The data presented in the following pages are provided to assist in the alignment of planning to enrollment and Student Achievement Standards. The data collected covers Fall 2012 to Fall 2014 results with the exception of the enrollment count which cover 2007 to 2014.

Enrollment Trends

| Year | Fall | Spring | Summer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 1767 | 1494 | 1100 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 1806 | 1621 | 1149 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 2188 | 1631 | 1367 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 2193 | 1787 | 1276 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 2042 | 1859 | 1108 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 1795 | 1659 | 746 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 1488 | 1262 | 803 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 1276 | 1220 | 711 |



| Spring Enrollment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |

## Notes for Fall Enrollment:

- Last enrollment peak was in Fall 2010.
- Biggest increase in enrollment was in Fall 2009 which increased by 21\% from Fall 2008. - Enrollment has decreased by a total of 41\% in Fall 2014 since Fall 2010.
- The biggest decline was recently in Fall 2014 where enrollment fell 14\% from Fall 2013.


## Notes for Spring Enrollment:

- Last enrollment peak was in Spring 2011.
- Biggest increase was in Spring 2010 which increased 10\% from Spring 2009.
- Enrollment has decreased by a total of 34\% in Spring 2014 since Spring 2011.
- The biggest decline happened in Spring 2013 when enrollment dropped 23\% from Spring 2012.
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## Student Achievement Standards

The data which follows was gathered for the institution to set standards for Student Achievement. Percentages were set using past data from Fall 2012 to Fall 2014, covering the 2012 catalog year. So far, the institution has set rates for three of the approved standards which are presented below.

## Standard 1: Developmental Courses

The successful Completion of highest developmental English and Math Courses which transition students into college readiness.

Developmental courses encompass remedial reading, writing and mathematics. This is the percentage of students who successfully completed the highest level of Developmental Reading (ENG 90), Developmental Writing (ENG 91), and Developmental Math (MAT 90) per semester. This rate has been set and approved by the institution at $70 \%$ of students passing developmental exit courses per semester.

|  | ENG 90 | ENG 91 | MAT 90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sum. 12 | $83 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $74 \%$ |
| Fa. 12 | $67 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Spr. 13 | $62 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Sum. 13 | $62 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| Fa. 13 | $69 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Spr. 14 | $64 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| Sum. 14 | $68 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| Fa. 14 | $81 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $65 \%$ |

## Standard 2: Gateway Courses

The successful completion of college level English and Math Courses as required by all degrees to transition into Gen-Ed and Program Requirements

Gateway Courses covers college level reading, writing and mathematics. The data in the table below summarizes rates presented to institution to set standard-2. Summative data (total percent of students who completed gateway courses with a " $C$ " or better), and formative data (assessment of learning outcomes) for Spring and Summer 2014 were used as a baseline. The rate for this standard has been set at $\mathbf{7 2 \%}$ of students who complete Gateway courses with a "C" or better.

| Gateway Courses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course | Summative Data |  |  | Formative Data |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2012-Fall 2014 <br> (Excluding Summer) |  |  | Spring and Summer 2014 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Semesters | Total Students | C or Higher | Students <br> Assessed | Beginning | Developing | Proficient | Total DP |
| ENG 150 | 5 | 874 | 76\% | 153 | 18\% | 39\% | 43\% | 82\% |
| ENG 151 | 5 | 812 | 74\% | 165 | 14\% | 36\% | 49\% | 85\% |
| MAT 151 | 5 | 888 | 64\% | 131 | 14\% | 31\% | 55\% | 86\% |
| Total Average |  | 2574 | 71\% | 449 | 15\% | 35\% | 49\% | 84\% |
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## Standard 3: Degree Program Requirements

The successful Completion of Gen-Ed, Core Foundational and Co-Foundational courses required by a Degree program.

This standard covers all General Education, Core Foundational and Co-Foundational courses as listed in the catalog. The following tables summarize rates presented to institution to set standard-3. Summative data (total percent of students from Fall 2012 to Fall 2014 who completed courses with a "C" or better), and formative data(Assessment of learning outcomes) for Spring and Summer 2014 were used as a baseline. The rate for this standard has been set at 75\% for General Ed, 80\% for Core Foundational, and $90 \%$ for Co-Foundational students who complete courses with a " $C$ " or better. Overall for Program Requirements, the rate has been set at $80 \%$ of students who complete all program requirements with a "C" or better per semester. The table for Co-Foundational does not show formative data as this data was not available at the time this standard was set.

| General Education Courses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Course | Summative Data |  |  | Formative Data |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2012-Fall 2014 (Excluding Summer) |  |  | Fall 2012-Summer 2014 (Gen-Ed Assessment Cycle) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Semesters | Total Students | C or Higher | Students <br> Assessed | Beginning | Developing | Proficient | Total D-P |
| ENG 150 | 5 | 874 | 76\% | 153 | 18\% | 39\% | 43\% | 82\% |
| ENG 151 | 5 | 812 | 74\% | 165 | 14\% | 36\% | 49\% | 85\% |
| SPH 153 | 5 | 403 | 97\% | 153 | 10\% | 41\% | 49\% | 90\% |
| ICT 150 | 5 | 830 | 71\% | 731 | 13\% | 21\% | 66\% | 87\% |
| MAT 151 | 5 | 888 | 64\% | 131 | 14\% | 31\% | 55\% | 86\% |
| PHSCI 150 | 5 | 539 | 67\% | 397 | 29\% | 28\% | 42\% | 70\% |
| HIS 150 | 5 | 193 | 59\% | 88 | 16\% | 37\% | 47\% | 84\% |
| HIS 151 | 5 | 172 | 68\% | 43 | 6\% | 46\% | 48\% | 94\% |
| HIS 162 | 5 | 336 | 93\% | 234 | 4\% | 68\% | 28\% | 96\% |
| HIS 170 | 5 | 313 | 69\% | 169 | 17\% | 30\% | 53\% | 83\% |
| HIS 171 | 5 | 303 | 66\% | 77 | 12\% | 21\% | 68\% | 89\% |
| PSY 150 | 5 | 327 | 85\% | 152 | 31\% | 36\% | 34\% | 70\% |
| HEA 150 | 5 | 164 | 56\% | 100 | 15\% | 29\% | 56\% | 85\% |
| Total Average |  | 6154 | 73\% | 2593 | 15\% | 36\% | 49\% | 85\% |

CORE FOUNDATIONAL

|  | SUMMATIVE DATA |  |  | FORMATIVE DATA |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fall 2012-Fall 2014 (Excluding Summer) |  |  | Fall 2014 |  |  |  |  |
| Course | Semesters | Students Enrolled | C or Higher | FA 14 Students Assessed | Beginning | Developing | Proficient | Total D-P |
| HEA151 | 5 | 65 | 57\% | 7 | 38\% | 24\% | 38\% | 62\% |
| HEA 152 | 4 | 32 | 100\% | 8 | 0\% | 6\% | 94\% | 100\% |
| HEA 299 | 5 | 33 | 100\% | 8 | 3\% | 25\% | 72\% | 97\% |
| HSV 150 | 1 | 15 | 100\% | 15 | 27\% | 42\% | 31\% | 73\% |
| ENG 250 | 5 | 403 | 89\% | 62 | 16\% | 42\% | 42\% | 84\% |
| ENG 251 | 5 | 591 | 82\% | 67 | 8\% | 49\% | 43\% | 92\% |
| BIO 150 | 5 | 229 | 73\% | 9 | 11\% | 41\% | 48\% | 89\% |
| BIO 155 | 5 | 101 | 98\% | 20 | 17\% | 32\% | 52\% | 84\% |
| BIO 251 | 1 | 7 | 100\% | 4 | 0\% | 35\% | 65\% | 100\% |
| MAT 250 | 5 | 502 | 58\% | 51 | 22\% | 38\% | 40\% | 78\% |
| SAM 101A | 5 | 69 | 93\% | 10 | 20\% | 60\% | 20\% | 80\% |
| SAM 101B | 3 | 35 | 94\% | 16 | 5\% | 7\% | 88\% | 95\% |
| SAM 151 | 5 | 167 | 87\% | 10 | 4\% | 48\% | 48\% | 96\% |
| SAM 152 | 5 | 132 | 91\% | 11 | 41\% | 36\% | 23\% | 59\% |
| MUS 150 | 5 | 96 | 95\% | 23 | 9\% | 0\% | 91\% | 91\% |
| MUS 160 | 5 | 135 | 98\% | 16 | 0\% | 5\% | 95\% | 100\% |
| MUS 170 | 5 | 32 | 98\% | 8 | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| ED 150 | 5 | 132 | 82\% | 7 | 7\% | 18\% | 75\% | 93\% |
| ED 157 | 5 | 85 | 75\% | 7 | 18\% | 25\% | 57\% | 82\% |
| ED 215 | 4 | 58 | 83\% | 8 | 13\% | 23\% | 71\% | 94\% |
| AUTO 172 | 1 | 5 | 100\% | 5 | 20\% | 46\% | 41\% | 87\% |
| AUTO 176 | 1 | 6 | 100\% | 6 | 9\% | 56\% | 35\% | 91\% |
| ELE 151 | 2 | 11 | 100\% | 8 | 44\% | 56\% | 0\% | 56\% |
| ELE 170 | 2 | 11 | 100\% | 7 | 36\% | 64\% | 0\% | 64\% |
| POL 150 | 5 | 78 | 72\% | 13 | 0\% | 56\% | 44\% | 100\% |
| Total Average |  | 3030 | 89\% | 406 | 15\% | 33\% | 53\% | 86\% |


| $\#$ | C or Higher Passing <br> Rates | Fall 2012 | Spring 2013 | Fall 2013 | Spring <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | Fall 2014 | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | FA12-FA14 (All <br> Semesters) | $89 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |
| 2 | Academic Years <br> (AY13-AY14) | $89 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Fall semesters only <br> (FA12-FA13-FA14) | $89 \%$ |  | $92 \%$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |  |  |
| 4 | Spring only (SP13- <br> SP14) |  | $98 \%$ |  | $91 \%$ | $\mathbf{9 1 \%}$ |  |
| 5 | FA 2014 Only |  |  |  | $91 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |

## INPUTS

The following data set was generated from the 2015 Academic Program Review submitted by the Academic Affairs office to IE for review. This does not replace analysis by the Academic Affairs office but is provided for review by the institution. The results are based on responses from 13 academic departments which submitted their surveys to Academic Affairs at the time they forwarded it to IE. Because the "Inputs" section of the Program Review consists mainly of open ended questions, this report is offered to provide an overview analysis of the results.

To condense the responses for better review, qualitative data from the surveys were themed and coded to provide a more quantifiable analysis of the result. The coding process began with reviewing the results of the survey and finding patterns in the responses by looking for certain keywords and phrases and grouping them into categories as illustrated in the table below.

| Yes | Mostly | Partially | Sometimes | No | Other responses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes <br> Absolutely <br> Definitely <br> Sure | Mostly <br> all but <br> except <br> for the most <br> part <br> generally <br> usually <br> most days | Partially ...but however ... <br> not all others are... with some depends.. | Sometimes occasionally one or the other <br> In the past year.. <br> Not lately <br> Not recently <br> hardly <br> not always <br> only if/when.. | No <br> used to <br> not ever <br> not that I know of <br> there is a need | NA = Not <br> applicable <br> DK= Don't know <br> U= Unanswered <br> NC= No comment |

After grouping comments into categories, percentages were calculated on the amount of responses in each category. In the tables which follow, "Missing" refers to those departments who missing from the summary submitted to IE.

## A. FACILITIES

In this section, respondents are given the opportunity to communicate problems they experienced or are experiencing with the use of facilities on campus. The table below lists the questions that were asked of the participants in this section and the number ( N ) and percentage (\%) of the responses by category. "Missing" refers to departments with no response.

| Table 1:Facilities Review | Yes |  | Mostly |  | Partially |  | Sometimes |  | No |  | Other responses |  | Missing |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Total | \% |
| 1. Are the facilities adequate for current programs / services? | 7 | 41\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 6 | 36\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 23\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 2. Are the facilities (classroom) clean and well maintained and sufficient? | 9 | 53\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 23\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 3. Is lighting (in classroom) adequate? | 11 | 65\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 23\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 4. Are there any safety hazards? | 6 | 35\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 5 | 29\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 23\% | 17 | 99\% |
| 5. Are facilities accessible to students and faculty with disabilities? | 10 | 59\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 12\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 23\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 6. Are the restroom facilities nearby and accessible for both genders? | 12 | 71\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 23\% | 17 | 100\% |

Table 2 lists the problems with facilities as detailed by the respondents. The detailed responses were grouped in a matrix to determine the commonality of the problems both by academic department and also by the facility identified. The column at the far right of the table shows how frequent a particular problem was reported (highlighted in green) and the row at the very bottom of the table sums up the number of problems reported for a particular facility (highlighted in blue).

IR Notes: The table on the following page can be used with the schedule from Academic affairs on classroom usage to validate the need for classroom space or repairs and a log of PFM job order requests to validate the frequency of problems occurring with each facility.
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| Table 2: Facility Problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Problems reported | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\xrightarrow[\text { N }]{\text { N }}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{U}{4} \\ & \stackrel{y}{4} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { N } \\ & \sum_{\sim}^{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { E } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | N I L |  | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}{ }_{\substack{\text { N }}}^{\sim}$ | $\sum_{i}^{N}$ | ( | O + $\vdots$ $\Sigma$ | U U O $\sim$ $\sim$ | O O E O O ¢ | $\varangle$ $\vdots$ $\Sigma$ $\Sigma$ | $\cup$ $N$ $\Sigma$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { U }}$ |  |  | $\sum_{\text {N }}^{\text {N }}$ |  |
| AC Not working properly | X | X | X |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| Need AC |  |  |  | X |  | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| AC Leaks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | 2 |
| Slippery Walkways |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Echo in classrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X | 2 |
| Non-working light fixtures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Lights Dull |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | 2 |
| No evening lights in front of building |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Exposed electrical Wiring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Insufficient Classroom Space |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Insufficient designated classrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Insufficient Office Space |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Rat Infested |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Termite Infested |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Drainage/ runoff problems in front of buildings |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Dirty classrooms | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| No trashcan in classrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Roofing Leaks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Wall Deterioration |  |  | X |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Floors need repainting/ retiling |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | 1 |
| No accessibility |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| No Ramp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| No ramp covering |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Unsuitable desks and chairs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| No Student accessibility to bathrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Frequency | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |

## B. EQUIPMENT

This portion of the survey evaluates the availability and adequacy of the department's equipment. As with the previous section, the table which follows provides the frequency of responses categorized with the same coding used for the facilities portion.

| Table 3: <br> Equipment Review | Yes |  | Mostly |  | Partially |  | Sometimes |  | No |  | Other responses |  | Missing |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Total | \% |
| ```1. Do you have the necessary equipment to fulfill your responsibilities adequately?``` | 3 | 18\% | 4 | 24\% | 2 | 12\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 18\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 2. Do you have textbooks for each course(s)? | 11 | 65\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 3. Do you have adequate (up to date) textbooks to support your course(s)/program(s)? | 9 | 53\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 12\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 4. What additional equipment do you need? | See Table 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Is the equipment adequately maintained? | 4 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 6\% | 5 | 29\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 6. Is all equipment recorded on the procurement inventory and tagged with ASCC identification? | 12 | 71\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 7. Are there any safety hazards with the current equipment? | 3 | 18\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 8 | 47\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 8. Is the equipment accessible for employees with disabilities? | 12 | 71\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 9. Do you have adequate access to supplies for repairs to keep equipment functioning? | 4 | 24\% | 1 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 82\% |

The table below lists the equipment needed by departments as answered by respondents to Q4. Not included in the table are the amounts of each item required by each department with the exception of those identified under "Program Specific Equipment".

| Table 4. EQUIPMENT NEEDED BY DEPARTMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Departments | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | U | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \text { Ø1 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underline{\underline{\tilde{n}}}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ | Program Specific Equipment |
| Agriculture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Business | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Criminal Justice |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CLP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELI/CAPP |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Fine Arts |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | X |  | Sound System |
| Health and Human Services |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Language and Literature | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mathematics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X | Graphing Calculators |
| Nursing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 Hospital Beds, vital sign machine, Alris IV pump, 4 manikins |
| Physical education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yearly replacement of sports equipment |
| ROTC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Science | X |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Scales and glassware in labs |
| TED |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| TTD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Maintenance and Safety

Below are the concerns reported by respondents in regards to the maintenance and safety of equipment:

- Lack of computer maintenance in Business Department Lab $=1$ response
- Slow response by MIS for equipment repair = 1 response
- No maintenance or repair for program specific equipment $=2$ responses
- AC leaks make walkways slippery = 1 response
- Beds in nursing are a safety hazard $=1$ response
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As part of Q9, departments listed inventory of equipment currently in their possession. The inventory is organized in the table below.

| Table 6. DEPARTMENT INVENTORY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Departments |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & \text { ò } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \stackrel{n}{0} \\ \frac{0}{0} \\ \frac{0}{3} \\ \frac{2}{0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $n$ $\stackrel{n}{0}$ $\stackrel{c}{\tilde{0}}$ $\stackrel{0}{n}$ | $\frac{\stackrel{y}{0}}{\stackrel{0}{y}}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Business | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Business Lab | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELI/CAPP | 8 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CAPP Lab | 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine Arts | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health and Human Services | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Language and Literature | 6 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| Mathematics | 8 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nursing | 3 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| Physical education | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Science |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science | 5 | 64 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| TED | 9 | 6 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| TED Lab | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TTD |  |  |  |  |  |  | be ad | dress | d in | TD-P |  |  |  |  |  |

IR Notes: This information can also be found in Department of Finance inventory reports.

## C. MATERIALS

This part of the survey evaluates the adequacy of materials the academic departments use for their operations.

| TABLE 8: MATERIALS | Yes |  | Mostly |  | Partially |  | Sometimes |  | No |  | Other responses |  | Missing |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Total | \% |
| 1. Are the instructional materials in the courses and program are up to date and do they reflect the needs of the industry and the community? | 12 | 71\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 2. What additional supplies and/or materials do you need? (See next page) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Do you have adequate research or resource materials to support your office and instruction? | 9 | 53\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 12\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 4. What additional research or resource materials do you need? (See next page) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Can employees with disabilities adequately use the current materials? | 10 | 59\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 6. Do you have adequate supplies and materials? | 4 | 24\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 7 | 41\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |
| 7. Are supportive and reference materials current, relevant, and readily available in order to carry out instructional activities? | 9 | 53\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 |  | 2 | 12\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100\% |

## Q2. Additional Supplies and Materials

For this question, the respondents did not identify any one supply more than once. Each department which responded listed materials and supplies which were mostly specific to their curriculum.

| Department | Materials needed |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business | Printing papers and toners |
| ELI/CAPP | Ink, novels and movies |
| Fine Arts | Updated Encyclopedia for music, art and theatre |
| Mathematics | Graphing calculators, working smartboards |
| Nurisng | Stethescopes, aneroid, desk sphygomanometers |
| Physical Education | laptops, calculators, automobile, scanner, video cameras, lab with body mass calculators |
| Social Science | World maps, globes |
| Science Department | Acids, reactive metals, glassware, pH paper, density blocks, safety glasses |

## Q4. Additional Resource and Research Materials

Most respondents feel they have adequate resource and research materials for its department with the exception of the Business Department which explained that the shortage of materials and supplies resulted in use of personal resources (namely paper and ink) at home for use in class.

## Q6. Adequate Supplies and materials

A common reply for this question is the shortage of office supplies which often run out in the bookstore and procurement. Respondents have listed paper clips, pens, tape, pencils, paper, staplers, and markers. As a result of the shortage, instructors have had to improvise.

## Q7. Current, relevant and readily available Reference Materials

With the exception of the Nursing Department, the rest of the departments feel that the reference materials are current. Respondents have noted the availability of reference materials in the library and online sources. Nursing has had to resort to personal funds to purchase reference materials because the available ones are outdated. TED also noted that although the reference materials are available in the ERC located in the library, access to it by teachers taking Education courses was limited to the Library hours and not available to them while on campus for classes after regular campus hours.

## D. METHODS

This section evaluates the effectiveness of methods used in the classroom and the support by which these methods are employed. The section covers methods for instruction, evaluation, recruitment and retention.

| Table 9: METHODS | Yes |  | Mostly |  | Partially |  | Sometimes |  | No |  | Other responses |  | Missing |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| 1. Is there a written curriculum, which relates to the specific learning outcomes of the program? | 13 | 76\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100 $\%$ |
| 2. Do course syllabi have measurable student learning outcomes? | 13 | 76\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| 3. Is the sequence of the course content appropriate and does it provide for program continuity? <br> 5. Is the institution and programs evaluated by students or peers on a regular basis? | 13 10 | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \% \\ & 59 \% \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 |  | 0 0 |  | 0 0 |  | 0 3 | 18\% | 0 0 |  | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \% \\ & 24 \% \end{aligned}$ | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ \% \\ 100 \\ \% \end{array}$ |
| 6. Does the program have a comprehensive strategy for recruitment? | 4 | 24\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 8 | 47\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ \% \end{array}$ |
| 7. Has the program been actively utilizing recruitment strategies? . <br> 11. Do all students have a designated advisor? | 8 13 | $\begin{aligned} & 47 \% \\ & 76 \% \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 |  | 0 0 |  | 0 0 |  | 2 0 | 12\% | 3 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | 4 | $24 \%$ $24 \%$ | 17 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ \% \\ 100 \\ \% \end{array}$ |
| 12. Are the advisors and faculty knowledgeable concerning program curriculum? | 13 | 76\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ \% \end{array}$ |
| 13. Is there a formal faculty advisement mechanism is in place to assist student with program and career decisions? | 11 | 65\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100 $\%$ |
| 14. Does the program have a comprehensive strategy in place for retention? | 8 | 47\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 3 | 18\% | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 24\% | 17 | $\begin{array}{r}100 \\ \% \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| 15. Does the institution provide developmental or remedial mathematics and English courses for students who are placed at these levels? | 11 | 65\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 100 $\%$ |

This table summarizes the responses to Q4 of this section.

| Table 10. Instructional Methods (Responses for Q4) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \stackrel{0}{4} \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { 른 }}{ }$ | 吴 |  |
| Lecture | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | 13 |
| Class Discussions | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | x | x |  | 6 |
| simulation | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| individual/group research | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| individual/group presentations | x |  | x |  | x | x |  |  |  |  | x | x |  | 6 |
| guest lecturers | X |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  | x |  |  | x | 5 |
| Field Trips |  | x |  | x | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x | 5 |
| Group projects/Pair assignments |  |  | X |  |  | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Individual summations |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| audio/visual examples |  |  |  | x | x | x |  | x |  | x | x |  | x | 7 |
| studio work or rehearsal/practice hours |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| PPT Presentations |  |  | x |  | x |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Practicum/ Work Experience |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |  |  | x | x | 3 |
| online testing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| hands on assignments |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  | x | 4 |
| service learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | 1 |
| Team teaching |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | 1 |
| Moodle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | x | 2 |
| Library Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  | 1 |
| demonstrations/illustrations | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | 2 |

The table below summarizes responses for Q5 of this section.

| Table 11. Evaluation Methods (Responses for Q5) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department | Department <br> instrument | IE instrument | Interviews | Department <br> meeting (peer <br> evaluations) |
| Business | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |
| ELI/CAPP |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| Fine Arts | $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |
| Health and Human <br> Services |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| Math |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| Nursing |  |  |  |  |
| Physical Education | $\mathbf{x}$ | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| Social Science |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| Science |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| Teacher Education | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |  |
| Trades and <br> Technology Division |  |  |  |  |

## Responses for Q6: Recruitment Methods

This question called for the department's strategies on student recruitment however three of the divisions reported strategies on recruiting faculty. Trades, Nursing, Fine Arts, Business
Department and Physical Education have all indicated working with the community as a student recruitment strategy. All have either gone out to or participated in events particularly with High Schools.

| Table 12. Student placement into courses (Responses for Q8) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Placement Exam/SAT scores for New Students | CAPP/GED requirements | Prerequisites stated in catalog | Declared Majors | Individual interests |
| Business | x |  |  |  |  |
| Criminal Justice |  | x | x |  |  |
| ELI/CAPP | x |  |  |  |  |
| Fine Arts |  |  |  |  |  |
| Language and Literature | x | x | x |  |  |
| Physical Education | x |  |  |  |  |
| Social Science |  |  | x |  | x |
| Science |  |  | x | x | x |
| Teacher Education | x |  | x |  |  |
| Trades and Technology |  |  |  |  |  |

## Responses for Q9: Program Enrollment

Table 13 lists the enrollment of students in programs as reported by departments.

| Table 13. Program Enrollment |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department | SPR15 | FA14 | SP14 |
| Business | 70 | 71 | 79 |
| Criminal Justice |  |  |  |
| ELI/CAPP |  |  |  |
| Health and Human <br> Services |  |  |  |
| Fine Arts | 8 to 10 |  |  |
| Language and <br> Literature |  |  |  |
| Math | 291 | 12 |  |
| Nursing | 120 |  |  |
| Social Science |  |  |  |
| Science | Teacher Education | 120 |  |
| Trades and <br> Technology |  |  |  |

Responses for Q10: Is current enrollment too high or too low?

| Table 14. Program Enrollment-status |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department | High | Low | Adequate | Don't know | Not <br> Applicable |
| Business |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |  |
| Criminal Justice |  |  |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |
| ELI/CAPP | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Health and Human <br> Services |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine Arts |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |
| Language and <br> Literature |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |
| Math |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nursing | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Social Science | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Science |  |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| Teacher Education |  |  | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |  |
| Trades and <br> Technology |  |  |  |  |  |

## Responses for questions Q11,12,13: Academic Advising

The table below summarizes the responses from the departments on 1) whether the departments had advisors, 2) if the advisors were knowledgeable of the curriculum and 3) if the departments had mechanisms to use when advising. The xs in the table below indicate what each department has. Those who claimed having an Advising Mechanism all were referring to Advising Sheets.

| Table 15. Advisors |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Advisor | knowledgeable | Advising <br> Mechanism |
| Business | x | x | x |
| Criminal Justice | x | x | x |
| ELI/CAPP | x | x | x |
| Health and Human <br> Services | x | x |  |
| Fine Arts | x | x | x |
| Language and <br> Literature | x | x | x |
| Math | x | x | x |
| Nursing | x | x | x |
| Social Science | x | x | x |
| Science | x | x | x |
| Teacher Education | x | x | x |
| Trades and | x | x | x |
| Technology | x | x | x |
| Business |  |  |  |

Responses for Q14 and 16: Retention
Table 16 and 17 summarizes responses to retention strategies, retention rates and graduation rates. $47 \%$ of the respondents indicated they had recruitment strategies. Table 16 summarizes these types of strategies. Q16 asked respondents for retention rates however $61 \%$ of the respondents did not have this data. $61 \%$ of respondents did not have data on graduation rates as well. Those which reported rates are listed in Table 17.

Table 16. Retention Strategies

| Department | Retention Strategy |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business | Pro-active approach- advising students who are lacking the effort |
| Criminal Justice | No |
| ELI/CAPP | Not passing course |
| Health and Human <br> services |  |
|  | Yes |
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| Fine Arts | Following the curriculum that allows student to complete degree |
| :--- | :--- |
| Language and | N/A |
| Literature | N/A |
| Math | Nursing scholarship, Passing NCLEX and working for LBJ are all strategies for |
|  | Rursing |
| Rhysical Education | No |
| Social Science | Encouraging and assisting those in need |
| Science | No |
| Teacher Education | Encouragement and assistance |
| Trades and |  |
| Technology | No |

Table 17. Program Retention and Graduation Rates

| Department | Retention Rate | Graduation Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business | 97\% | 80\% |
| Criminal Justice |  |  |
| ELI/CAPP | 40\% |  |
| Health and Human services |  |  |
| Fine Arts |  | 80\% |
| Language and Literature |  |  |
| Math |  |  |
| Nursing | 69\% | 62\% |
| Physical Education | 100\% |  |
| Social Science |  | 89\% |
| Science |  |  |
| Teacher Education | 100\% | 100\% |
| Trades and Technology |  |  |

## E. Teacher Qualifications

This brief section evaluates the qualifications of instructors in each department.

| TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS | Yes |  | Mostly |  | Partially |  | Sometimes |  | No |  | Other responses |  | Missing |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Total | \% |
| 1. Are the instructors in the program qualified to teach their particular courses? | 12 | 71\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 0\% |
| 2. Does the faculty have appropriate on the job training or work experience? | 10 | 59\% | 0 | 0\% | 2 | 12\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 0\% |
| 3. Is there adequate number of personnel to support your department/program/division? | 6 | 35\% | 2 | 12\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 18\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 | 1 |

## F. Faculty Professional Development

| FACULTY/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT | Yes |  | Mostly |  | Partially |  | Sometimes |  | No |  | Other responses |  | Missing |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Total | \% |
| 1. Does the institution provide a Faculty Handbook to keep Faculty informed about institutional policies and procedures? | 10 | 59\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 12\% | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 2. Does the institution require any in service training for new or adjunct instructors? | 13 | 76\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 3. Do the instructors attend workshops and professional committee meetings? | 11 | 65\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 12\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 4. Does the institution provide financial assistance and release time? | 7 | 41\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 6\% | 3 | 18\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 5. Do instructors regularly communicate with programrelated business or industries'? | 9 | 53\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 6\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 7. Are institutional manuals or handbooks available to all faculty? | 12 | 71\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 6\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 8. Is there adequate communication from supervisors and other divisions/departments, including sharing of pertinent data, reports, and surveys and | 12 | 71\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 6\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |


| needs assessments? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9. Is adequate in-service or local training provided? | 8 | 47\% | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 24\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 11. Do employees have the opportunity to visit other postsecondary institutions? | 3 | 18\% | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 6\% | 6 | 35\% | 3 | 18\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 12. Does the administration support professional development activities training for your department / division? | 6 | 35\% | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 6\% | 4 | 24\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 13. Are department / division meetings held regularly? | 11 | 65\% | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 14. Are there minutes of these meetings with a sign in sheet for attendance? | 11 | 65\% | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 15. Are guidelines for procedures and relevant information presented in a timely and consistent manner? | 10 | 59\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |

## Responses for Q6: Advisory Council

The table which follows summarizes the department responses for Q6, a-d. For responses to e-j, it is better to read actual comments as they cannot be summarized quantitatively. These are provided in the next pages.

|  | Advisory Council | represents local business/industry | Frequency of meetings | Minutes kept |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business |  |  | NA | NA |
| Criminal Justice | X |  | NA | NA |
| ELI/CAPP |  |  | Not recent | NA |
| Health and Human services | X | X | Not Recent | NA |
| Fine Arts | x |  | Beginning of every semester | Yes |
| Language and Literature | X | X | Never | No |
| Math | X | X | Once a semester | Yes |
| Nursing | X |  | Twice a year | Yes |
| Physical Education | x | x | Once a month | No |
| Social Science | X |  | None | NA |
| Science | X | X | Once a year | NA |
| Teacher Education | X |  | Twice a Year | Yes |
| Trades and Technology | X | X | When new course is introduced to curriculum | Yes |

6.e. HOW HAS THE LOCAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ASSISTED THE PROGRAM? Response should indicate the involvement of your academic departments in providing the necessary assistance that is requested by department faculties.

## 1. Business Department

Not Applicable
2. Criminal Justice

No Comment
3. English Language Institute - (CAPP-English)

I have no knowledge of this.
4. Fine Arts Department

No Comment
5. Health \& Human Services:

Not Applicable
6. Language \& Literature department

No Assistance
7. Mathematics department

The advisory council is very supportive in terms of providing the necessary assistance that is requested by department faculties,
8. Nursing department:

The nursing department provides information to LBJ and PH nursing representatives who call to request a list of students, syllabi, and schedule. Separate meetings such as with AHEC and Health Science are done on availability.
9. Physical Education department:

Currently the Dept. of Education focus is in academics and no on physical education
10. Reserve Officer Training Corps

ROTC did not submit the APR report.
11.Social Science

Not Applicable
12.Science department

None to my knowledge but may have provided insight into the health profession. This also needs to be revisited.
13.Teacher Education

- Yes, the council at the onset of the B.Ed. Program provided guidance for the program and specific community needs.

14. Trades \& Technology Division.

- By advising on courses that are relevant to the program
- Expected outcomes from a graduate when entering the workforce.

6f. WHAT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS HAS THE COUNCIL RECOMMENDED? Response should indicate recommendations that were made by your advisory council leading to program improvements.

## 1. Business Department

- No Comment

2. Criminal Justice

No Comment
3. English Language Institute - (CAPP-English)

II have no knowledge of this.
4. Fine Arts Department

No Comment
5. Health \& Human Services:

Not Applicable
6. Language \& Literature department

None
7. Mathematics department

They carefully reviewed the mission, course description, course objective, course rationale, program learning outcomes, and course learning outcomes for all mathematics courses that are currently offered.
8. Nursing department:

The LBJ and PH nursing representatives provide feedback from information submitted about the program and schedule of student placement in their area which helps in accommodating students and agency needs.
9. Physical Education department:

None
10.Social Science

Not Applicable
11.Science department

None to my knowledge but may have provided insight into the health profession. This also needs to be revisited

## 12.Teacher Education

- Strengthen community communications with ASDOE. This helped the TED administration to begin dialogue with ASDOE and to work on improving communication with ASDOE. As a result, more meetings have taken place between different divisions of ASDOE, for example, Teacher Quality. TED has been able to have several meetings with their administration and work on improving course offerings for teachers, strengthening outreach program to the high schools and providing stronger academic advising for teachers.


## 13. Trades \& Technology Division.

Revision where necessary.

6g. IN WHAT WAYS HAVE THE INSTRUCTORS AND ADMINISTRATION ACTED ON THESE SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS? Response should indicate recommendation that were made by your advisory council leading to program improvements.

## 1. Business Department

- Not Applicable

2. Criminal Justice

No Comment
3. College Life Planning

CLP did not submit the APR report.
4. English Language Institute - (CAPP-English)

Not Applicable
5. Fine Arts Department

No Comment
6. Health \& Human Services:

Not Applicable
7. Language \& Literature department

Not Applicable
8. Mathematics department

Whatever recommendations and suggestions that provided by the Advisory Council we discussed those issues among each mathematics instructor during our department meeting and decided which issues suggested improvements for our program.
9. Nursing department:

The clinical schedule is changed according to request from various agencies and does not require administration's recommendation or/and approval.

## 10. Physical Education department:

None
11.Social Science

Not Applicable
12.Science department

None to my knowledge but may have provided insight into the health profession. This also needs to be revisited
13. Teacher Education

TED administration has worked hard to maintain strong communication with ASDOE. As a result, better scheduling and advising is conducted for in-service teachers regarding their academic program, certification courses and other needs of teachers.
14. Trades \& Technology Division.

Utilizations of suggestions and recommendations in the curriculum for each program regarding expected outcomes a graduate should have when entering the workforce.

6h. TO WHOM DOES THE ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT ITS FINDINGS? PRESIDENT, VP, CHAIRPERSON, INSTRUCTORS? Response should indicate whom the advisory council directly reports its findings to.

## 1. Business Department

- Not applicable

2. Criminal Justice

No Comment
3. English Language Institute - (CAPP-English)

Not applicable
4. Fine Arts Department

Fine Arts chairperson and instructors.
5. Health \& Human Services:

Chairperson and then curriculum committee and Dean of Academic Affairs
6. Language \& Literature department

Not applicable
7. Mathematics department

Chairperson. Then the findings will be forwarded to Dean of Academic Affairs, Associate Dean, and Math Instructors.
8. Nursing department:

It will depend on what the report is, so far none has been submitted.
9. Physical Education department:

## 10.Social Science

Not Applicable
11.Science department

None to my knowledge but may have provided insight into the health profession. This also needs to be revisited

## 12.Teacher Education

- They report to the Dean of Teacher Education. The Dean of Teacher Education is to send all reports to the Office of Academic Affairs after each semester meeting.
13.Trades \& Technology Division.
- To the instructor who is responsible for a respective program
- From the instructor to the Chairperson
- From the Chairperson to the Dean of TTD


## 6i. IS THERE AN ADVISORY COUNCIL HANDBOOK DETAILING GUIDELINES AVAILABLE TO INSTRUCTORS AND ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS?

1. Business Department

- No

2. Criminal Justice

No Comment
3. English Language Institute - (CAPP-English)

Not Applicable
4. Fine Arts Department

No
5. Health \& Human Services:

Yes
6. Language \& Literature department

I do not know.
7. Mathematics department

Yes. The ASCC handbook consist of detailing guidelines.
8. Nursing department:

No. The members are listed in students' handbook and nursing section of the catalog.
9. Physical Education department:

Unknown
10.Social Science

Not Sure
11.Science department

None to my knowledge but may have provided insight into the health profession. This also needs to be revisited
12.Teacher Education

- Yes, there is an Advisory Council Handbook. Faculty will be provided copy of handbook in the fall semester 2015.
13.Trades \& Technology Division.

Yes

- Community Advisory Council Handbook (available on ASCC website)


## 6j. IS THERE ADVISORY COUNCIL PROVIDED RELATED PROGRAM INFORMATION TO HELP THEM ASSIST WITH PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS? Response should indicate if the department provides the advisory council with all related information that helps them with program recommendations. Explain what kind of information your department/division has provided the council.

1. Business Department

- No Comment

2. Criminal Justice

No Comment
3. English Language Institute - (CAPP-English)
4. Fine Arts Department

No Comment
5. Health \& Human Services:
6. Language \& Literature department
7. Mathematics department

- Yes. We provided them with the following related information that helps them with programs recommendations:
- Course Syllabi: details information about the course
- Handbook: guidelines and polices adhered in the institution.
- Catalog: Information about the program.

8. Nursing department:

They are provided with new changes each catalog.
9. Physical Education department:

Unknown
Not Sure
10. Science department

None to my knowledge but may have provided insight into the health profession. This also needs to be revisited
11. Teacher Education

- Yes, advisory council members are given all information brochures, the ASBEP Catalog, the ASCC Catalog and all other relevant information on the Teacher Education Program.

12. Trades \& Technology Division.

- Presentation of a new curriculum or revision(s) to an existing curriculum and any evidence that is available to support changes proposed.


## Responses to Q10: Off-island Training/ Professional Development

|  | Rarely | Assessment | Content | N/A or No comment | None | WASC | National Council |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Criminal Justice |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| ELI/CAPP | x |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Health and Human services |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine Arts |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Language and Literature |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Math |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Nursing |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |
| Physical Education | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Science | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Science |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teacher Education |  | x |  |  |  | X |  |
| Trades and Technology |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |

## G. Job Placement Training

## JOB PLACEMENT AND/OR TRACKING

- Is placement data collected on a continuing basis, readily available to instructor, and used in program planning and evaluation?
- Is employer satisfaction data collected on a continuing basis, readily available to instructors, and used in program planning and evaluation?
- Is there a mechanism in place to receive feedback from four year institutions on transfer students.
- Can the program justify non-degree student placement?

| Yes |  | Mostly |  | Partially |  | Sometimes |  | No |  | Other responses |  | Missing |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Total | \% |
| 7 | 41\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 2 | 12\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 6 | 35\% | 5 | 29\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 2 | 12\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 7 | 24\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 6 | 35\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 3 | 18\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |

Academic Program review _ IE Analysis

|  | Table 18. Certification Exams |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes | No | Exam | License |
| Business | x |  | 4 part Accounting exam | CPA |
| Criminal Justice |  | x |  |  |
| ELI/CAPP |  | $x$ |  |  |
| Fine Arts |  | x |  |  |
| Health and Human Services |  | x |  |  |
| Language and Literature |  | x |  |  |
| Math |  | x |  |  |
| Nursing | x |  | Nurse Aid national exam | CAN |
|  |  |  | NCLEX/ ASHSRB | PN/RN |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Physical Education |  | x |  |  |
| Social Science |  | x |  |  |
| Science |  | x |  |  |
| Teacher Education | $x$ |  | PRAXIS | Teaching certification |
| Trades and Technology | $x$ |  | ABR/AUTO | ASE student Certification |

## H. FACULTY/STUDENT EVALUATIONS

| FACULTY AND STUDENT EVALUATION | Yes |  | Mostly |  | Partially |  | Sometimes |  | No |  | Other responses |  | Missing |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Total | \% |
| 1. Are faculty performance evaluations conducted on a regular basis? | 11 | 65\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 12\% | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 2. Are the cooperative linkages with other programs/departments, employment services, or vocational training programs relevant to students? | 10 | 59\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 6\% | 2 | 12\% | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |
| 3. Do instructors view assessment as an integral and necessary part of instruction? | 13 | 76\% | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 24\% | 17 |  |


[^0]:    Notes for Summer Enrollment:

    - Last enrollment peak was in Summer 2009.
    - Biggest increase was in Summer 2009 which increased 19\% from Summer 2008.
    - Enrollment has decreased by a total of 47\% in Summer 2014 since Summer 2009.
    - The biggest decline happened in Summer

    2012 where enrollment dropped $33 \%$ from Summer 2011.

