

# 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: Humanities

Instructional Discipline Reviewed

2007-08

### 1. 3-year trend of quantitative data

	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Definitions
<b>Enrollment at Census</b>	300	271	288	<i>Self Explanatory</i>
<b>Census Enrollment Load %</b>	98.36%	85.49%	90.85%	Enrollment at Census Divided By Sum of Caps (aka "Seats")
<b>WSCH</b>	943	854	905	Weekly Student Contact Hours
<b>FTEF</b>	31.42	28.45	30.18	One Full-Time Equivalent Student = 30 WSCH
<b>Total FTEF</b>	1.40	1.40	1.40	Total Full-Time Equivalent Faculty
<b>WSCH/FTEF</b>	673	610	647	WSCH Generated per Full-Time Equivalent Faculty Member
<b>Full-time FTEF</b>	0.20	0.20	0.40	FTEF from Contract Faculty
<b>Hourly FTEF</b>	1.00	1.00	1.00	FTEF from Hourly Faculty
<b>Overload FTEF</b>	0.20	0.20	-	FTEF from Contract Faculty Overload
<b>Part-Time FTEF</b>	1.20	1.20	1.00	Hourly FTEF + Overload FTEF
<b>Part-Time FTEF %</b>	85.71%	85.71%	71.43%	Percent of Total FTEF Taught By Part-Time Faculty
<b>Retention Rate</b>	90.59%	87.94%	89.30%	Non-W Grades (A,B,C,CR,D,F,FW,NC) Divided By A,B,C,CR,D,F,FW,NC,W Grades
<b>Success Rate</b>	60.98%	53.31%	60.52%	A,B,C,CR Grades Divided By A,B,C,CR,D,F,FW,NC,W Grades
<b>Degrees Awarded</b>	-	-	-	Total number of Degrees awarded for the Full Academic Year
<b>Certificates Awarded:</b>	-	-	-	Total number of Certificates awarded for the Full Academic Year
<b>- Under 18 Units</b>	-	-	-	Total number of Certificates awarded for the Full Academic Year
<b>- 18 or More Units</b>	-	-	-	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.

The numbers show a consistent trend in almost every category: in Fall 2004, enrollment, WSCH, FTES, retention, and success reached a high point; in Fall 2005, all of these dipped to a low point; and in Fall 2006 and 2007, all these regained more than half of the loss between 2004 and 2005. The exceptions to this trend are the retention and success rates for Fall 2007, which dipped to an all-time low despite the stable numbers in other categories. This is an area of concern (further addressed in item 5).

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

PLAN – 2007-08	Progress – 2008-09
<p><b>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.)</b></p> <p>No changes that we are aware of in the Humanities requirement for programs, certificates, and degrees.</p>	
<p><b>b. Class scheduling (consider enrollment trends, growth, course rotation, comprehensiveness, etc.)</b></p> <p>Current scheduling seems to be adequate: 2 team-taught sections in P-32 at midday, 2 evening sections (one on-campus, one off-campus), and 1 Saturday morning section (at Escondido). The latter section did not fill for Spring 2008 and was cancelled.</p>	

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

PLAN – 2007-08	Progress – 2008-09
<p><b>a. Equipment/Technology – block grant funds, VTEA, other resources, etc.</b> At this time we have no technology requests.</p>	
<p><b>b. Budget – budget development process, one-time funds, grants, etc.</b> The department does not anticipate a need for change in the Humanities budget.</p>	
<p><b>c. Facilities – schedule maintenance needs, additional classrooms/labs due to growth, remodeling, etc.</b> P-32 is adequate for the team-taught sections; other classrooms (at Escondido, Mount Carmel H. S., and NS-260) seem to be adequate as well.</p>	
<p><b>d. Faculty position(s) – faculty priority process and projected full-time needs for 1 – 3 years</b> The department does not hire full-time instructors to teach Humanities solely.</p>	
<p><b>e. Staff position(s) – changes in instructional or support needs due to program growth, new technology, etc.</b> The department does not foresee any changes in instructional or support needs at this time.</p>	
<p><b>f. Other</b> None.</p>	

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

Objective/Activity 1 includes "strategies to improve retention ... and persistence." We plan to design and administer a brief survey for students this semester (Spring 2008) to gather feedback about why students drop or fail to complete the Humanities classes and what suggestions they have for what might assist them in completing the course(s) successfully. The department will also consider establishing a prerequisite for Humanities, perhaps requiring completion of English 50. Instructors teaching our Humanities curriculum find many students have very poor reading and writing skills; these deficiencies, no doubt, limit their ability to successfully complete their course.

**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.**

Humanities 100 and 101 are content-heavy interdisciplinary courses. The volume of material covered in the text and presented in class can be overwhelming until students grasp the importance of major themes (such as trends in subject matter or style, or socio-political developments that inspire or affect the works created) for effective note taking and studying. The three essay exams, each including three text chapters, are designed to assess what students have learned by allowing them to focus on two areas of greatest interest (visual art, music, or literature) and discuss how these major themes apply to specific works.

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

An important goal of Humanities 100 and 101 is to address the "aesthetic appreciation" phrase from Palomar's mission statement, particularly for students who may not complete other coursework in art, music, or literature and take one of these courses to fulfill their Humanities requirement. One assignment, a report written after visiting an art gallery or attending a musical or dramatic performance, does include a paragraph expressing their "appreciation" of the art that they experienced, but this is not the basis for our grading of the reports and seems a meager "measure" of an outcome. More often, students express their "appreciation" through their engagement in class, their questions, their enthusiastic comments, and by approaching instructors after class for further discussion -- all observable but hardly quantifiable.

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

Humanities is a small discipline (4-5 classes per semester), but the team-taught sections have the distinction of long-term, interdisciplinary success. Begun at least 27 years ago (check with Janet), ours is (according to Gene Jackson) the sole survivor of a number of team-taught, interdisciplinary courses (or Learning Communities).

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

No other resources needed.

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

Does not apply.

10. Other comments, recommendations:

The department is aware of fluctuations in enrollments and retention and success rates and will address these issues over the year through students' feedback and faculty discussion.

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

Sue Zolliker, John Goldsworthy, Richard Hishmeh, Steve Wozniak, Bruce Orton

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chair/Designee Discipline Review and Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Division Dean Review and Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\* By no later than 2/14/08, forward a hard copy to Instructional Services for review by IPC.

\* Also, by no later than 2/14/08, forward an electronic copy to Institutional Research and Planning.