

Administrative Response to Program Review Child & Family Studies (CFS) Program June 2020

In June of 2020, the Child & Family Studies Subject Area Committee (SAC) submitted their Program Review document findings to our PCC community. Given the constraints of working in the remote environment due to COVID-19, the SAC opted to forgo a presentation of their findings.

This Administrative Response will: A) note particular highlights of the program and Program Review document; B) provide observations and recommendations; and C) provide the administrative response to the SAC recommendations/resource requests.

Noteworthy Efforts or Achievements

- Thoughtful and effectively implemented expansion of the program to include Family & Human Services. Developing of the degree itself, as well as courses and focus areas.
- Successful renewal of the NAEYC National Accreditation.
- Commitment to implementing a 3-year review matrix for all department courses to ensure that all courses are thoroughly reviewed and maintain up-to-date with industry and accreditation standards.
- Attention to ensuring that there is a direct connection of course outcomes to assignments.
- Effective examination of completion rates and analysis of where the bottleneck was occurring in ECE, with resulting programmatic changes aimed at decreasing barriers and increasing completion.
- Consistent use of the same Child & Family Studies course templates and cadence, as well as efforts to ensure accessibility of materials to support student success.
- Focus on enhancing articulation to Clark College.
- Intentional application and development of retention tools/strategies like the CFS Student Support Form.

Observations and Recommendations

- Your department emphasizes diversity, equity, and inclusion as well as cultural competency in its mission statement. We see some evidence of this commitment in your degree/certificate outcomes, but note that this could

be elevated and made even more explicit in outcome statements. However, we acknowledge that for NAEYC, your degree outcomes are tied directly to accreditation standards. Where accreditation standards direct outcomes, we urge you to consider other ways you can ensure that your commitment to DEI and cultural competency is embedded throughout the program, utilizing PCC's Equity & Empowerment Guide and Critical Race Theory (CRT) toolkit to guide and analyze your process. We would also like to see a commitment to training students in anti-bias/anti-racist teaching practices reinforced throughout your program.

- We also appreciate your commitment to furthering the cultural competency of your faculty by integrating DEI topics into your “huddles” and reading books together. As you engage in these conversations, we hope that you critically reflect upon and analyze the ways that systemic oppression is built into the very fabric of your profession and academia, in general. Given that the fields of education and human services are poised to reinforce systems of oppression, as well as the parallel opportunities these fields offer to radically transform society, your ongoing attention to equity and inclusion in your program is absolutely critical.
- In your program review document, you note “Many practitioners ‘drop in’ to take a class in order to meet state required professional development obligations and then ‘drop back’ into the workforce.” We recognize that this drop in version of programming can create significant enrollment management challenges. In addition, when aiming to serve two different audiences (credit and continuing education) in the same course, we risk watering down our offerings. We encourage you to explore the possibility of partnering with CLIMB to offer non-credit programming, CEUs, or other methods for better assessing potential practitioner needs, packaging offerings, and advertising offerings to practitioners to create more predictability in programming and ensure that our credit students have a clear sense of when courses will be offered throughout the degree program.
- We strongly encourage you to add SAC level questions on student evaluations to get student feedback more systematically for each course and instructor.
- We appreciate your investment in better understanding the reasons that students struggle to complete your degrees. We encourage you to gather more input directly from students to inform programmatic changes aimed at increasing success/completion rates. We encourage you to consider whether a student survey and/or the SAC-specific questions on the course

evaluations could be used to help you gather feedback directly from students about the ways the program could better support completion and/or the barriers they face which impact their successful completion.

- In line with the college's commitment to equitable student success, we urge you to review disaggregated data on course success rates. We will be providing you these data in the upcoming Annual Program Update process. We look forward to your thoughtful review of these data and consideration of ways we can promote equitable student success in your program and beyond.
- You mention in your program review document that you “outline ‘job expectations’ of students working in the ECE and HUS fields to better clarify how the program can and cannot meet accommodations”. We ask that you please work with Disability Services to review these documents to ensure that these materials are in line with college expectations around inclusion, non-discrimination, and accessibility. We ask that you include your Dean and our Child Development Center Director in this consultation with Disability Services.
- We encourage you to consider how your field/industry will be impacted by the pandemic and begin integrating these considerations into your programmatic updates.
- We note that you currently have your Perkins advisor serving in a role of writing tutor. We encourage you to work with our Sylvania Manager of Academic Support, Kellin Thompson, to examine how we can better meet tutoring support needs, thereby freeing up your Perkins advisor to support advising and career development. Efforts are underway to expand tutoring hours and remote services.
- ECE Feedback on Learning Assessment: It is commendable that in the first year of assessment 86% of the 43 students who did this assignment have achieved the benchmark of 70% in ECE 123. ECE SAC's future plans to review the assignment instructions, adding details on citation requirements and providing examples will help achieve consistent and better results. While assignment improvements are considered, peer reviewers would like to see more clarity about any course outcomes under consideration for the revisions based on the assessment result. The ECE SAC is commended for carrying out the assessment in a timely fashion despite the challenges posed due to the pandemic. Given that 2020 was the first year using a rubric for the assessment, a review of the rubric can be considered by the SAC. It will help the reviewers to understand the

methodology if the SAC presents results of the assignment at a disaggregated level in the future.

- HUS Feedback on Learning Assessment: The SAC was only able to submit a Summary Data Report for the HUS portion of the SAC. We see good passing rates for non-TSA assessments.

We are pleased with the many advancements this SAC has made since the last program review and with the commitment we see from your SAC to promoting student success. We urge you to continue to keep up the great work.

Administrative Response to Recommendations Requiring Administrative Support

Recommendation: *Dual Faculty Department and SAC Chair Model.*

Our programs have grown substantially over the last five years. Not only have we improved and streamlined ECE practicum to shorten student time-to-completion, we have added a degree and certificate (HUS) to our departmental portfolio. As of May 2020, our program majors are robust with 429 ECE majors (degree/certificates), and 240 HUS majors (degree/certificate). HUS is only in its second year of implementation, and we expect these numbers to grow. In order to focus attention on each of these programs, navigate NAEYC and CSHSE accreditation requirements (including reporting and compliance), hire, support and develop part-time faculty, attend local, regional and national disciplinary conferences, student outreach/marketing, build community partnership through the advisory committees, off site contracted work, SAC requirements and additional college requirements for both disciplines and a champion each respective discipline. We highly recommend a dual chair model for the CFS program. Our recommendation includes adequate funding and a financial commitment from the college for one .50 release for ECE and one .50 release for HUS to support each respective program's needs. These chairs will work in collaboration and concert with one another to continue the robust leadership we provide to students and our regional, national and community partners in ECE and HUS.

- **Response:** This recommendation for dual FDCs has been implemented, understanding the unique needs of each of these programs and challenges associated with a separate national accreditation process and separate program support processes.

Recommendation: Full-Time HUS Field Experience Faculty. *As the HUS program grows, there is a need for more full-time faculty resources, especially for the HUS Field Experience (FE) Program. Currently, there is one full-time HUS faculty teaching, chairing, and running the FE program. Given the nature of FE and accreditation requirements outlined by CSHSE, FE needs more attention, focus, and faculty presence. Not only do students need to be placed in their respective internship sites, FE requires a level of expertise, consistency, and time that can't be provided in our current model. Our recommendation is to hire a full-time HUS faculty member to build and support our FE programs, orient and evaluate Onsite Supervisors, develop stakeholder engagement, manage FE logistics, and build key community connections that are essential to the growth, development, and quality of our HUS FE program.*

- **Response:** We are in support of your dean bringing forward an additional HUS position once we have data demonstrating consistent enrollment levels and completion rates. Currently, there is an annual process for deans to elevate faculty personnel needs to the district for a prioritization/reallocation process. However, we urge you to include this request in an upcoming Annual Program Update, supplying enrollment data/trends and completion rates as context for the request.

Recommendation: Continued Professional Development Support. *As a CTE department, our disciplines are consistently evolving and changing. As such, there is an ongoing need for continued professional development for both ECE and HUS faculty (PT and FT). In addition to the typical channels of accessing professional development (i.e., POD and Perkins) which are often dependent on frequency of development (i.e., every two years) or finite funds (Perkins has many programs to support; POD offers limited funds for conference attendance). Additionally, as CTE faculty, there are specific industry certifications we are required to maintain in order to do our jobs (i.e., CLASS certifications, MHFA Instructor Certifications, etc.) Our recommendation is that the college make a financial commitment and provide adequate funding for CFS to access professional development funds through our division budget to be determined in collaboration with the CFS co-chairs and Division Dean.*

- **Response:** While we understand the desire to have a separate pot of money, this approach creates redundancies which could have an adverse effect on other programs (especially those that are non-Perkins eligible). The college has recently shifted a great deal of resources to devote a greater allocation for non-personnel costs (like equipment and professional development) for Perkins programs. It is important to note, however,

Perkins does not make it a practice to pay for required certifications and continuing education requirements. Perkins believes this is the responsibility of the individual. Perkins will cover these items if they are part of a conference or other kind of meeting. We urge you to continue to use the Perkins request process. This funding is aimed at protecting funds for professional development for Career Technical Instruction to meet the specific needs you mention above.

Recommendation: *Child and Family Studies Conference.* *Plan, and implement a Child and Family Studies conference in collaboration with Dual Credit (School Districts), PCC Child Development Center and Community Partners to provide a series of ECE and HUS workshops. Participants would include: Dual Credit high school students, Dual Credit high school teachers, PCC students, early learning partners and parents. Our recommendation is that the college provide adequate funding and a financial commitment to plan, implement, and evaluate a conference of this nature on a bi-annual basis, including funding for coordination and presenter stipends.*

- **Response:** We support a bi-annual conference of this nature through the use of Perkins V funding, which should include support for coordination and presenter stipends. As the use of Perkins V funding may limit the total number of times such a conference can be held, we encourage the exploration of collaboration with external partners and/or grant opportunities. Please work with the Dual Credit Office on next steps.

Recommendation: *Increased Advising and Tutoring Support.* *As our programs grow, there is a need for more advising and tutoring support. Currently, we have a half-time perkins advisor that acts as both a program advisor and writing tutor for all students in the CFS department. In their current role, our advisor is stretched to support student needs at a .50 load, in addition to supporting the ongoing maintenance and updating of advising materials, developing job aids for faculty and students (e.g., APA style guides, PowerPoint tutorials, etc.). In addition, there is a need for additional support regarding the application processes, data entry and tracking for ECE and HUS practicum/field students. We recommend an increase in our Perkins tutoring load to .75 to meet the needs of students and to support equitable student learning and success in our department.*

- **Response:** The college is centralizing tutoring, offering an opportunity for programs to partner with requests for tutoring support, without the added challenges of training and managing tutoring support independently. Please reach out to Kellin Thompson, Sylvania Manager of Academic

Support, to determine how we can support the unique tutoring needs of your program and students. This will free up your Perkins advisor to focus on advising and career development.

Closing

In closing, we want to again thank the CFS faculty for sharing the results of your program review with us. We enjoyed learning more about the discipline, your successes, and plans for the future. We look forward to supporting your ongoing work on continuous program improvement.

Administrative Response submitted by Karen Paez, with input from and on behalf of the Deans of Instruction and Dean of Academic Affairs.

Ann Cary, Interim Dean of Academic Affairs

Cheryl Scott, Dean of Instruction, Rock Creek Campus

Jen Piper, Dean of Instruction

Karen Paez, Dean of Instruction, Sylvania Campus

Kurt Simonds, Dean of Instruction, Cascade Campus

Sarah Tillery, Interim Dean of Instruction Southeast Campus

In addition, the following administrators were consulted to inform this response:

Katy Ho, Vice President of Academic Affairs

Dana Fuller, Dean of Social Science, Sylvania

Simone Chaves, Director of the Child Development Center

Beth Molenkamp, Dual Credit Program Manager

Kellin Thompson, Sylvania Interim Manager of Academic Support

Jan Volinski, Grants Officer