

Program SAO Summary Evaluation Form

<p>Division/Program: Counseling and Matriculation, Student Services Academic Year Evaluated: 2017-18</p>	<p>Lead Evaluator: Ailsa Aguilar-Kitibutr, Psy.D.;</p> <p>Participants: Yancie Carter; Elizabeth Banuelos; Eric Begg; Yecica Bernardo; Frank Dunn; Armando Garcia; Earline Glover Laura Gomez; Andrea Hecht; Jamie Herrera; Patricia Jones; Deana Kelly-Silagy; Gilbert Maez; Desiree Martin; Rebecca Mendez; Debbie Orozco; Edward Palmer; Cindy Parish; Tahirah Simpson; Carlos Solorio; Michelle Tinoco; Veronica Valdez-Flynn; Janice Wilkins; Andre Wooten</p>
<p>Service Area Outcome Statement</p>	<p>Students will be able to demonstrate the following:</p> <p>a) to identify the reason/s for the utilization of the pre-and co-requisite challenge process;</p> <p>b) to appraise their background knowledge and skills relative to course/s preceding the intended course; and</p> <p>c) to pass the targeted course and maintain at least 2.0 GPA for the semester in which the challenge course was done and earn a cumulative GPA of 2.0.</p>
<p>Strategic Initiatives aligned with the SAO.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student Success <input type="checkbox"/> Facilities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communication, Culture, & Climate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Leadership & Professional Development <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Evaluation and Accountability</p>
<p>SAO Assessment Tool</p>	<p>Pre-requisite/Co-requisite Challenge Form; Semester's GPA; cumulative GPA</p>
<p>Criteria – What is “good enough”? Rubric</p>	<p>At least 95% of students are able to identify the reason/s for the utilization of the pre-and co-requisite challenge process;</p> <p>At least 90% of students are able to appraise their background knowledge and skills of the pre-and/or co-requisite to be able to pass the intended course;</p> <p>At least 85% of students pass the targeted course and maintain at least 2.0 GPA for the semester in which the challenge course was done and 2.0 overall GPA.</p>
<p>What are the results of the assessment? Are the results satisfactory?</p>	<p>All students were able to identify accurately their reason/s for the requests of challenging pre-requisite or co-requisite including advocating for themselves to get the approval from the discipline expert and/or Dean of the course/s in question. They were able to judge the breadth and depth of their knowledge and skills as well as assess the impact of the course/s to their graduation velocity in relation to their education plan. Only six students (11%) did not pass their course while fifty-six (89%) charted a passing grade.</p> <p>On a broader scope, the semester GPA of all the students averaged 2.67 and an average cumulative GPA of 2.53 boosting satisfactory results.</p>
<p>Were trends evident in the outcomes? Are there gaps?</p>	<p>All students exceeded the benchmarks set for student learning outcomes. This counseling service has promoted access and success as well as fostered communication and culture via augmented access to information and recognition of diversity in skills and knowledge. Grades are associated with multi-factors. Students who failed most likely did not appraise their skills accurately.</p>
<p>What content, structure, strategies might improve outcomes?</p>	<p>The counseling service delivery is effective. On the other hand, the Counseling Department can implement a more vigorous promotion of academic and student support services for students requesting the utilization of the pre-requisite/ co-requisite challenge</p>

	<p>process.</p> <p>By so doing, the Counseling Department effects a primary intervention to raise the awareness of students.</p>
<p>Will you change evaluation and/or assessment method and or criteria?</p>	<p>No changes on the pre- and co-requisite challenge processes have occurred; therefore, no modifications on research methodology and assessment instruments are necessary.</p>
<p>Evidence of Dialogue (Attach representative samples of evidence)</p>	<p><i>Check any that apply</i></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E-mail Discussion with <input type="checkbox"/> FT Faculty <input type="checkbox"/> Adjunct Faculty <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Date(s):</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Department Meeting. Date(s): meetings in September, March, April <input type="checkbox"/> Division Meetings. Date(s):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Campus Committees. Date(s): (ex: Program Review; Curriculum; Academic Senate; Accreditation & SLOs)</p> <p>SLO Dialogue focused on: Discussions were centered on processes and best practices for pre-and co-requisite challenges advisement and counseling, assessment and research methods including the results of the SAO's.</p>
<p>Will you rewrite the SAOs</p>	<p>No changes on the pre- and co-requisite challenge processes have occurred; therefore, no modification on the SAO's is necessary.</p>
<p>Response to program outcome evaluation and assessment? How were/are results used for program improvement.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Development <input type="checkbox"/> Intra-departmental changes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum action <input type="checkbox"/> Requests for resources and/or services</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Program Planning /Student Success</p> <p>Identified were opportunities to enhance counseling related materials as possible projects.</p>