

Las Positas College  
PROGRAM PLANNING UPDATE (Instructional) AY 2015-2016

| Name of Program | Division | Author(s)  |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| Speech          | ALSS     | James Dobson, Tim Heisler, and Janet Brehe Johnson |

### INSTRUCTIONS:

1. This Program Planning Update covers the academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.
2. The planning should be for the academic year 2015-2016.
3. Use the Save As feature in Word to save this template with your program name, so that you do not overwrite the original template. Please use your program's catalog rubric and this format when naming your document:

Rubric INS PPU 15\_16

e.g., ESL INS PPU 15\_16

4. If the document displays in large type with only File, Tools, and View tabs at the top of the page, select **View, Edit Document**. You will then be able to type where it says "Click here to enter text" and you will be able to click on the check boxes to select them.
5. In each section, click in the box under the instructions and fill in your information. The box will expand as you type. If a section is not pertinent to your program enter N/A in the box; do not leave it blank.
6. When you have completed the form, run the spell-checker (**click inside the text in the first box**, then click on the Review tab and find Spell-Check in the far left corner of the ribbon).
7. Please address your questions to your Program Review Committee representatives or the PR Chair Karin Spirn. Concerns, feedback and suggestions are welcome at any time to PRC representatives or co-chairs.
8. Instructions for submitting your Program Planning Update will be available at the start of the fall semester.

---

## I. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Review of academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14

**SLO Assessment Review**

Review your program's SLO assessment results through spring 2014 and respond to the following questions.

1. Discuss how assessment results indicate success in student learning. Identify results that indicate a need for improvement.

In our largest class offering (Speech 1 with 18+ sections offered each semester) we're seeing a 92% success rate for completion of our final assignment with a mastery level of 36%. The vast majority of assessments for all courses is *above proficiency* over the last five semesters.

The language of our SLO's seems to result in a consistency of the scores for each category of evaluation. This consistency of scoring may not accurately reflect actual results in student outcomes. We may need to find more accurate/fitting language to better reflect variance.

2. Discuss how distance education courses assessment results compare to face-to-face courses, if applicable? (*Respond to this question if your program has distance education courses.*)

N/A

3. Discuss how your discipline, or someone in your discipline, made changes in pedagogy as a result of SLO assessment results.

Due to the consistency of the results in our Speech 1 assessment we, as a discipline, collectively reviewed our course outline of record to discuss possible changes. The goal being, to see improvement in the numbers over time rather than seeing the consistent figures that we're currently experiencing.

4. Give an example of a change in the number of units and/or lab hours based on assessment data, if applicable.

N/A

5. Did your program discover the need for additional resources (for AY 2015-16) based on the assessment results?      YES       NO

If yes, please explain.

N/A

### SLO Process

1. Describe how your program reaches consensus when writing student learning outcomes that are used in multiple sections.

My program offers only one section of each course.

The Speech Program has a Student Learning Outcome Coordinator who took primary control in writing the assessments. Those assessments were then distributed to the other full time faculty for edits and approval.

2. Describe how your program reaches consensus when developing and evaluating assessment results for student learning outcomes that are used in multiple sections.

My program offers only one section of each course.

On courses that have multiple sections, the full time faculty meet and discuss the results. Our results have been consistent with each other. As a result, we have not had any discussions on changing the articulated SLOs at this time.

3. What methods does your program use for documenting SLO related discussions? Check all that apply.

Program emails

Program meeting minutes/agendas

Blackboard/other website

Other (please describe):

The full time faculty in the Speech Department have offices close to each other so we will discuss SLOs when convenient.

## II. PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Review of academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14

Review the student data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and any additional data your program has collected. Then respond to the sections below.

### A. Data Review

If applicable, summarize any **changes** in your program's data since the Annual Program Review of 2011-12 or observed significant trends that will affect program planning or resource requests.

**NOTE:** Only include changes that affect student learning, program planning or resource requests.

We find that there are low number of students who are taking multiple classes of speech at one time. We think this indicates a low number of Speech Majors in our discipline.

We find extreme consistency in the demographics of ours students as they align with the demographics of the institution.

Our completion rate is 90-93% for all courses showing a very low withdraw rate. Success of classes consistently stays at about 83% over the semesters.

Our class fill rate has averaged at 103% since Fall 2009.

### B. Program-Set Standard for Successful Course Completion Rates

Your program-set standard for successful course completion rates (i.e., number of grades of 'A', 'B', 'C', 'CR', and 'P' divided by total grades) is calculated by averaging successful course completion rates for your program over a five-year period and then multiplying that result by 95%.

In order to determine if you have achieved your program-set standard for successful course completion rates for a given year (e.g., 2012-13), you will need to assess if your program met or exceeded 95% of the previous 5-year average (i.e., 2007-08 through 2011-12) for your program; these calculations are done for you (*see links below*).

1. What was your program-set standard for successful course completion rates in 2012-13 and 2013-14?

|         | <b>Program-Set Standard for successful course completion</b>        | <b>Did you meet your program-set standard? (Yes or No)</b> |
|---------|---|--|
| 2012-13 | <a href="http://tinyurl.com/mmfwgfe">http://tinyurl.com/mmfwgfe</a> | Yes  |
| 2013-14 | <a href="http://tinyurl.com/q6dah55">http://tinyurl.com/q6dah55</a> | Yes  |

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

N/A – We are just that good.

### C. Curriculum Review

1. Review your program’s current curriculum. If applicable, describe any internal or external impacts which will affect your curriculum plans for 2015-16.

N/A

### D. Human Resources

1. Have there been changes in the number of full-time or part-time faculty associated with your program since the Annual Program Review of 2011-12? If yes, briefly describe the changes.

N/A

2. Have there been changes in the number of full-time or part-time classified staff associated with your program since the Annual Program Review of 2011-12? If yes, briefly describe the changes.

N/A

3. If applicable, describe how the changes indicated in 1 and 2 have impacted student learning?

N/A

**E. Other information pertinent to the program**

N/A

**III. PLANNING**

**A. Planning Update**

Summarize your program’s plans, initiatives, and objectives accomplished since the Annual Program Review of AY 2011-12 (include accomplishments for the academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14).

- The Speech SLO assessment process will be finalized.

We have taken a more active roll in getting our SLO assessments entered and evaluating the results.

- We seek to increase the Forensics budget by means that do not include fund-raising.

We have not been able to secure more funding from our co curricular account. Our V.P. was generous enough to provide the Forensics Program an addition \$4000.00 for the 2013-2014 academic year ONLY.

- We want fill the vacancy that exists in our instructional assistant position.

We have not been approved to have this position back.

- We want our Forensics team to become more involved in community service activities.

The Forensics team has really taken an active roll in doing more community based work. The tournament we host for collegiate competitors includes a theme and a performance by the team. We have developed a Children’s Holiday Story Hour in conjunction with the Early Childhood Development Center and the Library. The children in attendance will find snacks, activities, and a performance by the forensics team.

We also sent speech team members to a local grade school to teach storytelling techniques to 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> graders.

We want to increase the advertisement of our program and make it more accessible to the community and LPC students.

The involvement in the community has increased our visibility on campus. We are getting many new members joining the team. We have also done recruiting trips to local high schools and delivered

presentations on what the talk Hawks have to offer. A pamphlet has also been created as distribution material outlining the benefits of our program.

**B. Program Planning for AY 2015-16**

As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program’s plans, initiatives, and objectives for the academic year 2015-16. Focus on how planning will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.

1. SLO assessments. NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. As a guideline, each program should be assessing 25% of its courses every semester.
  1. How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning? Examples might include (Your responses may vary.):
    - changing number of units/lab hours
    - changing pedagogy/curriculum
    - changing assessments

We are looking at our course outline of record to evaluate both pedagogy and instructional relevance of course content.

We are looking at the language of our SLO’s for possible variance.

2. Have your assessment results shown a need for new SLOs? YES  NO 

If yes, in the table below, state the number of courses in your program and estimate the percentage of courses for which your program will write new SLOs.

| <b>Number of Courses</b> | <b>Estimated Percentage for which new SLOs will be written</b> |
|--------------------------|--|
| N/A                      | N/A  |

3. What percentage of courses will your program assess in the next academic year (2015-16)?

100%

4. In order to budget to pay part-time faculty to work on SLOs during the academic year 2015-16, estimate the number of part-time faculty in your program and the percentage of them who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

| <b>Estimated Number of</b> | <b>Estimated Percentage who will participate in the SLO process</b> |
|----------------------------|---|
|                            |   |

|                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| <b>Part-time faculty</b> |     |
| 6                        | 33% |

4. Curriculum

- a. Considering the criteria of relevance, appropriateness, achievement of course objectives, currency, and future needs and plans, will your program be making any changes to **existing** curriculum to address any of these criteria? If yes, please describe the changes and your program's reasons for the changes. Please provide any data which supports your program's reasons for the changes to your curriculum. Include a discussion of how the changes will improve student learning.

No

- b. Will new curriculum be submitted to the Curriculum Committee for the academic year 2015-2016? If yes, please describe briefly what new curriculum is planned and the rationale for the new curriculum. Please provide any data which supports your reasons for the new curriculum. Include a discussion of how the changes will improve student learning.

No

5. General Program Planning

Use this area to describe any program plans, initiative, or objectives your program wishes to accomplish in 2015-16 and their impact on student learning or the student experience. Focus on what the plans are and how they are to be accomplished (not resources needed).

We want to host a high school speech tournament at LPC without incurring costs as a program ourselves. This activity will increase the promotion of our institution and recruitment of students to the program/college. LPC students would be directly involved with the hosting/management/operation of the activity. Faculty involvement could add to the learning outcomes of the students involved.

We have already made contact with a tournament director wanting to use our facility. We need to streamline the process of LPC room reservation.



#### IV. Resource Requests for AY2015-16

Complete all areas that apply to your program's resource needs for 2015-16 (**not all areas apply to all programs**).

For each request, in the rationale section:

- Describe how meeting this request will improve student learning or the student experience.
- Provide any data or evidence which supports this request.

##### A. Enrollment Management

1. Request: New FTEF. Indicate amount being requested.

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|

2. Rationale for request(s).

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|

##### B. Human Resources

1. Request: New or replacement faculty position(s).

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|

2. Rationale for faculty position request(s).

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|

3. Request: Classified staff position(s) (for example, new or replacement classified staff position(s) or increasing classified hours/position level).

|   |
|---|
| The Speech Department is requesting the replacement position of an Instructional Assistant 2. |
|---|

4. Rationale for classified staff position request(s).

This position – already on the Org Chart – is an integral part of the LPC Speech program; it has not been filled for six years. It is primarily designed to provide support for the Speech and Debate Team and is unique in that it requires travel to tournaments. At tournaments, the employee helps to keep team members organized and on task and the person would also be required to help judge competitions. Based on the number of students the college takes to a competition and based on the number of events the students participate in, a formula determines the number of judges that a school must provide for the tournament. If LPC does not bring enough judges or provide enough judging, the school is financially penalized for not bringing their quota or students are limited from participation. Besides tournament travel, the person helps the Director and Assistant Director with clerical, organizational, fundraising, and computer support needs. Without filling the position, the LPC Team is unable to bring as many students to tournaments as we have in the past. Fewer students have the opportunity to participate in Forensics activity while this position remains unfilled. Student learning and student learning opportunities suffer.

The Institutional Goals addressed by this position are:

Teaching and Learning

Institutional Advancement

Accountability

Academic and Professional Excellence

Diversity and Pluralism

Communication and Infrastructure

Community Life

The Forensics Center in the Center for the Arts was specifically built with office space to accommodate this person. The building, the room and the office has been completed, yet we have no individual to occupy the space that was designed and designated for them.

Without an Instructional Assistant, we are not able to manage a Forensics Team as we have in the past. The assistant will enable more one-on-one attention to team members and this person will allow more individuals to participate in intercollegiate competition. Our institution has provided the program with a wonderful new facility; we need staff to manage and grow the program. In the past, the assistant's workload has consisted of, but not been limited to, the following:

Managing team travel

Management of program resources  
Creation of handouts, flyers and publicity matters  
Filing and typing materials  
Fulfilling judging commitments  
Helping to direct Speech performances  
Assisting with the every semester on-campus Speech tournament  
Assisting students with research  
Editing of student written speeches  
Helping with Speech rehearsals/practice

If the Director of Forensics is left to shoulder these responsibilities solely by himself/herself then he/she is forced to limit the individual attention all members of the Team need and deserve.

### C. Financial

1. Request: Maintenance of, or increase in, existing program budget (e.g., for supplies, etc.).

The Forensics Program is requesting a budget increase to include a total operating budget of \$30,000.

2. Rationale for financial request(s).

Co-Curricular funds are the primary source of funding for the Forensics team. The team simply would not be able to travel and compete at intercollegiate tournaments without this resource. These funds have been reduced over the years from approximately \$19,000 per year to just over \$15,000 today. It should also be noted that the funding of 21+ years from the district office (approximately \$6,500 per year) has been entirely eliminated. We are now operating on a budget that is about 65% of what it once was. The Forensics team continues to grow in the amount of students we service as well as their level and frequency of competition. Our success on a local, national, and international level has been well documented and we are now on a steady pace of constant success. As a result, we now receive yearly invitations to the International Forensics Association's Championship Tournament. Whenever we attend this tournament we require the students to pay for their travel and meals because our budget simply does not allow for us to cover even a fraction of these expenses.

A budget increase would enable a celebrated program like the LPC Forensics Team to compete against the highest level of competition that the country and world have to offer. The Talk Hawks are acknowledged by our entire region as being *the* premier Forensics institution in all of Northern California when it comes to Individual Event competition. We are known throughout the state (and the nation) as having a prominent, successful, and thriving speech and debate team. The Forensics Team could (and should) be used by the college to spotlight the areas of success at the school. Students who travel to the International tournament have always appeared in the Best of the Best show at the end of the school year and having international award-winners perform at the Best of the Best can only lead to good-will and favorable impressions. Additionally, we had 2 students perform at the recent Livermore Tedx. The publicity that goes along with having an internationally active program should only help to bring more attention to our institution and it would prove to be an excellent recruiting tool for both the Forensics Team and the college (locally, state-wide, and internationally!).

Increasing our budget will deeply and significantly enrich the student collegiate experience and improve the ability of the faculty and staff to have a greater impact on the student experience. The direct academic benefit to the students reaches far beyond the Speech program as well. An increased budget will enable student to travel to more competitive and diverse regions of the country and the world. Every year we have had to ask for extra money from the LPC Foundation, the LPC President, and the ASLPC. Each year these groups have been generous enough to offer financial assistance. We should not have to ask. We should have an operating budget that meets the minimum needs of our program.

**D. Technology (software only – discuss hardware in section E)**

1. Request: Upgrade existing software or purchase new software.

N/A

2. Rationale for technology request(s).

N/A

**E. Facilities, Equipment (include technology hardware), and Supplies**

1. Request: Renovation or upgrade of existing facilities or new facilities.

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|

2. Rationale for facilities request(s).

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|

3. Request: Upgrading of existing equipment or purchase of new equipment.

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|

4. Rationale for equipment request(s).

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|

5. Request: New supplies

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|

6. Rationale for supplies request(s).

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|