

# 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: Math**

Instructional Discipline Reviewed

2007-08

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

	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Definitions
<b>Enrollment at Census</b>	6,997	6,980	7,356	<i>Self Explanatory</i>
<b>Census Enrollment Load %</b>	85.96%	78.22%	78.14%	Enrollment at Census Divided By Sum of Caps (aka "Seats")
<b>WSCH</b>	25,941	26,098	27,558	Weekly Student Contact Hours
<b>FTEs</b>	864.71	869.92	918.59	One Full-Time Equivalent Student = 30 WSCH
<b>Total FTEF</b>	48.13	49.08	51.90	Total Full-Time Equivalent Faculty
<b>WSCH/FTEF</b>	539	532	531	WSCH Generated per Full-Time Equivalent Faculty Member
<b>Full-time FTEF</b>	21.01	21.32	23.34	FTEF from Contract Faculty
<b>Hourly FTEF</b>	24.00	25.03	25.17	FTEF from Hourly Faculty
<b>Overload FTEF</b>	3.12	2.73	3.39	FTEF from Contract Faculty Overload
<b>Part-Time FTEF</b>	27.12	27.76	28.56	Hourly FTEF + Overload FTEF
<b>Part-Time FTEF %</b>	56.35%	56.56%	55.03%	Percent of Total FTEF Taught By Part-Time Faculty
<b>Retention Rate</b>	89.47%	89.30%	89.91%	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>	56.56%	57.02%	54.98%	A,B,C,CR Grades Divided By A,B,C,CR,D,F,FW,NC,W Grades
<b>Degrees Awarded</b>	11	8	8	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 department believes that there may be a correlation between the onset of the new scheduling parameters (block scheduling) and the decrease in student success rate.

- Retention rate has increased and success rate has decreased since the time that Financial Aide begun requiring students to refund aide if dropping classes.

-Part time FTE is too high and doesn't follow the legal guidelines set forth by the state (and hasn't for the last 3 years). Student success is directly related to the % of Full time faculty and the instructor availability that comes from it.



**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>- Our COR committee is revamping and updating all CORs (Math 10-135).</p>	
<p><b>b. Class scheduling (consider enrollment trends, growth, course rotation, comprehensiveness, etc.)</b></p> <p>-The economy is forcing more adults to return to school after layoffs or in hopes of increasing their marketability and earning potential.</p> <p>-CSUs and other 4-year universities are limiting enrollments, which will impact our enrollments. More flexibility scheduling would take into consideration this impact.</p> <p>-Considering the decrease in student success rate correlation with the onset of scheduling parameters, the Department would like more flexibility and leeway in scheduling.</p> <p>- Considering growth in enrollment, the department would like to increase the number of classes but cannot due to the difficulty in finding rooms.</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></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Update data projectors, computers, and other technology/AV in Math classrooms.</li> <li>-Update Maple software and other implemented software.</li> <li>-Continue to update and increase the available TI equipment.</li> <li>-Funds to purchase ELMO equipment, such as the TT-02.</li> <li>-More and more of our instructors are finding interesting and engaging ways to present material to their classes, but the antiquated equipment in our classrooms is restricting them.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>b. Budget – budget development process, one-time funds, grants, etc.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Increase copy budget for Math.</li> <li>-Increase supply budget (keeping up with increasing costs of whiteboard markers, erasers, etc.)</li> <li>-One-time funds are helpful to dept. for technical needs.</li> <li>-Budget increases that reflect inflation of service contract for copy machine and allowing for the purchase of a new copier on the average of every 6 years.</li> <li>-Budget to support new high quality Mathletes in statewide competitions.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>c. Facilities – schedule maintenance needs, additional classrooms/labs due to growth, remodeling, etc.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Math needs more classrooms.</li> <li>-Larger lab space to ease the overcrowding of the Math Center.</li> <li>-Offices for Escondido faculty and computer/workstations for adjunct.</li> <li>-Carpets in Math classrooms and offices.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>d. Faculty position(s) – faculty priority process and projected full-time needs for 1 – 3 years</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Math needs 3-4 new faculty members each year for the next 3 years to decrease the part time to full time ratio that is currently out of balance.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>e. Staff position(s) – changes in instructional or support needs due to program growth, new technology, etc.</b></p>	

<b>-Continue to provide Math Center with tutors, graders, and clerks to facilitate the immense program.</b>	
<b>f. Other</b>	

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

The Math Department would like the scheduling parameters to be more flexible allowing the scheduling of classes to reflect the best learning environment for the student and thereby increasing student success. We do not feel that our students do as well with the 2-hour blocks as do with the one-hour classes. The new scheduling parameters make it more difficult to schedule 4 and 5 day per week classes that only meet for one hour per day.

**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.**

**Example of a learning outcome for Math:**

The student should be able to graph a linear equation. This outcome can be measured by asking students to graph a linear equation on tests.

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

Students should be able to communicate mathematical ideas verbally and symbolically, as well as display mathematical maturity, mathematical sophistication, and critical thinking skills.

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

**The formation the Palomar College Mathletes Team that will be competing at Cal State Monterey Bay April 2008.**

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

**-We could have used a paid weekend retreat for Math Instructors to work on this review.**

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:

Mona Smith, Bob Alidaee, Cindy Anfinson, Monika Brannick, Peri Brock, Craig Chamberlin, Mathews Chakkanakuzhi, Mark Clark, Dan Clegg, Mona Ellis, Rob Jones, Greg Larson, Shannon Lienhart, David Lowenkron, Wendy Metzger, Karen Mifflin, Chuong Nguyen, Susan Snow, Annie Squires, Yan Tian, Cindy Torgison, Fari Towfiq, Mark Walker, and Jay Wiestling

\_\_\_\_\_  
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.