

Program: Graphic Design & Digital Media

Division: Arts & Humanities

Date: November 4, 2024

Writer(s): Peter Kuo

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Peter Kuo

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

Uses: This Program Review will inform the audience about your program. It is also used in creating division summaries, determining college planning priorities, and determining the allocation of resources. The final use is to document the fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

Please note: Program Review is NOT a vehicle for making requests. All requests should be made through appropriate processes (e.g., Instructional Equipment Request Process) or directed to your dean or supervisor.

Time Frame: This Program Review should reflect your program status during the 23-24 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2024-25.

Helpful Links:

- ★ [Tools for Writers](#) - with contacts for help with specific sections.
- ★ [Program Review Glossary](#) - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ [Fall 2023 Program Reviews](#)
- ★ [Program Review FAQs](#)

For help with your program review, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu

Sections

There are four sections to the document:

1. Review your program, including curriculum updates, accomplishments, challenges, and planning.
2. Data Analysis
3. SLO/SAO Review
4. Feedback on the PR template and process

Instructions

1. Please answer each question with enough detail to present your information, but it doesn't have to be long.
2. If the requested information does not apply to your program, write "Not Applicable."
3. Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.
4. Send an electronic copy of this form to Program Review chair, Karin Spirn, and your Dean by Monday, Nov. 4, 2024

5. Even if you don't have much to report, we want to hear from you, so your voice is part of the college planning process.

Equity is a guiding principle. Here is the LPC definition:

Las Positas College will achieve equity by changing the impacts of structural racism, ableism, homophobia, and systematic poverty on student success and access to higher education, achieved through continuous evaluation and improvement of all services. We believe in a high-quality education focused on learning and an inclusive, culturally relevant environment that meets the diverse needs of all our students.

LPC Equity Definition: Equity is parity in student educational outcomes. It places student success and belonging for students of color and disproportionately impacted students at the center of focus.

Section 1: Your Program In 2024-2025

Please place an X next to N/A where relevant

A. Accomplishments: Identify your main accomplishments from the 23-24 academic year.

Some areas you **may** want to note in your explanation are:

- Did your accomplishments support your program's plans identified in recent PRs?
- Did they relate to guided pathways?
- Were they in support of the colleges [equity definition](#)?
- Did they connect to any of the college [planning priorities](#)?
- Did you receive any positive/negative feedback from students?
- Are there any innovations or new processes you'd like to integrate?
- Has your program changed in response to the SCFF model of college funding? (completions, increasing enrollment, offering certificates, degrees, etc.)?

Updated most curriculum and will complete by fall of 2024.

Work with art department to complete updates to ARTS24 (3D design and modeling) to include working with 3d modeling software. Currently working on 3d modeling and animation course for GDDM, long term plan is to incorporate the courses and create a new certificate/degree. Many students are interested in 3D modeling and animation and this was the fastest way to introduce the material into the curriculum while we develop a new course.

Enrollment is great. Fall 23 saw an enrollment of 148 students and Spring 24 had 160 students. The average enrollment per section is at 28 students. This is the highest enrollment average we've seen in many years. Students appreciate classes that are offered as hyflex, which gives them more options for how to attend class. Offering a section as hyflex allows to increase the enrolment cap for the section as well. Many students have long commutes, and having hyflex as an option sometimes mean the difference between missing class and being able to attend.

N/A_____

B. Challenges, Pain Points, and Needs

What significant or ongoing challenges or obstacles did your Program face during the 23-24 academic year, especially related to accomplishing program goals/plans? Consider funding, staffing, materials, facilities, outside requirements such as legislative mandates, working on equity gaps, etc. Highlight/identify any challenges mentioned in previous reviews.

Enrollment is good, but we continue to have to cross list courses. Introductory courses get good enrollment but the advanced courses are lower enrolled usually do not have enough students to be its own class. Some capstone classes (portfolio), cannot be offered as frequently as we would like, making it difficult for students to adhere to the program map, and thus taking longer to complete their degree or certificate. There are many students who have not completed their degree with LPC because they had to move or transfer, and end up finishing their courses

elsewhere. When possible we've offered independent studies for students, but we will not be able to offer that solution to everyone.

Because our classes are a mixture of lab and lecture, sections are usually long. With the current schedule the single classroom we have is often at capacity. As we plan for the program to grow and to offer new courses and certificates, this will make scheduling difficult unless we offer sections that start really early (730am) or end really late at night (930pm). The move to the steam building will allow us to move to a new space, but in the future we (hopefully) will need an additional classroom.

N/A_____

C. Planning: What are your program's most important plans, either new or continuing?

We are currently planning on moving to the new STEAM building!

We have also sunset s a couple of courses (GDDDM 65 Electronic prepress, GDDM 67 InDesign 2, GDDM63 Multimedia production, and discontinued the digital print design certificate.

Currently working on developing a 2D animation course and a 3D modeling and animation course. If courses are successful, we plan on creating a new certificate in the future.

N/A_____

D. Identify any college, district, or legislative barriers to your program's equity work. What suggestions do you have for minimizing or eliminating these barriers?

Barriers:

Suggestions:

N/A_✓____

E. Curriculum Updates

Reasons for updating include that it is required every two (CTE) or five (non-CTE) years, there is a program or college need, starting a new program, or new legislation.

1. Are you planning to update any curriculum in 24-25?

Yes_✓____ No_____

We are continuing curriculum updates that have not been completed in the 23-24 cycle, including GDDM 2 (Wordpress), GDDM 45A/B (Digital Painting I/II), GDDM 51 /Arts 26 (Color Theory), GDDM 57 (Branding & Identity), GDDM 58 (Photoshop II), GDDM 62 (Web Design II)

Sunsetting GDDM 63 (multimedia production), GDDM 67 (InDesign II). Deactivation of the "Digital Print Certificate" is in progress

New courses GDDM 10 (3d Modeling & Animation, GDDM 12 (2D animation) currently in development and working its way through curriculum and expected to be able to be offered Fall 2025

2. Please review your program [maps](#). Do you need to make any modifications?

Yes No

3. If yes, compare each [Program Map](#) to your current course offerings and sequencing. Pay close attention to prerequisite information, and classes offered only during certain semesters.

a) If your map requires a **non-curricular change** (i.e., course sequencing), consult your [Pathway counseling faculty liaison](#) to initiate changes.

b) **If your map requires a curricular change** (Program modifications) - these are initiated through the Curriculum Committee.

Any questions? Contact the [Curriculum Chair](#) or the [Curriculum and SLO Specialist](#).

We are deactivating some classes (prepress, indesign ii, multimedia production), which may affect both course sequencing and program modifications. Curriculum chair Craig will make changes for our program because he said it was pretty straight forward.

Section 2: Data Analysis – Quantitative and Qualitative

IR Data Review: Discuss any significant trends in the data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (or any other data you use for decision-making and planning).

(Note: Not all Programs have IR data available; if your program does not have a data packet or dashboard data, you may note that in the response box and reach out to [the IR team](#).)

Here are a few samples of data to review and reference if that's helpful.

- IR Data packets [are available here](#) (Posted Fall 24)
- Academic & Career [Pathway Specific data](#) (Posted Fall 24)
- Your program's survey data
- [Transfer data](#)
- Course Set Standard Overview & Success Rates Dashboard are in the middle of [this page](#)

B. Program-Set Standard (Instructional Programs Only):

The program-set standard is a baseline that alerts programs if their student success rates have dipped suddenly. 95% of the rolling 5-year average. There are valid reasons a program does not meet the Program Set Standard; when a program does not meet this standard, they are asked to examine possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate. | [Program-set standard data can be found on this page](#).

1. Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion?

Yes No

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

Section 3: SLOs/SAOs: Assessment of Student Learning and Support

Program Review is the college's major data source on student learning and support and is, therefore, regularly reviewed. *Each year, programs must discuss their PSLOs, CSLOs, or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs.) This helps us to see how our students are progressing in their learning.* For assistance with these questions and instructions on running reports using eLumen, [click here](#).

Please complete at least one of the following three sections based on what is appropriate for your program.

Check at least one below:

- C1: Instructional Programs with PSLOs (disaggregated PSLOs)**
- C2: Instructional Programs with CSLOs (Departments without degrees, non-major courses, and/or other courses up for assessment)**
- C3: Non-Instructional Programs (SAOs)**

C1: Instructional Programs with PSLOs (disaggregated PSLOs)

To assess PSLOs within eLumen, CSLOs must be correctly mapped to only one PSLO, and every mapped CSLO must have assessment data. Please review the items below and proceed accordingly.

- If the CSLOs are mapped correctly and there is data for each CSLO, then continue to question 2.
 - If the CSLOs have assessment data and the mapping needs to be completed, then complete the mapping within eLumen ([See SLO Handbook, p. 7](#)) and continue to question 2.
 - If not all mapped CSLOs have assessment data, then you cannot assess the PSLO. In this case, continue to section C2.
1. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all courses will be assessed by June 2026. (between Fall 2023 – Spring 2026)
Will at least one SLO be assessed in each course by June 2026?
Yes No

We currently do not have an updated 3-year plan for Fall 2023-Spring 2026. Discipline coordinator will update 3-year plan and then assess all courses on the plan. We are also missing assessments for GDDM 57 (Branding & Identity) and GDDM 52 (typography). Discipline coordinator will create assessment and add assessments into elumen. We expect the 3-year plan for Fall 23-Spring 26 to be similar to the previous 3-year plan.

If not, please update your 3-year plan to include any courses you missed. If you plan to revise your 3-year plan, then send your updated plan to the [Curriculum and SLO Specialist and the SLO Chair](#).
 2. Based on your [3-year plan](#), list the PSLO(s) for the academic year 2023-2024 that your program selected to review and explain why these were chosen.
The PSLO we chose to review is “Students are able to use industry standard software with technical proficiency and create documents to required specifications for delivery to clients”. This PSLO is chosen

because it is a foundational skill required for both production and design work and is one that is assessed through multiple courses and we have data for both semesters.

3. What percentage of faculty completed the planned CSLO assessments? (In eLumen, [run a Faculty Participation report](#) for 23-24).
 - 83.333 % 40 out of 48 Assessments
4. Analysis of PSLO(s): What conclusions can be drawn about student learning and equity in your program based on eLumen and/or other data? You may want to consider disaggregated data. When using eLumen [See the Guide](#) for instructions on how to disaggregate PSLO data.

Aggregated data shows typical student success rates, with about 50% demonstrating mastery on the PSLO, about 20% at above average, around 13% at “average” and the rest is below average or no demonstrated achievement.

Disaggregated data shows no major difference in success rates between male/female students, students above/below age of 21. It’s difficult to draw conclusions about breakdown by ethnicity because our program is small and there are many categories for ethnicity, leaving many fields blank. The report show that the majority of students are non-first-generation college students (155:51) and non-first-generation college students do have a higher success rate at the “mastery” level (46% vs 33%) and a lower level of “no demonstrated achievement (5% vs 19%) (19% is 10 students across the two semesters)

The other disaggregated data we looked at was by section attributes. Data show that fully face to face classes have much higher student success rates (72% Mastery) compared to hybrid (for us its primarily hyflex, at 42%) and also lower “no demonstrated achievement” rate (9 versus 17 percent). Students who are in the classroom are generally more engaged and less distracted. Even with technologies like zoom and owl, screen sharing, file sharing, students in the classroom can much more easily ask questions and have it answered promptly, compared to having students enable screensharing...etc. When asked if there are questions, students (online synchronous) who are more likely to ask questions are the same students who also have another class that’s f2f or have taken a f2f class in the past. It’s also easier to see if a student is struggling and not asking questions while in the classroom, or to just offer casual suggestions based on what they are working on in lab.

Having taught multiple hyflex classes in the last few semesters, my experience is that the many students treat the class as a fully online synchronous class rather than actually take advantage of the hyflex (coming in certain days and logging on for others). Students who are online also sometimes have technology issues such as non functioning cameras/microphones, laggy internet connections..etc.

Students in f2f classes also request to have zoom links frequently for a number of reasons (family, medical, work, commute)... Students seem to prefer f2f classes for the experience, but like the convenience of being able to be online (compared to missing class entirely).

5. Based on discussions with others in your program, explain potential changes designed to improve student learning and close any equity gaps identified through the analysis of PSLO data. Please also note if you decide to update any CSLOs or PSLOs based on this analysis (If updating, then you may do this through eLumen, see the [SLO Handbook](#) if you need instructions on how to do this).

Despite lower success rates, students like being able to attend online as an option for most classes. Some even ask why certain classes aren't being offered as hyflex. Hyflex classes also allow us to increase enrollment caps for sections since some students will always be online. Some instructors record lectures for classes that have zoom meetings, allowing all students to go back and review lecture topics, although this is not a datapoint that elumen can disaggregate so we don't have information on whether having recorded lectures increase student success rates for our program.

6. If you experienced any challenges in completing your PSLO assessment process, please list those below along with any items that would help you improve this process in the future.

C2: Instructional Programs with only CSLOs - Departments without degrees, non-major courses, and/or other courses up for assessment

1. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all courses will be assessed by June 2026. (between Fall 2023 – Spring 2026)

Will all courses be assessed by June 2026?

Yes____ No____

If not, please update your 3-year plan to include any courses you missed or if you plan to revise your 3-year plan, then send your updated plan to the [Curriculum and SLO Specialist](#), and the [SLO Chair](#).

2. Based on your [3-year plan](#), list the CSLO(s) for the academic year 2023-2024 that your program selected to review.
3. What percentage of faculty completed the planned assessments for the selected CSLO? (In eLumen, [run a Faculty Participation report](#) for 23-24).
4. What conclusions can you draw from the CSLO data and reflections in eLumen. If you used any additional evidence or methods to answer this question, please explain.
5. Explain potential program changes designed to improve student learning. Please also note if you have decided to update any CSLOs or PSLOs based on analysis (If updating, then you may do this through eLumen, see the [SLO Handbook](#) if you need instructions on how to do this).
6. If you experienced any challenges in completing your CSLO assessment process, please list those in the box below, along with any items that would help you improve this process in the future.

C3: Non-Instructional Programs (SAOs)

1. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all courses will be assessed by June 2026. (between Fall 2023 – Spring 2026)

Will all courses be assessed by June 2026?

Yes____ No____

If not, please update your 3-year plan to include any courses you missed or if you plan to revise your 3-year plan, then send your updated plan to the [Curriculum and SLO Specialist](#), and the [SLO Chair](#).

2. Based on your [3-year plan](#), list the SAO(s) for the academic year 2023-2024 that your program selected to review.
3. Based on discussion with others in your area, what conclusions can be drawn from the SAO data and reflection questions from eLumen or other sources of data?
4. Explain any planned changes to improve outcomes in your service area. Please note if you have decided to update any SAOs based on this analysis.
5. If you experienced any challenges in completing your SAO assessment process, please list those below, along with any items that would help you improve this process in the future.

Section 4: Suggestions for the Program Review Committee (optional)

What questions or suggestions about this year's Program Review forms or process do you have?

I heart program review.