PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING
Approved 9/2/08 Governing Council

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

Department or Program:	**Disabled Students Programs and Services**
Division:	**Counseling Services**

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM *(Data resources: "Number of Sections" data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators; CSM Course Catalog; department records)*

> Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) provide accommodations to students with verified disabilities, based on individual educational limitations, so that they may access institutional programs and services. Five units: Adapted Physical Education (APE); Assistive Technology Center (ATC); Disability Resource Center (DRC); Learning Disabilities and Assessment Center (LDAC) and Transition to College (TTC) work cohesively to provide: test, furniture, parking accommodations, a distraction reduced environment, assistive computer technology, alternate media, counseling, learning disability assessment and learning strategies, adapted physical education courses, computer lab, registration assistance, and advocacy.

II. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES *(Data resources: SLO records maintained by the department; CSM SLO Coordinator; SLO Website)*

    a. Briefly describe the department's assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. Which courses or programs were assessed? How were they assessed? What are the findings of the assessments?

> DSPS was interested in determining if students were independent users of resources, so looked at test accommodations since it is one of our largest service areas. As students enter the program, they are given information on how to speak with instructors and DSPS staff to arrange test accommodations. Students are asked to schedule each test accommodation at least five days in advance. A log in the Learning Disabilities and Assessment Center tracks student requests: the date the request was made and the date of the test. Seventy-eight percent (78%) of all students receiving test accommodations are following procedure. This is down from the previous year. The sharp increase in this accommodation, may account for some of the decline in those appropriately requesting extended time. New students typically take a semester or so to get into the swing of things. We will continue to track this area, particularly as procedural changes are incorporated to mitigate staffing losses.

b. Briefly evaluate the department's assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. If applicable, based on past SLO assessments, 1) what changes will the department consider or implement in future assessment cycles; and 2) what, if any, resources will the department or program require to implement these changes? (Please itemize these resources in section VII of this document.)

The department will make several changes to the way students process test accommodations, not because current procedures were not effective, but as a means to deal with recent staffing changes. Students and faculty will be asked to assume a larger responsibility in arranging accommodations. Forms will be updated, and a new 'test proctoring form' made available to faculty to complete and attach to each test to be proctored. Faculty will need to deliver their exams to the office; and students will need to make sure that the initial test accommodation form is shared and discussed with each faculty member. This will eliminate the need to approve the accommodation more than once per academic year, freeing staff time to focus on incoming students.

c. Below please update the program's SLO Alignment Grid. The column headings identify the GE-SLOs. In the row headings (down the left-most column), input the course numbers (e.g. ENGL 100); add or remove rows as necessary. Then mark the corresponding boxes for each GE-SLO with which each course aligns. The definitions of the GE-SLOs can be found on the CSM SLOAC website: http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmsloac/sl_sloac.htm (click on the "Institutional" link under the "Student Learning Outcomes" heading.) If this Program Review and Planning report refers to a vocational program or a certificate program that aligns with alternative institutional-level SLOs, please replace the GE-SLOs with the appropriate corresponding SLOs.

GE-SLOs ☐ Program Courses ☐	Effective Communication	Quantitative Skills	Critical Thinking	Social Awareness and Diversity	Ethical Responsibility

III. DATA EVALUATION (Data resources: Core Program and Student Success Indicators from the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness)

a. Referring to the Enrollment and WSCH data, evaluate the current data and projections. If applicable, what programmatic, course offering or scheduling changes do trends in these areas suggest? Will any major changes being implemented in the program (e.g. changes in prerequisites, hours by arrangement, lab components) require significant adjustments to the Enrollment and WSCH projections?

As of March 2010, DSPS served at total of 569 students across nine disability categories: acquired brain injury (ABI), developmentally delayed; hearing; learning disability; mobility; other; psychological; vision; and speech. Final counts will not be available until the end of the semester. DSPS has received 5,334 visitors thus far. We have provided nearly 2000 test accommodations, more than 1500 counseling appointments and 113 parking accommodations. ATC staff noted an increase in service demand. Lab usage has increased 9%; alternate media requests 35%. Test accommodations have climbed nearly 25%. The program is serving more students in the developmentally delayed (+23%); mobility (+23%); psychological (+24%); and vision (+10%) categories. Conversely, the following populations have decreased: hearing (−45%); learning disabilities (−36%); other (−16%), and acquired brain injury (−14%). This has significant budgetary implications for DSPS as categories are funded based upon a 'weighted' count. Acquired brain injury and learning disabilities receive a higher weight than those served as psychological or other. This will negatively impact funding allocations. The decline in ABI and learning disabled populations can be attributed to the reduction in APE class offerings (limited instructional aide support), and the unfilled full−time LD specialist position. With the anticipated return of California veterans, it is likely that increases in mobility; other; psychological; and ABI populations will occur. The influx of four year students to the community college may also flood LD services. The program is not staffed to accommodate them. Priority will be established to determine who has immediate access to LD testing. The loss of the office assistant II position compromises the programs ability to respond quickly, efficiently and effectively to student accommodation requests and will erode service delivery. Staff will look at policies and procedures to assist in efficiency of services, but the reality is that students will have to become more self−sufficient earlier if they are to be successful.

   b.   Referring to the Classroom Teaching FTEF data, evaluate the current data and projections. 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?

N/A

   c.   Referring to the Productivity data, discuss and evaluate the program's productivity relative to its target number. If applicable, what programmatic changes or other measures will the department consider or implement in order to reach its productivity target? If the productivity target needs to be adjusted, please provide a rationale. (Productivity is WSCH divided by FTE. The College's general target productivity will be recommended by the Budget Planning Committee.)

N/A

IV. **STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS** *(Data resources: Educational Master Plan; "Success Rates," "Dimension" data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports; other department records)*

   a.   Considering the overall "Success" and "Retention" data from the Dimension section of Core Program and Student Success Indicators, briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs relative to current, past, and projected program and 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.*)

Overall, DSPS is effectively meeting the needs of its students, despite difficulties due to budget cuts. For now, students receive timely accommodations and most course offerings (with the exception of a decline in APE classes) have not changed. Part of the reason for this success has been the ability of the staff to respond to individual student needs based upon verified disabilities. If a service lapse appeared, staff were able to confer and determine how best to fill the gap. Oftentimes, this included services like individualized tutoring or educational coaching, mobility assistance in elevators and/or the Bldg. 16 lift, and filling furniture requests. This has been compromised due to recent staff departure and budget limitations. Students, particularly those with more challenges, often speak of individualized services and relationships as the staple that keeps them enrolled. Programmatically, the ability of staff to provide this level of service has been threatened. The changes we are considering will not increase student retention: they are gap-stop measures to help ensure that we are able to meet current core mandates, and will offer very little above and beyond those mandates. The reality of this situation is hard for staff to accept, and will be difficult for students to absorb as the 'rubber hits the road.' To the degree possible, staff will attempt to deliver services in such a way that students' minimal needs and institutional legal obligations are met. The expectation is that many students will fall through the cracks.

b. Briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs specifically relative to equity, diversity, age, and gender. If applicable, identify unmet student needs and describe programmatic changes or other measures the department will consider or implement in order to improve student success with specific regard to equity, diversity, age, and gender.

By the very nature of its existence, DSPS is an inclusive program, its participants a broad spectrum of age, race, ethnicity, ability, sexual orientation, and language groups. Students present with one of nine disabilities, 27% have multiple disabilities. Because students are accommodated based upon individual educational limitations, students generally feel 'served'—that is their needs are heard, and to the degree possible, met. When service gaps are discovered, staff is creative and responsive in addressing those needs. For example, implementation of an educational coaching program for students having difficulty organizing time, homework assignments receive one-on-one peer assistance. Staff are also instrumental in serving as a liaison between instructional departments and students, often consulting with faculty to develop student success strategies. These services will decline with the loss of the full-time LD specialist and office assistant II positions. These vacancies will challenge staff and will likely result in less individualized services for students and follow-up with instructors who teach DSPS populations.

Unfortunately, we have not tracked disaggregate success rates as closely as we would like: program demand has increased approximately 23% over the 2007-08 year. A vacant LD specialist position (the last two years) and a newly defunded office assistant II position will make it difficult to respond to student needs while closely tracking success. However, program staff will work with the research office to assist in this endeavor.

V. REFLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND PROGRAM/STUDENT SUCCESS *(Data Resources: Educational Master Plan; "Dimension: Retention and Success" data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports; department records)*

a. Using the matrix provided below and reflecting on the program relative to students' needs, briefly analyze the program's strengths and weaknesses and identify opportunities for and possible threats to the program (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 program; review program links to other campus and District programs and services; look at similar programs at other area colleges; and investigate auxiliary funding.

	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
Strengths	Staff are dedicated and engaged in student learning and success. Faculty and staff serve on a number of committees; offer workshops, and participate in trainings, health fair and recruitment events such as Connect to College. Connection with high school special education teachers remains strong.	College has backfilled some of DSPS budget so that more positions have not been lost; District located funding to backfill APE Instructional Aide II position.
Weaknesses	Staff reductions have placed program in jeopardy. An office assistant II position was defunded; learning disability specialist hours have been reduced from 24 to 18 hours per week, and will be further reduced to 12 hours per week Fall 2010. Ability to process requests in timely manner is compromised. Hourly instructional aides were discontinued in APE due to budgetary deficits and the managed hiring process among classified ranks.	College must backfill allocation lost to retain existing program staff, however face daunting cuts to the general fund. System office may revisit funding formula for 'other' category, but is unlikely will redistribute weighted count for rising populations such as psychological and intellectual disability groups.
Opportunities	Reconstitution of an Advisory Committee can provide community feedback and partnerships in serving students with disabilities.	Community partnerships may maximize program services; create revenue streams; and encourage creative, collaborative problem solving.
Threats	Budget reductions have greatly impacted delivery of program services in three areas: LD assessment and accommodations; Disability Resource Center staffing; and APE courses. More students will be served in the 'other' category which will decrease funding. Unclear how services such as furniture and test accommodations will be filled with limited staff resources. Will reduce some advocacy; outreach functions. May need to close office early one day per week for paperwork review and follow-up.	Restoration of program funds is needed to provide effective and timely core program services to matriculating students. Program may need to hire interpreters for two full-time students next semester—requiring additional backfill from college and/or district. Priority for backfill remains in restoration of the OAII position.

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).

> Due to state funding cuts, DSPS had to offer two positions to the classified managed hiring process. APE instructional aide position and the Disability Resource Center office assistant II positions were defunded with priority given to the OAII position should additional funds be located. The district and/or college found funds and removed the instructional aide position from the managed hiring list. Restoration of the office assistant II position will alleviate congestion in providing mandated accommodations to matriculating students, and will greatly help avert possible legal action as a result of untimely service delivery. Learning disabilities continue to be one of the highest served populations, which also carry a higher weighted count in the state allocation formula; however the ability of the college to increase this subset has been decimated. This will not only have implications for future program allocations, but will challenge program staff to meet the needs of these students. Assessments will be severely limited as will instructor advocacy, and individual appointments with the learning disabilities specialist. Reinstatement of these two positions is a program priority.
>
> In past years a request has been made for an additional LD specialist. This would aid in rebuilding a robust program, increase students served, DSKL course offerings, and provide staffing needed to move more students from the 'other' to 'LD' category thereby increasing state allocations. All program staff, but particularly the ATC will require software and equipment updates. Finally, once the needs of matriculating students are met, reinstatement of the two part-time instructional aides in APE would allow for expansion of course offerings which would also increase overall program revenue.

VI. **Action Steps and Outcomes** *(Data resources: Educational Master Plan, GE- or Certificate SLOs; course SLOs; department records; Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports; Division work plan)*

    a. Identify the program's action steps. Action steps should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate <u>some sort of measurable action</u> and should connect to the Educational Master Plan, the Division work plan, and GE- or certificate SLOs.

> - Streamline test accommodation procedures and forms
> - Increase faculty knowledge of ADA and legal mandates in serving students with disabilities
> - Reinstate the DSPS Advisory Committee
> - Increase support staffing
> - Develop and offer DSKL 880 course fall 2010

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

> Actions are designed to meet the needs of students; increase and promote diversity events and topics; and allow DSPS to serve more LD students through the introduction of an experimental DSKL course.

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

- New test accommodations procedures implemented
- Number and range of workshops/seminars sponsored
- DSPS Advisory Committee meeting
- DSKL courses offered

VII. SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH PROGRAM ACTION STEPS *(Data resources: Educational Master Plan, GE-SLOs, SLOs; department records; Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports)*

a. In the matrices below, itemize the resources needed to reach program 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 program changes or plans. Ideally, SLOs are assessed, the assessments lead to planning, and the resources requested link directly to those plans.

Full-Time Faculty Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, briefly indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
Learning Disability Specialist	Ability to effectively provide timely accommodations. Increase student participation in this population, increases program revenue.	Instrumental in increasing student academic success and completion of certificate, degree and transfer requirements. Assists students in learning educational limitations, required accommodations, and student rights and responsibilities.

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 department action steps based on SLO assessment.
Office Assistant II	Ability to provide accommodations in timely and efficient manner; support for counselor; instructional staff who are working with DSPS students.	Instrumental in helping students transition from dependency to independence. Reinforces learning outcomes; assists in program assessment, outreach and communication.

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 instruction (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, briefly indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
Item: Input text here. **Number:** Input text here. **Vendor:** Input text here. **Unit price:** Input text here. **Total Cost:** Input text here. **Status*:** Input text here.	Input text here.	Input text here.

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

VIII. Course Outlines *(Data Resources: department records; Committee On Instruction website; Office of the Vice President of Instruction; Division Dean)*

a. By course number (e.g. CHEM 210), please list 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
DSKL 811	Unknown	2010
DSKL 817	2002	2008
DSKL 819	2002	2008

IX. Advisory and Consultation Team (ACT)

a. Please list non-program faculty who have participated on the program's Advisory and Consultation Team. Their charge is to review the Program Review and Planning report before its submission and to provide a brief written report with comments, commendations, and suggestions to the Program Review team. Provided that they come from outside the program's department, ACT members may be solicited from faculty at CSM, our two sister colleges, other community colleges, colleges or universities, and professionals in relevant fields. The ACT report should be attached to this document upon submission.

N/A

N/A

b. Briefly describe the program's response to and intended incorporation of the ACT report recommendations.

N/A

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

Date of evaluation: April 28, 2010

Please list the department's Program Review and Planning report team:

Primary program contact person: Danita Scott-Taylor
Phone and email address: 574-6155; scott@smccd.edu
Full-time faculty: Carolyn Fiori; Kevin Sinarle; Shana Young; Mikel Schmidt (half-time)
Part-time faculty: Marie Paparelli; Joyce Meyer
Administrators: Danita Scott-Taylor
Classified staff: Laura Skaff; Audra Fernandez (through April 13, 2010); Sue Roseberry; Paul Sacomano
Students: Misty Mendez; Tiffany Von Bardeleben; Ursula Williams

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Faculty's signatures   *Date*

_____

Dean's signature   *Date*