**Glossary of terms for Program Review** (alphabetized)

**Annual Program Review:** This document looks back at the previous academic year and looks forward one year from the time of writing (i.e., if you are writing the Annual Program Review during AY 2012-2013 you will reflect back on AY 2011-2012 and forward to plan for AY 2014-2015.

**Common Tool (2012):** This document was a major component of the previous Program Review written in 2009-10. It may be used as a point of reflection but it will not be used in the Annual or Triennial Program Review.

**Equipment** tangible district property of a more or less permanent nature. Equipment should have a purchase price of at least $200, and a useful life of more than one year.

**FTEF:** Full-time Equivalent Faculty. This is a measurement of faculty teaching hours. 1 FTEF is needed to put 15 units worth of classes on an academic schedule.

**FTES:** Full-time Equivalent Student. This is a measurement of student contact hours

**IR: Office of Institutional Research.** This office provides data for our college. Rajinder Samra is the Institutional Researcher.

**Maintenance and Development Forms (2012):** These forms were a major component of the previous Program Review written in 2009. They may be used as a point of reference in writing the Annual or Triennial Program Review, but they will not be used in the Annual or Triennial Program Review.

**Program:** a discipline or service area as defined in the catalog (e.g., ESL, Welding, Counseling, Admission and Records, Library) or as an institutionalized learning community (e.g., The College Foundation Semester) or any institutional entity supporting instruction or students (e.g., Writing Center, Counseling, EOPS). A collection of programs may choose to submit a single program review (e.g., Fire Science, Administration of Justice and OSHA have, historically, submitted a joint program review).

**Program Review Update (2012):** This document was used to capture new information since the last 4 year Program Review was completed in 2010. The Program Review Update (spring 2012) may be used as a point reference in writing the Annual or Triennial Program Review, but it will not be used in the future.

**SAOs:** Student Area Outcomes. Similar to SLOS, these are used in non-instructional programs, such as Student Services.

**Self-Study (2009-10):** This document was a major component of the previously used Program Review template. It may be used as a point of reference in writing the Annual or Triennial Program Review, but it is no longer a part of the template.

**Supplies**- Supplies are expendable and are consumed or wear out, deteriorate or are easily broken. Supplies have a short life span, usually less than a year.
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**Triennial Program Review:** This document looks back over the previous three years and forward the next three years from the time of writing (*i.e.*, if you are writing the Triennial Program Review during AY 2013-2014, you will be looking back at Academic Years: 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2012-13 and forward to Academic Years: 2015-2016, 2016-2017, 2017-2018.).

**Validation:** The Program Review Committee will exercise validation through a peer-review, mentoring process that provides support and feedback to writers. The Program Review Committee will not determine the legitimacy, priority nor appropriateness of a writer’s Program Review.

**WSCH:** (Weekly Student Contact Hours)

\[
WSCH = (\text{# of hours per week the class meets}) \times (\text{Enrollment})
\]

**Example:** Suppose someone is teaching a class in which they lecture for 3 hours per week and they conduct lab activities with their students for 1 hour per week. Then 1 student would be in contact with the instructor for 4 total hours per week. So if the class had 20 students enrolled then it would generate \(4\times20 = 80\) WSCH.

**WSCH/FTEF:** When you take the weekly student contact hours generated by a class and then divide that by the FTEF required to pay for it you get the productivity for the course. This ratio is a number used to evaluate how efficient the generation of FTES for the course was. When this ratio is a large number (525 and higher) that means that the revue earned came in at a low cost to the district. The district uses WSCH/FTEF to arrive at an FTEF allocation for LPC given an FTES target.