



Annual Program Review 2011-2012 - INSTRUCTIONAL

Division - Program **VISUAL & PERFORMING ARTS CERAMICS**

Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be reviewed and submitted to the Program Review Committee by the Division Chair.

Author: Mark Poore, Robert Kibler

Division Chair: Dr. Peter Green

Date Received by Program Review: November 8, 2011

Overview of the Program

All degrees and certificates are considered programs. In addition, divisions may further delineate and define programs based on their assessment needs (developmental sequences, career track, etc).

The Ceramics Department serves students by offering a structured sequence of courses that satisfy general education humanities requirements for transfer to 4-year colleges and universities. Our Certificate of Proficiency in Ceramics prepares students for work in the ceramic industry as designers and technicians. Students are also prepared to work as individual studio artists.

Please list the most significant achievement accomplished since your last program review: The expansion of our kiln area was completed, tripling the available area for gas kiln and raku firing. Additionally, the Ceramics Department was the beneficiary of a major donation: a large, 30-cu. ft. gas kiln, which was installed in the expanded kiln area. This kiln was transported and installed with no cost to the college district as all expenses were paid from Ceramics Departmental sale proceeds. A kiln of this quality and size would have cost the college over \$20,000. The Ceramics Department continues a 30-year tradition of paying for studio equipment from sale proceeds and not requesting any college equipment funding.

List the current major strengths of your program

1. A strong, sequential curriculum that serves both introductory and advanced students
2. Strong student demand for courses as evidenced by our 100% fill rate
3. Professional faculty and staff who are all working artists as well as instructors

List the current weaknesses of your program

1. Lack of sufficient space for our glaze preparation and testing
2. Lack of funding for additional course sections to accommodate student demand. Courses are at 100% fill rate, with long wait lists of students trying to get into our classes
3. Lack of sufficient space for storage of student work-in-progress

1.0. Trend Analysis

For each program within the division, use the data provided to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures.

Program	Academic Year	FTEs Trend	FTEF Trend	WSCH / FTEF Trend	Full-Time % Trend	Fill Rate Trend	Success Rate Trend	Awards Trend
CERAMICS	2007-2008	82	3.8	697	73.3%	91.5%	74.4%	4
	2008-2009	89	4.0	706	62.5%	96.5%	69.9%	4
	2009-2010	93	4.0	741	62.5%	101.3%	74.1%	2
	2010-2011	82	4.9	532	64.2%	100.6%	81.1%	0
	% Change	-0.6%	+30.2%	-23.7%	-12.5%	+9.9%	+8.9%	-100.0%
	4-Yr. Trend	stable	increasing	decreasing	decreasing	stable	stable	Decreasing
VISUAL & PERFORMING ARTS DIVISION TOTAL	2007-2008	1,281	74.5	547	56.0%	86.5%	69.2%	36
	2008-2009	1,338	72.4	588	53.1%	97.5%	70.5%	40
	2009-2010	1,328	76.4	553	50.0%	96.6%	72.1%	22
	2010-2011	1,228	79.3	493	50.6%	94.4%	70.0%	28
	% Change	-4.1%	+6.3%	-9.8%	-9.7%	+9.2%	+1.3%	-22.2%
	4-Yr. Trend	stable	stable	stable	stable	stable	stable	decreasing

1.1. Describe how these trends have affected student achievement and student learning:

The data in this chart for Ceramics contain several factual errors (highlighted). These errors were discussed with Ed Karpp and he agreed that the 2010-2011 data are problematic. He suggested we substitute corrected data here. The FTEF for 2010-2011 (4.9) is incorrect. This number should be 4.0. The FTES data for 2010-2011 (82) is also incorrect. This number should be 90. As a result, the WSCH/FTEF number for 2010-2011 (532) is also incorrect. The WSCH/FTEF for 2010-2011 should be 715. These corrected data show that the ceramics department is operating at a very high level of efficiency. Statewide recommended WSCH/FTEF is 525. The ceramics department is recording a WSCH/FTEF of over 700 in each of the last 3 years and classes are over 100% fill rate. Our WSCH/FTEF is higher than the VPA division average, GCC average, and statewide recommended average. Note that student success rates have also increased over the past three-year period. Faculty efforts to reach underperforming students are paying off with student success rates increasing from 69% to 82% during this period.

1.2. Is there other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

It is important to note that each of the ceramics department class offerings includes 2 hours per week of student TBA hours. These are reportable hours for FTES for state funding. These hours are TBA and do not have an assigned, paid faculty member present. The ceramics department meets state requirements to count these hours for FTES by ensuring that students log in and out of

our computer system to record those 2 hours of TBA each week. Also, the state requires that a fully qualified instructor be present during these hours. Each of our classified, laboratory workers in Ceramics possesses a valid Master's Degree (or higher) in Ceramics. This qualifies us to claim those TBA hours as FTES. The importance of this is that the college is paid FTES for those 2 hours of TBA for each student in each section but GCC does not have to pay salary for those 2 hours for each student in each class. This is one of the main reasons the Ceramics Department maintains such a high WSCH/FTEF ratio.

2.0. Student Learning and Curriculum

Provide the following information on each department and program within the division.

List each Department within the Division as well each degree, certificate, or other program* within the Department	Active Courses with Identified SLOs		Active Courses Assessed		Course Sections Assessed		If this area has program outcomes have they been assessed? Yes or No
	n/n	%	n/n	%	n/n	%	
CERAMICS	9/9	100%	2/9	22%	2/8	25%	no

2.1. Please comment on the percentages above.

The Ceramics Department has begun the process of assessing all its course offerings. All courses have established SLO's defined. Thus far 2 of the 9 classes offered by the department have had SLO's assessed. This current year 2 more courses will be assessed, including Art 186 our most popular course with 4 sections. Art 195 will also be assessed this academic year. This will double the number of courses assessed from 22% to 44%, and increase the number of sections assessed from 22% to 75%. The following academic year the remainder of the courses will be assessed bringing our totals to 100% of courses and sections assessed to 100% by the end of Fall 2012.

- 2.2. a) Please provide a **link*** to all program assessment timelines here. This link could be to your division /department website, eLumen, etc.
- b) Briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses/programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of developing assessment timelines and course/program alignment matrixes.
- c) Based on the program assessment timelines you have developed and the evidence you have gathered, please comment briefly on how far along your division/program is in the assessment process.

<http://vision.glendale.edu/index.aspx?page=188>

- 2.3 a) Please provide a **link** to any program and/or relevant course assessment reports. Does the evidence from assessment reports show that students are achieving the desired learning outcomes?
- b) Please briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses and/or programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of the assessments conducted.

<http://vision.glendale.edu/index.aspx?page=188>

2.4 Please list all courses which have been reviewed in the last academic year.

Note: Curriculum Review is required by the Chancellors Office every 6 years.

Art 193

2.5 Please list all degree/certificate programs within the division that were reviewed in the last academic year.

None

2.6 For each program that was reviewed, please list any changes that were made.

Art 193 (Raku) was reviewed Spring 2011. The results showed a very high percentage of students meeting the SLO's for this course. For the first SLO, 83% of students were rated as exceeding the outcome requirements. For the second SLO, 100% of students met the outcome requirement. As a result, no changes were planned or implemented in course content or delivery.

3.0. Reflection and Action Plans

3.1 What recent activities, dialogues, discussions, etc. have occurred to promote student learning or improved program/division processes?

Faculty in the area meet regularly over lunches to discuss current issues. Courses that have multiple instructors especially are concerned that students are meeting or exceeding the mutually agreed upon student learning outcomes.

3.2 Using the weaknesses, trends and assessment outcomes listed on the previous pages as a basis for your comments, please briefly describe your plans and/or modifications for program/division improvements

Plans or Modifications	Anticipated Improvements
Our curriculum offerings are in demand and additional sections should be offered.	No anticipation of any additional funding for more sections in the near future due to state budget conditions.
Courses that have been reviewed for SLO's show students are meeting or exceeding outcomes, but more work is needed to complete a review of each course offering.	SLO review of Art 186 and Art 195 this current semester. This will bring the % of sections reviewed from our current 22% to 75%.
Additional space for glaze preparation	No anticipation of any additional funding for this capital improvement in the near future due to state budget conditions.