

PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE 2016-2017

Program: Financial Aid Office

Division: Enrollment Services

Date: October 5, 2016

Writer(s): Andi Schreiberman

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Andi Schreiberman

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Purpose: To document significant program accomplishments, plans and needs between Triennial Program Reviews. This update should provide a snapshot of your program.

Uses: This update will be used to inform the campus and community about your program. It will also be used in the processes of creating Dean's Summaries, determining College Planning Priorities and allocating resources.

Time Frame: This update should reflect on program status during the 2015-16 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2017-18.

Topics: The first section of this Program Review Update focuses on general program reflection and planning. The second, third and fourth sections focus on reflection and planning regarding Student Learning Outcomes. Only instructional programs need to complete Sections 2, 3, and 4.

Scope: While this Program Review Update does ask for some analysis of data, detailed data reports in the form of appendices should be reserved for the Triennial Program Review.

Instructions:

- 1) Please fill in the following information as completely as possible.
 - 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, please write "Not Applicable."
 - 3) Optional: Meet with your dean to review this document before October 10, 2016.
 - 4) Send an electronic copy of this form to the Program Review Committee Chair and your Dean by October 10, 2016.
-

Part One: Program Snapshot

A. Have there been any significant changes to your program, your program's data or your program's needs since the previous Program Planning Update?

If there are any changes, describe the relevant information and its significance in the space below.

These changes might have originated from within the program or because of an external source (the institution or the state, for example). Possible sources of relevant information might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Data generated by your program
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research (<http://goo.gl/Ssfik2>)
- CEMC Data
- Retirements
- State Mandates
- Labor Market Data
- SLO/SAO Data (<http://goo.gl/iU2yIZ>)

Financial Aid is currently in the process of significant testing as we prepare to move from our current modification-based system to Banner baseline for processing financial aid for the 2017-18 school year.
--

We have experienced significant staffing changes, with a new full-time replacement hire requiring significant training, and on-call hourly support also requiring significant training

We implemented another new scholarship software again (AwardSpring) for 2015-16, completely different from 2014-15 (STARS) based on company's recommendation. Very labor intensive.

Data indicates financial aid numbers are decreasing with respect to Fafsas and pell recipients; we expect this is at least partially due to understaffing and staffing changes, and our limitations in providing inreach, outreach and follow-up.

Securing a consistent funding source for GetSAP and Financial Aid TV continues to be a big problem. Financial Aid TV provides essential short topical video clips on a huge number of topics to our students on our website, and we rely on it to provide significant important information to our students. GetSAP is an online video presentation of topics related to Satisfactory Academic Progress. GetSAP is designed to assist in two main ways: 1) to provide pertinent information to our general financial aid students so that they will be provided good information in a clear, concise manner via video and print, to assist in making them more aware of progress requirements up front so they are aware to be proactive in maintaining their aid eligibility, and 2) the program can be targeted specifically to disqualified students who will have to view the program as part of an appeal process, replacing the current in-person workshops which are labor-intensive.

We are currently still working on implementation of GetSAP; we spent 2015-16 working with the company to design and implement but due to timing and staffing issues were unable to go live. Expect to be live for Spring 2017.

Need to secure permanent funding source for 2017-18 and thereafter, for online scholarship program, either continuing the current AwardSpring software or adapting a new software (\$5000 - \$10,000/year).

B. What objectives, initiatives, or plans from the 2015 Program Review Update have been achieved and how? PRUs from 2015 are available here: <http://goo.gl/9iF3m9>

Implemented a new online scholarship program in 15-16 (AwardSpring), underwritten by the LPC Foundation. There were glitches with the newly designed program which we encountered in implementation and there were issues that affected student's ability to apply. We shared our issues with the company and expect many of the problems to be addressed for the upcoming cycle.

We successfully implemented the new 3SP regulations regarding loss of BOGW fee waiver for students who do not meet the college's Satisfactory Progress standards during two consecutive primary terms. We worked with IT programmers and admissions staff to develop the programming for the mandate, and we provided clear communication with students about the change in policy and communicated to the students who were identified as those who lost their BOGW. Developed an appeal process to comply with 3SP implementation guidelines.

C. Discuss at least one example of how students have been impacted by the work of your program since the last program review update (if you did not already answer this in Question B).

SAP Workshops have continued to be provided in person (This is an SAO); student satisfaction exit surveys conducted anonymously indicate 100% of students overall were very satisfied with the delivery of the content. Many were able to successfully appeal following the workshop, but more importantly, we assume they now understand the policy much better and by understanding, we hope most will avoid **disqualification in the future**.

D. What obstacles has your program faced in achieving objectives, initiatives, or plans?

Staffing changes have been very disruptive in many ways through the 15-16 school year.

Lack of a designated funding source to pay for software we are counting on to serve our students has been a significant issue (Financial Aid TV and GetSAP online satisfactory academic progress counseling) for 2016-17.

Unreliable source of funding to continue the hiring of on-call hourly staff; without a 3SP/Equity Director to ensure we have continued funding, we are very vulnerable if these funds are not continued, as we will not be able to provide adequate services and follow-up if our limited regular staff must again assume front desk duties rather than concentrate on processing files to get our students paid timely.

Understaffing and staffing changes have precluded us from implementing Cash Course financial literacy as we have had to focus our efforts on getting our students paid and maintaining compliant. Continued understaffing impacts our ability to maintain compliance with some federal and state regulations.

Inability to provide adequate inreach, outreach and follow-up due to staffing issues is now beginning to result in decreasing numbers of students applying for and receiving aid.

E. What are your most important plans (either new or continuing) for next year?

The migration to Baseline Banner (end of fall 2016)

FA has requested 3 new positions through RAC. Until our office is able to grow we cannot implement Cash Course, which is a great important service to the entire student body, and cannot pursue many other endeavors which would directly benefit our low income students.

Professional development and training of new/replacement staff and maintenance of on-call hourly relief staff is key to continuing to serve students in the coming year

Implementation of GetSAP to replace in-person workshops

F. Instructional Programs: Detail your department’s plans, if any, for adding DE courses, degrees, and/or certificates. For new DE degrees and/or certificates (those offered completely online), please include a brief rationale as to why the degree/certificate will be offered online.

G. Do plans listed under Question E or Question F connect to this year’s planning priorities (listed below)? If so, explain how they connect.

Planning Priorities for 2016-17

- Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards***
- Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance***

- **Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes**
- **Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses.**

Financial Aid is a key aspect of access and retention of approximately 50% of our student population, possibly more if we were able to provide adequate outreach.

Ongoing additional funding for financial aid staff is required to meet federally-mandated level of administrative capability needed to run a full service financial aid office to ensure compliance and to serve and support our students in the way a full service financial aid office is intended. This ties in directly with ACCJC standards.

H. Instructional programs: Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion? ___yes ___no

(This data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/Ssfik2>)

If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.

I. Units with SAOs: Using SAO data from last year, describe the impacts of SAO practices on student learning, achievement, or institutional effectiveness. Describe the practices which led to the success. (Copy the box below if you would like to discuss multiple examples). SAO data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/iU2yIZ>

SAO:

'By offering Back on Track SAP workshops, students will demonstrate an understanding of the new Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress standards.' *Implementation still in process*

'Students will have multiple ways to learn about and understand the Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress Policy through the development of interactive online multimedia and in-person presentations.' Quantitative survey results indicate in-person Satisfactory Academic Progress workshops have been well-received by students and no average score was less than 4 out of 5. We strongly believe these workshops have been very educational for our students and it is our assertion that the education gained will result in less students being disqualified in the future based on a much clearer understanding of our policy.

'Increased number of students will take advantage of scholarship opportunities on campus through improvements in the scholarship application.' Offering an electronic version of the scholarship application has increased applicant numbers, but there have been issues

Describe the quantitative or qualitative results: Regarding our scholarship program, in Spring 2014, the last year that the paper scholarship application process was used, there were 109 applicants. In spring 2015, when STARS online system was implemented, there were 211 applicants. However, in 2016, when AwardSpring was implemented, there were only 154 applicants. There were significant issues that we were unaware of that caused some students to not be able to complete the application process, related to incorrect logic setup, issues with the ability to upload multi-page transcripts, frustration, and lack of staffing to assist with questions as we experienced very serious staffing issues during the spring term.

Discuss any actions taken so far (and results, if known): Worked intently with AwardSpring to address the issues. Submitted report at end of season to software company with requested improvements necessary going forward.

Discuss your action plan for the future: secure funding for scholarship software going forward. Survey student's satisfaction with software and to identify problem areas for improvement.

Part Two: Course-Level SLO Assessment Schedule

THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REMOVED. PLEASE SKIP TO PART THREE.

Part Three: Assessment Results
(Instructional Programs Only)

1. Describe an example of how your program used **course SLO data (SLOs)** from last year (2015-16) to impact student learning or achievement. (Copy the box below if you would like to discuss multiple examples).

Course:
Course SLO:
Describe the quantitative or qualitative results:
Discuss any actions taken so far (and results, if known):
Discuss your action plan for the future:

2. Degree/Certificate granting programs only: Describe an example of how your program used **program-level SLO data (PSLOs)** from last year (2015-16) to impact student learning or achievement. (Copy the box below if you would like to discuss multiple examples).

Degree/Certificate:
Program SLO:
Describe the quantitative or qualitative results:
Discuss any actions taken so far (and results, if known):
Discuss your action plan for the future:

Part Four: Program Curriculum Map (Instructional Programs with Degrees/Certificates Only)

Background: Program-level Student Learning Outcomes

Program-level Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) are defined as the knowledge, skills, abilities, or attitudes that students have at the completion of a degree or certificate. Faculty within a discipline should meet to discuss the expected learning outcomes for students who complete a particular series of courses, such as those required for a certificate or a degree. PSLOs should be the big things you want students to get out of a degree or certificate. PSLOs should be developed throughout the program and in multiple courses. Discussions might also involve colleagues in other programs regarding prerequisites and transfer courses or community stakeholders regarding job expectations.

It is recommended that each program have 3-6 PSLOs. Discipline faculty members might need to have a more comprehensive list based on the requirements of external stakeholders (employers, state requirements, etc.). For most programs, PSLOs are only assessed through linked course-level SLOs. You might assess PSLOs in a capstone project or capstone course that many students complete when earning a certificate or degree. Alternatively, you could assess development of a set of skills as students advance through different courses in your program (ENG 1A -> ENG 4 or 7).

Program-level outcomes should

1. **describe** what students are able to do after completing a degree or certificate;
2. be **limited** in number (3-6 outcomes);
3. be **clear** so that students and colleagues can understand them;
4. be **observable** skills (career-specific or transferable), knowledge, attitudes, and/or values;
5. be **relevant** to meet the needs of students, employers, and transfer institutions;
6. be **rigorous** yet realistic outcomes achievable by students

Curriculum Map Directions

Note: If you have multiple degrees/certificates, choose one to map. If you have already submitted mapping to the SLO committee and do not wish to make changes, you may copy that mapping into this chart or attach the map you already created.

1. In the boxes across the top row, review all the non-GE courses required for your degree/certificate. (including those that aren't in your discipline). Make any desired changes to those courses. (Electives do not need to be included, though they may).
2. In the left column, write the program learning outcomes you have drafted for your program.
3. In the boxes in the center of the page, mark the course SLO that maps to the program SLO you have identified. Each program SLO should map to multiple courses in your program.

Example: English Associate's Degree for Transfer						
Program Learning Outcomes	Required Courses in Degree/Certificate					
	Eng 4	Eng 7	Eng 35	Eng 41	Electives* (Eng 20, 32, 45, 44)	MSCM 1*
1. Identify and evaluate implied arguments in college-level literary texts.	x					
2. Write an academic essay synthesizing multiple texts and using logic to support a thesis.	x	x				
3. Write a research paper using credible sources and correct documentation.	x	x				x
4. Analyze an author's use of literary techniques to develop a theme.			x	x	x	

*Including electives is optional.

Your Program's Map

Degree or Certificate:														
Program Learning Outcomes (3-6 recommended)	Required Courses in Degree/Certificate													
1.														
2.														
3.														
4.														
5.														
6.														

1. Did you make any changes to your existing mapping? (circle one)

Yes No This degree/certificate did not have previous mapping

2. If you answered "yes" to Question 1, explain what changes you made.

3. Reflection Questions: The following questions are for the consideration of your program as you look at your completed chart. You do not need to record your responses here. If you discuss these questions with others (for example, at a department meeting), you may want to take minutes documenting your discussion.

- a. How many courses help students achieve each program outcome? Do students have enough opportunities to achieve the outcome?
- b. In which course(s) are students likely to demonstrate satisfactory achievement of each program outcome? In other words, which courses(s) might be an official or unofficial capstone requirement?