

## Program Review (SP11)

1. Enrollment Patterns	2. Achievement Data	3. Staffing /Resources	4. SLOs	5. Goals
Data provided by Institutional Effectiveness and Academic Services	Data provided by Institutional Effectiveness and Academic Services	Data Provided by HR	Data provided by Department Faculty	Department Plan
<b>6. College Wide</b> <b>Overall – How does this information fit with the College Wide Goals?</b>				

*The purpose of Program Review is to summarize and interpret the data and information collected from the resources listed above, reflecting how your department program(s) have been successful and incorporated the information into improvements, where necessary. As a part of the overall college planning process, a meaningful Program Review will be the primary document CPC and other college committees will rely on for qualitative and quantitative information on a program, informing enrollment management, budgeting (cap outlay, grants), hiring priorities, and finally accreditation. Therefore, it is important that each department create a report that is meaningful for their program(s) while demonstrating the program(s)' value to the college and community.*

*The questions below are designed to help you create, primarily, a narrative review (roughly 5-10 pages); each curriculum guide (AA or Certificate) represents a “program”, and requires a separate review report (this document). Any data included should be interpreted, not simply “plugged in”; this document should refer to supporting documents for larger amounts of raw data. It is expected to take more than Flex day, and be an on-going conversation among the faculty in the program. Please refer to the timeline to help you map out an internal timetable for your program. To further assist you, we are planning a workshop for the March Flex day (see timeline).*

***It is important to note that while “Program Plans” are really “Department Plans” (yearly), you need to create a separate “Program Review” (3-year cycle) document for each program (curriculum guide) within your department.***

Program Review Questions (Use form boxes, they will automatically expand.)

1. – 3. Summarize and interpret the data for each of the first three above (Enrollment Patterns, Achievement Data, Staffing/ Resources) as they relate to your program.

### 1. ENROLLMENT PATTERNS

#### Speech Communication

Enrollment data reveals consistently high enrollment rates in Speech Communication courses. Collectively, student FTES in the Speech Communication department have steadily increased (471.1 [2006-2007], 508.72 [2008-2009], 537.33 [2009-2010]) over the last three fiscal years. Student enrollment patterns in the Speech Communication department have been respectively consistent during the Summer (29.67 [2007-2008], 28.46 [2008-2009], 31.09 [2009-2010]), Fall (25.55 [2007-2008], 26.86 [2008-2009], 29.07 [2009-2010]), and Spring (25.36 [2007-2008], 26.58 [2008-2009], 31.89 [2009-2010]) sessions. A steady increase in enrollment rates, combined with lengthy student waitlists, suggest that there is an increasing demand for Speech Communication courses. As student enrollment

## Program Review (SP11)

increases, so does the number of weekly student contact hours (14, 133.25 [2006-2007], 15, 261.26 [2008-2009], 16, 119.70 [2009-2010]). With a 50% decrease in our full-time faculty due to retirements in the last eight years and with three of the five full-time faculty members planning to retire within the next 2-5 years, such data suggests that it would behoove both the Speech Communication department and students to hire additional full-time faculty members to serve the enrollment needs of the students and community alike.

### Sign Language

Enrollment data reveals steadily increasing enrollment rates in Sign Language courses. Specifically, enrollment data suggests that a significant increase in student enrollment had occurred in Sign 2a/b (18.00 [Spring 2008], 16.00 [Spring 2009], 26.00 [Spring 2010]) as well as in Lip Reading 633 (12.00 [Spring 2008], 35.00 [Spring 2009], 32.00 [Spring 2010]) in the last three fiscal years. Increased enrollment patterns in the above mentioned Sign Language (S.L.) courses can be attributed to permitting S.L. courses to fulfill the CSU foreign language requirement and increased recruitment efforts.

## 2. ACHIEVEMENT DATA

### Speech Communication

The student success rate refers to the percentage of students who complete a course with an A, B, C, and CR grade. Achievement data suggests that the average student success rate of students enrolled in courses that are offered within The School of Creative Arts are relatively similar to the average student success rates of students enrolled in Long Beach City College as a whole. Specifically relevant to the Speech Communication department, between the years 2008-2011, the average student success rates for summer course offerings have steadily increased (81.61% [Summer 2008], 86.96% [Summer 2009], 88.83% [Summer 2010]). This increase in student success may be attributed to a decrease in the amount of summer courses offered in the summer of 2010, as compared to the number of courses offered in the summer of 2009 or 2008. The scarcity of courses offered in the summer of 2010 may have ignited an appreciation for the opportunity to enroll in the summer session as well as a desire to successfully complete the course.

Achievement data revealed the following Speech Communication courses to have the highest student success rates in 2007-2008 (SP 50 [95%]), 2008-2009 (SP 25 [89.66%]), 2009-2010 (SP 20 [92.68%]), and 2010-2011 (SP 20 [91.94%]). Respectively, the following Speech Communication courses were reported to have the lowest student success rates: 2007-2008 (SP 25 [68.75%]), 2008-2009 (SP 20 [74.16%]), 2009-2010 (SP 31 [67.65%]), 2010-2011 (SP 31 [44.44%]). The average student success rate for all Speech Communication and Sign Language courses offered from 2007-2011 ranged from 73.46% (Spring 2008) to 86.96% (Summer 2009). These high student success rates may be attributed to the Speech Communication department's philosophy of experiential learning. Through experiential learning, students take a hands-on approach to learning. The low student success rates in

## **Program Review (SP11)**

the Speech 31 course may be a result of a shift in department goals and student expectations for the class. The Speech Communication department feels secure that the success rates in Speech 31 will continue to rise.

The student retention rate refers to the percentage of students who complete a course with an A, B, C, CR, D, F, NC, and Incomplete grade. Achievement data reveals that, on average, the student retention rates between the years 2007-2010 in the Speech Communication department range between 79.01% (Fall 2007) and 93.39% (Summer 2010). The high retention rate in Summer 2010 may be attributed to a decrease in the number of courses offered that summer. The courses with the highest retention rates include: 2007-2008 (SP 31 [96.00%]), 2008-2009 (SP 25 [90.80%]), 2009-2010 (SP 25 [94.90%] and SP 30 [94.90%]), 2010-2011 (SP 30 [94.83%]). Speech 31, which was taught by a seasoned faculty member during this time frame, is a mandatory course for Speech Communication majors. That said, the combination of having serious students taught by a passionate and experienced faculty member in the SP 31 course, may have created a strong foundation for the course, which fostered a high rate of student retention. The courses with the lowest student retention rates include: 2007-2008 (SP 10 [77.31%]), 2008-2009 (SP 10 [81.08%]), 2009-2010 (SP 31 [80.77%]), 2010-2011 (SP 31 [81.48%]). The higher attrition rates in the SP10 and SP31 courses are not unanticipated. Since numerous students experience high levels of apprehension associated to the act of public speaking, some would rather discontinue enrollment in a SP 10 course rather than subject themselves to high levels of anxiety.

The student completion grade refers to the percentage of students who complete a course with A, B, C, CR, and D grades. Achievement data reveals that, on average, the student completion rates between the years 2007-2010 in the Speech Communication department range between 76.62% (Spring 2008) and 90.93% (Summer 2010). The high student completion rates in Summer 2010 may be attributed to a decrease in the number of courses offered that summer. The courses with the highest student completion rates include: 2007-2008 (SP 31 [96.00%]), 2008-2009 (SP 25 [90.80%]), 2009-2010 (SP 30 [94.90%]), and 2010-2011 (SP 20 [93.55%]). The courses with the lowest student completion rates include: 2007-2008 (SP 10 [71.26%]), 2008-2009 (SP 10 [75.51%]), 2009-2010 (SP 31 [70.59%]), and 2010-2011 (SP 31 [70.37%]). Although there is a fairly significant difference between the lowest and highest completion rates, it is a positive reflection of the Speech Communication department that 73.37% is the lowest completion rate between the years 2007-2010.

### Sign Language

The student success rate refers to the percentage of students who complete a course with an A, B, C, and CR grade. Achievement data suggests that the student success rates for the Sign 1A and Sign 1B courses have steadily increased. For instance, the student success rates in the Sign 1A courses have steadily increased in the summer sessions (76.92% [Summer 2007], 78.57% [Summer 2008], 81.25% [Summer 2009]). Respectively, the student success rates in Sign 1B steadily increased during the Spring semesters (53.03% [Spring 2008], 70.73% [Spring 2009], 71.72% [Spring 2010]).

## Program Review (SP11)

The following S.L. courses were reported to have the highest student success rates: 2007-2008 (Sign 2A [86.96%]), 2008-2009 (Sign 2B [87.50%]), 2009-2010 (Sign 2A [84.21%]), 2010-2011 (Sign 2A [73.68%]). The S.L. courses to report the lowest student success rate include: 2007-2008 (Sign 1A [51.25%]), 2008-2009 (Sign 1B [58.93%]), 2009-2010 (Sign 1A [65.73%]), and 2010-2011 (Sign 1B [63.33%]). The average student success rate for all Speech Communication and Sign Language courses offered from 2007-2011 ranged from 73.46% (Spring 2008) to 86.96% (Summer 2009). Since Sign 2A and Sign 2B offer a more advanced level of sign language than the sign 1A and sign 1B courses.

The student retention rate refers to the percentage of students who complete a course with an A, B, C, CR, D, F, NC, and Incomplete grade. Achievement data reveals that, on average, the student retention rates between the years 2007-2010 in the Speech Communication department range between 79.01% (Fall 2007) and 93.39% (Summer 2010). The S.L. courses with the highest retention rates include: 2007-2008 (Sign 1A [80.77%]), 2008-2009 (Sign1A [94.32%]), 2009-2010 (Sign 2A [94.74%]), 2010-2011 (Sign 1A [89.81%]). Additionally, the high retention rates may be linked to students' need to fulfill the foreign language requirement. The courses with the lowest student retention rates include: 2007-2008 (Sign 1A [58.75%]), 2008-2009 (sign 1B [60.71%]), 2009-2010 (Sign 1A [83.22%]), 2010-2011 (Sign 2A [73.68%]). This data suggests that the student retention rates had increased from 2007-2010. However, in the 2010-2011 fiscal year, the retention rates dropped once again. Although it is unclear why the student retention rate in the Sign2B course dropped in the 2010-2011 fiscal year, it is encouraging to see a continuous increase in the student retention rates in the previous years.

The student completion grade refers to the percentage of students who complete a course with A, B, C, CR, and D grades. Achievement data reveals that, on average, the student completion rates between the years 2007-2010 in the Speech Communication department range between 76.62% (Spring 2008) and 90.93% (Summer 2010). The high student completion rates in Summer 2010 may be attributed to a decrease in the number of courses offered that summer. The courses with the highest student completion rates include: 2007-2008 (Sign 1A [80.77%]), 2008-2009 (Sign 2B [87.50%]), 2009-2010 (Sign 2A [84.21%]), and 2010-2011(Sing 2A [73.68%]). While the student completion rates increased from 2007-2010, there was a decrease in the 2010-2011 fiscal year. The courses with the lowest student completion rates include: 2007-2008 (Sign 1A [51.25%]), 2008-2009 (Sign 1B [58.93%]), 2009-2010 (Sign 1A [65.73%]), and 2010-2011 (Sign 1B [65.00%]). The art of sign language can be a difficult for some to grasp. That said, some of the above mentioned student completion rates may be a result of the difficulty in acquiring the ability to sign.

### 3. STAFFING RESOURCES

#### Speech Communication

As it currently stands our full time faculty consists of 6 members and our adjunct faculty numbers are holding at 19. The most notable issue in staffing

## Program Review (SP11)

has been the loss of 50% of our full time faculty (due to retirements) in the last several years. As a department that is one of the highest in demand across the college the loss of colleagues who can not only teach but also contribute to departmental and college-wide obligations has placed a burden on our workload. It is our hope that while we did secure 1 full-time faculty member beginning in the 2011 year, we need to continue securing our department's program with additional full time hires in the very near future. Of our current 6 full time members fifty percent will more than likely be facing retirement over the next 3-5 years and it is imperative that we recruit faculty who continue to provide a solid foundation for the program's success.

### Sign Language

The S.L. program currently has a staff of 5 adjunct faculty members. In the past we had a 3 instructors and recently hired two additional adjunct faculty to support the programs. The S.L. program offerings have always been staffed by adjunct. While these courses do not offer a certificate, students often take sign language classes to fulfill the language requirement. Therefore, our adjunct faculty is serving an important need to the students as they complete their coursework and make plans to transfer.

#### 4. SLOs – a) Summarize the collected program data

##### Speech Communication

Our program SLOs were completed in Spring of 2011 with resounding success. The first SLO assessed critical thinking and communication strategies. The average score was 85% for all students tested. Key findings indicate that students are demonstrating and implementing effective critical thinking and persuasive communication strategies. Such scores indicate that students are mastering the experiential nature of this intended SLO. The second SLO focused on assessing effective presentational strategies. The average score was 73% for all students tested. Key findings indicate that students are demonstrating and implementing effective presentational skills. Such scores indicate that students are mastering the experiential nature of this intended SLO.

##### Sign Language

The S.L. course offerings are housed with the Speech Communication Department, and the department is the process of administering program SLOs to randomly chosen classes amongst our full and adjunct faculty in our public speaking and argumentation and debate course not amongst S.L. courses. Sign Language is participating in course specific SLOs but not an independent Program SLO assessment. Our S.L. courses provide a service to our campus in terms of a foreign language fulfillment or general enrichment we do not offer a certificate in this area.

##### b) Based on analysis of course and program SLO assessment:

- How are program-level and course-level SLOs being implemented, assessed, and used for program improvement?

##### Speech Communication

## **Program Review (SP11)**

We have completed assessment on four courses in academic year 2010-2011. We have chosen to administer course-level assessments solely amongst our full-time faculty. Program SLOs however, are inclusive to both full and adjunct faculty. Courses were selected in a random fashion and assessment methods consisted of objective testing as well as subjective testing. Although we do not have the full scope of course assessments complete we are scrutinizing the early results and have decided to re-work assessments to improve our student success prior to the next round of testing. Student outcomes at this time are a mixed result of both positive demonstration of specific SLOs, but at the same time students are struggling with some SLOs. While students are excelling in specific SLOs naturally we would like to see our assessment results have more consistency in achievement level across the board.

### Sign Language

Course level assessments for the S.L. program will commence in the Fall of 2011.

Courses will be selected in a random fashion and assessment methods will consist of subjective testing and will be part of the students' final assignment in the course.

- Summarize how the program has responded to SLO assessment results.

### Speech Communication

Due to the fact that we have only completed four courses to date it would be pre-mature to draw conclusions on the whole process at this time. However, we are pleased that students are demonstrating success in specific SLOs and we are revisiting those with which our student population struggled with to ensure a greater percentage of success on the next assessment cycle. We have revised assessment tools to ensure stronger results in our next round of assessments.

### Sign Language

S.L. course assessments have not commenced therefore we have no data to address program changes.

- Discuss how each action/change is based on ASLO results and how it will contribute to the improvement of the program.

### Speech Communication

In consort with the College wide student goal of producing students who are competent in communication the data collected may inform us of our success level as well as areas that need to be fortified. As it stands from our earliest assessments we are aware that we need a randomizing sampling pool, we also need to expand the scope to include

## Program Review (SP11)

our part-time faculty as we have had a fifty percent decrease in our full-time faculty over the past several years. We also know that we need to expand the student pool to include both campuses as well as day, evening and weekend classes. Making such modifications will allow a more inclusive assessment of our program. We are proud to say that we have one of the highest in demand programs on campus. In order to maintain success, introspection through SLOs will allow our program to review its rigor, productivity, and accomplishments.

### Sign Language

In consort with the College wide student goal of producing students who are competent in communication the data collected will inform us of our success level and well as areas that need to be fortified. We have a strong demand for Sign courses and participating in the assessment will inform us of our success as well as areas to strengthen. We want students to be able to communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and cultural environments and sign language is inclusive of that overarching department and campus goal.

### 5. Goals -

a) Based on the data from questions 1 – 4 and any other relevant internal or external data your department has collected, how have your department and program goals developed and changed over the past three years?

#### Speech Communication

Our department and program goals have not changed over the last three years. By channeling our attention to concrete and measurable strategies, we have been able to validate our previous teaching philosophies, objectives and goals. Over the last two years, through critical analysis and objective review, we know we are on a constructive, successful path to achieving our department and institutional goals.

The data shows that enrollment patterns have remained consistently high.

- There has been a steady increase in FTES in the last 3 fiscal years.
- Student success rates continued to climb between 2008-2010
- Student retention rates from 2007-2010 ranged from 79.01%- 93.39%
- Student Completion Rates - Student completion rates from 2007 - 2010 ranges from 77% - 91%.

All the achievement data suggests that the Speech Communication department have been successful in achieving student success.

The Speech Department is one of the highest demand departments for the college, and as the data shows, that demand is steadily increasing. However, we are facing this challenge with a significant decrease in full-

## Program Review (SP11)

time faculty. There is a desperate need for additional full-time faculty. Our number of full-time faculty has decreased by 50% over the past few years and 3 of the remaining 6 are likely slated for retirement in the next 3-5 years. In order to support the needs of the students, have time for the work required for class planning and evaluation, and continue with the increased effort of SLO evaluations, we must have more full-time faculty support.

### Sign Language

The enrollment data suggests an increase in enrollment rates attributed to the recent acceptance of Sign to fulfill the CSU foreign language requirement, the department's increased recruitment efforts and highly positive student testimonies.

The programs achievement data shows:

- Student success rates from 2007-2011 ranged from 73% - 87%. The highest student success rates were noted in Sign 2A and 2B (the Intermediate class.)
- Student retention rates from 2007-2011 ranged from 79% - 93%. The highest student retention rates were noted in Sign 1A for 3 fiscal years and Sign 2A for 1 fiscal year.
- Student completion rates from 2007-2011 ranged from 77% - 90%. The highest student completion rates occurred in Summer 2010, perhaps due to only 1 session being offered.

b) Discuss the steps you have taken to address each goal. What have been the results of these efforts?

### Speech Communication

We have had four distinct goals since our previous Program Review.

Goal: Speech Communication Requirements for A.A. Degree

Intercultural Communication (Speech 25) is currently offered as a requirement option under the Social Sciences Area for both Plan B and Plan C, but not Plan A. If students are given the option to enroll in Speech 25 in order to fulfill a Social Science requirement for Plans B and C, then they should equally be given the same opportunity to complete Speech 25 for Plan A.

While Plan B (Area A1) and Plan C (Area 1C) of Long Beach City College's General Education Plan both require students to complete a Speech course, Plan A of LBCC's General Education Plan does not. If students are required to complete a Speech course in order to fulfill the course requirements on Plan B and Plan C, then students should also be required to complete a Speech course in order to adequately complete requirements of Plan A.

Our department has been and is in the process of conducting online surveys of local California Community Colleges in order to investigate whether or not such colleges offer Speech 25 as a Social Science course option

## **Program Review (SP11)**

for the A.A./A.S. degree and/or have a mandatory Speech course requirement for the completion of an A.A./A.S. degree.

We have begun the discussion with representative members of Long Beach City College's curriculum committee in order to understand the rationale as to why Speech is not a mandatory requirement, and why Speech 25 is not a Social Science course offering under Plan A.

Our next step is to review and discuss findings within our Speech Communication department and determine our course of action to achieve this goal.

### **Goal: Mentoring**

Our intention is to develop a formalized mentoring program between full-time and part-time faculty. By creating a stronger relationship among faculty we can collectively focus on departmental goals related to student success and professional development. Moreover, we are practicing the theory of what we teach in terms of fostering interpersonal relationships among colleagues. Engaging in an active mentoring program allows the full-time faculty to ensure that our newer as well as seasoned adjunct faculty is complying with departmental policies and student learning outcomes. Likewise, the full-time faculty can benefit from our adjunct's knowledge and resources that they bring from other campuses that may, in turn, strengthen our department to its fullest potential.

Our initial plan was to begin in the spring 2011 semester, to devise a systematic process to initiate and build on the mentoring program which would involve partner pairing, orientation with newly hired faculty, providing workshops, and devising methods of communication and assessment of the mentoring program. We were not able to begin this process as planned largely due to the significant amount of work required this year with Program Review, four Course-specific SLO assessments and two Program-level assessments. When we are able to begin our program, we intend to include mentoring opportunities with informal communication both face-to-face and electronically as well as formal workshops on specific courses, enhancement of teaching strategies/techniques and interview workshops to help strengthen their hiring potential.

### **Goal: Department Restructuring**

Our Department has continued to investigate the feasibility of restructuring the Department of Speech Communication. Several community colleges and universities in our area have changed the department name of their Speech Communication Department to Department of Communication Studies. We feel there is a possibility that the name change could alleviate any confusion regarding discipline-content and course titles.

A change could create a course of study that students would find user-friendly and ensure course viability.

We did conduct a comprehensive review of area schools and gathered data regarding trends in Speech Communication/Communication Studies department structures. We found evidence that there was merit for the change. We have decided to proceed with the department name change.

### **Goal: Course Offerings**

Our intention is to offer more sections of our courses as our consistency long wait-lists indicate a critical need in this area. Achieving this goal is dependent upon the hiring of more faculty ideally full-time.

Sign Language formerly Communicative Disorders

## **Program Review (SP11)**

We have had one specific goal for this program since our previous Program Review.

Goal: Name Change of ComDi to Sign Language/Lip Reading

The Communicative Disorders title is misleading and non-compliant with the standards for Sign Language and Lip Reading. With this change it will now be social conscious. We will create a course of study that students will find user-friendly and ensure course viability. In addition to renaming the courses, we also numbered them to be more consistent to the course content and program development.

We have not begun collecting data for our course-level SLOs in Sign. However, because the student demand in this program is on the rise, the need for additional faculty members may soon be required. While the program is under the umbrella of the Speech Communication Department, the disciplines do not over-lap; thus there may be a need for a full-time instructor in this specific area of study in the future.

We successfully completed our goal for this program. The course titles have been changed along with the specific numbers and will be reflected in the Fall, 2011 catalogue. This success was due to the research and commitment of the department as well as the assistance of varied areas of the college community.

**c) Based on the new data collected (4), what are your plans for change in the future?**

Speech Communication

This early opportunity to create, test and analyze our Student Learning Objectives has been a learning experience. The results have been proven to be at times successful and other times indicators that we have more work to be done in creating a valid tool. The process of creating objective criteria with the best of intentions and forethought was enlightening and motivating for the department. To then use the instrument and see the findings has been a first step towards setting, reaching and maintaining a standard of excellence for the department and ongoing success for the students.

In the area of our goals, we want to continue working on #1 (as mentioned above) and commit to our #2, #3 and #4 goals with renewed resolve. It is likely we will be able to meet this target no later than Spring, 2012.

While facilities are not within our control, we have and will continue to work with the appropriate teams in order to secure permanent classrooms and offices for our department. We were moved to a long-term temporary location recently, however, it is a major desire for our department to have permanent classrooms designed specifically for our discipline and for full and part-time faculty offices to allow us to work together as a team. We are

## Program Review (SP11)

currently allocated three designated classrooms which does not meet student demand.

### Sign Language

Again, at this time predicting "change" is not possible until we are able to begin the process of SLO assessment and review. However, it does appear that this program while small has been consistently growing and will need to be evaluated for additional staff and possibly a certificated program in the future.

## 6. College Wide –

Discuss how the program SLOs as well as the department goals integrate, articulate, and complement the institutional goals and initiatives. (How does your department fit into the big picture?)

### Speech Communication

As a discipline, our department is in direct and successful alignment with the College Wide Goals in the areas of Communication and Critical Thinking.

Every one of our courses address the individual points of:

- Ability to listen
- Ability to speak clearly
- Cooperate and work effectively with individuals and groups using appropriate social skills.
- Find, use, manage, evaluate, and convey information efficiently and effectively.

By reviewing our department's intention in writing our SLOs and the assessment tools we created, it is clear that our goals for our students are the same as those of the college. Our department faculty consistently strives for the success of the student in the classroom, in their current everyday lives and for their future. Each course includes an element of listening, presenting, working together, knowing where to get their information, what to do with it, and how to critically analyze what they have discovered in order to achieve a productive, successful result.

While the SLO results are recent and still in the fine-tuning stages, it is clear that our department is achieving a high standard of success in all of our courses. Our student demand is one of the highest in the college, while being supported by a small, full-time faculty base. Our retention rate is high, student evaluations of instructors are positive, and student grade achievement remains strong.

## Program Review (SP11)

Sign Language

As a program, Sign is in alignment with the College Wide Goals in the areas of Listening, Communicating clearly, Information competency and Collaboration.

Each of the courses in this program rely on the:

- Ability to listen
- Ability to communicate clearly
- Cooperate and work effectively with individuals and groups using appropriate social skills.
- Find, use, manage, evaluate, and convey information efficiently and effectively.

While this program is small, it serves a valuable purpose for our department and the College at large. The need for assisted communication courses and skill development is paramount.

By reviewing our department's intention in writing the SLOs and the assessment tools for this program, it is clear that the goals for the students are the same as those of the college. The Sign faculty consistently strives for the success of the student in the classroom, in their current everyday lives and for their future. Each course includes an element of listening, presenting, working together, and developing the skills necessary to achieve productive, successful results.

The retention rate for this program is high, student evaluations of instructors are positive, student grade achievements are strong and the program is steadily growing - and all with a part-time faculty staff of 5.