Flight Attendant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Travel Tourism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Certificates</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Degrees</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Awards</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Cypress College’s ACCJC institutional set standards for degree and certificate completion are 845 degrees and 520 certificates per year.

4. Transfer: Please evaluate transfer rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unduplicated Graduates</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Transfer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at 2-year College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at 4-year College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transfers</strong></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 8)</td>
<td>(n = 11)</td>
<td>(n = 4)</td>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Cypress College’s ACCJC institutional set standard for the number of transfers is 863 per year.

---

8 J:\Program Review and Department Planning\03IQA Data\NumberOfCertificatesDegrees

9 Source: National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) [http://www.studentclearinghouse.org/](http://www.studentclearinghouse.org/)

Transfer rates are calculated as the ratio of students who either enrolled at a 4-year college or received a bachelor degree over the amount of unduplicated graduates, excluding those in which NSC could not match.
5. Success Rates: Please evaluate the following success rates\(^\text{10}\) provided by Institutional Research and Planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATC</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Change (% Pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATC 101 C</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 102 C</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 103 C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 112 C</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 123 C</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 132 C</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 140 C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 144 C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 174 C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 175 C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 182 C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 183 C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 190 C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 192 C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 196 C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 197 C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 198 C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 199 C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 223 C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 256 C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 270 C</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 274 C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 295 C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 299 C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Total</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Total</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>1,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Total</td>
<td>30,625</td>
<td>43,620</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>31,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Cypress College's ACCJC institutional set standard for successful course completion is 71.2%

\(^{10}\) J:\Program Review and Department Planning\03IQA Data\Success and Retention

\(^{11}\) Success rates are the percentage of students earning an A, B, C/credit/pass out of all students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Spring 2015 Successful</th>
<th>Spring 2015 Total</th>
<th>Spring 2015 Success Rate</th>
<th>Spring 2016 Successful</th>
<th>Spring 2016 Total</th>
<th>Spring 2016 Success Rate</th>
<th>Change (% Pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATC 101 C</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 102 C</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 103 C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>-13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 112 C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 118 C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 132 C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>-14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 136 C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 147 C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 157 C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 172 C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>-31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 183 C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>-17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 190 C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 192 C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 195 C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 196 C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 197 C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 198 C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 199 C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 212 C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 232 C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 240 C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>-29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 250 C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>-25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 270 C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 271 C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 274 C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 295 C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 299 C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>-34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVIA 232 C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>423</strong></td>
<td><strong>583</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>396</strong></td>
<td><strong>556</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,797</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,349</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,474</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,559</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,526</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,059</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cypress College’s ACCJC institutional set standard for successful course completion is 71.2%

6. Distance Education: Please provide an overview of the role of distance education (online, hybrid, etc.) as a delivery mode in your department. Identify and any issues that may be impacting student success.

---

12 Success rates are the percentage of students earning an A, B, C/credit/pass out of all students.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
<th>Distance Education*</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
<th>Difference (% Pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATC 101 C***</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 102 C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 112 C**</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 118 C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 123 C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 132 C**</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 136 C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 140 C</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 144 C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 174 C***</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 175 C***</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 182 C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 183 C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 192 C**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 196 C</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 197 C</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 198 C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 199 C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 212 C</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 223 C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 232 C**</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 240 C</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 250 C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 256 C**</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 270 C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 271 C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 274 C**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 295 C***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC 299 C***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVIA 232 C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note</strong>: ATC 103 is excluded from the table as a lab course. ATC 190 and 195 are excluded as field experience courses. <strong>Note</strong>: This course was offered through hybrid instruction only. *<strong>Note</strong>: This course was offered through online instruction only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department Total: 752 | 980 | 76.7% | 795 | 1,175 | 67.7% | 9.0%

*Note*: ATC 103 is excluded from the table as a lab course. ATC 190 and 195 are excluded as field experience courses.

**Note**: This course was offered through hybrid instruction only.

**Note**: This course was offered through online instruction only.

---

13 This table includes data for all courses from Fall 2014, Spring 2015, Fall 2015, and Spring 2016

14 Success rates are the percentage of students earning an A, B, C/credit/pass out of all students.
A. Please comment on the student success rates for on campus instruction, including best practices and strategies to improve success rates:

B. Please comment on the success rates for online/hybrid instruction, including best practices and strategies to improve success rates:

7. Student Equity: Review the student equity data, and identify any achievement gaps in student success.\textsuperscript{15} Note strategies to improve success by student subpopulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th># Enrolled</th>
<th># Successful</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>% Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 or less</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or PI</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Youth Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Labor Market Data (CTE only): Review labor market data for projected job openings, job placement, wages, and comment on any noteworthy trends that may affect your program.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{15} This table includes data for all courses in the department from Fall 2014, Spring 2015, Fall 2015, and Spring 2016
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### Program: Flight Attendant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College Rate</th>
<th>Statewide Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Projected 5-year Job Openings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Projected Annual Job Openings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate for Skills-builders after two quarters</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate for Skills-builders after four quarters</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Annual Earnings for Skills-builders</td>
<td>$11,636</td>
<td>$14,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Earnings for Skills-builders</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program: Commercial Piloting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>College Rate</th>
<th>Statewide Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Projected 5-year Job Openings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Projected Annual Job Openings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate for Skills-builders after two quarters</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate for Skills-builders after four quarters</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Annual Earnings for Skills-builders</td>
<td>$32,829</td>
<td>$24,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Earnings for Skills-builders</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Please comment on how the data in the prior tables and other factors describe the department’s effectiveness as a whole.

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT:**

SLO assessment provides faculty with an opportunity for dialogue and for the identification of best practices and challenges in achieving outcomes.

The SLO Coordinator will provide departments with a Course SLO Assessment Report. This report can also be accessed in the Adhoc Reports area of TracDat. Faculty will need data from that report to respond to the following questions. For departments not using TracDat, please generate comparable data.

**Course Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs)**

6. After reviewing the Course SLO Assessment Report, please respond to the following.
   A. Have your department’s course-level SLOs been assessed for all active courses within the last three years?
      Yes____ No____
   B. If not, what seems to be the largest obstacle in assessing within this timeframe?
   C. What is the overall SLO success rate for your department’s courses? ____%
   D. Please include highlights from your course SLO results and action plans, including best practices and challenges. What changes will be made to course curriculum, methodology, and/or the SLO process as a result of this assessment?
   E. What resources are needed to implement these changes?

In addition, a Department SLO Assessment Report (summary) will be provided, along with the pre-populated Program Review form, to the faculty and deans during the summer. Faculty and deans will need this report to answer their respective questions. For departments not using TracDat, please generate comparable data, and submit it to the Program Review Committee and your Division Dean. This data will also be entered into TracDat for Accreditation PLO and ILO reporting purposes.

Note: If you have difficulty accessing TracDat results, please contact your division’s Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator.

**CURRICULUM:**

6. What new courses are you planning that will be going through the curriculum committee review process?

7. If there are courses that have not been revised in the last six years:

---

16 From the Launchboard at [www.calpassplus.org](http://www.calpassplus.org) (Faculty may request a password using your Cypress email address and evaluate the labor market demand in the Program Snapshot Reports by TOP code; the password may take a few days to receive). Employment data from students who were enrolled in the Program for at least one course but did not receive an award (Skills-builder students) during 2011-12 is reported. To view wage data, select three years prior as there is a lag in reporting wages. Please note that this is a new data source and may not represent all student groups. Programs may also want to compare these data to the projections provided by other sources such as O*NET (onetonline.org), regional sources, and industry associations.
a. Provide a list of these courses:

b. What is the plan for reviewing these courses?

BASIC SKILLS STUDENTS NEEDS:

8. How does your department assist your underprepared students so that they can succeed in your class? (ex. Tutoring, supplemental instruction, explanation of study skills that are effective in your discipline, i.e. how to read the textbook)

DEPARTMENTAL OBJECTIVES:

9. Past Action Plans: Using the last Departmental Planning and Program Review, please copy and paste the department’s past action plans/objectives using the provided format.

10. Goal: Insert goal statement here

   Supports District Strategic Direction17:

   Objective: insert first objective here

   Person(s) responsible: 

   Timeframe:

   Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”):

   Objective: insert second objective here (if applicable)

   Person(s) responsible: 

   Timeframe:

   Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”):

Were these goals met? Please explain.

11. New or Updated Action Plans: Based on the information provided in this report, use the provided format to list your department’s goals for the next four years to improve learning outcomes for all your students. For each budget request, please indicate the corresponding District Strategic Direction(s), Institutional Learning Outcome(s), and/or Program Learning Outcome(s), and the consequences of not receiving requested resources or funding.

   Goal: Insert goal statement here

   Supports District Strategic Direction: 

   Supports Institutional Learning Outcome Pathway: 18

   Pathway I (AS degree, CSU/IGETSE Transfer):

   Pathway II (CTE Certification):

   Pathway III (Personal, Academic, Prof. Dev.):

   Supports Program Learning Outcome:19

   Objective: insert first objective here

   Person(s) responsible:

   Timeframe:

   Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”):

   Objective: insert second objective here (if applicable)

17 District Strategic Directions may be found in the most recent District Strategic Plan: http://www.nocccd.edu/StrategicPlanning/StrategicPlan.htm

18 Reference the Institutional Learning Outcomes noted in the Cypress College Catalog.

19 Reference the Program Learning Outcomes noted in the Cypress College Catalog.
Person(s) responsible:

Timeframe:

Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”):

IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDED RESOURCES AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:

12. Please list all grants or special funding resources that apply to this program, including the type of grant, cycle, and amount:

13. Please summarize the resources needed outside of the above grant funding for personnel, equipment, supplies, instructional support, clerical support, and other areas to achieve the goals identified in this Department Planning and Program Review?

List the needed resources and specify a dollar amount, indicating the appropriate funding sources of each item (i.e. division prioritization for personnel, division funding request for instructional supplies and equipment under $2000, one-time budget request for items over $2000, and possible other funding).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of resource</th>
<th>Appropriate budget process</th>
<th>Cost in $:$ (annual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department Planning and Program Review Participation

Department Coordinator (Print & then sign): ________________________________

Participating Faculty (Print & then sign):

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Date of meeting when Department Coordinator presented this Departmental Planning and Program Review form to departmental faculty: ________________________________

DIVISION DEAN EVALUATION:

This portion of the Program Review document is to be completed by the Division Dean.

MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT:

Do you agree with the department’s evaluation of their mission statement supports the college’s mission statement?

Why or why not?

TREND DATA/DEPARTMENT TRENDS:

Do you agree with the department’s evaluation of their five-year enrollment trends? Why or why not? Did the department miss any important information from the table?

Do you agree with the department’s evaluation of their degree and certificates table? Why or why not? Did the department miss any important information from the table?

Do you agree with the department’s evaluation of their success rates for both on campus and online/hybrid instruction? Did the department miss any important information from the table?

Do you agree with the department’s effectiveness as a whole? Why or why not? Did the department miss any important information?
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT:

(Before responding to this section, please review the department’s response to the Student Learning Outcomes section of this report, and the Department's SLO Assessment Report (summary) provided to division deans by the SLO Coordinator. For departments not using TracDat, faculty should submit comparable data).

According to the Department SLO Assessment Report (summary report), has the department assessed the course-level SLOs within the last 3 years? If not, what seems to be the largest obstacle in the process?

What resources or recommendations can you suggest to the department to support expanding best practices and/or overcoming obstacles related to SLO results and future action plans?

CURRICULUM:
What are your thoughts on the proposed and current curriculum indicated in this report?

BASIC SKILLS STUDENTS NEEDS:
How does the department assist underprepared students so that they can succeed in class? (ex. Tutoring, supplemental instruction, explanation of study skills that are effective in the discipline, i.e. how to read the textbook)

DEPARTMENTAL GOALS:
Do you agree with the department’s evaluation of meeting their past goals met? Why or why not?

Based on the information provided in this report, do the department’s goals for the next three years to improve learning outcomes for all their students make sense?

IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDED RESOURCES AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:
Based on the information in this report, are the funding requests reasonable and have the potential to positively impact student learning?

Final Approval
Division Dean Signature__________________________

Date Reviewed______________________

After Dean's Review and Discussion with Department Director/Coordinator:
Department Director/Coordinator Signature __________________Date Reviewed____
Appendix E: CTE Two-year Review Form
# Index
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- California Community College Chancellor’s Office · 3
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## D
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- Distance Education · 11, 13, 25
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## E

- Ed Code · 26
- Education Code section 78016 · 21, 22
- Educational Master Plan · 5, 11, 23
- Evaluating Distance Education · 25
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## G
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## I
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## K
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## L
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## M

- Matriculation Plan · 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Abbreviation and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>North Orange County Community College District · 4, 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PRC Annual Report · 9  
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Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) · 10, 24  
Program Review Committee · 4, 5, 6, 38 |
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Section 53200 · 3, 5  
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Standard 1.B.5. & B.6  
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Strategic Plan · 4, 5, 14, 23, 39  
Student Equity · 5, 11, 13 |
| T      | Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) Codes · 19  
Technology Plan · 5  
Ten Plus One · 3, 5  
Timeline · 9  
Title 5 · 3, 5, 6, 10, 21, 22, 26, 29  
TOP · 8, 19, 26, 38  
Tracdat · 13 |
| U      | U.S. Department of Education · 26 |
| W      | WSCH per FTEF · 12 |