



**ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)**  
ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011

The purpose of this document is to collect information to be used by the college planning bodies IPC (Instruction Planning Council), APC (Administrative Planning Council), SSPC (Student Services Planning Council), Budget Planning Committee, and CPC (College Planning Council) and may be used for Program Improvement and Viability (PIV). Through this process, faculty have the opportunity to review the mission and vision of their department/program. Then, using multiple measures and inquiry, faculty will reflect on and evaluate their work for the purposes of improving student learning and program effectiveness. This reflection will identify steps and resources necessary to work towards the program vision including personnel, professional development, facilities, and equipment. *Faculty should use their judgment in selecting the appropriate level of detail when completing this document.*

**The deadline for submission of the Annual Program Plan to the IPC is March 31.** Complete this document in consultation with your Dean who will then submit a copy to IPC. Members of the IPC review the document and return their comments to the author for use in the next annual program plan.

**Cañada College**

**Mission Statement**

It is the mission of Cañada College to ensure that students from diverse backgrounds have the opportunity to achieve their educational goals by providing quality instruction in general, transfer, career, and basic skills education, and activities that foster students' personal development and academic success. Cañada College places a high priority on supportive faculty/staff/student teaching and learning relationships, responsive support services, and a co-curricular environment that contributes to personal growth and success for students. The College is committed to the students and the community to fulfill this mission.

**Vision**

Cañada College ensures student success through personalized, flexible, and innovative instruction. The College infuses essential skills and competencies throughout the curriculum and assesses student learning and institutional effectiveness to make continuous improvement. Cañada responds to the changing needs of the people it serves by being involved in and responsive to the community, developing new programs and partnerships and incorporating new technologies and methodologies into its programs and services.



**ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)**  
**ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011**

Document Map:

- 0) Key Findings
- 1) Planning group
- 2) Authors
- 3) Program
- 4) Responses to previous Annual Program Plan & Review (APP&R)
- 5) Curricular Offerings
- 6) Program Level Data
- 7) Action Plan
- 8) Resource Identification



**ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)**  
ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011

**Note: To complete this form, SAVE it on your computer, then send to your Division Dean as an ATTACHMENT to an e-mail message.**

**Department/Program Title:**

**Date submitted:**

**Key Findings:** ECON/ enrollments were flat as compared to a year ago. This is probably a function of the strengthening California economy. I anticipate that enrollments will be down this year, as the economy further improves. Additionally, the new algebra requirement should impact enrollments negative in the Spring of 2104 as well as the Fall of 2014. On a different note, students seem to continuing to be taking classes later into the afternoon. Additionally, we proposed investigating “short” (8 week) course in economics (102) to be paired with a science course for working adults perhaps themed around the environment or health care last year, that has yet to be examined.

**0.**

**1. Planning Group** (include PT& FT faculty, staff, stakeholders)

List of names and positions: Paul Roscelli with input from Professors Digneo, Williams and Nelson.

**2. Writing Team and Contact Person:** Paul Roscelli with input from Professors Digneo, Williams and Nelson

**3. Program Information**

**A. Program Personnel**

Identify all personnel (faculty, classified, volunteers, and student workers) in the program:

**FT ECON Faculty** Paul Roscelli **PT Econ Faculty** Kevin Nelson, Michelle Williams, Mario Digneo      **FTE FT Classified**

**PT Classified (hrs/wk)** 0      **Volunteers** 0      **Student Workers** 0

**B. Program mission and vision**

**Mission** It is the mission of this economics Department to ensure that students from diverse backgrounds have the opportunity to achieve their educational goals by providing quality education in general education/core transfer material in the area of economics. (200 word limit). Per the College’s request, Economics is part of the greater “Social Sciences” program. This grouping recognizes both the natural connections that all social sciences along with the reality that at Canada College, the social sciences are made up of almost exclusively one full time faculty per social science discipline.



**ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)**  
ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011

**Vision** The program strives to provide opportunities for student success through in class, online and hybrid courses in economics. Additionally, the program supports the college's honors program by offering honors opportunities in economics.

**C. Expected Program Student Learning Outcomes**

Tool: **TracDAT folders in the SLOAC sharepoint.** Click on the link below to access your folder and log in with your complete smccd e-mail account, ex:smithj@smccd.edu and password <http://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/CANSLOAC>

List expected Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) (minimum of 3) and assessment tools for each.

Guideline: List knowledge, skills, abilities, or attitudes upon completion of program or significant discipline work and list assessment tools. Can be copied from Tracdat.

**PLO's**

1. Analyze social science concepts and theories.
2. Evaluate diverse viewpoints related to the human experience.
3. Produce evidence-based arguments.

*Assessment of PLO's to be done indirectly via the SLO's at the course level. Additionally, direct PLO assessment occurred for PLO #1 via a group meeting and agreed upon rubric in which the social scientists randomly selected various assignments and, using a rubric keyed to PLO # 1, evaluated each other's assignments. This exercise was helpful in seeing the strengths and weaknesses in both our teaching evaluation tools (assignments) and how each discipline approaches the evaluation of those assignments. See section 6B for more analysis.*

**4. Response to Previous Annual Program Plan & Review**

Tool: <http://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/canio/ipc>  
(log in with your complete smccd e-mail account, ex: smithj@smccd.edu and password)

List any recommendations for the program and your responses to these recommendations based on previous Annual Program Plan and/or CTE Professional Accreditation report.

Guideline: Original documents can be linked or attached, as needed.

See conclusions of the Social Sciences Program Review Document. No individual Econ recommendations, no individual Econ responses.



ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)  
ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011

**5. Curricular Offerings (*current state of curriculum and SLOAC*)**

**All curriculum and SLOAC updates must be completed when planning documents are due.**  
SLOAC = Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle

Tools: **TracDAT folders in SLOAC** sharepoint <http://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/CANSLOAC>  
**Curriculum Committee** <http://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/cancurriculum/>

**A. Attach the following TracDat and Curriculum data in the appendix:**

- List courses, SLOs, assessment plans, and results and action plans (attach report from [TracDAT folders in SLOAC sharepoint](#)).
- See attached pdf 2013-14 SLOs
  
- List courses with COR's over 6 years old (attach documents from [Curriculum Committee](#))  
**none**

**B. Identify Patterns of Curriculum Offerings**

Guidelines: What is the planning group's 2-year curriculum cycle of course offerings by certificates and degrees? What is the ideal curriculum cycle? Discuss any issues.

- Class curriculum all up to date.
- Completed CI-D work with updates and changes to courses
- SLO's complete for all courses offered each semester
- College offers online and traditional courses in both macro (100) and micro (102) economics. These classes are offered day, evening and online. Over a given year (one cycle) The College offers between 5-6 sections of 100 and 2-3 sections of 102.
- No plans for new course offerings, however the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) is expected to be finalized Feb 1<sup>st</sup> 2014. Course offerings will be reviewed, again, at that point in time.
- Offer contracts for honors in Econ 100 and 102
- Econ 230 with a dual CRN honors/non honors course continues to be part of the honors program

**6. Program Level Data**

**A. Data Packets and Analysis from the Office of Planning, Research & Student Success and any other relevant data.**

Tool: [http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/research/programreview/info\\_packet/info\\_packet.html](http://www.canadacollege.edu/inside/research/programreview/info_packet/info_packet.html)

Guidelines: The data is prepared by the Office of Planning, Research & Student Success and is to be attached to this document. Include the following:



**ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)**  
ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011

- Describe trends in the measured parameters.
- Reflect and analyze causes of trends.

**Enrollments** in Econ are flat relative to the year prior. Head count is up slightly over 2012 but not as high as 2011. The same is true for enrollments per section. This is probably best explained by the fact that when the economy was worse (2011) enrollments across the college (and in econ) rose above their long run averages. As the economy has improved the averages have regressed to the mean.

**Econ Department efficiency** is down from a year ago and down dramatically from two years ago. This is probably most likely due to the bettering California economy which translates into fewer students and thus falling rates of efficiency.

**Student success rates** in Econ continue to be greater than 10% below the college average, yet retention rates are both rising and not out of the college norm. The former may be explained by the fact that economics, traditionally, incorporates both a level of math and reading that is difficult for many of our students. As the math requirement to enroll in economics is becoming greater (to Algebra) it will be interesting to watch the success rates. GPA, Units attempted etc. show little change from a year ago.

While student **enrollment profiles** in Econ have not changed significantly year over year, there is a significant increase in those declaring transfer as their goal.

**Student demographics** in Econ show two trends of note, the number of Hispanics has fallen while the multi-race category has exploded. Additionally, economics seems to buck the College trend of **more females in classes**. A **dominant fraction (80%) are coming from high school**, this has only increased with time.

**B. Analyze evidence of Program\* performance. Explain how other information may impact Program (examples are business and employment needs, new technology, new transfer requirements)**

Tool: **TracDAT folders in SLOAC** sharepoint <http://sharepoint.smccd.edu/SiteDirectory/CANSLOAC>

**Guidelines:**

- Explain how the assessment plan for Program Student Learning Outcomes (listed on #3c) measures quality and success of each Program.
- Summarize assessment results of Program Student Learning Outcomes.
- Describe and summarize other data that reveals Program performance.
- Explain how changes in community needs, technology, and transfer requirements could affect the Program.

**\*Program**

**The Social Sciences program** consists of nine departments: anthropology, communication studies, economics, geography, history, philosophy, political science, psychology, and sociology, and has three PLOs. Mostly these are one full-time person departments. In order to assess the PLOs efficiently, the Social Science faculty have created a general analytic rubric to be used across the departments to score student writing assignments as a program (note: an analytic rubric is a rubric that provides descriptive feedback along several dimensions or parts, and a general rubric is one that can be used across assignments and/or disciplines). Each department brought 5 ungraded student writing samples selected by lot from one



**ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)**  
ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011

assignment administered during the semester to create a pool of assignments to draw from (the writing prompt was also attached to each of the samples). The rubric was then used to score a random sample of student writing assignments from the program as a whole. All faculty scored student writing assignments outside of their disciplines.

**Rubric scoring.** The rubric was organized into three rows, one row for each PLO, and into three columns that included descriptive feedback for each level of competency: “Incomplete”, “Acceptable”, and “Accomplished”. When evaluating the student writing assignments, the faculty selected one of the five scoring options (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, or 2) for each row of the rubric to indicate the students’ level of competency (“incomplete” was represented by the scores 0 and 0.5, “acceptable” by 1 or 1.5, and accomplished by a 2). An average score of 1.0 (“acceptable”) was desired.

**Results.** 18 student writing assignments were scored using the rubric. 14 writing samples were scored to assess students’ competency of PLO 1, with 3 papers marked as “not applicable” for this learning outcome. The average score for PLO 1 was 1.17, exceeding the minimum average score of 1.0. 13 writing samples were scored to assess students’ competency of PLO 2, with 3 papers marked as “not applicable” for this learning outcome. The average score for PLO 2 was 1.0, meeting the minimum average score of 1.0. 17 writing samples were scored to assess students’ competency of PLO 3, with 1 paper marked as “not applicable” for this learning outcome. The average score for PLO 3 was 1.09, exceeding the minimum average score of 1.0.

**Reflection.** The criterion was met, as the average competency for each of the three PLOs was found to be “acceptable.” Because this was the first time the rubric was used to assess students’ competency of the PLOs, qualitative feedback was gathered from the scoring faculty. There was one major area of concern that was discussed during the scoring of the samples: there was some difficulty identifying the social science theories that the writing assignments were targeting (although faculty attached the writing prompt). This may have resulted in unnecessary scores of 0 (“incomplete”), or a no-score (“not applicable”). Faculty also discussed a benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as a refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program. By discussing and reading what is done in others’ departments and classes, several faculty viewed the assessment process as valuable.

Changes in community needs, technology and transfer for **Economics....**

Economics is not a study that lends itself to creating job/employment opportunities after the acquisition of an AA; ADT or any other two-year certificate/degree. Changes in the business community, its employment needs, technology have, therefore, little if any affect on the economics program needs. The AD-T (the consequence of the TMC work) should be published in the 2013-14 academic year. The anticipation is that three economics courses, at most, will be part of the published AD-T degree. When publication occurs we shall look to see its impact on the economics degree offerings and react accordingly—especially with respect to our calculus and stats courses. The C-ID courses developed will impact the program as soon as Spring 2014. As we have completed the course work revision to ensure compliance with the C-ID. The next step will be the AD-T. Before



**ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)**  
ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011

that, however, the change to prerequisite change in 100 and 102 (algebra required). Will impact enrollments negatively in the short run. In the long run it should yield a better-prepared student; while allowing these courses to be more mathematical.

**C. Other Considerations**

none

**7. Action Plan (Program and Econ Department)**

Include details of planning as a result of reflection, analysis and interpretation of data.

**Guidelines:**

- Describe data and assessment results for Program Student Learning Outcomes. Analyze and reflect on assessment results for Program Student Learning Outcomes and other measures of Program performance.
- Analyze and reflect on other evidence described in previous sections. Identify the next steps, including any planned changes to curriculum or pedagogy.
- Identify questions that will serve as a focus of inquiry for next year.
  - > Determine the assessments; set the timeline for tabulating the data and analyzing results.
  - > Describe what you expect to learn from the assessment efforts.

**Reflection of PLO assessment.** The criterion for the **SS Program** was met, as the average competency for each of the three PLOs was found to be “acceptable.” Because this was the first time the rubric was used to assess students’ competency of the PLOs, qualitative feedback was gathered from the scoring faculty. There was one major area of concern that was discussed during the scoring of the samples: there was some difficulty identifying the social science theories that the writing assignments were targeting (although faculty attached the writing prompt). This may have resulted in unnecessary scores of 0 (“incomplete”), or a no-score (“not applicable”). Faculty also discussed a benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as a refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program. By discussing and reading what is done in others’ departments and classes, several faculty viewed the assessment process as valuable. However, the economics department continues to believe that this effort is not worth the time. Information gain is marginal, at best and time could be better spent elsewhere.

**Economics Only:**

**Program staffing is very thin.** Only one F/T professor exists and he has upwards of five preps EVERY semester in as many as THREE different subjects. ADDITIONALLY, he serves on MORE committees than he is CONTRACTUALLY responsible to serve. He also works with the HONORS PROGRAM and is a co chair on an ACCREDITATION standard. Finally, he is the LEAD ADVISOR to the college’s honor society (PTK), which consumes much time--many of the faculty members here face a similar Hobson’s





**ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)**  
ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011

choice. This should not be forgotten. The part timers contribute much to the teaching and discussion here, however one is geographically distant while another is a full time high school teacher. As a result, they cannot contribute dramatically to the economics program, beyond their teaching time.

As a result of the aforementioned facts, and given the statistical SLO evidence that has been thoroughly examined, with each economist contributing to this conversation. (see above and see trac dat) it appears that no additional material new steps need to be taken. There is currently very little time for any substantive changes given and even less evidence that anything substantive should be altered--with this in mind:

Given the context described below, we believe economics will next year focus its inquiry on the following things:

- 1) Developing longitudinal SLO evidence. As a result, the program will again assess the same course level, program level and institutional level SLO's to see if any trends emerge.
- 2) Ask the college research to examine the SLO, PLO and ILO efforts to determine if they have an efficacy level commensurate with the current allocation of time and energy by this department and the SS's in general.
- 3) Ask the college researcher to provide aggregated data around the SS PLO's, something that was promised to us three years ago but has yet to be delivered.
- 4) Attend economics conferences to stay current in the field and to speak to peers to see what they are doing in this very important area of assessment.
- 5) Responding to the TMC for economics, expected to be finalized in Feb of 2014.
- 6) Attend NCHC conference to present on innovative honors classes.

## **8. Resource Identification**

### **A. Faculty and Staff hiring requests**

**Guidelines:**

- Explain clearly and with supporting data showing how hiring requests will serve Department/Division/College needs.
- Include information from the most recent Comprehensive Program Review or Annual Program Plan, whichever was last year's document.

None

### **B. Professional Development needs**

**Guidelines:**

- List faculty and staff professional development activities.
- Describe faculty and staff professional development plans for next year.
- Explain how professional development activities improved student learning outcomes.



**ANNUAL PROGRAM PLAN & REVIEW (INSTRUCTIONAL)**  
ASGC ADOPTED SPRING 2011

Need money for attendance economics conferences to discuss teaching and content trends in economics and to stay current with the literature. Additionally, money to support honors courses and conferences would also benefit the social sciences program by keeping abreast of changes in teaching as it relates to honors courses.

**C. Classroom & Instructional Equipment requests**

Guidelines:

- List classroom & instructional equipment requested, including item description, suggested vendor, number of items, and total cost.
- Explain how it will serve Department/Program/Division/College needs.
- List the requests (item description, suggested vendor, number of items, and total cost).
- List special facilities and equipment that you currently use and require.

Need new pull down screen in 13-116—old one is filthy. Pencil sharpeners in all the rooms

**D. Office of Planning, Research & Student Success requests**

Guidelines:

- List data requests for the Office of Planning, Research & Student Success.
- Explain how the requests will serve the Department/Program/Division/College needs.

Data aggregated for all social sciences

**E. Facilities requests**

Guidelines:

- List facilities requests.
- Explain how the requests will serve the Department/Program/Division/College needs.

none