APR Report for 2017-2018
2018-2019 Cycle

Section I: Program Description

IA1. Program (Select your program from the drop down list)

Career and Technical Services

IA2. Other Program (If your program is not on the above list, write it in here)

Jessica Grimes

IB. Program Lead (Your first and last name)

IC. Program Mission Statement

Provide the Program's Mission Statement.

The mission of the Career and Technical Education (CTE) program is to educate, train, and support students pursuing careers in a variety of occupational fields. To accomplish this mission, it will provide relevant career, occupational, and CTE program data; facilitate programmatic and student support from community businesses and industries, and coordinate occupational field experiences for students.

ID. Program Summary

Provide a brief summary on the current status of the program being reviewed.

The Career and Technical Education program is an unofficial meta-program: it is neither a program of study for students to declare as a major, nor is it a division. Rather, it is a meta-program that works in tandem with the Career and Technical Education Team, comprised of eight members, mostly supported by Career and Technical grants. Second, this meta-program works with the Academic Senate Career and Technical Education Committee. Its charter entails "enhancing communication and transparency among CTE programs, non-CTE programs, management and administrators." Third, the meta-program works with four divisions--Applied Technologies, Sciences and Mathematics, Learning Support, and Social Sciences--that house CTE programs leading to degrees and certificates. Those programs are the following: Administrative Services, Court Reporting, Criminal Justice Administration, Dental Hygiene, Direct Support Education, Early Care, Education and Family Studies, Energy Technology, General Business, Industrial Health and Safety, Information Technology, Management, and Welding. As a meta-program, it facilitates grants focused on the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) "Doing What Matters" Strong Workforce CTE campaign: "More and 'Better' CTE" or more students in better CTE programs.

Section II: Looking Back—2017-2018

IIA. Present the Results (Rubric Criterion 3)

Provide a descriptive summary of the outcomes from the 2017-2018 cycle of program review.

According to the previous APR, the outcomes identified by the CCCCO's Strong Workforce metrics were "More and 'Better' CTE." Based on those metrics, we did not increase enrollment. According to the Management Information Systems (MIS) Division for Perkins, in 2016-2017, 17,672 students were identified as enrolled in CTE. That number dipped in 2017-2018 to 13,438. However, we did see a modest increase in completions. In 2016-2017, 203 students in CTE either earned a certificate, degree, or reached transfer, whereas in 2017-2018, that number increased to 228 with an increase in the following **special populations**: limited English proficiency, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities. These fluctuations may be due to the FTES that Taft College receives from its contract with WESTEC. What percentage of WESTEC students accounts for these fluctuations remains unclear, so this reason remains mere conjecture.

Notably, the following programs increased in enrollment by 5% or more between 2017-2018: Business Administration (~14%); Early Care and Education (~12%); Petroleum Technology (~19%); and Management and Development and Supervision (~8%).

However, the following programs experienced dramatic decreases in enrollment: Office Technology (~80%); Industrial and Occupational Safety and Health (~14%); and Manufacturing and Industrial Technology (30,000%). More research should reveal what accounts for these dramatic decreases as these programs are not housed primarily with WESTEC. Moreover,

The "'Better'" CTE outcome is somewhat difficult to measure as the criteria of what constitutes a "better" program has not been clarified. As defined by the CCCCO, a better program is one that increases its enrollment, completions, and employment. In the previous program review, there was mention of using the job placement rate to measure the success of a program. However, the Chancellor's Office produces scant data on job placement; in addition, its most recent data is two years old. For instance, Launch Board charts 48% of 888 students attained a living wage in 2015-2016, down from 59% of 1,003 students the previous year. Additionally, there is only one year of data related to students landing a job related to the CTE pathway, and that was from 2014-2015 when 81% of 26 students reported having a job in their field.

What this summary reveals is that there are more questions than answers, and thus a need to analyze the data to understand puzzling trends and where we might begin to make adjustments to improve completion, employment, and transfer.

IIB. Probe the Results: I Wonder . . . (Rubric Criteria 1, 3)

In this section, judge whether the activities you implemented in 2017-2018 to reach your goals were effective. Did the activities have an effect on the outcome? Please describe WHY you believe your outcomes came out the way they did. Did you reach your goals? If yes, explain why. If you did not reach your goals, explain why.

In the "Looking Forward" section, the goal was to capture the financial status of students in CCCapply for WESTEC students. While this activity could have produced increased funding, its correlation to the "More [students] and 'Better' CTE [programs]" outcomes needs to be more comprehensive. Therefore, outlining clearly defined goals and continuously measuring those goals could become a new practice and process. One way to accomplish this is to begin to look at data on a granular level. One way to parcel the data is to understand student behavior when declaring themselves in a CTE major versus enrolling in a CTE course.

As Aldrin's reports show, from my "I wonder" statements, there is more to learn from what students declare versus what they do.

I wonder, for example, why more students complete 6 units than 9 units, the momentum point identified by the Chancellor's Office that predicts the likelihood for completion. For instance, in the Administration of Justice pathway, there were 27 students who completed 6 units in the Spring of 2018 versus 6 students who completed 9 units that spring. Of those 27 students, 8 were not declared majors for the Administration of Justice degree, including the AD-T degree. Even more interesting is that if you included previous semesters, the number of students who completed 6 units increases to 62 versus 34 students who completed 9 units. Also, in the spring of 2018, 19 were declared transferrable and non-transferable CJA majors.

I wonder why some students enroll in fewer degree-applicable CTE courses, for the same trend was observed in ECEF—45 students completed 6 units versus 13 students who completed 9 units in the spring of 2018. If you included previous semesters, the number of students who earned 6 units in that major by the spring of 2018 balloons to 55 versus 41 who earned 9 units. However, only 17 of those students had declared an ECEF pathway.

Similarly, in Business Administration, there were 16 students who completed 6 units versus 2 who completed 9 units. Again, if you include previous semesters, the number of students who completed 6 units in spring 2018 was 46 versus 10 who completed 9 units. Also, 9 students were declared majors.

What constitutes this baffling behavior? How many of the students who completed 6 units persisted to complete another 3 units for a total of 9 units the following semester? Are these behaviors different based on whether a students' pathway is an AD-T versus an A.S. degree? Do these numbers represent what the Chancellor's Office classifies as "Short Term/Career" students? How do we differentiate students' interests and needs based on their behaviors, and how do we use data to increase completion of certificates and degrees, a mutual goal shared by CTE grants and the Chancellor's Office?

Another goal listed in the previous APR was an expansion of CTE courses for dual enrollment. The Dual Enrollment committee has worked to expand more course offerings to high school students to increase enrollment; however, the one CTE course offered, welding, was canceled due to a scheduling conflict. In addition, I wonder how the CCAP (College and Career Access Partnership) Agreement with TUHS can be strengthened to bolster dual/concurrent enrollment.

Still, an increase in enrollment does not necessarily directly correlate to producing better programs, hence the need to increase the participation of industry partners to help understand industry demands so that students do not only complete CTE programs, but also, are more qualified to be placed into jobs closely related to their programs.

Therefore, I wonder if there could be more of a deliberative process to track data correlating efforts to outcomes where we could see if an intervention or new if industry partner participation improved a program. It would help if the CTE Team could work with produce the types of surveys and tracking to understand how its activities have fared.

IIC. Ideate Innovations: What if . . . (Rubric Criteria 1, 5)

In this section, describe activities you believe would have an effect on your 2018-2019 outcome measures.

Integrated planning needs to be at the foundation of improvement. Once there is clear alignment with grant outcomes, which could become CTE PSLOs, we can understand where we are doing well and where we need to improve.

Other factors could contribute to "More and 'Better' CTE." For instance, labor market data could factor into program review to gauge what program needs that correspond to industry demands. Analyzing labor market data could help us determine if new programs are needed, thus, responding to the dynamism of the ever-changing workforce. In addition, more input from all stakeholders—faculty, counselors, the CTE team, IR, IT, and a representative from financial services could help demystify the barriers to improving programs and increasing funding. Annual cost analyses of programs could help determine what adjustments, if any, should be made, although faculty, in concert with division chairs should be at the helm of what the analyses might mean. Furthermore, as the Dual Enrollment Committee continues to expand its course offerings, we can begin to strengthen our relationship with area high schools to expand opportunities for students in the community.

Section III: Looking Forward—2018-2019

III. List Your 2018-2019 Goals—Be Quantitative!

List your 2018-2019 APR goals in terms of their expected changes on the outcome measures as indicated earlier. Each goal that requires resources, impacts other areas, or otherwise is substantive requires the submission of an APR Goal form. Keep in mind the scoring rubric criteria:

1. The relationship between program review narrative and the APR Goal is evident and strongly supported by evidence.
2. The APR Goal directly implements institutional planning document goals.
3. The outcome directly implements institutional planning outcomes, and is transferrable and/or scalable institutionally.
4. APR Outcome indicators, methods and/or timelines use institutional measures, transferrable/scalable institutionally
5. Before/after benchmarks and timelines are completely specified, identical methods, transferrable/scalable.

> 1). Run reports on CTE freshmen to learn what programs they declare, if they enroll, and in what courses for the 2018-2019 academic year
> 2). Determine the needs of the community through advisory board meetings and surveys
> 3). Ascertain how current CTE programs correlate to current labor market trends
> 4). Establish a biannual dinner for CTE industry partners during the fall and spring semesters
> 5). Identify/develop Program Level Outcomes based on the integration of grant goals and institutional planning documents
> 6). Run reports on what courses students are taking recognized by COCI versus non-COCI, CTE courses

Section IV (Optional): Evaluation of Program Review and Planning Process

IVA. Evaluation of Program Review and Program Planning Process

In this cycle of program review, what aspects of the program review and program planning process worked best and why?

The questions are succinct without sacrificing substance. I appreciated how the APR invites a deeper dive into the data to initiate broader conversations that resulted from asking probing questions.

IVB. Evaluation of Program Review and Program Planning Process

In this cycle of program review, what aspects of the program review and program planning process would you change and why?

Coming from a faculty perspective, my experience with APR has been enriched by collaboration.

Therefore, I wonder if non-educational programs that support educational programs should have time marked for teams to work on the APR together during in-service. Additionally, as program demands necessitate increased collaboration, I wonder how other key stakeholders across campus can become more involved in analyzing data together.

Since CTE programs receive district and grant funds, I hope that we can begin to add more data from the labor market, from special populations, and from the momentum points that the Chancellor's Office has identified as significant for student success. In addition, I wonder if there could be annual professional development on analyzing data for program improvement in instructional and non-instructional programs, to perhaps, gain greater clarity on what a non-instructional annual program review entails.