The Program Review Process

Program review ensures that the college’s academic programs are effective and responsive to students and the local community within the limitations of available resources. The review process includes the systematic collection, analysis and interpretation of relevant data, an assessment of progress made in achieving student learning outcomes, the fulfillment of program needs, and the accomplishment of program objectives and goals.

Academic program review is an integral part of educational planning, supports the Enrollment Management Plan, and enables the college to meet the accreditation standards of the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior College (ACCJC).

The major objective of program review at Feather River College is to guide the development of the Education Plan. Essential items within program reviews include the following:

1. Collect and analyze accurate and complete data on key performance indicators, student learning outcomes, program activities, and accomplishments.
2. Ascertain and document program weaknesses and strengths.
3. Develop program objectives and goals.
4. Justify program budget requests.
5. Comply with Federal and State law, Title 5, Student Equity, VTEA, matriculation (including prerequisite and co-requisite standards), ADA (American with Disabilities Act), and other legal or certification requirements.

**Academic Program Link to College Mission**

Feather River College provides high-quality, comprehensive student education as well as opportunities for learning, workforce preparation, and achievement in a small college environment. The College provides general education, associate and bachelor’s degrees, certificates, transfer programs, and life-long learning for a diverse student population by serving local, regional, national and international students through traditional face-to-face instruction as well as distance education. The College also serves as a cultural and economic leader for all communities that lie within the District and embraces the opportunities afforded by its natural setting.

**Environmental Studies Program Review**

###### Connection to Mission

1. Briefly describe your program objective(s) and how the program supports and furthers the College’s mission.

The Environmental Studies Department provides a hands-on, broad-based, science-oriented curriculum designed to prepare students for a variety of careers related to solving environmental and natural resource issues.

The ENVR Department helps FRC achieve its mission by offering transfer and workforce preparation education that capitalizes on the College’s natural setting and the region’s workforce needs.

######  B. Program Curriculum, Instruction & SLO Assessment

1. Describe how your program’s curriculum and instruction connect with the program objectives (see Appendix G-2: Data Sets for supporting information).

Hands-on – We teach and train our students with hands-on activities and in the outdoors. 15 of our Core and Elective courses, out of 23 (65%), have a lab or major field component (e.g., they are a field course).

Broad-based **–** Our program ranges across the full spectrum of natural resources disciplines, including watershed, forestry, wildlife, fisheries, soils, policy, etc.

Science-oriented curriculum – Students learn the scientific method and apply it experientially through projects that have lasting applications on campus. For example, monitoring of forest plots, water quality, wildlife populations, and soil types is ongoing.

Prepare students for a variety of careers – Students can go on to work in careers in all levels of government, private industry, and non-governmental organizations. Further education through transfer to four-year institutions is encouraged as well.

Solve environmental and natural resource issues – By embracing our role as the caretakers of the natural part of FRC’s campus, there are many opportunities to directly solve challenging issues right here on campus: how can we best safeguard against fire and make our forest systems healthy? How can we ensure Spanish Creek is a healthy riparian system?

1. What are the Program-level Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) for the degrees and certificates in your program? (see also Appendix G-1: SLO Assessment Forms from Prior Years).

**Environmental Studies AS SLOs:**

* Knowledge: A quantitative and qualitative understanding of how our planet functions, how technological societies operate, and how policy interacts between the two.
* Application skills: Proficiency in disciplines related to the environment comes at the price of practice; technical field skills will be taught and practiced regularly at FRC, where our spatial proximity to a variety of environmental issues encourages fieldwork.
* Communication: Written and oral communication skills in disciplines and professions related to the environment; this includes the ability to convey information and work effectively with groups of varying sizes, as well as different audience levels.
* Multidisciplinary perspective: The ability to speak the language of the various environmental disciplines keeps graduates competitive in an increasingly interrelated and competitive market.
* Environmental ethic: A developed ecological identity, established professional and educational goals, and an identified career track will cement the student’s sense of place in the environmental fields, and provide direction toward a constructive career in their chosen field.
* Understanding of sustainability: An appreciation for responsibly managing critical natural resources: striving toward a balance between meeting today’s needs while ensuring ecosystem health and resource plentitude for future generations.

**Environmental Science AS SLOs:**

* Scientific literacy: A quantitative and qualitative understanding the fundamentals of biological and physical science that will provide students the required knowledge to move forward in scientific disciplines.
* Application skills: Proficiency in disciplines related to the environment comes at the price of practice; technical field skills will be taught and practiced regularly at FRC, where our spatial proximity to a variety of environmental issues encourages fieldwork.
* Communication: Written and oral communication skills in disciplines and professions related to the environment; this includes the ability to convey information and work effectively with groups of varying sizes, as well as different audience levels.

• Multidisciplinary perspective: The ability to speak the language of the various environmental disciplines keeps graduates competitive in an increasingly interrelated and competitive market.

• Environmental ethic: A developed ecological identity, established professional and educational goals, and an identified career track will cement the student’s sense of place in the environmental fields, and provide direction toward a constructive career in their chosen field.

* Understanding of sustainability: An appreciation for responsibly managing critical natural resources: striving toward a balance between meeting today’s needs while ensuring ecosystem health and resource plentitude for future generations.

**Ecological Agriculture Certificate SLOs**

* Demonstrate application of sustainable agriculture production techniques specific to high altitude crop production.
* Understand the complexities of managing a small farm, including product and market development, and appropriate technologies.
* Increase understanding of the food system and how small farms can be used as a tool for positive social, economic, and environmental change.
1. How do PSLOs support college-wide SLOs (CWSLOs)?

The Ecological Agriculture Certificate is expected to come online in Fall 2018, depending on faculty availability. Once the first round of courses have been taught, SLO assessment will begin.

Program faculty examined how PLSOs mapped to CWSLOs and were pleased to see that while different PSLOs emphasize different desired college outcomes, in-sum the PSLOs capture the desired college outcomes in a balanced way, with CWSLOs receiving between a 13 and 16 in our ranking system (*see Table 1*). As a result, we think that our program is doing a good job of addressing college SLOs.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Commun-ication** | **Critical Thinking** | **Info****Assessment** | **Ethics** | **Sense of Self** | **Inter-personal**  | **Respon-sibility** |
| **Knowledge (ENVR)** | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **Scientific Literacy (Env Sci)** | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| **Application of Skills** | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **Communication** | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| **Multidisciplinary Perspective** | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **Environmental Ethic** | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| **Understanding of Sustainability** | 2 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| **Total Impact** | **15** | **15** | **15** | **13** | **13** | **14** | **16** |

*Table 1: CWSLOS to ENVR PSLOs*

1. **PSLO does not address CWSLO**
2. **PSLO scarcely touches on CWSLO**
3. **PSLO addresses the CWLSO to a moderate degree**
4. **PSLO strongly meets the CWSLO**
5. How do course-level student learning outcomes (CSLOs) and other program learning experiences support the PSLOs?

Since there are so many individual course SLOs, it became too complicated to try to map every course SLOs to PLSOs. Instead, program faculty mapped the overall emphasis of each course, which should reflect its SLOs, to PLSOs. Again here, we were pleased to see that while different courses emphasize different skill sets and other desired educational outcomes, in-sum the breadth of courses available to students allows students completing a degree to meet all PLSOs in a balanced way, with all PSLOs receiving between a 30 and a 40 in our ranking system (*see table 2*). According to our ranking, the PSLOS that were addressed the least successfully by program courses were:

1. **scientific literacy,** a PSLO for Environmental Science, a major which requires to students to take many other foundational science courses, such as chemistry, biology, physics, etc. that address scientific literacy. And,
2. **sustainability**, which is an undertone in all classes that focus on understanding and managing natural resources. Our curriculum is very hands-on and skills based. However, our attention to technical skills is not meant to undermine the importance of teaching students about sustainability as a value and a goal, but it may be important for us to remember not to overlook this learning outcome. Our ranking system, however, does not capture the value for sustainability that students gain by participating in extra-curricular activities outside the classroom, such as the Student Environmental Association activities, the Sustainability Action Teams’ Spring Sustainability Series events or community events like Plumas Earth Days. These events help our help our program students foster a more complete understanding of and value for sustainability.

Overall, we think that we do a good job addressing the PSLOs.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Knowledge (ENVR)** | **Scientific Literacy (Sci)** | **Application of Skills** | **Commun-ication** | **Multi-disciplinary Perspective** | **Environ-mental Ethic** | **Sustain-ability** |
| **102** | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| **103** | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **142** | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| **142L** | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| **160** | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **180** | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **201** | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| **210** | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **220** | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **240** | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| **250** | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| **251** | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| **264** | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| **266** | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| **280** | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| **Total Impact** | **40** | **30** | **38** | **33** | **37** | **31** | **30** |

*Table 2: ENVR PSLOs to ENVR courses*

1. **Course does not address PSLO**
2. **Course scarcely touches on PSLO**
3. **Course addresses the PSLO to a moderate degree**
4. **Course strongly meets the PSLO**
5. What methods did you use to assess these PSLOs (methods may include student survey, portfolio, exit class, etc.)?

PSLOs were addresses qualitatively through faculty reflection and quantitatively through our ranking system (seen above) and through students exit surveys. In the last three years, a total of 17 students in the ENVR capstone course have been asked to reflect on their experience in the program through an exit survey. Their responses are tabulated below (*see table 3*).

* The majority of students identified as being above average in most areas.
* The majority of students identified as exceling in 1) working in groups of varying sizes, a questioned aimed assessing communication skills, and 2) understanding of sustainability. Interestingly, understanding of sustainability was the area in which program faculty rank themselves most weak. It seems that program students have heard this message, which is an undercurrent, if not an overt message, in all of our courses.
* The majority of students ranked themselves as only average in 1) an understanding of how technological societies operate, a question aimed to address overall knowledge, 2) oral communication skills, a question aimed to address overall communication skills, and 3) ability to communicate to a variety of audiences, also aimed at addressing students’ overall communication skills. Program faculty could do a better job defining the meaning of a technological society to our students. We do talk a lot about technology and trade-offs related to use of different natural resources, so we think that students so have an strong underrating of this issue, but we may be remiss in defining what a technological society is in our classes. The second and third responses illustrate a potential for program faculty ensure we provide students with more opportunities to present to a variety of audiences. Program faculty should keep this in mind, while developing assignments.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **I excel**  | **I am above average**  | **I am about average**  | **I need to improve**  | **I am poor**  |
| **Overall Knowledge** | 12% | **41%** | 35% | 12% | 0% |
| An understanding of how our planet functions | 12% | **53%** | 35% | 0% | 0% |
| An understanding of how technological societies operate | 12% | 35% | **47%** | 6% | 0% |
| An understanding of how policy interacts with the planet's functions and society | 18% | **47%** | 29% | 6% | 0% |
| **Overall Application Skills** | 29% | **41%** | 29% | 0% | 0% |
| Technical field skills | 29% | **47%** | 24% | 0% | 0% |
| **Overall Communication** | 12% | **47%** | 41% | 0% | 0% |
| Written communication skills in Environmental Studies discipline | 18% | **47%** | 29% | 6% | 0% |
| Oral communication skills in Environmental Studies discipline | 24% | 35% | **41%** | 0% | 0% |
| Ability to work effectively with groups of varying sizes | **47%** | 24% | 29% | 0% | 0% |
| Ability to convey information to a range of audiences | 12% | 29% | **53%** | 6% | 0% |
| **Overall Multidisciplinary Perspective** | 12% | **59%** | 24% | 6% | 0% |
| The ability to speak the language of the various disciplines in Env Studies (e.g., wildlife, forestry, watershed, soils, etc.) | 6% | **65%** | 18% | 12% | 0% |
| **Overall Environmental & Professional Ethic** | 24% | **47%** | 29% | 0% | 0% |
| A developed ecological identity | 29% | **53%** | 12% | 6% | 0% |
| Established professional and educations goals | 35% | **41%** | 18% | 6% | 0% |
| An identified career track | 24% | **41%** | 29% | 6% | 0% |
| **Overall Understanding of Sustainability** | **47%** | 35% | 18% | 0% | 0% |
| An appreciation for responsibly managing critical natural resources | 35% | **53%** | 12% | 0% | 0% |

*Table 3: Results from ENVR Capstone Exit Survey*

1. What were the most meaningful findings from the assessment of PSLOs (which outcomes showcase student achievement; which indicate a need for program improvement?)?

Overall, across the ENVR curriculum students are given opportunities to and achieving success meeting college-wide, program and course-level SLOs. It appears that students can use the most help practicing and building confidence in their communication, particularly oral communication, skills. Anecdotally, many students suffer a lot of anxiety about presenting information to their peers and others in a formal way. Program faculty should keep this in mind and continue to design activities and assignments that allow students to hone these skills that will be critical for success in almost any future career.

1. What are the program’s overall strengths and weaknesses? Describe any changes in the following since the last program review. Explain the reasons for those changes, and their impact on the program.

The Environmental Studies Department is strong overall in the diverse skills and perspectives among its faculty, good working relationships and open communications among faculty, and sense of camaraderie between faculty and students. We also have an excellent working relationship with location land management agencies and other community partners such as the Maidu Summit Consortium, Feather River Land Trust, and Plumas Corp. Generally, the department is well known for its contributions to campus and community enrichment.

The weaknesses of the Environmental Studies Department are mostly related to lack of resources for recruiting efforts and subsequent low enrollment in some department courses and lack of declared majors. With more time dedicated to recruiting, most classes could handle up to a doubling in class size.

At the same time, there are several classes that have larger enrollments and would struggle with significantly more students (e.g., ENVR 180 Environmental Policy, ENVR 210 Soil Science), because they are General Education courses or required in other majors. If recruiting is increased, addressing accompanying increased enrollment in these courses would be an issue.

Faculty are planning to start a mentorship/advising program with ENVR students, where each student is paired with one program faculty member based on student’s interests and career goals. Each student will be strongly advised to have a sit-down meeting with their faculty mentor each semester to make sure that they are making appropriate course and other choices to help them achieve their educational and career goals. We hope that this program, along with better students tracking, will result in better enrollment in classes, better degree and certificate completion and, most importantly, better success for students as the move beyond FRC into future educational opportunities and the work-force.

* 1. Curriculum (including articulation and course scheduling)

Strengths:

* Strong connection and access to natural setting
* Added acreage along Spanish Creek and in forest thanks to 180-acre purchase
* Coordinated course scheduling which avoids conflicts
* Articulation with Humboldt State, Western State Colorado U

Weaknesses:

* Struggling to fill all course sections, resulting in cancellation at times (impacts Fisheries courses especially)
	1. Instructional methodology (i.e., distance education)

Strengths:

* Applied nature and heavy field emphasis
* Seven of ten Major Core courses have lab component
* Instructional equipment generally sufficient or exceptional

Weaknesses:

* Strong lab component has a trade-off, which is the schedule of student athletes make it very difficult for them to complete our major
	1. SLO Assessment

Strengths:

* All faculty (FT and AF) up-to-date on course-level SLOACs
* Program-level SLOAC multi-faceted
* Assessments have become more data driven, with qualitative and quantitative components

Weaknesses:

* N/A
1. Describe any proposed future changes to the following. Explain how these changes will positively impact the program and improve achievement of PSLOs.
	1. Curriculum (including articulation and course scheduling)

In the Fall of 2014, program faculty developed a proposal for a Bachelor’s degree in Watershed Restoration. While the proposal was not forwarded for Chancellor’s Office consideration, the development process was enlightening, inspiring, and lead to positive collaboration on many levels. In subsequent semesters, program faculty met with faculty at Sonoma State, Humboldt State, and UC Davis to determine level of support (unqualified), learn about sister programs (inspiring), and identify potential for articulation agreements (substantial).

This effort resulted the development of a number of positive relationships (especially at Sonoma and Humboldt) and articulation agreements being formed (especially at Humboldt).

In the future, given the likely passage of SB 769 soliciting additional Bachelor’s degree proposals, our department will consider submitting again. We feel strongly that Watershed Restoration is an important field that is in high demand, and given recent events such as the Oroville Dam spillway overtop, will continue to receive attention.

* 1. Instructional methodology (i.e., distance education)

We are excited about receiving a Block Grant for the purchase of a drone, tablets, and associated equipment. Providing students the tools needed to develop these applied career skills is a wonderful opportunity. Finding a solution to the GIS computer lab challenge is also something we look forward with positive anticipation.

* 1. SLO Assessment

We will continue our SLO assessment as is, with faculty cross-examining PSLOs with courses and students rating their progress toward PSLOs at the end of their FRC careers in the Environmental Studies Department. One potential improvement is to have students rate themselves at the beginning of their careers (perhaps in ENVR 103 Environmental Seminar), then do a cross-tabs statistical analysis to match ratings at the end and check for changes…hopefully improvements. The more data we obtain, the better!

 **C. Physical Resources**

1. How is the program affected by the size, type and quality of available:
	1. Physical space and facilities
* WE will need to identify or create a secure storage needs for new drone system, screen and stand, and tablets. This could be perhaps be accommodated in the Physics lab prep room and SCI 101.
	1. Information technology
* Currently, students are only able to access computers with ARC GIS during class. Once Room 600 is converted from Macs to PC’s, this issue will be resolved.
	1. Library holdings and services
* Our department needs are met through the FRC library, and if a resource is needed, faculty work with the library director to request it.
	1. Instructional equipment and supplies
* We have used Lottery and VTEA funds to get the equipment needed to date. Electroshock backpacks would be beneficial for all aquatic classes; block grants could be pursued for this equipment in 2017-18.
1. Have there been significant changes in the program’s facilities, technical infrastructure, or other resources since the last review? If so, how have the changes impacted the program?
* The new 180-acre addition to campus affects the ENVR Department by providing learning opportunities and a larger responsibility for monitoring water, soils, forest stands, wildlife and fish, etc. It increases the need for restoration projects exponentially, particularly related to forest health and Spanish Creek.
1. What are the program’s projected needs in facilities, technology, or other resources, and how are these needs related to program goals? Are these goals supported by results from the assessment of program and course-level student learning outcomes?
* Electro shock backpacks need to be fixed.
* Greenhouse for aquaponics program (in synergy with Ecological Farming cert, Ag Department, Culinary Arts). Fuller will be submitting grant proposal through the Strong Workforce program to hopefully pay for a new hatchery-based greenhouse.

######  D. Staffing

1. What is the full- to part-time ratio of faculty within the program? (Determine the ratio by counting up the number of sections taught by full-time faculty and the number of sections taught by part-time faculty in the most recent semester for which the data is available). How does the current staffing structure positively and/or negatively affect the program?

The Environmental Studies Department for Spring 2017 has 67% of its courses taught by full-time faculty. Having about a third of our courses taught by associate faculty provides a nice balance and diversity of perspectives for students.

1. What are the objectives and goals in staffing to make this program more effective? Are these goals supported by results from the assessment of student learning outcomes described in Section B? (see also Appendix G-1: SLO Assessment Forms from Prior Years)?

We are happy with our current staffing structure. When Darla starts teaching a course in the Ag bachelor’s program (Spring 2018), she will drop ENVR 194 Current Environmental Issues. That course could be picked up by Adam or perhaps Ryan Thoni.

######  E. Student Retention and Success

1. Describe any significant trends within the student demographics of the program (see Appendix G-2: Data Sets for supporting information).

Our program has more male (61%) than female students, and many more white (72%) students than students of color (data from 2011-2016). This is been consistent through this period of time.

1. What are the program’s strengths or weaknesses in the area of student retention and success (see Appendix G-2: Data Sets for supporting information)?

Our course completion rate is 86% (over the last four semesters) compared to 95% (spring 2016) for the campus as a whole. This is in part likely because of the high in-class time commitment that our course require. Some students find that they are unable to be here enough to complete these types of courses. Student success is also a little bit lower 77% compared to 84% for the campus as a whole. We think this is because our courses are rigorous and some students are not properly prepared to have success in college-level science classes. We think hat maintaining rigor is important and do not plan to alter our courses to try to improve student success as measured by this metric.

1. What objectives are needed to better ensure student retention and success? Are these goals supported by results from the assessment of student learning outcomes described in Section B? (see also Appendix G-1: SLO Assessment Forms from Prior Years)?

Because our classes are small, field-based, and both students and faculty develop personal relationships, we tend to have strong retention. The Plumas National Forest Internship program may also help with retention, as having a job during the summer can keep a student motivated to stick it out through the semester.

Conversely, because a majority of our students are drawn from local or regional areas, they tend to be, on average, older and have more complex family lives than traditional college students. This can lead to early withdrawal and lack of completion in some instances.

 **F. Outreach and Compliance**

If program faculty and staff are tasked with outreach and/or compliance efforts, which can include outreach, working with advisory committees, consulting or technical assistance, service-based instruction, compliance with laws or regulations, or economic development, please respond to the following.

1. In what types of community outreach does the program engage, and how is the program’s academic and professional expertise extended to the local communities?

Below are some examples of events and programs where ENVR faculty engage in community outreach. In many instances, faculty from the Department serve as lead coordinators for these programs. The Department is well known in the community for providing engaging and educational opportunities.

* 1. Sustainability Action Team’s Spring Sustainability Series
	2. Plumas Earth Days
	3. Quincy Elementary Science Night
	4. Plumas County Fair
	5. Plumas Audubon Society Board, Fieldtrips, and Programs
	6. FRC Hatchery serves as host for fieldtrips
	7. Trout sales and information source for home trout care
1. If there is a program advisory committee, list the names and titles of members, and the meeting dates since the last program review. Describe any advisory committee involvement in this program review.

2017: February 23rd. Members: Ryan Bauer (USFS), Aaron Grove (USFS), Linda Batson (Friend of Program), Guy McNett (FRC Trustee), Devin Wilcox (Plumas Corp), Matthew Johnson (USFS), Elizabeth Powell (Five Foot Farm), Darrel Jury (Friends of Plumas Wilderness), Derek Lerch

2015: November 10. Members: Ryan Bauer (USFS Fuels Officer), Linda Batson & Guy McNett (Friends of Program / FRC BOT), Gia Martynn (FR CRM), Matthew Johnson (PNF), Derek Lerch (and Luke & Jovie), Elizabeth Powell (High Altitude Harvest)

2014: November 19. Members: Danny Manning (Greenville Indian Rancheria), Leslie Mink (Plumas Corp.), Guy McNett (FRC board of trustees, friend of the program), Linda Batson (friend of the program), Matthew Johnson (USFS), Ryan Bauer (USFS), Derek Lerch

2014: January 10. Members: Matthew Johnson (Plumas National Forest, Wildlife Program Manager), Terry Benoit (Feather River CRM, Project Manager), Mik McKee (Sierra Institute, Renewable Energy / Biomass Utilization Program Lead), Ryan Bauer (Plumas National Forest, Fuels Officer), Linda Batson (Citizen at Large), Derek Lerch

2012: November 14: Members: Kara Rockett-Arsenault (CRM), Linda Batson (donor, #1 fan), Rob Wade (PCOE), Matthew Johnson (USFS), Kyle Rodgers (Sierra Institute), Nicole Bogle (student), Terri Weist (DFG), Derek Lerch

We discuss many of the issues address in the program review during annual Advisory Committee meeting, and as such, we think that their voice is reflected in this assessment.

1. How does the program help the College comply with laws, regulations, and other legal or certification requirements?

Darla DeRuiter manages the college’s federal permits for Migratory Birds, Golden and Bald Eagles, and the Plumas National Forest Special Use Permit, along with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Scientific Collection Permit. Darla is also serving on the FRC Ad Hoc committee regarding a low water crossing for Spanish Creek to the new 180-acre property purchased by the college. Adam Fuller manages the aquaculture facility permit and ensures that members of the public purchasing trout are property certified.

**G. Appendices**

1. DATA SETS
2. Program FTES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester | F 2014 | S 2015 | F 2015 | S 2016 | F 2016 | S 2017 |
|   | 15.8 | 16.46 | 10.95 | 9.95 | 9.51 | 14.39 |

1. Duplicated Headcount

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester | F 2014 | S 2015 | F 2015 | S 2016 | F 2016 | S 2017 |
|   | 157 | 142 | 109 | 101 |   |   |

1. Demographic Information (duplicated headcount): Gender, Age, Ethnicity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester | F 2014 | S 2015 | F 2015 | S 2016 | F 2016 | S 2017 |
| Male | 104 | 71 | 109 | 101 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Female | 53 | 71 | 52 | 55 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Am. Indian or Alaskan Native | 14 | 20 | 11 | 15 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Black Non-Hispanic | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Hispanic | 19 | 10 | 16 | 7 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Other | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 |  N/A | N/A  |
| White Non-Hispanic | 115 | 97 | 73 | 70 |  N/A | N/A  |

1. Number of Students with Declared Majors in Program

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester | F 2014 | S 2015 | F 2015 | S 2016 | F 2016 | S 2017 |
| Male | 104 | 71 | 109 | 101 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Female | 53 | 71 | 52 | 55 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Am. Indian or Alaskan Native | 14 | 20 | 11 | 15 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Black Non-Hispanic | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Hispanic | 19 | 10 | 16 | 7 |  N/A | N/A  |
| Other | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 |  N/A | N/A  |
| White Non-Hispanic | 115 | 97 | 73 | 70 |  N/A | N/A  |

1. Number of Courses Offered

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester | F 2014 | S 2015 | F 2015 | S 2016 | F 2016 | S 2017 |
|   | 11 | 17 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 |

1. Number of Sections Offered

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester | F 2014 | S 2015 | F 2015 | S 2016 | F 2016 | S 2017 |
|   | 11 | 17 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 |

1. Average Enrollment per Section

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester | F 2014 | S 2015 | F 2015 | S 2016 | F 2016 | S 2017 |
|   | 14.27 | 8.35 | 13.625 | 9.182 |  N/A | N/A  |

1. Course Completion Rate (# of students who received a grade/total students enrolled at census)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester | F 2014 | S 2015 | F 2015 | S 2016 | F 2016 | S 2017 |
|   | 0.89 | 0.85 | 0.90 | 0.82 |  N/A | N/A  |

1. Student Success Rate (# of students with C or better/total students enrolled at census)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester | F 2014 | S 2015 | F 2015 | S 2016 | F 2016 | S 2017 |
|   | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.78 | 0.76 |  N/A | N/A  |

Data can be found here:

<http://frc-sps-01/Admin/IR/TabularDataTest/Forms/AllItems.aspx>

This template is an adaptation of the Instructional Program Review template designed by Saddleback College.