PROGRAM REVIEW OF LABS AND CENTERS
Pilot Review – Phase I
Approved by the Academic Senate
May 12, 2009

The Program Review process should serve as a mechanism for the assessment of performance that recognizes and acknowledges good performance and academic excellence, improves the quality of instruction and services, updates programs and services, and fosters self-renewal and self-study. Further, it should provide for the identification of weak performance and assist programs in achieving needed improvement. Finally, program review should be seen as a component of campus planning that will not only lead to better utilization of existing resources, but also lead to increased quality of instruction and service. A major function of program review should be to monitor and pursue the congruence between the goals and priorities of the college and the actual practices in the program or service.

~Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

Name of Lab or Center: Business Microcomputer Labs and Business Student Lab
Division: Business and Technology

I. **GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE LAB*** ***(Data resources: CSM Course Catalog; Course Outline of Record; department records)***
***Note: The term "lab" will be used to refer to centers as well as labs in this document.**

a. **Briefly describe the general purpose of the lab.**

The purpose of the rooms referred to as the Business Microcomputer Computer Labs is to help CSM students of all backgrounds to succeed in their business courses or to learn about topics of interest to the student or in support of other coursework. The Business Microcomputer Computer Labs are also places where students can improve their computer (hardware & software) skills and reduce their anxiety. By offering these facilities with attendant skilled instructional aides , the Business Microcomputer Computer Labs of the College of San Mateo serve to improve students' retention in computer-related classes, students' successes in other courses as well as students' successes in their future lives. These labs also provide the essential access to maintained computer lab facilities for the Middle College and Community Education computer-based courses, as well as large labs for computer-based training for other college entities requiring a computer facility for training.

b. **List the courses that are linked to this lab.**

All ACTG, BUS, BUSW, DENT, COSM, CRER, DSPS and Community Ed courses. The labs are also periodically utilized by most of the other departments on campus, either by reserving space for special presentations, classes and their own lab work requiring a computer. The students also use the labs as a drop-in resource for assignments, research and papers preparation, and as computers for use in lieu of their own home computers, if they even own one. Hours-By-Arrangement for all CSM courses may be met by participation.

II. **STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES** ***(Data resources: SLOs listed on Course Outline of Record; records maintained by the department; CSM SLO/Assessment Coordinator; SLO Website –***

http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/sloac/; "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey"; other lab surveys.)

a. **Briefly describe the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the lab.**

This is not applicable because these labs and computers are for use as adjuncts to facilitate disparate classes and activities which have their own separate and unique SLOs.

b. **If an assessment of the lab's SLOs has been completed, briefly describe this evaluation. Which support services for courses or programs were assessed? How were they assessed? What are the findings of the assessment? Based upon this assessment, what changes to the lab will be considered or implemented in the future?**

Not applicable. This is the responsibility of each disparate user of the labs.

c. **If SLOs were assessed for courses or programs using the lab, briefly describe this evaluation. What are the findings of the assessment? Based upon this assessment, what changes to the lab will be considered or implemented in the future?**

Not applicable. This is the responsibility of each disparate user of the labs.

d. **Using the results from the "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey," summarize the findings in the grid below on how students rated their progress on general education Student Learning Outcomes.**

The column headings identify the GE-SLOs. The first row headings indicate the matrix/scale students used to self-assess progress.

GE SLOs→ Matrix/Scale:	Effective Communication Combination of 12:a,b,e	Quantitative Skills Combination of 12:f,g	Critical Thinking Combination of 12:c,d,h,i	Social Awareness and Diversity Combination of 12:j,l	Ethical Responsibility 12:k
Major / moderate Progress	83.6%	82.1%	81.6%	77.0%	74.0%
Minor/ no Progress	16.4%	17.9%	18.4%	23.0%	26.0%

e. **If general education Student Learning Outcomes have been measured using another type of assessment, such as student surveys, summarize the findings in the grid below on how students rated their progress on these Student Learning Outcomes. (Please identify data sources.)**

GE SLOs→ Matrix/Scale:	Effective Communication	Quantitative Skills	Critical Thinking	Social Awareness and Diversity	Ethical Responsibility
Major Progress					
Moderate Progress					
Minor Progress					
No Progress					
Does Not Apply to Lab					

Deliberately left blank: No other assessment GE-SLOs completed

III. DATA EVALUATION *(Data resources: "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey"; other lab surveys; "Student Profile Data for Labs, Spring 2009"; "Core Program and Student Success Indicators" for department(s) using lab obtained from the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness – see website at http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program_review.html .)*

a. **Referring to all lab usage data available, evaluate the proportion of students using the facility versus the potential population of users. If data is available, indicate the number of users and specify whether this is a duplicated or unduplicated count. If applicable, discuss programmatic, course offering or scheduling changes being considered as a result of lab usage projections? Will any major changes being implemented in the program (e.g. changes in prerequisites, hours by arrangement, lab components) require significant adjustments to lab operations?**

It is impossible to estimate the potential population of users because of the broad usage of the microcomputer labs by the entire campus community. The numbers of users for the non-instructional use of labs hand counted March 09 through July 09 was 9758. There was no measure of the time used by each and these times could range from ¼ hour to all day. A new program, SARS, will be instituted in August 09 to better capture the lab usage.

No major changes in prerequisites, hours by arrangement, lab components that require significant adjustments to lab operations have been implemented.

One full-time instructional aide who worked 37 1/2 hours per week and two part-time instructional aides who worked a total of 45 hours per week during the Fall and Spring semesters to staff the Microcomputer Lab.

The job duties of the instructional aides include helping students with assignments, projects, hardware and software issues; opening, closing, and cleaning the lab; and maintenance of computers, check in/out equipment and other assigned duties.

b. **Discuss staffing of the lab. Obtain FTE data for classified and certificated personnel assigned to staff the lab (available from division deans). Evaluate the current data and departmental projections as indicated on the "Core Program and Student Success Indicators." If applicable, how does the full-time and part-time FTE affect program action steps and outcomes? What programmatic changes do trends in this area suggest? If student assistants work in the lab, discuss hours of employment, job duties, and how they support program services and scheduling.**

Program, course offering and scheduling changes are being considered and made for reduced and canceled lab hours and courses offered campus-wide due to severe budget cuts.

Starting in August 2009 due to budget cuts lab staff was reduced to one full-time instructional aide who works 37 1/2 hours per week, one part-time instructional aide who works 20 1/2 hours per week and one student aide who is assigned 15 hours per week during the Fall and Spring semesters.

If non-instructional lab usage continues as reported in (a) above, it will not be possible to provide the same level of service.

c. **Report on student satisfaction as indicated in the "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey" and, if applicable, as indicated in other student surveys.**

Question #2: "Overall, how would you rate the quality of the lab services you received?"
(n=117 respondents)

	Count	Percent
Excellent	55	47.0%
Very Good	38	32.5%
Good	20	17.1%
Fair	2	1.7%
Poor	2	1.7%

Question #3: " Overall, was the lab staff helpful?"
(n=114 respondents)

	Count	Percent
Yes	108	94.7%
No	6	5.3%

Question #4: "Were the procedures for using the lab clear and easy to follow?"
(n=116 respondents)

	Count	Percent
Yes	114	98.3%
No	2	1.7%

Question #5: "Did you understand what lab activities were expected of you?"

(n=113 respondents)

	Count	Percent
Yes	106	93.8%
No	7	6.2%

Question #6: "Was the lab available when you needed it?"

(n=115 respondents)

	Count	Percent
Always	58	50.4%
Most of the time	49	42.6%
Sometimes	6	5.2%
Rarely	2	1.7%
Never	0	0%

Question #7: "Were you able to get help when you needed it in this lab?"

(n=106 respondents)

	Count	Percent
Always	68	64.2%
Most of the time	31	29.2%
Sometimes	5	4.7%
Rarely	2	1.9%
Never	0	0%
*Does not apply	9	7.8%

*Note: Percentages reported above exclude students who responded "Does not apply"

Question #8: "If applicable, were individual meetings with faculty helpful?"

(n=44 respondents)

	Count	Percent
Very helpful	33	75.0%
Somewhat helpful	9	20.5%
Not helpful	2	4.5%
*I did not have individual meetings	69	61.1%

*Note: Percentages reported above exclude students who did not have individual meetings

Question #9: "Were the learning resources (e.g., workbooks, course materials) you needed to co

(n=83 respondents)

	Count	Percent
Always	57	68.7%
Most of the time	22	26.5%
Sometimes	4	4.8%
Rarely	0	0%
Never	0	0%
*Does not apply	31	27.2%

*Note: Percentages reported above exclude students who responded "Does not apply"

Question #10: "Were the learning resources (e.g., workbooks, course materials) you needed to complete your lab activities or classroom assignments readily available?"

(n=107 respondents)

	Count	Percent
Always	73	68.2%
Most of the time	31	29.0%
Sometimes	3	2.8%
Rarely	0	0%
Never	0	0%
*Does not apply	8	7.0%

*Note: Percentages reported above exclude students who responded "Does not apply"

Question #11: "To what extent did your work in this lab help your academic performance in courses linked to the lab or supported by this lab?" (For example, you use the Math Resource Center and are also enrolled in a Math course.)

(n=92 respondents)

	Count	Percent
Very helpful	69	75.0%
Somewhat helpful	23	25.0%
Not helpful	0	0%
*I am not enrolled in a course linked to this lab	20	17.9%

*Note: Percentages reported above exclude students who were not enrolled in a linked course

IV. STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS *(Data resources: "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey"; other lab surveys; "Student Profile Data for Labs, Spring*

2009"; "Educational Master Plan, 2008" – see website at http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional_documents.html ; student success data from departmental "Core Program and Student Success Indicators" – see website at http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program_review.html ; previous Program Review and Planning reports; other department records.)

a. **Based on findings from the "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey" and other student surveys administered by the lab, briefly describe how effectively the lab addresses students' needs relative to overall college student success rates. If applicable, identify unmet student needs related to student success and describe programmatic changes or other measures the department will consider or implement in order to improve student success. (*Note that item IV b, below, specifically addresses equity, diversity, age, and gender.*)**

Please identify the survey instruments used and the number of respondents.

The Business Microcomputer Labs are a highly successful resource. Most students reported positively on the "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction survey." Data provided by PRIE in the chart titled *CSM Lab & Learning Center: Student Profile Spring 2009,* indicates that among the 114 voluntary respondents to the Business Microcomputer Labs survey, success and retention rates were consistently higher than for their campus wide counterparts, by ethnicity, gender, and age. It is noted that formal statistical analysis of the significance of these difference is not undertaken due to the non-randomness of sampling.

CSM Lab & Learning Center: Student Profile Spring 2009
Microcomputer Lab/Total Number of Respondents: 114

Demographic		Column	Respondent Count			Respondent Percentage			Collegewide Percentage		
Variable	Count	%	Success	Non-success	Retention	Success	Non-success	Retention	Success	Non-success	Retention
Ethnicity											
Asian	113	24.5	98	15	105	86.7	13.3	92.9	73.7	26.3	83.9
African American	23	5	20	3	22	87	13	95.7	57.8	42.2	80
Filipino	18	3.9	14	4	15	77.8	22.2	83.3	67.4	32.6	80.3
Hispanic	83	18	62	21	71	74.7	25.3	85.5	67.4	38.4	78.4
Native American	2	0.4	2	0	2	100	0	100	64.8	35.2	82.4
Pacific Islander	18	3.9	16	2	18	88.9	11.1	100	60.3	39.7	80.6
White	138	29.9	114	24	126	82.6	17.4	91.3	71.5	28.5	83.6
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73.7	26.3	89.5
Unrecorded	67	14.5	50	17	61	74.6	25.4	91	70.9	29.1	83.8
Total	**462**	**100**	**376**	**86**	**420**	**81.4**	**18.6**	**90.9**	**68.5**	**31.5**	**82.2**
Gender											
Female	246	53.2	204	42	225	82.9	17.1	91.5	70.2	29.8	82.9
Male	189	40.9	150	39	170	79.4	20.6	89.9	66.2	33.8	81
Unrecorded	27	5.8	22	5	25	81.5	20.6	92.6	74.5	25.5	85.5
Total	**462**	**100**	**376**	**86**	**420**	**81.4**	**18.6**	**90.9**	**68.5**	**31.5**	**82.2**

Age											
19 or less	148	32	125	23	138	84.5	15.5	93.2	64.6	35.4	81.5
20-24	116	25.1	88	28	102	75.9	24.1	87.9	64	36	79.4
25-29	61	13.2	50	11	53	82	18	86.9	69.7	30.3	81.5
30-34	7	1.5	6	1	6	85.7	14.3	85.7	72.8	27.2	82.6
35-39	24	5.2	20	4	22	83.3	16.7	91.7	73.1	26.9	83.1
40-49	29	6.3	27	2	28	93.1	6.9	96.6	77.7	22.3	87.7
50+	50	10.8	38	12	46	76	24	92	80	20	88.1
Unrecorded	27	5.8	22	5	25	81.5	18.5	92.6	79.3	20.7	88.4
Total	**462**	**100**	**376**	**86**	**420**	**81.4**	**18.6**	**90.9**	**68.5**	**31.5**	**82.2**

b. **Briefly discuss how effectively the lab addresses students' needs specifically relative to equity, diversity, age, gender, disability and access. If applicable, identify unmet student needs and describe programmatic changes or other measures that will be considered or implemented in order to improve student success with specific regard to equity, diversity, age, and gender.**

The following chart was provided by PRIE. The respondents to the survey have similar ratios of ethnicities and gender as the campus. The population of students who use the Business Microcomputer Labs has all age groups represented.

CSM Lab & Learning Center: Student Profile Spring 2009
Microcomputer Lab/Total Number of Respondents: 114

Demographic Variable	Count	% of Total	College wide (%)
Ethnicity			
Asian	29	25.4	15.2
African American	5	4.4	3.8
Filipino	5	4.4	5.8
Hispanic	20	17.5	19.3
Native American	1	0.9	0.5
Pacific Islander	4	3.5	2.3
White	33	28.9	37.2
Other	0	0	0.1
Unrecorded	17	14.9	15.7
Total	**114**	**100**	**100**
Gender			
Female	60	52.6	47.7
Male	48	42.1	47.2
Unrecorded	6	5.3	5.1
Total	**114**	**100**	**100**
Age			
19 or less	38	33.3	20.3
20-24	26	22.8	27.5
25-29	12	10.5	12.4

Enrollment Profile	Count	% of Total	College wide (%)
Total Number of Courses Enrolled			
1	2	1.8	48.3
2	15	13.2	17.4
3	28	24.6	12.1
4	31	27.2	11.4
5	16	14	6.8
6	17	14.9	2.8
7	2	1.8	0.9
8	2	1.8	0.3
8+	01	0.00.9	0
Total	**114**	**100**	**100**
Total Units Enrolled			
0.5 – 3.0	6	5.3	43.9
3.5 – 6.0	11	9.6	18.1
6.5 – 12.0	52	45.6	23
12.5+	45	39.5	15
Total	**114**	**100**	**100**
Day/Evening Course Enrollments*			
Day Courses	82	68.4	

30-34	2	1.8	8.2
35-39	7	6.1	6.2
40-49	9	7.9	10.4
50+	14	12.3	12.2
Unrecorded	6	5.3	2.8
Total	**114**	**100**	**100**

Evening Courses	18	31.3
Total	**100**	**100**

V. REFLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND PROGRAM/STUDENT SUCCESS *(Data Resources: "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey"; other lab surveys; "Student Profile Data for Labs, Spring 2009"; "Educational Master Plan, 2008"; "2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan" – see website at http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional_documents.html ; student success data from departmental "Core Program and Student Success Indicators" – see website at http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program_review.html ; previous Program Review and Planning reports; department records; other environmental scan data.)*

a. **Using the matrix provided below and reflecting on the lab relative to students' needs, briefly analyze the lab's strengths and weaknesses and identify opportunities for and possible threats to the lab (SWOT). Consider both external and internal factors. For example, if applicable, consider changes in our community and beyond (demographic, educational, social, economic, workforce, and, perhaps, global trends); look at the demand for the lab; review program links to other campus and District programs and services; look at similar labs at other area colleges; and investigate auxiliary funding.**

Note: Please indicate the source of the data that was used to complete this section.

	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
Strengths	**Faculty and Staff, support of Division Dean**	
Weaknesses	**Not all faculty participate directly or indirectly in HBA activities.**	**Under-staffing: State Budget – funding of classified position, student assistants, faculty load**
Opportunities	**Encourage increased direct faculty participation.**	
Threats	**Full time faculty are overloaded with campus/division/department and committee work. Adjunct faculty are working full-time in the industry.**	**Loss of Staff: State Budget – funding of classified position, student assistants, faculty load; State definition of HBA and associated rules**

b. **If applicable, discuss how new positions, other resources, and equipment granted in previous years have contributed towards reaching program action steps and towards overall programmatic health (you might also reflect on data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators). If new positions have been requested but not granted, discuss how this has impacted overall programmatic health (you might also reflect on data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators).**

In the renovation of Building 14 completed for Spring 2009, the Business Microcomputer Labs were updated to Smart Classroom technology, which included newer, faster computers, updated software and new workstations. This should contribute to overall program health.

VI. Action Steps and Outcomes *(Data Resources: "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey"; other lab surveys; "Student Profile Data for Labs, Spring 2009"; "Educational Master Plan, 2008"; "2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan" – see website at http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional_documents.html ; student success data from departmental "Core Program and Student Success Indicators" – see website at http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program_review.html ; previous Program Review and Planning reports; department records; other environmental scan data.)*

a. **Identify the lab's action steps. Action steps should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate some sort of measurable action and should connect to the *"Educational Master Plan, 2008"; "2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan";* the Division work plan; and GE- or certificate SLOs.**

1. **Continue and assess pilot program and continue to evaluate student feedback/usage every semester**
2. **Create a more balanced environment that meets the needs of students desiring quiet and students needing to work with groups.**
3. **Increase staff at peak hours**

b. **Briefly explain, specifically, how the lab's action steps relate to the Educational Master Plan.**

The above address aspects of the following College Goals as stated in the Educational Master Plan (October 2008, v. 2):

Action 1,2,3, address-changing delivery to meet the needs and expectations of students.	**Goal 1: Program and Services – CSM will match its programs and services – and the manner in which they are delivered – to the evolving needs and expectations of our students.**
Action 1,2,3, support student learning and thus retention.	**Goal 2: Enrollment Management - CSM will develop and implement a comprehensive research-based enrollment management initiative that addresses all the states of enrollment management, including marketing, outreach, recruitment, and retention.**
Action 2 promotes respecting the needs of other students in the learning environment	**Goal 3: Diversity – CSM will promote a diverse learning and working environment that encourages tolerance, mutual respect, and the free exchange of ideas.**
Action 1 facilitates continuous	**Goal 4: Assessment – CSM will ensure continuous quality**

assessment based improvement.	**improvement by integrating and promoting evidence-based assessment throughout the institution.**

c. **Identify and explain the lab's outcomes, the measurable "mileposts" which will allow you to determine when the action steps are reached.**

1. **Completion of end of semester reports.**
2. **Increase in student satisfaction, survey questions 2 and 7.**
3. **End of Semester Report, tracking student usage by course, increased visits per class.**

VII. **SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH LAB ACTION STEPS** ***(Data Resources: "Student Self-Assessment and Satisfaction Survey"; other lab surveys; "Student Profile Data for Labs, Spring 2009"; "Educational Master Plan, 2008"; "2008-2013 College of San Mateo Strategic Plan" – see website at http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/institutional_documents.html ; student success data from departmental "Core Program and Student Success Indicators" – see website at http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmresearch/prie/program_review.html ; previous Program Review and Planning reports; department records; other environmental scan data.)***

a. **In the matrices below, itemize the resources needed to reach lab action steps and describe the expected outcomes for program improvement.* Specifically, describe the potential outcomes of receiving these resources and the programmatic impact if the requested resources cannot be granted.**

***Note:* Whenever possible, requests should stem from assessment of SLOs and the resulting lab changes or plans. Ideally, SLOs are assessed, the assessments lead to planning, and the resources requested link directly to those plans.**

Faculty Time Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, briefly indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving lab action steps based on SLO assessment.
NONE	**NONE**	**NONE**

Classified Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, briefly indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving lab action steps based on SLO assessment.
Return to 2008-2009 level (Add back one part-time classified instructional aide)	**Maintain/improve the current level of student service, coordinate lab activities, coordinate student tutor/assistant hiring, training, monitoring etc, ordering of lab copies of current text books**	**If this position is not re-instituted, the program will be struggling to maintain the level of service from 2008-2009.**

	and ancillary materials, ordering of supplies, maintain and up-date student web resources. **If not granted the quality of student service will be negatively impacted.**	

b. **For instructional resources including equipment and materials, please list the exact items you want to acquire and the total costs, including tax, shipping, and handling. Include items used for <u>instruction</u> (such as computers, furniture for labs and centers) and all materials designed for use by students and instructors as a learning resource (such as lab equipment, books, CDs, technology-based materials, educational software, tests, non-printed materials). Add rows to the tables as necessary. If you have questions as to the specificity required, please consult with your division dean. Please list by priority.**

Resources Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving lab action steps based on SLO assessment.
NOT APPLICABLE		

**** Status = New, Upgrade, Replacement, Maintenance or Repair.***

VIII. Course Outlines – for labs that are discrete courses *(Data Resources: department records; Committee On Instruction website – http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmcoi ; Office of the Vice President of Instruction; Division Dean)*

a. **If applicable to the lab, list by course number (e.g. CHEM 210) all department or program courses included in the most recent college catalog, the date of the current Course Outline for each course, and the due date of each course's next update.**

Course Number	Last Updated	Six-year Update Due
NOT APPLICABLE	**NOT APPLICABLE**	**NOT APPLICABLE**

Upon its completion, please email this Program Review of Labs and Centers report to the Vice President of Instruction, the appropriate division dean, and the CSM Academic Senate President.

Date of evaluation: July 2009

Please list the department's Program Review of Labs and Centers report team:

Primary program contact person: Patricia Brannock / Darrel M. Dorsett
Phone and email address: 574-6668, brannock@smccd.edu / 574-6439, dorsett@smccd.edu

Full-time faculty: Patricia Brannock / Darrel M. Dorsett
Part-time faculty:
Administrators: Kathleen Ross: Dean, Business/Technology Division
Classified staff: Russell Cunningham
Students:

Faculty's signatures

_____

Patricia Brannock ***Date***

_____

Darrel M. Dorsett ***Date***

Dean's signature

_____

Kathleen Ross ***Date***