

Program Review & Planning (PRP)

PART 1: BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Review is a self-study of your discipline. It is about documenting the plans you have for improving student success in your program and sharing that information with the college community. Through the review of and reflection on key program elements, program review and planning identifies program strengths as well as strategies necessary to improve the academic discipline, program, or service to support student success. With that in mind, please answer the following questions:

Discipline Name:	ArtD
Department Name:	Art
Division Name:	AMBA

Please list all participants in this Program Review:

Name	Position
Jay Schultz	Faculty Member (contract)
Lily Glass	Faculty Member (contract)

Number of Full Time faculty	1	Number of Part Time Faculty	4
------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---

Please list the Classified positions (and their FTE) that support this discipline:

Note: All three positions support the three disciplines.
 Department ADA, 100%
 Instructional Support Assistant II (Arts Media Library), 100%, 11-month
 Instructional Support Assistant I (Arts Media Library), 40%, 10-month

What additional hourly staff support this discipline and/or department:

Student hourly as availability and funding permits

Discipline mission statement ([click here for information on how to create a mission statement](#)):

The mission of the Design program is aligned with the mission of Art Department.
 Our goal is to create a challenging and inspiring learning environment that educates our diverse student body in Graphic Design, Visual Communication, and technical careers in visual communication.

Our program is based on the development of aesthetic awareness within contemporary and historical context, while providing a strong foundation in the techniques and processes of producing commercial visual art both traditionally and digitally. We are committed to providing programs and state-of-the-art facilities that promote student learning through industry-standard methods and technologies.

We welcome and encourage interdisciplinary approaches within and outside of the professional field, and seek to provide well rounded two-year degree programs for transfer while also preparing students for careers in the Visual Arts. We consider our program to be a partnership discipline with the Art I (Illustration) program, since our students share core courses.

List any new degrees and certificates offered within this discipline since your last comprehensive review:

New certificate (3D Printing for Artists) was planned but is currently on hold (has not been started in Curricunet) pending clarification of recent developments in the class scheduling process. We are concerned that scheduling limitations may make it all but impossible to schedule new courses, or will necessitate trading new courses for core curriculum courses, which would put ongoing degrees and certificates at risk. Until the process is developed and understood, we believe it is inadvisable to add further certificates/courses.

Discipline Level Data: <https://sharepoint2.palomar.edu/sites/IRPA/SitePages/PRP%20Summary%20Source.aspx>

PART 2: PROGRAM REFLECTION

1. Program Analysis:

Reflect upon and provide an analysis of your summary data.

Our enrollment at census numbers were significantly higher in Fall 16 than in the previous four years; in fact, our Fill Rate was 109%, compared to a more typical low to mid 90's in the prior four years. Somewhat surprisingly, the Spring 2017 numbers were somewhat lower than in previous years. This is a trend we will be watching in the future to see if it's a one-time anomaly or an actual trend. Fall 16 WSCH was 734, an historic high, while Spring 17 was a more typical 528. Not certain why that might be the case, though the Spring courses are primarily taught by adjunct while Fall is primarily taught by contract faculty, so that might be a factor. But it doesn't explain the relative consistency of previous years. We will be interested to see how Spring 18 compares when data comes in next Fall.

Success rate and retention rates were nearly identical from Fall 16 (96.8%/96.3%) to Spring 17 (95.7%/95.6%), which is great to see.

2. Standards:

ACCJC requires that colleges establish institutional and program level standards in the area of course success rates. These standards represent the lowest success rate (% A, B, C, or Credit) deemed acceptable by the College. In other words, if you were to notice a drop below the rate, you would seek further information to examine why the drop occurred and strategies to address the rate.

Discipline Level Course Success Rate:

- A. The College's institutional standard for course success rate is 70%.**
- B. Review your discipline's course success rates over the past five years.**
- C. Identify the minimum acceptable course success rate for your discipline. When setting this rate, consider the level of curriculum (e.g., basic skills, AA, Transfer) and other factors that influence success**

Standard for Discipline Course Success Rate:

75%

Why?

The curriculum within the discipline is skill (and ultimately portfolio) based, and as such, students cannot expect to compete in the field without a minimum level of technical skill.

Our success rate continues to outpace that of the college as a whole (86% vs. 68%). Since we don't have any online or satellite site offerings at the moment, those numbers are specific to the main campus site. The rates are where we would expect them to be. They bounce around from year to year, but within a range that suggests the average is correct.

3. Program Update:**Describe your proudest moments or achievements related to student success and outcomes.**

In the ArtD programs and courses we continue to work with other departments and campus communities to have our students work on real-world projects and problems in addition to their basic course work. This cross pollination is extremely useful for students to build experience with client relationships and for building their portfolios for transfer. Our students are working on poster projects, logo projects, Impact magazine, Bravura and the Telescope.

4. Program Improvement:**What areas or activities are you working on this year to improve your program? Please respond to new data as well as feedback from last year's program review.**

We're organizing our ArtD/ArtI Advisory meeting for early Spring semester. We're going to make a concerted effort to focus on making use of Perkins requests to upgrade and expand our equipment (when necessary) to give students additional experiences and opportunities moving forward. **Addition responding to Dean's note:** An example of this is, if the Spring 3D Printing for Artists class is well attended, expanding the equipment we're using to teach the class via Perkins funding. This would allow for additional 3D printers and a reliable source for supplies and maintenance. **(Dean's note: Can you be more specific? Any new data and/or feedback from last year's program review? What changes/improvements do you anticipate making?)**

5. Unanticipated Factors:**Have there been any unanticipated factors that have affected the progress of your previous plan?**

Our entire PRP request last year was used to purchase a replacement vent hood for the jewelry program... something that would have been a facilities purchase in prior years. This was both demoralizing and disappointing since we've had to cobble together solutions since all other requests for the department were essentially disregarded.

6. SLOACs:**Describe your course and program SLO activities this past year. How have you used the results of your assessments to improve your courses and programs? Refer to the SLO/PRP report – <https://outcomes.palomar.edu:8443/tracdat/>**

We always check the results of our SLO's to ensure that our courses are meeting expectations. Considering our course retention rates as well as success rates, we are pleased with the consistency in the results of our SLO's, as they mirror our course success rates. Where we find SLO's most helpful is ensuring that adjunct faculty are meeting the goals of our Course Outlines. The other useful assessments are in new courses, and with our 3D Printing for Artists course beginning as a topics course this Spring we will be looking towards the SLO's for that course to help us tune the effectiveness of the course. **(Dean's note: what were your course and program SLO activities this past year?) Response to Dean's note: is it necessary to reiterate the details of the course and program SLO's that are available in TracDat? Happy to do so, but it seems redundant...**

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING

1. Progress on Previous Year's Goals: Please list discipline goals from the previous year's reviews and provide an update by placing an "X" the appropriate status box .

Goal	Completed	Ongoing	No longer a goal
Hire new full time faculty member for ArtI/ArtD		X	
Expand social media presence	X		
Implement 3D Printing for Artists	X		

2. New Discipline Goals: Please list all discipline goals for this three-year planning cycle (including those continued from previous planning cycle):

Goal #1	
Program or discipline goal	Hire a new full-time faculty member for ArtI/ArtD
Strategies for implementation	Via formal request
Timeline for implementation	2018/19 based on approval
Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)	Two existing programs will grow by securing highly-trained digital media faculty. We will be able to develop additional pathways for new CTE opportunities.
Goal #2	
Program or discipline goal	Hire a 45% ISA I position for computer lab
Strategies for implementation	Demonstrate the need by tracking use of lab via sign-in system
Timeline for implementation	Begin tracking Spring 2018 to establish evidence of need.
Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)	Improved access and use by students leading to additional avenues for student success.
Goal #3	
Program or discipline goal	Develop system to solicit and acquire on-campus design jobs for students
Strategies for implementation	Website and advertising via on-campus publicity
Timeline for implementation	Fall 2018
Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)	Additional venues for students to build real-world experience and enhance portfolio work for transfer.

PART 4: FEEDBACK AND FOLLOW-UP

This section is for confirming completion and providing feedback.

Confirmation of Completion by Department Chair

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING

Department Chair	Mark Hudelson
Date	Nov. 6, 2017

***Please email your Dean to inform them that the PRP has been completed and is ready for their review**

Reviewed by Dean	
Reviewer(s)	Norma Miyamoto
Date	Nov. 25, 2017
1. Strengths and successes of the discipline as evidenced by the data and analysis:	
The success and retention rates are outstanding. It would be interesting to know what strategies are being used to produce these kind of results.	
2. Areas of Concern, if any:	
CTE departments must continually examine their curriculum and make adjustments to meet the needs of the marketplace. It's concerning that there is a hold on the 3-D Printing program. Disciplines are being allowed to grow when demand warrants such; it's concerning that there has not been any dialogue about this and that the faculty just assumed that adding a program would not be feasible. Please continue to look at the demand and discuss the viability of adding a new program with the incoming AMBA Dean.	
3. Recommendations for improvement:	

***Please email your VP to inform them that the PRP has been completed and is ready for their review**

Reviewed by Vice President	
Reviewer(s)	Jack S. Kahn, Ph.D. VPI
Date	1/7/18
1. Strengths and successes of the discipline as evidenced by the data and analysis:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> How many times can I brag about your mission statement? We shall see! Please speak with chair and dean about new certificate proposals to clear up any misunderstandings (or clarify any)- I think it's good to be careful- we also have to follow our process (which we discovered in curriculum recently that we have not been)- see Deans note above - worth looking into Good review of your fill-rates etc. and I agree that is an odd trend. Im curious about the spring data as well (which will be out in Feb- most recent anyway) 86% is incredibly high- what does Palomar have to learn from this? It is a more specified student population? Thanks for follow-up information on deans questions- very cool (and I like the color coding!) Im sorry to hear about your frustrations with equipment requests Id like to learn more about your idea of getting work for students (on-campus design jobs)- what a great idea Overall a solid job, good overall summary here. 	
2. Areas of Concern, if any:	
Your SLO section could be strengthened by including actual data and examples though this isn't a comprehensive report. The summary isn't saying much at this very broad level. See dean's note. And yes, discussing the PRP results is part of Program	

ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING

Review- taking info from TRACDAT etc. Like you did in the ART PRP- a great model!

3. Recommendations for improvement:

SLO section needs some detail - otherwise a sold job.