

This is the review your department or program submitted in Spring 2008. For Questions #3 and #4 on this form, please provide a progress or status report on the plans you identified last year. For each item, type your progress report in the right column titled, Progress-2008-09. Also, please list the faculty and staff who participate in this progress report. Forward (1) a hard copy to Instructional Services for review by IPC and (2) an electronic copy to jdecker@palomar.edu no later than 3/2/2009

Palomar College – Institutional Review and Planning Instructional Programs

Purpose of Institutional Review and Planning:

The institution assesses progress toward achieving stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an on-going and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data (ACCJC/WASC, Standard I, B.3.)

Discipline: Art

Instructional Discipline Reviewed

2007-08

1. 3-year trend of quantitative data

	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Definitions
Enrollment at Census	1,984	1,677	1,696	Self Explanatory
Census Enrollment Load %	98.03%	89.85%	92.36%	Enrollment at Census Divided By Sum of Caps (aka "Seats")
WSCH	9,149	7,738	7,833	Weekly Student Contact Hours
FTEs	304.98	257.92	261.09	One Full-Time Equivalent Student = 30 WSCH
Total FTEF	17.11	17.09	16.69	Total Full-Time Equivalent Faculty
WSCH/FTEF	535	453	469	WSCH Generated per Full-Time Equivalent Faculty Member
Full-time FTEF	6.67	5.67	7.67	FTEF from Contract Faculty
Hourly FTEF	10.44	11.09	8.69	FTEF from Hourly Faculty
Overload FTEF	-	0.33	0.33	FTEF from Contract Faculty Overload
Part-Time FTEF	10.44	11.43	9.02	Hourly FTEF + Overload FTEF
Part-Time FTEF %	61.04%	66.85%	54.06%	Percent of Total FTEF Taught By Part-Time Faculty
Retention Rate	94.82%	95.09%	94.95%	Non-W Grades (A,B,C,CR,D,F,FW,NC) Divided By A,B,C,CR,D,F,FW,NC,W Grades
Success Rate	77.98%	75.53%	75.45%	A,B,C,CR Grades Divided By A,B,C,CR,D,F,FW,NC,W Grades
Degrees Awarded	7	7	6	Total number of Degrees awarded for the Full Academic Year
Certificates Awarded:	1	-	-	Total number of Certificates awarded for the Full Academic Year
- Under 18 Units	-	-	-	Total number of Certificates awarded for the Full Academic Year
- 18 or More Units	1	-	-	Total number of Certificates awarded for the Full Academic Year

2. Reflect upon and analyze the above 3-year trend data. Briefly discuss overall observations and any areas of concern or noteworthy trends.

Census enrollment load is quite high, which is expected since we have made a concerted effort to weed out low enrollment classes early and currently have very few cancellations. We have few rooms available for additional classes, and the Photo department's use of our computer lab makes student lab time nearly non-existent, which is becoming a concern. We still have a large adjunct faculty pool due in part to unfilled contract faculty positions due to retirements.

This is the review your department or program submitted in Spring 2008. For Questions #3 and #4 on this form, please provide a progress or status report on the plans you identified last year. For each item, type your progress report in the right column titled, Progress-2008-09. Also, please list the faculty and staff who participate in this progress report. Forward (1) a hard copy to Instructional Services for review by IPC and (2) an electronic copy to jdecker@palomar.edu no later than 3/2/2009

3. Reflecting on the 3-year trend data, describe/discuss discipline planning related to the following:

PLAN – 2007-08	Progress – 2008-09
<p>a. Curriculum, programs, certificates and degrees (consider changes due to CSU/UC transfer language updates, articulation, workforce and labor market projections, certificate or degree completions, etc.)</p> <p>No changes anticipated (the art disciplines don't fluctuate much in response to labor/workforce trends).</p>	<p>We are looking into articulation proposals from two area high schools involving digital art classes and anticipate making a decision shortly. As described previously, no changes are anticipated in terms of labor/workforce trends.</p>
<p>b. Class scheduling (consider enrollment trends, growth, course rotation, comprehensiveness, etc.)</p> <p>We are looking at course rotations for our degree programs, after discovering some issues with the Design and Illustration programs that have been adjusted and will change as of Fall 08.</p>	<p>The Design and Illustration courses described at left are now in effect. We are encouraging other disciplines within our department to analyze and make similar arrangements in the near future to streamline degree planning for students. The changes made already have had an unintended benefit: they have made it MUCH easier to schedule classes by removing inappropriate flexibility in the schedule.</p>

This is the review your department or program submitted in Spring 2008. For Questions #3 and #4 on this form, please provide a progress or status report on the plans you identified last year. For each item, type your progress report in the right column titled, Progress-2008-09. Also, please list the faculty and staff who participate in this progress report. Forward (1) a hard copy to Instructional Services for review by IPC and (2) an electronic copy to jdecker@palomar.edu no later than 3/2/2009

4. Discuss/identify the resources necessary to successfully implement the planning described:

PLAN – 2007-08	Progress – 2008-09
<p>a. Equipment/Technology – block grant funds, VTEA, other resources, etc. We are in line for a computer lab upgrade, which will keep our classes and students current.</p>	<p>Computer upgrade completed and additional changes made to computer lab by IS have had a positive impact in our classes.</p>
<p>b. Budget – budget development process, one-time funds, grants, etc. We are getting a good handle on how to allocate our resources, due in part to diligent work between the chair and ADA, and some recent budget additions in particular areas. The next year will be an interesting budget year. Stay tuned.</p>	<p>Good progress made in terms of budget, with the exception of ongoing problems with funding models for Life Drawing classes (budgeted amounts are inadequate).</p>
<p>c. Facilities – schedule maintenance needs, additional classrooms/labs due to growth, remodeling, etc. We do have limited room for growth in our classes since the classroom needs are so specific to the discipline being taught. An additional studio art classroom would be beneficial and would allow for more efficient class scheduling and the addition of more core class sections.</p>	<p>We have had some minor safety-related classroom improvements (vent hoods in C-15). When MIB building is completed, we anticipate modifying our schedules to reflect the absence of existing Photography classes in our computer lab.</p>
<p>d. Faculty position(s) – faculty priority process and projected full-time needs for 1 – 3 years Primary need is to replace the two losses due to retirement/reassignment in Commercial Art area (which currently has two contract faculty). Secondary need is a contract faculty position in Glass area, currently staffed solely by adjunct. We also have a continuing need for another contract Art History instructor, as many of those classes continue to be filled by adjunct instructors.</p>	<p>We are moving up the list, but budget crises will probably limit growth in the near future.</p>
<p>e. Staff position(s) – changes in instructional or support needs due to program growth, new technology, etc. We rely extensively on student hourly support in our Ceramics program, and need to convert a 40% Instructional Support position to a full time position to maintain continuity in the program (which student hourly personnel are not able to provide).</p>	<p>We continue to rely on Student Hourly positions to augment classroom and facility needs that would be better served with Classified staff. Again, budget realities will probably (at best) maintain the status quo.</p>
<p>f. Other</p>	

This is the review your department or program submitted in Spring 2008. For Questions #3 and #4 on this form, please provide a progress or status report on the plans you identified last year. For each item, type your progress report in the right column titled, Progress-2008-09. Also, please list the faculty and staff who participate in this progress report. Forward (1) a hard copy to Instructional Services for review by IPC and (2) an electronic copy to jdecker@palomar.edu no later than 3/2/2009

5. Discuss one discipline goal linked to Palomar's Strategic Plan 2009 and how it will support the success of students.

Strategic plan point: Provide up-to-date technology and related technical and equipment support for instructional purposes. Our programs are dependent on technology, and over the past two years, and through consultation with our faculty as well as our classified staff, we have prioritized equipment that needs to be replaced. We have recently been able to make several capital acquisitions that have made an enormous impact on our ceramics and foundry programs.

6. Student Learning Outcome progress:

a. Describe a learning outcome at the course or program level and the assessment used to measure student learning of that outcome.

Learning outcome from an Art 100 (Fundamentals of Art) course.

"Which of Édouard Manet's paintings is considered to be one of the earliest examples of "modern" art? Why is it modern? What makes it so different from the aim of earlier paintings? In your discussion, address both the subject matter and style of the painting

A quantitative assessment is used to evaluate the response to this question.

These are the results from the Fall 2007 semester:

40% responded with complete understanding (100% score),

40% responded with good understanding (90% score)

20% responded with moderate understanding (70% score).

b. Discuss a learning outcome that is observable yet difficult to measure.

Many learning outcomes in studio art classes are difficult to measure quantitatively unless they are presented in a quantitative way to the students (which isn't always the case). For example, when discussing composition, there are quantitative methods that can be used to create a "pleasing" composition. However, there are *always* exceptions to these methods that often result in *more* pleasing compositions. Thus an observable success by a student isn't always easy to quantify based on a "taught" method.

This is the review your department or program submitted in Spring 2008. For Questions #3 and #4 on this form, please provide a progress or status report on the plans you identified last year. For each item, type your progress report in the right column titled, Progress-2008-09. Also, please list the faculty and staff who participate in this progress report. Forward (1) a hard copy to Instructional Services for review by IPC and (2) an electronic copy to jdecker@palomar.edu no later than 3/2/2009

7. Describe a discipline accomplishment that you want to share with the college community.

Our ArtD 250 class completed a full-semester collaborative project for the Earth Sciences department. Two 15 minute projections were created and are currently on display in the hallway of the NS building (in front of the Earth Sciences departmental offices). The projections utilize sound, 3-d animation, 2-d animation, and paintings and drawings created by members of the Spring, 2008 ArtD 250, New Media Studio class. The project was suggested by Steve Spear, of the Earth Sciences department, and was coordinated by the co-instructors of the NMS class, Lily Glass and Jay Schultz of the Art Department. They hope to coordinate further projects for on-campus use in future classes.

8. Are there other resources (including data) that you need to complete your discipline review and planning?

None that I am aware of.

9. For programs with an external accreditation, indicate the date of the last accreditation visit and discuss recommendations and progress made on the recommendations.

N/A

10. Other comments, recommendations:

Please identify faculty and staff who participated in the development of the reviewer's planning:

Doug Durrant Sasha Reibstein Mark Hudelson Lily Glass Jay Schultz

Department Chair/Designee Discipline Review and Signature Date

Division Dean Review and Signature Date

Please identify faculty and staff who participated in the development of the reviewer's progress/status report -

Input Names Here:

Jay Schultz, Lily Glass, Sasha Jonestein, Doug Durrant

Department Chair/Designee Discipline Review and Signature Date

Division Dean Review and Signature Date