2026-27 Comprehensive Program Review

Program: Graphic Design & Digital Media

Division: Arts & Humanities

Writers: Peter Kuo

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Peter Kuo

Email your completed form to Karin Spirn and your dean by November 2, 2026.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts and info for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Discipline Data Packets – institutional research about disciplines and student services
- ★ Course Success Rates Dashboard – allows you to research your program's success rates

Detailed information and instructions appear at the end of this form. For help, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu.

Section 1: Program Reflection and Planning

These questions appear on all Program Reviews including comprehensive and updates.

1. Please describe your program's most important **achievements** in year 25-26.

- **AI & the Arts Panel Discussion**
  On November 20, 2025 from 7–920pm, Las Positas College Graphic Design & Digital Media program hosted an "AI & the Arts" panel discussion. Hosted by GDDM instructor Peter Kuo and Studio Arts instructor David Wagner, with Outreach Specialist Lilibeth Juarez coordinating the details. Panelists included Jack Ohman from the San Francisco Chronicle, (2016 Pulitzer Prize, 2006 Robert F Kennedy Journalism Award), Chris Meyer from Tri Valley ROP, Marcus Schults (concept artist), Nathan Nickel (Lead Designer, Turner Duckworth), Sonny Thomas (Chief Creative Officer, Inspired Thinking Group), Stephnee Leathers (VP of Brand & Creative, Highspring), Ann Nguyen (Designer, Art Director AN Creative).
  The evening started with the panelists introducing themselves followed by students asking panelist questions and sharing their thoughts. The panelists are from various creative fields and had diverse opinions about the state of the industry, how the industry might change in the future, and their own experiences using AI. The event was well attended, with many students attending from GDDM and ARTs, as well as journalism.
- **Digital Media Showcase**
  On May 20, 2026 from 6:30–9:30pm GDDM held our first Digital Media Showcase in the lobby of the 1000 building. When we typically have portfolio class, we arrange for advisory board members to come as panelists for students to present their work. With the higher than typical enrollment for the Spring 26

semester, the class decided to do a Showcase instead, where each student has a table setup to display and showcase their design portfolio. About 20 students displayed their works and there were many attendees. The lobby area was decorated with oversized banners announcing the event and TVs with slides of student's profiles.

- **GDDM10 – 3D Modeling and Animation**
  Spring26 our new class with focus on 3D software was offered.

2. Please describe your most important **challenges** in year 25-26

Like many other programs, GDDM's current challenges involve the use of AI. As a CTE program, the introduction and adoption of AI technology has a huge impact on the design industry. Over the last few years, the conversation around AI in the creative industry has changed from the limitations of the technology to how to integrate and adopt the technology into existing workflows. There are now multiple AI tools that are used specifically for image and video generation (Nano Bananna, Flux..etc) in addition to AI features being introduced into traditional creative software like Photoshop, Illustrator, InDesign. Our challenges with AI is summarized below:

- **AI Model Standardization**
  The department encourages students to experiment with various AI tools and models but do not have any official guideline for recommended software. Many of these tools are new and there is no industry consensus on standardization of software or workflow. This is one of the issues we will bring to our advisory board for their insight and recommendations.

- **AI Model Subscriptions**
  AI use is computationally expensive, and many models limit usage or wall off advanced features unless users pay a subscription fee. Subscriptions are also usage based so the more the software is used, the more it costs. Though we do not require students to use specific AI tools for projects, it does mean that not all students have equal access to exploring and experimenting with these new tools. This is an equity issue.

  This challenge is especially problematic with Adobe software. Adobe Creative Cloud has been the industry standard in creative software for many years and remains the dominant software taught in the classrooms across the country. The school has an institutional license for Adobe Creative cloud, meaning that machines on campus can have an installation of the software and any user (with a free account) will be able to use the software. However, this license does not allow users to take advantage of many of the newer, more advanced AI features. In order to do so, users have to individual purchase a Creative Cloud Pro account which includes premium credits. GDDM program coordinator and A&H Dean has contacted the IT department regarding this issue in the past to see what options are available for students but has not heard back. This creates huge issues on both ends, for students to be able to complete assignments and for instructors to figure out how to teach tools that not all students have access to. Currently, our instructors are using their own paid licenses to be able to demonstrate premium tools in the classroom, but students might not be able to follow along and try the tools themselves unless they have their own paid license.

- **AI's effect on the Industry**
  While creative AI tools proliferate, the long term impact on the industry remain uncertain. We already see other schools implement courses with AI tools as a central part of the curriculum, and the program must make sure students are prepared and ready for the future job market. During our next advisory board meeting we will spend a portion of time to discuss how to teach and incorporate this new technology into the classroom even as the tools are changing and evolving.

3. What are your upcoming **plans**? Please note any ways that these support student achievement and equity.

- **Request new Wacom tablets and printers:** They are really old and the software drivers no longer work. IT has to install really old, outdated software to get them to run.
- **Consult with Advisory board** on incorporation of AI technology regarding shifting industry skillsets in various disciplines within our program (graphic design, web design, digital illustration)
- Based on advisory board recommendations, update curriculum, degrees and certificates
- Deactivate GDDM 63

Section 2: SLOs/SAOs

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review, with brief annual check-ins on the Program Review Updates. The following resources will be useful when completing this section:

- Three-Year Assessment Template
- Aggregated and Disaggregated Data from the following sources:
  - ELumen (if saved--no longer available online)
  - CurrlQunet
  - Student Success Dashboard

1. During the 2023-2026 three-year assessment cycle that just concluded, what did your program set out to learn through your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessments?

2. Based on your analysis of your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessment data, what conclusions did you draw about student outcomes and equity in your program?

- Overall student success rates across GDDM for the last 3 years 73%, 65%, 67%) are within the set-standard for course success at 61%
- *In regards to equity, we looked at student success rates across multiple demographics*
  - *Students with disabilities and without disabilities have similar success rates*
  - Male and females students have similar success rates
  - First-Time Any College students have a lower success rates than the program average and success rates have declined within the last 3 years (60%, 57%, 46%)

    - Enrollment for First-Time Any College students have dropped as well from 29 to 24 to 18.
    - High School and Continuing students have the highest success rate, though overall enrollment of high school students is statistically low
    - Students between 20-21 and between 30-39 have the lowest success rates.
    - Many other demographic indicators such as income, gender, etc have similar success rates
- Based on my experience, there are multiple factors that contribute to student success that cannot be captured in demographic data. From the data that is reflected in the student success dashboard, the program is doing well in meeting equity goals.

3. Explain potential plans to improve student outcomes and close equity gaps.

- When there are qualified students and scheduling allows, GDDM sometimes have embedded tutors from the tutoring center in our classes. Embedded tutors work with students one-on-one to review course materials, discuss assignments, and reinforce learning. Embedded tutors are especially helpful for students that need more individualized attention.

4. Describe any obstacles that you encountered in your assessment process and any supports that would be helpful.

Section 3: Data Discussion

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review. Workshops and office hours will be offered in Fall 2026 to support Program Review writers.

1. RPIE Data Review: Discuss any significant trends in the data provided by the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (or any other data you use for decision-making and planning).

*(**Note**: Not all Programs have RPIE data available; if your program does not have a data packet or dashboard data, you may note that in the response box and reach out to the RPIE team.)*

Data may come from:

- RPIE Data Packets
- Transfer data
- Succes Rates Dashboard (scroll down on page)
- Requested data from the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE)
- SLO/SAO data
- Data from program-created surveys or investigations
- Any other relevant source of quantitative or qualitative data

- RPIE Data Shows information from Fall 2021 to Spring 2026. Over that period, both student headcount and total course enrollments have increased on average, with Fall 25 and Spring 26 each with 179 enrollments (the highest in the last 5 years).
- Distance Education data reflects the modalities in which the classes are offered, with Fall 21 showing 93% DE only courses, while other semesters have a more diverse mix between face-to-face courses, hybrid, and DE courses. In the last couple of years, the department has made it a focus to offer courses in both formats where possible and that's reflected in the data. In Spring 26, 78% of students use both face-to-face and DE. The percentage of face-to-face only students have fallen from a high of around 45% (F22 47%, S22 42%, F23 45%) to around 10 percent. In 25-26 (F24 14%, S25 11%, F25 14%, S26 13%)
- Student Success Rates tend to be lower in the fall than in the spring semester, and has been trending downwards for the last 3 years from a high of 74% in F23 to 68% in F24 and then 59% in F25. Students are more successful in the spring semester. Though S25 is low at 64%, the other semesters have 70% and higher success rates.
- Productivity (WSCH/FTEF) was really low for S22 to S23 (S22 361, F22 308, S23 341) but then is higher from F23 till the latest data at S26 (between 435 to 547).
- FTES is slowing creeping up, from a low of 18.7 in S22 to a high of 33.7 in S26. Every spring and every fall has a small increase in the total FTES
- Fill rates are fairly consistent at the high 70s, with S24 having an unusually high rate of 110%

2. Equity: Did your data reveal any patterns of inequity? If so, please explain those patterns and any actions that should be taken at the program or college level.

- *Analyzing the Data from course success rates, there was no major difference in student success rates across several demographics including disability status, gender, income.*
- *For race-ethnicity it's hard to evaluate the data since there are many different categories and with a small sample size sometimes the sample size for a category is just one student.*

3. Course Modality (Instructional Programs Only): In reviewing your program's data packet and Succes Rates Dashboard, are there differences in success rates by modality (i.e. face-to-face, asynchronous, synchronous, hybrid, or hyflex)? If so, reflect on what might account for differences and any actions that should be taken. (Non-instructional programs may also choose to reflect on online vs. in-person services if applicable).

- *Students continue to enjoy the convenience of a hyflex class, with many students taking the an entire course as an online synchronous course, some treat it as full face-to-face and some switching back and forth based on illness, scheduling, etc. Students sometimes have challenges in attending class if they are online in one class with the next class in person.*
- *GDDM only has one online asynchronous class (GDDM3 history of design) which is offered during summers. GDDM 3 has a lower than average success rate with the last 2 years being 60% and 58%. The use of AI for the course has grown over the years and has contributed to lower student success.*

- *Beyond that, DE and none DE courses have similar success rates*

4. Program-Set Standard (Instructional Programs Only): The program-set standard is a baseline that alerts programs if their student success rates have dipped suddenly below 95% of the rolling 5-year average. There is no punishment for not meeting the standard, and many valid reasons this may occur. When a program does not meet this standard, they are asked to examine possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate. | Program-set standard data can be found on this page

5a. Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion in AY25-26?

Yes_✓_ No____

5b. If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests. Success rates for individual courses can be found on the Success Rates Dashboard.

Section 4: Special Topics

These questions have been chosen for this year's Comprehensive Program Review to meet reporting mandates (for accreditation, Ed. Code, or other sources).

1. Mission: Describe 1-3 examples of how your program's work has aligned with the college's mission, vision, values, and/or educational master plan over the past three years. (Possibilities might include new initiatives, resource allocation/use, program improvements, or other activities). • Mission, Vision, and Values • Educational Master Plan

- LPC's Graphic Design & Digital Media program teaches students in-demand technical tools, creative problem solving and critical thinking skills. Graphic designers have always been required to be versatile and adaptable to changes in the media landscape. Designers embrace emerging technologies, defining new professional roles and responsibilities as technologies grow and shift. Graphic designers are the first to become experts in building websites, user interfaces, app development, and will possess the skills and mindset to incorporate upcoming technological innovations as they develop and become active, valuable contributors in their communities.

2. Regular Substantive Interaction (Instructional Programs Only)

To meet our college, ACCJC, state, and federal standards, **all online instructors** must demonstrate "**regular and substantive interaction**" (RSI) with students. That is, we must be clearly providing instruction and interacting with our online students, just like we would in an on-campus class. The following reflection questions allow us to capture how RSI is occurring in our classes.

The following documents explain requirements and best practices for RSI:

- ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education
- Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements

2a. If your program offers DE courses, how are Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements met in your area? Examples appear on the DE addendums of your Course Outlines of Record. Place an X next to each method used in your courses.	
X	Course materials make clear to students how often and when the instructor will interact with students (e.g. syllabus/home page lists email/office hours/other ways to communicate and typical response times)
X	Provides direct instruction over Zoom (e.g. regularly scheduled live online class sessions in synchronous/hybrid/hyflex courses)
X	Provides direct instruction through instructor-created videos (e.g. lecture videos created using Studio in asynchronous courses)
X	Provides additional information from various sources/mediums to engage students with course content (e.g. instructor-curated content in Canvas pages that help deepen students understanding of course content)
X	Facilitates discussions (e.g. through Canvas discussion boards, Pronto, Studio, or Hypothesis)
X	Provides feedback on students' coursework (e.g. through detailed rubrics and/or assignment comments in Speedgrader; note: a grade alone does not quality as RSI, nor does auto-graded feedback students may get through completing publisher content)
X	Responds to students' questions (e.g. through timely responses to student messages in Canvas Inbox, discussion boards, social annotation assignments)
X	Facilitates student success through ongoing outreach (e.g. posts announcements; uses "Message Students Who" to encourage struggling students to attend office hours or access free tutoring)
	Other [explain]:

2b. What challenges if any have you faced in implementing RSI? What additional training or resources might instructors in your program need to increase the quality of RSI in online courses?

- The majority of GDDM classes are offered in person. Online course are mostly synchronous hybrid or synchronous online. All instructors in GDDM also use Canvas for instruction which facilitates discussion boards, zoom meetings, emails,
- One class GDDM 3 – history of design is offered as an asynchronous online class during summer. We use canvas discussion boards, instructor regularly participates in online discussion boards, provide individualized student feedback on discussions, assignments (research paper thesis development, feedback on outline and drafts), respond to canvas emails and office hours.

Section 5: Program Review Feedback

What questions or suggestions do you have about this year's Program Review forms or process?

- I heart program reviews!

Detailed Instructions

Instructions

1. Send an electronic copy of this form to Program Review chair, Karin Spirn, and your Dean by Monday, November 2.
2. Please respond to questions with enough detail to present your information; it doesn't have to be long.
3. If the requested information does not apply to your program, write "Not Applicable."
4. Even if you don't have much to report, we want to hear from you, so your voice is part of the college planning process.
5. Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.

Sections: There are five sections to the document:

1. Program Reflection and Planning
2. SLO/SAO Review
3. Data analysis
4. Special topics
5. Feedback on the PR template and process

Time Frame: This Program Review should reflect your program status during the 25-26 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2026-27. It is fine to discuss topics beyond these time frames, but please specify the time frame in your responses.

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Uses: This Program Review will inform the audience about your program. It is also used in creating division summaries, determining college planning priorities, and determining the allocation of resources. The final use is to document the fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

Equity: Here is the LPC definition of equity, which is a guiding principle in reviewing programs: "Equity is parity in student educational outcomes. It places student success and belonging for students of color and disproportionately impacted students at the center of focus."

Please note: Program Review is NOT a vehicle for making requests. All requests should be made through appropriate processes (e.g., Instructional Equipment Request Process) or directed to your dean or supervisor.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Fall 2023 Program Reviews
- ★ Program Review FAQs

For help with your program review, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu