

PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE 2015-2016

Program: *Administration of Justice*

Division: *STEMPS*

Date: *October 1, 2015*

Writer(s): *Mark Tarte*

SLO/SAO Point-Person: *Mark Tarte*

Audience: *Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.*

Purpose: *To document significant program accomplishments, plans and needs between Triennial Program Reviews. This update should provide a snapshot of your program.*

Time Frame: *This update should reflect on program status during the 2014-15 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2016-17.*

Topics: *The first section of this Program Review Update focuses on general program reflection and planning. The second and third sections focus on reflection and planning regarding Student Learning Outcomes.*

Scope: *While this Program Review Update does ask for some analysis of data, detailed data reports in the form of appendices should be reserved for the Triennial Program Review.*

Instructions:

- 1) *Please fill in the following information as completely as possible.*
 - 2) *If the requested information does not apply to your program, please write "No Changes Since the Program Planning Update."*
 - 3) *Send an electronic copy of this form to the Program Review Committee Chair and your Dean by ____.*
-

Part One: Program Snapshot

A. Have there been any significant changes to your program, your program's data or your program's needs since the previous Program Planning Update?

If there are any changes, describe the relevant information and its significance in the space below.

These changes might have originated from within the program or because of an external source (the institution or the state, for example). Possible sources of relevant information might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Data generated by your program
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research
- CEMC Data
- Retirements
- State Mandates
- Labor Market Data

Yes. A state-mandated ADT for AJ has been approved by the state and is now part of the AJ program.

B. What objectives, initiatives, or plans from the 2014 Program Planning Update (PPU) have been achieved and how?

We have finally received a patrol car from a local police agency that was surplus and donated to the AJ program. This car has been painted and is being equipped as a teaching aid and also to supplement Campus Safety when not being used by the AJ program. It is in current use with the AJ64, Patrol Procedures class and will hopefully have the rest of the equipment for it by Spring, 2016 which will allow expanding its use to other classes.

C. What obstacles has your program faced in achieving objectives, initiatives, or plans?

Budget, or the lack of for several years due to state budget cuts. This academic year (2015-2016) appears to finally have monies available to both purchase needed educational materials and to also prepare new courses for approval.

D. What are your most important plans (either new or continuing) for next year?

To finish proposed new courses, degrees and certificates that have been planned or are currently being proposed through Curricunet. In Spring, 2016, have a ½ day event for adjunct AJ instructors on teaching and learning instruction. Lastly, continue assessing AJ course SLO's and make changes or improvements as needed.

E. Do plans listed under question (D) connect to this year's planning priorities (listed below)? If so, explain how they connect.

Planning Priorities for 2015-16

- *Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards*
- *Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance*
- *Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes*
- *Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses.*

Yes.

Currently, this has been an on-going process since AJ SLOs were created.

F. Instructional programs: Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion? YES NO

(This data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/y9ZBmt>)

If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.

N/A. AJ has meet or exceeded its program-set standard of 77% success rate for the past six years with six-year success rate average of 80.83%

G. How have students been impacted by the work of your program since the last Program Planning Update (PPU)?

The AJ program has been changed to include more multi-disciplinary core course requirements as well as a new AJ/ADT degree having been approved by the state.

Part Two: SLO/SAO Assessment Review

Review your program's SLO assessment results for AY 2014-2015 and respond to the following questions.

- A. Discuss how assessment results in at least one course in the program indicate success in student learning (OR) Discuss how assessment results of at least one SAO in the program indicate success in service to students.**

All AJ courses, to include the Regional Training Center, have an SLO and have been assessed at least twice since 2010.

- B. Discuss assessment results that indicate a need for improvement.**

Many of the assessments found that students who did not pass the course did so due to lack of attendance and a lack of completing assigned work. Those courses where changes were made, it was found that the changes positively impacted the course and the students.

- C. Instructional Programs: For the course(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program, or someone in your program, made changes or plans to make changes in pedagogy as a result of SLO assessment results.**

Non-Instructional Programs: For the areas(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program made changes or plans to make changes as a result of SAO assessment results.

Most AJ courses remain basically the same, with some minor adjustments to testing and writing requirements. One course, AJ54, Investigative Writing, has undergone a more significant change, in that it is now part of the course to do a grammar review of about four class sessions as well as more emphasis on the report writing form usage. This semester has seen a marked improvement in overall scores early on as a result of these changes.

- D. Instructional Programs Only: Give an example of a change in the number of units and/or lab hours based on assessment data, if applicable.**

There have been no unit changes as a result of SLO assessments, only minor to moderate changes in instruction delivery.

- E. Instructional Programs: Discuss how distance education course assessment results compare to face-to-face courses, if applicable. (*Respond to this question if your program has distance education courses.*)**

Non-Instructional Programs: Discuss how SAO assessment results for online services compare to face-to-face services, if applicable. (*Respond to this question if your program provides services online.*)

N/A

F. Did your program discover the need for additional resources (for AY 15-16 or 2016-17) based on the assessment results? YES NO

If yes, please explain.

Additional monies need to be identified (CTE, VTEA, etc) that can be used to have a dedicated cadre of English tutors who will assist AJ 54 (Investigative Writing) students. A pilot program between AJ and English garnered good results with students attempting AJ54 with limited English skills. The tutors were able, with training in police report writing, to help the student with what they specifically needed beyond that of the AJ54 instructor's ability.

Also, library resources are very important to the AJ program for instructors and students alike. The library resources support student success in AJ through databases and programs such Kanopy Streaming Videos and Films on Demand. The library is also a repository of hundreds of books, periodicals and publications that support the AJ program as well as DVDs that can be used for classroom instruction and individual student use. The library is probably the single most important campus resource that supports the AJ program.

Part Three: SLO/SAO Continuous Improvement Process

A. SLO Planning through AY 2016-17

As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program's plans starting now and continuing through the academic year 2016-17. Focus on how the program's SLO process will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.

1. SLO/SAO assessments: How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning or services? (*NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. Each program must assess at least 25% of its courses every semester. Programs with SAOs should assess at least 50% of their SAOs every year*).

Examples might include (Your responses may vary.):

- changing number of units/lab hours
- changing pedagogy/curriculum
- changing assessments
- changing service hours
- changing modes of service delivery

SLO assessments indicate that overall, the instruction delivery, with minor adjustments, is doing well. There is no indication from the data of a need to change the number of units. Curriculum changes are not indicated either. One thing learned from assessment data is the continued need for English grammar review in those courses that have a great deal of writing built into the course, such as AJ54, Investigative Writing.

2. Have your assessment results shown a need for new/revised SLO/SAOs? YES NO

If yes, complete the table below:

Estimated number of courses for which SLOs will be written or revised:	N/A
Estimated number of SAOs that will be written or revised:	N/A

- a. What courses or SAOs will your program assess during this academic year (2015-16)?

N/A

- b. Instructional programs only: In order to budget to pay part-time faculty to work on SLOs during the academic year 2015-16, estimate the number of part-time faculty in your program who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

Number of Part-Time faculty who will participate in the SLO process (creating, assessing or discussing SLOs)	
Fall 2015	3
Spring 2016	4