

Student Services Annual Program Review Update

I. General Information

Date: 7/8/10

Program/Department:

Hope

Authors of Report:

Sandi Kovach-Long, Chris Magnin, Monica Sheirich, input by Janet Takahashi, Priscilla Davis

II. Status Since Previous Program Review

What significant changes have occurred since the last complete program review? Were those changes based on SSLO assessments? How have these changes affected your program? You may also address how these changes affect the following: resource allocation requests, strategic initiatives, "main areas for improvement", mission statements, or physical/organizational restructuring.

Change: IA Transferred	Effect: Vacant IA position filled at Alfred site. Scope of services and instruction available greatly enhanced with additional position. Relieves instructor from doing IA duties.
Change: IA Saved	Effect: IA position at Whittier site slated for bumping. Position put into "Escrow 2" to save staff.
Change: Grant Application	Effect: Applied for not funded yet... grant for on-campus program with job development and internships. Based upon needs identified in SSLO.
Change:	Effect:

III. SSLO Information

	How many SSLOs have been written?	How many were assessed in 2009-10?	How many are committed to be assessed in 2010-11?	How many SSLOAC* were completed in 2009-10?	How many SSLOAC are committed to be completed in 2010-11?
Program/Department:	4	4	?	4	?

	Total	How many participated in writing SSLO?	How many participated in assessment phase in 2009-10?	How many will participate in assessment phase in 2010-11?	How many participated in Reflection & Enhancement discussions in 2009-10?
Faculty/Staff in Program:	7	4	3	3	4

*SSLOAC = a complete SSLO Assessment Cycle includes writing an SSLO, assessing the SSLO, reflecting on the results /process, and planning enhancements to improve student learning/achievement.

SSLOAC Discussion and Analysis: Summarize the discussions and analyses of your program/departments' SSLOAC results.

Student Services Annual Program Review Update

The HOPE team met 2 times for 2008-2009 and 4 times for 2009-2010. The sites were at 3 different locations consolidated into 2 for 2009-10. Additional phone, email, or fax contact was done in-between. SSLO 1 "Identify/explain" 40% met the criteria, 40% partially met, and 20% did not meet. Different methods of delivery were tried with an improvement of 20%. Continue exploring different methodologies to suit varied learning styles. SSLO 2 "objectives" 74% met the criteria. Motivation strategies utilizing peer pressure and "contests" were implemented resulting in 81% meeting the criteria. Continue using strategies. SSLO 3 "services provided" 63.5% were satisfied. The major complaint being lack of community-based employment and a desire by some students to take classes on-campus. The partner agency, HOPE, is responsible for community employment. A grant was submitted: College To Career Program, in order for De Anza to become more involved in job development and placement as well as on-campus participation. SSLO 4 "ideas/concerns/questions" 43% strongly agreed and 21% somewhat agreed that the college addressed student's ideas/concerns

/ questions. Again, the main dissatisfaction was related to community employment and lack of subcontract work.

Detailed data supporting some or all of the statistics collected.

Patterns that emerge or are confirmed when SSLO data are viewed, either alone or in combination with other data (such as student success or retention rates) at the program level.

What your goals were for any 'benchmark' percentages and whether you achieved those goals.

Evidence of value derived from the SSLOAC process within your program.

Some of the challenges your staff and faculty continue to face in attempting to hit your program goals with respect to SSLO.