

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Program Name: Economics
Faculty Contact: Steven Lehigh

Academic Year: 2011-2012
Program Review Submission Date: 3/25/2013

I. Description of Program

Provide a brief description of the program and how it supports the college's [College Mission and Diversity Statements](#), [Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#), [5 in 5 College Strategies, Spring 2011](#), and other [institutional planning documents](#) as appropriate.

The Economics program provides courses in introductory Macroeconomics and Microeconomics, primarily to students seeking to transfer or obtain an AA/AS degree. The department offers approximately 10 courses a semester and seeks to achieve academic excellence, develop critical thinking skills and provide relevant information to promote students intellectual pursuits and academic success. Currently the guidelines for the AA-T in Economics are being developed at the state level and will eventually be implemented at CSM, streamlining the transfer process for students interested in majoring in Economics.

II. Summary of Student and Program Data

A. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Summarize recent SLO assessments, identify trends, and discuss areas in need of improvement.

As mentioned in last year's review, the department was without a full time faculty member for a few years and fell behind in implementing SLO assessments. For 2011-2012 limited SLO assessment was done and without any baseline information from previous years, limited comparisons and analysis could be accomplished. 2011-2012 provided the foundation for discussing our assessment plans and laying the foundation for assessment in the coming years. Beginning Fall 2013 one SLO will be assessed in every class offered. Once regular SLO assessment starts the department will use the data to better understand student success, as well as review assessment quality and strategy.

B. Student Success Indicators

1. Review [Student Success and Core Program Indicators](#) and discuss any differences in student success indicators across demographic variables. Also refer to the [College Index](#) and other relevant sections of the [Educational Master Plan: Update, 2012](#), e.g., Student Outcomes and Student Outcomes: Transfer. Basic Skills programs should also refer to [ARCC](#) data.

2011-2012 Success Rate was 68% and Retention Rate was 82%, continuing a three year trend of improvement. These rates are reasonably close to the campus wide averages of 70% and 85% respectively, especially considering the level of analytical and critical thinking our courses require. Across demographics there does not seem to be too many discernable trends. Any large variability in Success Rates over the last three years occurs in groups with fairly small population sizes, the larger demographic groups have all shown fairly consistent rates over that time. One consistent outcome has been that the Hispanic student population has had a lower Success Rate than the average, but without controlling for other variables like Math/English placement or avg time spent working etc. it's hard to know where the source of that difference is coming from. Rates for gender type and age are consistent with the campus-wide trends and don't seem class specific.

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

2. Discuss any differences in student success indicators across modes of delivery (on-campus versus distance education). Refer to [Delivery Mode Course Comparison](#).

N/A – Economics is currently only offered as a face to face class.

C. Program Efficiency Indicators. Do we deliver programs efficiently given our resources?

Summarize trends in program efficiency as indicated in the [Student Success and Core Program Indicators](#) (LOAD, Full-time and Part-Time FTEF, etc.).

With the hiring of a Full time Faculty member for 2011-2012 there was an adjustment to the distribution of FTEF, but LOAD and total FTEF have been consistent and no changes seem to be on the horizon. All course offerings seem to be enrolled close to capacity, with multiple day and evening options. Given the financial climate, the department is operating efficiently.

D. Course Outline Updates

Review the [course outline update record](#). List the courses that will be updated in the next academic year. For each course that will be updated, provide a faculty contact and the planned submission month. See the [Committee on Instruction website](#) for [course submission instructions](#). Contact your division's [COI representatives](#) if you have questions about submission deadlines. Career and Technical Education courses must be updated every two years.

N/A Both courses were updated in 2012-2013

Courses to be updated	Faculty contact	Submission month
		Tab to add rows

E. Website Review

Review the program's website(s) annually and update as needed.

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
Steven Lehigh	8/1/2013
	Tab to add rows

F. Additional Career Technical Education Data – CTE programs only. (This information is required by California Ed. Code 78016.)

1. Review the program's [Gainful Employment Disclosure Data](#), [External Community](#), and other institutional research or labor market data as applicable. Explain how the program meets a documented labor market demand without unnecessary duplication of other training programs in the area. Summarize student outcomes in terms of degrees, certificates, and employment. Identify areas of accomplishment and areas of concern.

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

N/A

2. Review and update the program's Advisory Committee information. Provide the date of most recent advisory committee meeting.

N/A

III. Student Learning Outcomes Scheduling and Alignment

A. Course SLO Assessment

Explain any recent or projected modifications to the course SLO assessment process or schedule.

2012-2013 will be the first year the department conducts the first phase of comprehensive SLO assessment. The initial phase involves questions imbed within examinations, focusing on the specific SLOs of the course. One SLO is being assessed in every course, every semester. In order to aggregate the data all courses are assessing the same SLO in a given semester.

After the first few years of data collection has been completed and analyzed, any opportunities to improve success will be addressed. Additionally, our assessment methods will be analyzed and improved if needed. Preliminary results from Fall 2013 indicate that our students come away from the introductory courses with a solid understanding of principles of Economics. A full report of the results will be in the next Program Review.

B. Program SLO Assessment

Explain any recent or projected modifications to the program SLO assessment process or schedule.

N/A

C. SLO Alignment

Discuss how Course SLOs support Program SLOs. Discuss how Course and/or Program SLOs support Institutional/GE SLOs. Refer to [TracDat](#) related Program and Institutional SLO reports.

Course SLOs in Economics are designed to assess a student's ability to communicate effectively, critically think, analyze social constructs and develop quantitative skills. These are all essential components of the Economics discipline and align with the Institutional/GE SLOs identified.

IV. Additional Factors

Discuss additional factors as applicable that impact the program, including changes in student populations, state-wide initiatives, transfer requirements, advisory committee recommendations, legal mandates, workforce development and employment opportunities, community needs. See [Institutional Research](#) as needed.

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

With the state-wide implementation of SB 1440, the CI-D for Economics is going to force us to implement a Math 110 pre-requisite for both of the courses. While there is an academic justification for the change, it is also going to have a negative impact on accessibility. I have not seen any data showing a strong trend between Math level and Success Rates in Economics and given the number of students that start at CSM in below college level Math it is possible that this change will strain enrollments, limit offerings or extend the amount of time a student stays at CSM before transferring while not increasing Success Rates. While it is worth following to assess the impact of the change, our hands are tied by the guidelines outlined in the CI-D.

V. Institutional Planning

A. Results of Plans and Actions

Describe results, including measurable outcomes, from plans and actions in recent program reviews.

2011-2012 was a year to gain perspective and outline areas that we would like to address in the future. Steps were taken to expand our role in the Learning Center, providing tutoring assistance and exam review sessions. We will continue to analyze and develop our offerings as we gain more experience.

B. Program Vision

What is the program's vision for sustaining and improving student learning and success during the *next six years*? Make connections to the [College Mission and Diversity Statements](#), [Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#), and other [institutional planning documents](#) as appropriate. Address trends in the SLO assessment results and student success indicators and data noted in Section II. Summary of Student and Program Data.

[Note: CTE programs must address changes in the context of completion and employment rates, anticipated labor demand, and any overlap with similar programs in the area as noted in Sections II.F.1 and II.F.2.]

[Note: Specific plans to be implemented in the *next year* should be entered in Section V.C.]

The next six years will be about laying the foundation for assessment exploring ideas and allocating our available resources to address improvements to student success where necessary. Since we have just begun SLO assessment we will need a few years to correctly identify any trends or flaws in our assessment methods. While we work to build that base of information, we are also exploring the use of other campus resources to improve student performance. The Learning Center now offers regularly scheduled free Economics tutoring and we will continue to support that service in any way we can. We are open to any other campus programs or resources that may be suited to helping our students succeed. Along these lines, the department was well represented in the first semester of the Honors Project where 5 students with the assistance from 3 Economics Faculty members, completed semester long projects related to Economics. We were one of the most well represented disciplines and I hope that students continue to take advantage of the opportunity.

1. To guide future faculty and staff development initiatives, describe the professional enrichment activities that would be most effective in carrying out the program's vision to improve student learning and success.

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

At this point, without previous research and analysis to point us to the areas of need, it is hard to specify what activities will be most pertinent. As we uncover trends in our assessments, we will be better suited to formulate these initiatives. In the mean time we will do our best to communicate about issues as they arise. With only one full time faculty member it can be difficult to establish departmental initiatives given adjunct faculty's commitments outside of campus.

2. To guide future collaboration across student services, learning support centers, and instructional programs, describe the interactions that would help the program to improve student success.

As mentioned previously, we have begun participating with the Learning Center to make tutors available and explore other methods that may contribute to student success. Some of the ideas we're exploring include organizing review sessions and creating Supplemental Instruction sections. We will continue to explore, review and refine these programs as we gain more experience.

3. To guide the [Institutional Planning Committee](#) (IPC) in long-range planning, discuss any major changes in resource needs anticipated in the *next six years*. Examples: faculty retirements, equipment obsolescence, space allocation. Leave sections blank if no major changes are anticipated. Specific resource requests for the next academic year should be itemized in Section VI.A below.

Faculty:

Equipment and Technology:

Instructional Materials:

Classified Staff:

Facilities:

C. *Plans and Actions to Improve Student Success*

Prioritize the plans to be carried out next year to sustain and improve student success. Briefly describe each plan and how it supports the [Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#). For each plan, list actions and measurable outcomes.

Plan 1

Title:

Assessment

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Description

Implement full SLO assessment and begin interpreting results. Once we have enough data to compare longitudinally, we can take steps to improve student success, promote academic excellence and use resources efficiently.

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Assess SLO1 in all classes	Fall 2012	All Classes will be assessed, success defined on Tracdat
Assess SLO2 in all classes	Spring 2013	All Classes will be assessed, success defined on Tracdat
Assess SLO3 in all classes	Fall 2013	All Classes will be assessed, success defined on Tracdat

Plan 2

Title:

Tutoring

Description

Analyze and support the tutoring program with the goal of:
 -increasing student success
 -supporting and developing high quality tutoring
 -efficiently using our resources to help improve academic achievement

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Provide well qualified candidates to the Learning Center	Ongoing	Learning Center is adequately staffed and satisfied with econ tutor performance
Establish regular exam review sessions	Fall 2012	Establish and analyze success of the sessions from feedback from the students and performance on exams

Plan 3

Title:

Professional Development

Description

Attend conferences to develop new teaching techniques with the goal of increasing student success and academic achievement.

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Attend OnCourse Conference	Spring 2013	Report on findings and implementation of new

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

		techniques/lesson plans
Attend additional conference	Spring 2014	Report on findings and implementation of new techniques/lesson plans

[Note: Itemize in Section VI.A. Any additional resources required to implement plans.]

VI. Resource Requests

A. Itemized Resource Requests

List the resources needed for ongoing program operation and to implement the plans listed above.

Faculty

Full-time faculty requests (identify specialty if applicable)	Number of positions
	Tab to add rows

Complete [Full-Time Faculty Position Request Form](#) for each position.

Description of reassigned or hourly time for prioritized plans	Plan #(s)	Cost

Equipment and Technology

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan #(s)	Cost

Instructional Materials

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan # #(s)	Cost

Classified Staff

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan # #(s)	Cost

Facilities

For immediate or routine facilities requests, submit a [CSM Facility Project Request Form](#).

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan # #(s)	Cost

B. Cost for Prioritized Plans

Use the resources costs from Section VI.A. above to provide the total cost for each plan.

Plan #	Plan Title	Total Cost
1		
2		
	For additional plans, add rows and number accordingly.	