

De Anza College 2017 APRU

Business Department 2017 APRU – Complete as of March 21, 2017

Program Mission Statement: We just have one program learning outcome: Each student shall acquire the knowledge and skills described in the course level SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes) of the Business courses that student completed at De Anza College. Forty-five of our 46 course-level SLOs support Institutional Core Competency #2, Information Literacy. Forty of our course-level SLOs support Institutional Core Competency #5, Critical Thinking. Nine of our course-level SLOs support Institutional Core Competency #1, Communication and Expression. Six of our course-level SLOs support Institutional Core Competency #3, Physical/mental wellness and personal responsibility, and six of our course-level SLOs support Institutional Core Competency #4, Civic capacity for global, cultural, social, and environmental justice. See reference document busdept_supportofmission.pdf for further details.

I.A.1 What is the Primary Focus of Your Program?: Transfer

I.A.2 Choose a Secondary Focus of Your Program?: Career/Technical

I.B.1 Number Certificates of Achievement Awarded: 37

I.B.2 Number Certif of Achievement-Advanced Awarded: 4

I.B.3 #ADTs (Associate Degrees for Transfer) Awarded: 226

I.B.4 # AA and/or AS Degrees Awarded: 60

I.C.1. CTE Programs: Impact of External Trends:

I.C.2 CTE Programs: Advisory Board Input:

I.D.1 Academic Services & Learning Resources: #Faculty served:

I.D.2 Academic Services & Learning Resources: #Students served:

I.D.3 Academic Services & Learning Resources: #Staff Served:

I.E.1 Full time faculty (FTEF): 15.5

I.E.2 #Student Employees:

I.E.3 % Full-time : Over the three-year period from 2012-13 to 2015-16, the ratio of our FT % to our PT % improved from 32%:55% to 36%:44%.

I.E.4 #Staff Employees:

I.E.5 Changes in Employees/Resources:

II.A Enrollment Trends: Our enrollment was up 3.7% in 2015-16 compared with the preceding year.

II.B.1 Overall Success Rate: Our success rate overall has improved slightly over the past two years from 69% in 2013-14 to 71% in both 2014-15 and 2016-17. While this is a bit lower than the average for De

Anza College as a whole during this period (76%-77%), we attribute this difference to the fact that we offer many challenging courses, including some that are taught as upper division courses at most four-year colleges that offer them.

II.B.2 Plan if Success Rate of Program is Below 60%: Not applicable, since our success rate is 71%.

II.C Changes Imposed by Internal/External Regulations:

III.A Growth and Decline of Targeted Student Populations: Enrollment in our program among targeted student groups is up 0.9% in 2015-16 compared to the previous year. Targeted student populations represented 31% of our enrollment in 2015-16.

III.B Closing the Student Equity Gap: In our April 2014 Comprehensive Program Review, we set a goal to decrease the equity gap in our department from its 2012-13 level of 18.1% percentage points to something lower. We implemented a number of actions in about a third of our classes in support of this goal. In 2013/14, most of which was behind us when we set this goal, the gap fell to 17.3%. In 2014/15, the gap worsened to 19.0%, even though success rates among the targeted populations increased from 57.3% to 58.1%. The reason for this is that success rates among the non-targeted groups increased even more, from 74.6% to 77.1%. In 2015/16 however, we believe our efforts began to bear fruit. The gap fell from 19.0% to 14.7%, its lowest level since we began keeping records. We hope and expect to reduce this gap still further in 2016/17 and beyond.

III.C Plan if Success Rate of Targeted Group(s) is Below 60%: In 2015-16, for the first time since we began keeping records, we achieved a success rate above 60% among members of the targeted ethnic groups, achieving a success rate of 60.7% among these groups. We attribute this success to the many changes our instructors have made in their individual courses, spurred by the many dialogs we have had as a department on this topic over the past three years. However, we want to improve our success rate among the targeted groups further. We have noticed that the success rate for targeted groups for two of the 18 courses we offer, Business 54 (Business Mathematics) and Business 58 (The Business Plan) are well below the mean for the department. Specifically, the mean success rate for our program for targeted populations was 60.7% in 2015-16, while the success rates in these two courses that same year were 26% and 20% for Business 54 and 58, respectively. These two courses seem, on their face, to be fertile ground for further increasing our department's success rate among targeted populations. Accordingly, our department chair, Byron Lilly, has initiated a dialog with the instructors of these courses to explore ways they might modify their courses to increase the success rate of members of the targeted populations without in any way compromising the academic rigor or pedagogical effectiveness of their courses. We hope to report positive results from these explorations in next year's program review.

III.D Departmental Equity Planning and Progress: Covered in items III.B and III.C above.

IV.A Cycle 2 PLOAC Summary (since June 30, 2014): 0%

IV.B Cycle 2 SLOAC Summary (since June 30, 2014): 27/46 = 59%.

V.A Budget Trends:

V.B Funding Impact on Enrollment Trends:

V.C.1 Faculty Position(s) Needed: None Needed Unless Vacancy

V.C.2 Justification for Faculty Position(s):

V.D.1 Staff Position(s) Needed: None needed unless vacancy

V.D.2 Justification for Staff Position(s)::

V.E.1 Equipment Requests: Under \$1,000

V.E.2 Equipment Title, Description, and Quantity: We would like to purchase and install the equipment necessary to amplify the instructor's voice electronically in two of our three most-used classrooms. Those classrooms are Forum 3 and MCC-17. We feel the third classroom we use often, Admin 102, does not offer enough sonic isolation between the classrooms it borders for voice amplification to be appropriate in that room. We envision the necessary equipment consisting of a clip-on microphone attached to a battery-powered transmitter, together with a "base station" or receiver that can be attached to the existing amplifier and speakers already located in these two rooms. We estimate this equipment will cost about \$200 per room, for a total of \$400 for two rooms.

V.E.3 Equipment Justification: Some of our faculty are aging. Their voices are not as strong as they were when they were younger. Some of our part-time instructors, while younger, speak more quietly than they should sometimes. We believe that if students could hear every word spoken by the instructor with crystal-clarity, our classroom instruction would be more effective. The two classrooms we are seeking to amplify are pretty large. Forum 3 holds about 105 students and MCC-17 about 88 students. We think this equipment will provide a significant enhancement to the quality of instruction in those two rooms at a modest expense. All instructors who use these classrooms could use this equipment or not, at their individual option. Use would not be limited to faculty who teach for our department. All who use these rooms could potentially benefit.

V.F.1 Facility Request:

V.F.2 Facility Justification:

V.G Equity Planning and Support:

V.H.1 Other Needed Resources:

V.H.2 Other Needed Resources Justification:

V.J. "B" Budget Augmentation:

V.K.1 Staff Development Needs:

V.K.2 Staff Development Needs Justification:

V.L Closing the Loop:

Submitted by: Byron Lilly, Dan Salah, Michele Fritz, Emily Garbe, Emanuele Cappello, Manisha Karia, Sujung Park

Last Updated: 03/13/2017

APRU Complete for 2016-17: Yes

#SLO STATEMENTS Archived from ECMS: 57

