

Name of Program	Division	Author(s)
Economics	BSBA	Gina Webster

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

1. This Program Planning Update covers the academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.
  2. The planning should be for the academic year 2015-2016.
  3. Use the Save As feature in Word to save this template with your program name, so that you do not overwrite the original template. Please use your program’s catalog rubric and this format when naming your document:  

Rubric INS PPU 15\_16  
e.g., ESL INS PPU 15\_16
  4. If the document displays in large type with only File, Tools, and View tabs at the top of the page, select **View, Edit Document**. You will then be able to type where it says “Click here to enter text” and you will be able to click on the check boxes to select them.
  5. In each section, click in the box under the instructions and fill in your information. The box will expand as you type. If a section is not pertinent to your program enter N/A in the box; do not leave it blank.
  6. When you have completed the form, run the spell-checker (**click inside the text in the first box**, then click on the Review tab and find Spell-Check in the far left corner of the ribbon).
  7. Please address your questions to your Program Review Committee representatives or the PR Chair Karin Spirn. Concerns, feedback and suggestions are welcome at any time to PRC representatives or co-chairs.
  8. Instructions for submitting your Program Planning Update will be available at the start of the fall semester.
- 

**I. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

Review of academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14

**A. SLO Assessment Review**

Review your program’s SLO assessment results through spring 2014 and respond to the following questions.

1. Discuss how assessment results indicate success in student learning. Identify results that indicate a need for improvement.

<p>The aggregate SLO assessment results indicate that targeted 95 percent rate of “Proficiency and Above” has been met in all sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Economics 1 Aggregate “Proficiency and Above” rates (eLumen scores 2, 3, 4 aggregated across all sections) decreased slightly from 97.1 percent in Spring 2012 to 96.3 percent in</li></ul>
---

Spring 2014;

- Economics 2 Aggregate “Proficiency and Above” rates (eLumen scores 2, 3, 4 aggregated across all sections) decreased slightly from 96.7 percent in Spring 2012 to 95.7 percent in Spring 2014.

2. Discuss how distance education courses assessment results compare to face-to-face courses, if applicable? (*Respond to this question if your program has distance education courses.*)

The SLO assessment results indicate that face-to-face and DE Economics sections follow similar trends with “Proficiency and Above” exceeding targeted rate of 95 percent in all sections:

- Economics 1 face-to-face “Proficiency and Above” rates (eLumen scores 2, 3, 4 aggregated across DE sections) decreased slightly from 97.1 percent in Spring 2012 to 96.4 percent in Spring 2014;
- Economics 1 DE “Proficiency and Above” rates (eLumen scores 2, 3, 4 aggregated across DE sections) decreased slightly from 97.5 percent in Spring 2012 to 97.1 percent in Spring 2014.
- Economics 2 face-to-face “Proficiency and Above” rates (eLumen scores 2, 3, 4 aggregated across DE sections) decreased slightly from 98.0 percent in Spring 2012 to 95.6 percent percent in Spring 2014;
- Economics 2 DE “Proficiency and Above” rates (eLumen scores 2, 3, 4 aggregated across DE sections) increased slightly from 95.0 percent Spring 2012 to 95.3 percent in Spring 2014.

3. Discuss how your discipline, or someone in your discipline, made changes in pedagogy as a result of SLO assessment results.

Since the targeted 95 percent rate of “Proficiency and Above” has been met no changes in pedagogy were made. Also, the Economics faculty agrees that noted above fluctuations are statistically insignificant and thus have no future pedagogical implication. However, the faculty intends to develop an alternative assessment rubric to measure the course’s SLOs.

The new rubric will replace the existing measure in Spring 2015.

4. Give an example of a change in the number of units and/or lab hours based on assessment data, if applicable.

N/A

5. Did your program discover the need for additional resources (for AY 2015-16) based on the assessment results?      YES       NO

If yes, please explain.

N/A

#### B. SLO Process

1. Describe how your program reaches consensus when writing student learning outcomes that are used in multiple sections.

My program offers only one section of each course.

The Economics faculty meets in person and communicates via email.

2. Describe how your program reaches consensus when developing and evaluating assessment results for student learning outcomes that are used in multiple sections.

My program offers only one section of each course.

The Economics faculty meets in person and communicates via email.

3. What methods does your program use for documenting SLO related discussions? Check all that apply.

Program emails

Program meeting minutes/agendas

Blackboard/other website

Other (please describe):

N/A

## II. PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Review of academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14

Review the student data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and any additional data your program has collected. Then respond to the sections below.

### A. Data Review

If applicable, summarize any *changes* in your program's data since the Annual Program Review of 2011-12 or observed significant trends that will affect program planning or resource requests.

**NOTE:** Only include changes that affect student learning, program planning or resource requests.

The Economics Program continues to attract a steadily growing number of students.

Since 2011-12 Annual Program Review:

Students Headcount has increased:

- 7.2 percent, from 360 in Fall 2012 to 386 in Fall 2013, and
- 6.5 percent, from 325 in Spring 2012 to 346 in Spring 2014;

Total Course Enrollments have increased:

- 4.2 percent, from 383 in Fall 2012 to 399 in Fall 2013, and
- 4.9 percent, from 348 in Spring 2012 to 365 in Spring 2014;

The Economics Program continues to be dominated by white, male students who plan to transfer to 4-year institutions.

Since 2011-12 Annual Program Review:

The gender composition of the Program fluctuated term by term, with Males accounting for 56 – 64 percent of the student population in AY 2012-13 and 2013-14;

The age composition of the Program has changed noticeably:

- 22 – 24 year old population has decreased 3 percentage points from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013 and 8 percentage points from Spring 2012 to Spring 2014, whereas
- 25 – 29 year old population has increased 7 percentage points from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013 and
- 30 – 39 year old population has increased 3 percentage points from Spring 2012 to Spring 2014;

The race/ethnicity composition of the Program has changed reflecting campus-wide trends:

- Latinos increased from 18 percent in Fall 2012 and 20 percent in Fall 2013, and from 16 percent in Spring 2012 to 22 percent in Spring 2014, whereas
- Asians decreased from 25 percent in Fall 2012 to 18 percent in Fall 2013 and from 21 percent in Spring 2012 to 18 percent in Spring 2014;

Number of Continuing students has increased:

- from 67 percent in Fall 2012 and 71% in Fall 2013;

Number of Full-Time students (12 units or more) has increased:

- from 62 percent in Fall 2012 to 64 percent in Fall 2013 and
- from 58 percent in Spring 2012 to 66 percent in Spring 2014;

Number of Transfer (w or w/o AA/AS degree) students has recently increased from previous high of 82 percent to 87 percent in Spring 2014.

The noted above changes likely reflect demographic and socio-economics changes occurring in the surrounding community and have no pedagogical implications.

The Economics Program Student Performance remains solid.

Since 2011-12 Annual Program Review:

Course Success Rate (*A, B, C, CR*) increased from 73 percent in Spring 2012 to 77 percent in Spring 2014 and remained unchanged, at 72 percent, in Fall 2012 and 2013;

Course Retention Rate increased from 85 percent in Spring 2012 to 89 percent in Spring 2014 and remained largely unchanged, at 87 percent, in Fall 2012 and 2013.

The Economics Program maintains high productivity levels.

Since 2011-12 Annual Program Review:

FTES has increased:

- 2.2 percent, from 37.0 in Fall 2012 to 37.8 in Fall 2013;
- 5.1 percent, from 33.1 in Spring 2012 to 34.8 in Spring 2014;

FTEF from Full-Time Faculty decreased:

- 6 percentage points, from 56 percent in Fall and Spring 2012 to 50 percent in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014;

Productivity (WSCH/FTEF) has decreased:

- 9.3 percent, from 638.3 in Fall 2012 to 579.0 in Fall 2013;
- 5.6 percent, from 580.0 in Spring 2012 to 547.5 in Spring 2014;

Fill Rate has decreased:

- from 97 percent in Fall 2012 to 91 percent in Fall 2013;
- from 86 percent in Spring 2012 to 83 percent in Spring 2014;

The reported decrease in Productivity (WSCH/FTEF) and Fill Rate reflects a greater than proportional increase in Capacity coupled with a smaller than proportional increase in Enrollments.

The loss of Productivity (WSCH/FTEF) likely reflects socio-economic changes occurring in the surrounding community, in particular recent improvements in local labor markets. It may also be reflective of Program schedule and staffing changes. Productivity (WSCH/FTEF) and Fill Rate will be monitored closely going forward.

## **B. Program-Set Standard for Successful Course Completion Rates**

Your program-set standard for successful course completion rates (i.e., number of grades of 'A', 'B', 'C', 'CR', and 'P' divided by total grades) is calculated by averaging successful course completion rates for your program over a five-year period and then multiplying that result by 95%.

In order to determine if you have achieved your program-set standard for successful course completion rates for a given year (e.g., 2012-13), you will need to assess if your program met or exceeded 95% of the previous 5-year average (i.e., 2007-08 through 2011-12) for your program; these calculations are done for you (*see links below*).

1. What was your program-set standard for successful course completion rates in 2012-13 and 2013-14?

	Program-Set Standard for successful course completion	Did you meet your program-set standard? (Yes or No)
2012-13	<a href="http://tinyurl.com/mmfwgfe">http://tinyurl.com/mmfwgfe</a>	
2013-14	<a href="http://tinyurl.com/q6dah55">http://tinyurl.com/q6dah55</a>	

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

The program-set standard was met.

### C. Curriculum Review

1. Review your program’s current curriculum. If applicable, describe any internal or external impacts which will affect your curriculum plans for 2015-16.

Economics Program consists of 4 Courses: Economics 1 (*Principles of Microeconomics*), Economics 2 (*Principles of Macroeconomics*), Economics 5 (*Economic History of the United States*) and Economics 10 (*General Economics*). The total number of sections varies between 10 and 11 per term. In response to Senate Bill 1440, the Academic Senates for California Community Colleges and California State University developed new Associate Degrees for Transfer in the most common transfer majors, including an AA-T degree in Economics (approved on November 26, 2013).

Students who complete AA-T/AS-T degrees are guaranteed admission to the California State University. While SB 1440 does not pertain to the University of California, AA-t/AS-T applicants are expected to receive comprehensive review and will likely be better prepared to compete.

The LPC Economics Program plans to develop its AA-T degree to help streamline students’ transition to CSU and to increase their competitiveness at UC.

### D. Human Resources

1. Have there been changes in the number of full-time or part-time faculty associated with your program since the Annual Program Review of 2011-12? If yes, briefly describe the changes.

There have been no changes; Economics Program consists of 1 full-time and 3 part-time faculty.

2. Have there been changes in the number of full-time or part-time classified staff associated with your program since the Annual Program Review of 2011-12? If yes, briefly describe the changes.

N/A

3. If applicable, describe how the changes indicated in 1 and 2 have impacted student learning?

N/A

#### **E. Other information pertinent to the program**

[Click here to enter text.](#)

### **III. PLANNING**

#### **A. Planning Update**

Summarize your program's plans, initiatives, and objectives accomplished since the Annual Program Review of AY 2011-12 (include accomplishments for the academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14).

Economics Program continues to provide high-quality transferable courses accessible to all students in the Tri-Valley community, and superior faculty committed to facilitating student success.

In AY 2012-13 the scope of the Program was extended to include previously eliminated due to budget cuts Economics 5. Since, the Program has continued to draw a large number of highly-motivated students; nearly all scheduled sections remain full, many with full wait-lists.

In AY 2013-14 the outlines of the two corner-stone Economics Courses - Economics 1 and Economics 2 - were revised, submitted and later approved by C-ID.

Also in AY 2013-14 the recently adopted AA-T in Economics was initially reviewed.

**B. Program Planning for AY 2015-16**

As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program’s plans, initiatives, and objectives for the academic year 2015-16. Focus on how planning will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.

1. SLO assessments. NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. As a guideline, each program should be assessing 25% of its courses every semester.
  - a. How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning? Examples might include (Your responses may vary.):
    - changing number of units/lab hours
    - changing pedagogy/curriculum
    - changing assessments

Since SLO assessment results for AY 2012-13 and 2013-14 clearly indicate that targeted “Proficiency and Above” rate of 95 percent in all sections has been met every term, alternative assessments/rubrics will be developed and applied. The new assessments/rubrics will be designed to more effectively measure/quantify students’ accomplishments.

- b. Have your assessment results shown a need for new SLOs? YES  NO
- If yes, in the table below, state the number of courses in your program and estimate the percentage of courses for which your program will write new SLOs.

Number of Courses	Estimated Percentage for which new SLOs will be written
N/A	N/A

- c. What percentage of courses will your program assess in the next academic year (2015-16)?

100%

- d. 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 and the percentage of them who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

Estimated Number of Part-time faculty	Estimated Percentage who will participate in the SLO process
3	3

4. Curriculum

- a. Considering the criteria of relevance, appropriateness, achievement of course objectives, currency, and future needs and plans, will your program be making any changes to **existing** curriculum to address any of these criteria? If yes, please describe the changes and your program’s reasons for the changes. Please provide any data which supports your program’s reasons for the changes to your curriculum. Include a discussion of how the changes will improve student learning.

No; upon the initial review of the approved AA-T in Economics it became apparent that no immediate changes to the existing curriculum are needed. However, in AY 2015-16 Economics faculty plans to explore opportunities of expanding the existing curriculum to include an interdisciplinary course on “Environmental Politics”. The faculty will engage in conversations with Political Science and Environmental Science faculty as well as the College’s Articulation Officer.

- b. Will new curriculum be submitted to the Curriculum Committee for the academic year 2015-2016? If yes, please describe briefly what new curriculum is planned and the rationale for the new curriculum. Please provide any data which supports your reasons for the new curriculum. Include a discussion of how the changes will improve student learning.

Yet to be determined.

5. General Program Planning

Use this area to describe any program plans, initiative, or objectives your program wishes to accomplish in 2015-16 and their impact on student learning or the student experience. Focus on what the plans are and how they are to be accomplished (not resources needed).

The LPC Economics Program plans to develop its AA-T degree to help streamline students' transition to the California State University and to increase their competitiveness at the University of California. As previously mentioned, students who complete AA-T/AS-T degrees are guaranteed admission to CSU and are expected to receive a comprehensive review at UC.

#### IV. Resource Requests for AY2015-16

Complete all areas that apply to your program's resource needs for 2015-16 (**not all areas apply to all programs**).

For each request, in the rationale section:

- Describe how meeting this request will improve student learning or the student experience.
- Provide any data or evidence which supports this request.

##### A. Enrollment Management

1. Request: New FTEF. Indicate amount being requested.

0.2 FTEF

2. Rationale for request(s).

Additional FTEF would allow for Economics 10 – General Economics – to be offered. Economics 10 remains active, yet due to limited FTEF available has not been offered in several years.

##### C. Human Resources

1. Request: New or replacement faculty position(s).

1 new full-time faculty

2. Rationale for faculty position request(s).

Assuming that current enrollment growth continues, a second full-time faculty will be needed. Currently, FTEF from full-time faculty stands at 50 percent.

3. Request: Classified staff position(s) (for example, new or replacement classified staff position(s) or increasing classified hours/position level).

N/A

4. Rationale for classified staff position request(s).

N/A

#### **D. Financial**

1. Request: Maintenance of, or increase in, existing program budget (e.g., for supplies, etc.).

N/A

2. Rationale for financial request(s).

N/A

#### **E. Technology (software only – discuss hardware in section E)**

1. Request: Upgrade existing software or purchase new software.

N/A

2. Rationale for technology request(s).

N/A

#### **F. Facilities, Equipment (include technology hardware), and Supplies**

1. Request: Renovation or upgrade of existing facilities or new facilities.

With the planned closure of building 200, the Economics faculty request that Economics classes currently taught in that location are relocated to building 2400.

2. Rationale for facilities request(s).

Since Economics classes rely heavily on the use of in-class technology, including Internet access, smart classrooms located in building 2400 are most appropriate. Also, given large class sizes Economics courses need to be taught in large classrooms, such as building 2400 rooms.

3. Request: Upgrading of existing equipment or purchase of new equipment.

N/A

4. Rationale for equipment request(s).

N/A

5. Request: New supplies

N/A

6. Rationale for supplies request(s).

N/A