

Mini Instructional Program Review Criteria- 2017/2018

Note to Preparers:

Please complete this form that includes the Program Review criteria for a mini instructional program review, to be completed every other year until the comprehensive program review. One of the major functions of Program Review is to ensure that all work units of the Evergreen Valley College are aligned with its goals. The college's goals are set forth in its Mission and Strategic Initiatives, which are expressed in the narrative below.

Program relevant data sets are provided- via email- by the campus researcher or the Dean of Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Please see your Dean if you need additional help.

Additional information, including a submission timeline (**Due December 1st for feedback**) and samples of recent Program Reviews, are available on the college website <http://www.evc.edu/discover-evc/institutional-effectiveness/program-review>. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact any member of EVC's Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC).

After your submission to IEC, members of the committee will provide feedback to assist you in preparing a final version. The review committee will consist of IEC members and an optional external reader of your choice. The review committee will make a recommendation and your Program Review will precede to College Council and the EVC President for his/her final approval. Completed/approved Program Reviews will be eligible to participate in resource allocation through the College Budget Committee.

Evergreen Valley College's Mission:

With equity, opportunity and social justice as our guiding principles, Evergreen Valley College's mission is to empower and prepare students from diverse backgrounds to succeed academically, and to be civically responsible global citizens.

Strategic Initiatives:

1. Student-Centered: We provide access to quality and efficient programs and services to ensure student success.
Areas of focus are:
 - Access
 - Curriculum and programs
 - Services
2. Community Engagement: We will transform the college image and enhance partnerships with community, business and educational institutions.
Areas of focus are:
 - Increase visibility
 - Develop strategic partnerships
 - Building campus community
3. Organizational Transformation: We create a trusting environment where everyone is valued and empowered.
Areas of focus are:
 - Communication
 - Employee development
 - Transparent Infrastructure

Department/Program Name: Paralegal Studies (LA)

Last Comprehensive Review: 2015-16

Current Year Mini Review: 2017-18

Preparers' Name(s): R.J. Ruppenthal

Area Dean: Maniphone Dickerson

Progress on program goals

1. Please provide an update on the program's progress in achieving the goals (3 years) set during the last comprehensive program review.

Goals from the last comprehensive program review focused on steady growth and keeping the curriculum up-to-date in the face of some big changes in the legal job market. After a dip, enrollment has been trending upwards over the last 2-3 years. The curriculum has been updated with some more practical elements, including more e-filing to match the Santa Clara County Superior court's move in this direction, and the addition of the promised Wills, Trusts, and Estate Planning course.

2. Please state any recent accomplishments for your program and show how it contributes to the College's success.

(1) The Paralegal Studies (LA) Program has made great progress in the area of curriculum development with a goal of streamlining the required courses and trimming the length of the program so that students can complete it more quickly. (2) A new elective course has been launched to meet industry needs. (3) The program has transitioned much of its course content to the Canvas platform and (4) will be offering its first ever fully-online course in Spring 2018. (5) Enrollment has improved since the last comprehensive Program Review. #1, #3, and #4 above contribute to the college's Student Centered focus. #2 aligns with the college's strategic initiative of Community Engagement. #5 is an observation.

PART A: Program Effectiveness and student success- please note that the Excel data workbook you received from the Research Office will be needed to complete this section. With each of the data elements, the underlined header corresponds with the name of the tab on the data spreadsheet to indicate where you will locate the data.

1. Program Set Standards (Summary Tab)

<u>Success Rate</u> (completion with "c" or better)	Program	EVC	Program Set Standard (established during last comprehensive PR)	Program Success Goal (new)
F'14-F'16 average	75%	70.64%	68%	68%

Program Set Standard: It is recommended that programs identify a success standard. This standard should reflect the *baseline* success rate.

Recommendation: 90% of the average success rate could be your program standard (average x 0.9).

Program Success Goal: It is recommended that programs identify a success goal. This goal should reflect the success rate to which your program *aspires*.

Is your program success rate higher or lower than the campus?	Higher
<p>If your success rate is higher than the campus, how are you helping students succeed in and outside the classroom? If your program success rate is lower, what are some strategies your program is implementing to improve?</p> <p>Faculty in the program work hard to help students succeed, in and out of class. The Advisory Committee assists in identifying opportunities for internships and job placement. This is a career program, so the students are somewhat self-selecting. Many of them tend to be goal-oriented and committed to learning the skills and legal knowledge necessary for them to gain employment in the legal field. At the same time, there are always some students who are attracted to this field of employment, but who do not possess the work ethic, study skills, or language fluency necessary to complete the program. Others are too busy with other parts of their lives to invest the time needed to succeed. This number is relatively constant, though it can vary with the economy and based upon which instructors are teaching which classes.</p>	
<p>Is the current program success rate higher than the program set standard?</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>How close is the program to meeting the program success goal?</p> <p>Achieved</p>	
<p>Are these measures (program set standard and program success goal) still current/accurate?</p> <p>Yes</p>	

2. Success Rate (c or better)-average F14 F16

<i>Success Rates: Measures by IPEDs</i>	Program (total enrolled students/Success Rate)	EVC
American Indian	3/50%	208/ 73.6%
Asian	169/77.97%	13,612/ 77.7%
Black or African American	23/71%	1896/ 63.5%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1/100%	232/ 66.6%
Hispanic	397/74.89%	16,936/ 64.8%
Two or More Races	32/83.33%	1,444/ 67.9%
Unknown	77/77.1%	3729/ 71.9%
White	56/60.17%	4498/ 74.5%

Success Rates: Measures by Gender		
	Program (total enrolled students/Success Rate)	EVC
Female	589/76.26%	23,259/ 72.3%
Male	168/73.71%	19,167/ 68.6%
No Value Entered	3/0%	126/ 76%
Success Rates: Measures by Age		
	Program (total enrolled students/Success Rate)	EVC
17 & Below	8/70%	918/ 79.6%
18-24	255/69.3%	25,325/ 67.4%
25-39	338/79.32%	11,321/ 73.6%
40 & Over	157/79.21%	4951/ 79%
Unknown	0	37/ 72.6%

With respect to success rates, how are your program success rates similar to different from the rest of the campus? What equity gaps have you identified?

Overall, the program's success rates are higher than those of the college and that also is true for all individual categories except for two. Lower-than-campus-average success rates appeared only for students in the lowest age group (17 and under) and for white students. For 17 and under students: in most semesters, there was only one student in this group, so it's not a statistically significant number.

For white students: the success rate typically has been slightly lower for this group than for others in the Paralegal Program; we do not know why. However, in one of these semesters, there was a very small group of white students (only 7 students) and the success rate was under 30%. This was probably an anomaly and it brought down the average success rate. In most semesters, the success rate for white students in this program hovers around 70%, which is +10% above the reported average for the 2014-16 data and still exceeds the overall program set standard.

3. Program Awards- if applicable

If the classes in your program lead to a degree or certificate, please visit DataMart and indicate how many degrees/certificates were awarded in your program: http://datamart.cccco.edu/Outcomes/Program_Awards.aspx You will need to select drop down menus as shown below and then "select program type by major of study" (for example, select Legal for paralegal studies).

Program Awards Summary Report - Parameter Selection Area

Select State-District-College: Collegewide Search

Select District-College: Evergreen Valley

Select Academic Year: Annual 2015-2016

Select Award Type: All Awards

Select Program Type: ALL

View Report

Program Awards Summary for Special Population/Group, please [click here](#).

Then at the bottom of the report, select the box “program type- four digits TOP”, then update report to get program specific information.

Report Format Selection Area - Check field to include in the report

Row Options	
<input type="checkbox"/> District Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Award Type
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> College Name	<input type="checkbox"/> Program CDCP Status
	<input type="checkbox"/> Program Type - Two Digits TOP
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program Type - Four Digits TOP
	<input type="checkbox"/> Program Type - Six Digits TOP

[Update Report](#)

Degree Type:	Number of Awards (2015-2016)
AA	12
AS	2
AS-T	
AA-T	
Certificate 12-18 units	17

4. Student Enrollment Types (average F14-F16)

<i>Day or Evening Student</i>	Headcount	Pct of Total	EVC- Headcount/Pct Total
Day	13	14.66%	7764/ 47.8%
Day & Evening	42.4	47.11%	5278/ 32.5%
Evening	34.4	38.22%	2621/ 16.2%
Unknown	0		558/ 3.4%

<i>Academic Load</i>	Headcount	Pct of Total	EVC Headcount/Pct Total
Full Time	25.4	27.56%	4848/ 29.6%
Half Time or less than half time	74.6	72.44%	11,347/ 69%

5. Student Demographics- Headcount (average F14-F16)

Gender	Headcount	Pct of Total	EVC Headcount/Pct Total
Female	68.8	77%	4753/ 53.9%
Male	21	23%	4030/ 45.7%
No Value Entered	0		33/ 0.4%
Age	Headcount	Pct of Total	EVC Headcount/Pct Total
17 & Below	1.6	1.77%	499/ 5.6%
18-24	32.8	36.4%	5262/ 59.6%
25-39	36	40%	2068/ 23.4%
40 & Over	19.6	21.77%	982/ 11.14%
Unknown	0		12/ 0.14%
IPEDs (Race Ethnic Classification)	Headcount	Pct of Total	EVC Headcount/Pct Total
American Indian	0.4	0.44%	52/ 0.59%
Asian	17.4	19.33%	3436/ 39%
Black or African American	3.8	4.22%	226/ 2.6%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.2	0.22%	40/ 0.46%
Hispanic	48.2	53.55%	3392/ 38.5%
Two or More Races	3.8	4.22%	231/ 2.6%
Unknown	9.4	10.44%	853/ 9.7%
White	6.8	7.55%	586/ 6.7%

How is your percent of total program headcount (average F14-F16) compared to the campus?

The headcount is comparable to the campus average with some variations. Most notably, this program attracts more women, more older students, and more Hispanic students than average. As a result, other students have a proportionally smaller representation in the program's headcount.

What gaps have you identify in your program? How is your program enrollment similar or different from the campus? Which gender, age, and/or ethnic group are proportionally smaller than campus make up?

This program has more Hispanic and fewer Asian students than the college as a whole. Also, the program has more older students than the campus as a whole. These are patterns rather than gaps, and they have persisted for many years.

6. Institutional Effectiveness (2 year average, see Summary Tab)

	Program	EVC
Capacity	60%	73%
Productivity (goal 16)	10.73	14.86

Is your capacity rate higher or lower than the campus?	Lower. The campus average includes GE courses, while career areas are lower.
Is your productivity goal higher or lower than the campus?	Lower. It took a dip while the full-time faculty member was on sabbatical and classes were not staffed adequately.

PART B: Curriculum

1. Identify any updates to curriculum since the last comprehensive program review, including any new programs and indicate the 6 year timeline for scheduled course outline revision.

The program has updated the curriculum for six courses (LA 10, 36, 44, 46, 50, and 71) over the last two years, including online and hybrid supplements for all six of those subjects. In addition, a new course (LA 34: Wills, Trusts, and Estate Planning) has been created and launched. The program's degrees and certificate will be updated shortly. Other courses will be updated as needed to maintain currency, which means that a group of them will be updated each year so that the entire curriculum is addressed within each six year period. The program will choose which courses to update each year in cooperation with its advisory committee and with feedback from industry and faculty members about emerging needs, since it is not always possible to anticipate in advance which subject areas have the greatest need for revision.

2. Identify and describe innovative strategies or pedagogy your department/program developed/offered to maximize student learning and success. How did they impact student learning and success?

Many of this program's students are working professionals or parents (see the older-than-average demographics). To support adaptive teaching and provide more time flexibility for students, the hybrid courses have been expanded and deepened with additional exercises. In-class meetings have become more focused and student engagement in those live class sessions has increased as a result. Basically, each student has more time with hands-on learning than was ever achievable in courses that were offered only in the traditional live format.

3. If external accreditation or certification is required, please state the certifying agency and status of the program.

There is no external licensing authority. However, California Business & Professions Code Section 6450 regulate use of the "Paralegal" and "Legal Assistant" job titles. The EVC Paralegal Studies Program's degrees and certificate meet the requirement under this law and allow students to comply with its mandate.

PART C: Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

1. Since your last program review, summarize SLO assessment results at the course and program level. Please include dialogue regarding SLO assessment results with division/department/college colleagues and/or GE areas. Provide evidence of the dialogue (i.e. department meeting minutes or division meeting minutes...)

All program-level SLOs have been assessed at least once over the last few years. SLOs have been assessed regularly in the courses that have been taught during this period by the program's full-time faculty member.

2. What plans for improvement have been implemented to your courses or program as a result of SLO assessment?

The LA 36 course provides a good example of how SLO assessment has led to improvements. One of the course SLOs measures students' understanding of deeds of conveyance. Assessment results indicated that their understanding was limited and that they needed more time on this subject matter. The program added to this course a practical step-by-step checklist for deed preparation. Additionally, this change led to a faculty discussion about the trusts and estates material at the end of this course. Program faculty members made a decision to create a new course in this subject rather than trying to handle it as a unit within the LA 36 course. The newly designed course is being offered for the first time in Spring 2018.

In addition, another SLO from this course involved a two-part assessment, an assignment + posting feedback in the class Canvas forum. The forum posting was not mandatory, so the response rate was too low, but still there were 19 great responses from students that provided in-depth feedback. In the future, as a result of this evaluation, the forum posting will become mandatory. And it may prove to be a very effective SLO assessment model (replicable) for certain other course and program level SLOs.

PART D: Faculty and Staff

1. List any changes to faculty or staff since the last program review

None

PART E: Budget Planning

1. List any changes to budget since the last program review (including any funding allocations from previous program reviews and/or external (fund 17) funding opportunities.

None

PART F: Technology and Equipment

1. List any changes to technology of equipment since the last program review.

None

PART G: Additional Information

Please provide any other pertinent information about the program that these questions did not give you an opportunity to address.

The program's subscription to the Westlaw legal research database is critical to student success and job placement of its graduates. This budget item should be part of the program's Fund 10 budget going forward and not addressed through less reliable sources such as Fund 17 or one time funding sources.

PART H: Future Needs and Resource Allocation Request:

Based on the areas noted below, please indicate any unmet needs for the program to maintain or build over the next two years. Please provide rationale on how the request connects back to SLO/PLO assessment, strategic initiatives or student success. If no additional requests are needed in any of the areas, put N/A.

Faculty and staffing requests N/A	Ongoing Budget Needs: One-time Expenditure:	Request linked to: SLO/PLO #: Strategic Initiatives (student centered, organizational transformation, community engagement): Improving Student success rates: Achievement of program set standard for student success:
Facilities N/A	Ongoing Budget Needs: One-time Expenditure:	Request linked to: SLO/PLO #: Strategic Initiatives (student centered, organizational transformation, community engagement): Improving Student success rates: Achievement of program set standard for student success:
Technology N/A	Ongoing Budget Needs: One-time Expenditure:	Request linked to: SLO/PLO #: Strategic Initiatives (student centered, organizational transformation, community engagement): Improving Student success rates: Achievement of program set standard for student success:
Equipment/Supplies N/A	Ongoing Budget Needs: One-time Expenditure:	Request linked to: SLO/PLO #: Strategic Initiatives (student centered, organizational transformation, community engagement): Improving Student success rates:

		Achievement of program set standard for student success:
--	--	--