2026-27 Comprehensive Program Review

Program: Mathematics

Division: STEM

Writers: Math Department (Alain Olavarrieta, Ashley McHale, Ashley Young, Bhairav Sigh, Carrie Frates, David Powers, Elizabeth Owens, Michael Peterson, Robert August, Jennie Graham)

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Jennie Graham

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.

- *Continued outreach to local High School students.*
- *Continued outreach to local adult schools.*
- *Continued to offer synchronous evening year-long Math 3 to local High Schools – it consistently fills with a waitlist prompting offering a second semester long math 3 that focused on dual enrollment in Fall 2026.*
- *Continued to offer attached concurrent support sections for both Statistics and Pre-Calculus for Puente cohort as well as a Statistics section and two calculus sections for the general student population – these continue to fill.*
- *Moved all completely asynchronous math classes for STEM majors (trigonometry, precalculus, calculus and above) to hybrid for in-person tests. The department has noticed an unfortunate downward trend in student success rates from calc 1 (online testing was allowed) to calc II and beyond where online testing is not allowed. So not only were we already shifting the direction of on-campus tests, but this was also in response to articulation push back from transfer institutions unwillingness to accept units from math classes that had online testing. Additionally, the CSU Math Council Resolution Regarding*

Academic Integrity and In-Person Testing Requirements, while not legally enforceable (yet), has caused some concern over creating difficulties for student transfer.

- *Collaborated with Chabot Math Department to update the Math 1 and 2 curriculums during the transition to common course numbering so that our school's course outlines maintain parity, making it easier for students to take their classes at either school.*

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

- *An overarching challenge is balancing diverse educational needs with effective course deliveries under limited resources and support structures. Our students continue to be forced into math classes that they aren't prepared for, and we are supposed to say "you can do it!" While this may be true for some students, it is not true for all students, especially given the varying resources they have available to them. Our Concurrent support courses, Math Jam, and our tutorial center can only do so much and only if the students use them. Our faculty and instructional assistants are the primary factor in student success, and they are all stretched thin with college responsibilities in addition to their teaching obligations.*
- *Two unfilled full-time faculty replacement positions leave holes in the department's productivity and ability to adjust to the continuing changes the state dictates. All our full-time faculty are stretched thin with responsibilities, and our part-time faculty, while helpful, cannot fill in these gaps adequately since their availability to focus on LPC issues and students is limited. Additionally, full-time faculty, contractually, have to give their students more time and support through their office hours whereas it is optional for part-time faculty. Our students are in desperate need of support with their math classes given the expectations laid upon them by the state.*
- *A replacement for our missing instructional assistant was ranked number 1 via RAC in Spring 2026, but the position was not funded. Our position increase request for our Sr. Instructional assistant was not ranked high enough for potential funding but was equally as important. Thankfully, we were able to hire a replacement for our Sr. IA (retired May 2026) for the next academic year, but at the previous 32-hour/week 12-month. This Sr. IA's only support, outside of the faculty, is a 10hr/week, 10-month position which is just enough to give them time to have lunch and still give the faculty support. The ranked #1 IA position was another 12-month position that would have not only offered more substantial support for our Sr. IA, but also our students. It would have allowed us to support not only the Emporium classes, but the Concurrent Support classes as well.*
- *Potentially we will need to shift our Stat classes that currently allow online testing to all have on-campus testing as well. We had four hybrid sections in Spring 2026, six fully online and the rest in-person. The hybrid students' student success rates were nearly 20% lower than the fully online students. The department already knew that the online classes were inflating grades, but to see by how much was alarming. While we are not experiencing the same push back from the transfer institutions regarding articulating online stat classes (except the CSU resolution), we are considering a departmental decision to make all our stat classes hybrid as well. However, this will no doubt reduce college enrollments since many of our online stat classes are populated by students who are outside our service area and in some cases would have no way to come to campus for testing. This also removes stats from the California Virtual Campus exchange. This coming spring 2027, many of our faculty who typically teach the online stat classes have already opted to make them hybrid. We have 8 hybrids (tests on campus),*

4 fully online and the rest are in-person. So, it will be interesting to see what the fill rates/enrollments look like for those classes next spring.

- *Coordinating with other STEM disciplines so that students aren't blocked from taking needed classes for their pathways. We make it work, but it is a challenge – we are also not taking the GE classes into account when we plan our schedules. One major issue has always been classroom management. It is impossible to know when a room has space and if that space is being used effectively during the scheduling process.*
- *Explosion of (student and instructor) use of AI with very little direction from the college to normalize behavior around it has been an issue. Both faculty and students are confused about how it should and could be used to effectively help learn/teach. Faculty feel like students are cheating and students are, in some cases, scared to use it. Faculty don't know enough to know what tools students have at their fingertips and how to effectively teach them to use it with integrity.*
- *Updating Math 2, 3 and Math 34 to use open educational resources instead of the VERY expensive publisher materials. As noted, FT faculty already have plenty on their plates, so finding time to work on this project has been a challenge. PT faculty have been helpful in bursts, but without having someone, or multiple someones, to coordinate the efforts, the project is not being managed as efficiently as it could be.*

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

- *Acquire class sets of scientific calculators for instructors to borrow for testing to alleviate the burden of students purchasing calculators. We already have three sets of Graphing calculators (the expensive ones) to help cover the nearly 20 sections of statistics that are offered each semester, but the rest of our classes typically only require/recommend a scientific calculator. Outside of the limited supply the library has for check-out, there isn't another option for students other than to buy them.*
- *Moving Calculus sequence to early transcendentals (rearrangement of content to be standardized across Math 1 and Math 2). This is in line with many of our neighboring schools and transfer institutions.*
- *Compete the transition for Math 2 and 3 to use Open Educational Materials. This will be a requirement for LPC faculty to use as of Fall 2027, though this academic year all faculty currently teaching these sections are using some form of OER materials. Completing this project gives our students consistent, free material to use throughout the sequence.*
- *Complete the transition for Math 34 to use Open Education Materials. It is already a requirement for faculty to use the content, but it was all based on Chabot's resources which are not ideal for LPC classes since our course outlines do not align. The project will help identify the holes in the textbook, online homework template, and adjust the course information sheet to support all new faculty teaching this class, which will ideally improve student experiences in that course.*
  Revisit CBE for more of our courses. The requirements for students to apply for CBE might be updating to something that will make CBE possible for new LPC students as well as dual enrollment students.

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)
    - CurrIQunet
    - 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?

- *Based on data collected both through SLOS and college success data for the previous three years, for the 2023-2026 cycle, we decided to just focus on two of our PSLOs each semester for all 3 years in order to follow trends from semester to semester.*
    - *Upon successful completion of the Mathematics AS-T, students will be able to use mathematical reasoning and, when appropriate, a general problem-solving process to solve problems.*
    - *Upon successful completion of the Mathematics AS-T, students will be able to learn mathematics through modeling real-world situations.*
- *More specifically, we wanted to focus on Math 1 (Calculus I) and Math 40 (Statistics – Now STAT C1000) as entry level classes for our AS-T.*

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?

- *The data collects during the last three years has been in consistent for a few reasons:*
    - *Issues with elumen – missed a semester*
    - *Transition out of eLumen - Used Google Sheets*
    - *Issues with the new data collection system - used combination of new system and GoogleSheets*

  While we were unable to fully follow trends in the disaggregated data, we were able to at least follow "success data" for the courses.
    - *We did originally intend to look at the throughline of Math 1 to Math 2 to Math 3, but due to inadequate faculty participation, we don't have enough data to make that meaningful comparison.*

- *For our Problem Solving SLO we found the following percent met the SLO for each academic year:*
    - *STAT: 58.06% (AY23-24) --> 45.08% (AY24-25) --> 52.62%(AY25-26)*
    - *Math 1: 52.97% (AY23-24) --> 48.79% (AY24-25) --> 41.52%(AY25-26)*
- *For our Modeling SLO we found the following percent met the SLO for each academic year:*
    - *STAT: 62.21% (AY23-24) --> 56.96% (AY24-25) --> 58.19%(AY25-26)*
    - *Math 1: N/A (AY23-24) --> 40.00% (AY24-25) --> 36.67%(AY25-26)*
- *Conclusions?*

- *Strictly using the SLO data makes it hard to make firm conclusions since the percentages were not based on data from the entire math department. However, the values do alight relatively well with the college's course success data. At that level, there is the same dip in Calculus success rate as well as relatively similar statistics success rates, so we can be reasonably sure the data set is a "good" sample of how students are doing with those topics.*
- *During the data reflection, faculty noted that for calculus*
    - *Students are struggling with arithmetic, fundamental algebra, and other basic problem-solving skills that faculty do not have time to review and still complete the course outline's content.*
- *During the data reflection, faculty noted that for Statistics*
    - *The SLO used to assess problem solving is a topic that faculty interpret many different ways, making as many different types of assessment styles, some notably easier for students than others. This makes the data for this assessment challenging to take at face value.*
    - *In general, though, the topic is covered early in the semester, so regardless of how it is assessed, it is noticeably missed in cases where faculty do not continue to emphasize it throughout the semester since the SLO is assessed on the final exam.*
- *General comments on student performance/behavior and assessment methods for either course:*
    - *Students are struggling with the transition of daily homework in high school to weekly homework assignments.*
    - *Use of AI has made teaching online/hybrid classes more challenging. Even in-person classes are struggling with helping students understand how to use AI tools with integrity and to help learn rather than to do.*
    - *Having both asynchronous and in-person data in the same data set does not make sense. Students testing online vs. students testing in-person have very different permissions.*

- *Equity:*
    - *Part of our analysis of disaggregated Program Level data in Fall 2023, showed that*
        - *Based on gender, our students met the standard for Problem Solving equitably, but there was a slightly larger gap between male student success and the other groups for Modeling.*
        - *Based on ethnicity, modeling proved more difficult for all groups with only a couple of exceptions.*
    - *We were unable to capture disaggregated data during the following year, and the remaining year we were unable to run program level data. However, we do have disaggregated data for a year of Math 1 and a semester of Stats (both part of the program)*
        - *Based on gender, for Math 1 and Stats, we found that for problem solving and modeling, all groups performed similarly.*
        - *Based on ethnicity, for Stats, there isn't a large discrepancy between the two outcomes, with a few exceptions: White students, Hispanic students and the "other" category all perform higher on the modeling outcome. For Math 1, there is still more difficulty with modeling, however, the discrepancy isn't as obvious given the number of students who met the problem-solving standard has decreased drastically for all groups.*

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

- *Math 1 – Problem Solving/modeling: Discussion for increasing the number of students who met the standard revolved around ways to help improve their prerequisite knowledge while they are taking calculus. Strategies such as just-in-time review, review assignments, more skill & drill style assignments to target specific areas, etc. The focus is tending more towards sorting out how to give them the algebra and trig skills they need so that they can then learn the calculus content.*
- *Stats – Problem Solving/Modeling: Discussion mostly focused on the idea of revamping the SLO for problem solving to either focus on a different topic that still allows faculty to gage problem solving comprehension or creating a set of standardized SLO assessment questions that all faculty used to make the collected data more meaningful.*
- *General: We are going to continue to assess the Problem Solving/Modeling SLOs for all of our courses. With the new assessment platform, and more faculty consistently adding their data, the goal will be to dig more into the disaggregated data to identify any inequities. At the moment, not only does our data has too many holes in it to have a meaningful equity discussion, but the requirements for math placement also shifted dramatically during the course of this three year assessment period which added another variable to consider. So, outside of general strategies to help all the students in our classes, we will wait to do a more in-depth impact study until we have data for this new cycle. One such strategy is rehiring our third department Instructional assistant to be able to offer more out-of-class support time for students as well as more make-up test proctoring coverage to allow faculty to be more situationally fair for students who need that allowance.*

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

- *See note in question 1 about data collection. No supports needed at this time, just working through the kinks of the new assessment data college platform.*

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

- *Overall, there has been an increase in enrollment into math classes at LPC, from 3,377 in 2021 to 4,688 in 2025-26.*
- *Our overall success rates have shown steady improvement from 59% in 2020-21 to 67% in 2025-26. Part of this may reflect the disruption to students' education during the pandemic, but it also reflects the robust response to helping students succeed, such as our support classes.*
- *One course where we had a slight drop in success rates was Math 1 (Calculus 1). This is somewhat expected in view of AB 1705 which pushes more students, regardless of preparation, into this course. As a result of AB 1705, there has been a large increase in enrollment into Math 1, from 478 students in 2020-21 to 1195 in 2025-26. As we continue to improve our support options, we hope to see these success numbers improve. However, we also recently implemented the policy that all testing for Calc I will be done on campus. Our asynchronous, fully online calc I classes, at times, had unusually high success rates. If our recent experiment with fully online stats vs. Hybrid stat success rates are anything to go by, then we may see significant drop in success rates for calc I during the 2026-2027 AY.*
- *There was also a sharp drop in success rates in Math 39 (Trigonometry) from 2024-25 to 2025-26 (56% to 39%), as well as a drop in enrollment (252 to 94). This again likely reflects AB 1705, which narrowed down those taking Math 39 to the students with the least prerequisite math preparation. We are no longer able to offer any algebra-based math classes for our STEM minded students below the level of calculus per the state's guidelines, so many students who are coming out of high school have no choice but to start with trigonometry regardless of their prior math experience.*

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.

- *Success rates were lower for low-income students, students whose gender was listed as other, students with disabilities, older students, and African American/Hispanic/Latino/Native American students.*
- *According to the Student Services Data Packets, Umoja students have a "Successful Completion" of transfer-level math in the spring semester that nearly matches the overall LPC average. For Puente students, the completion rate is significantly higher. Although the sample sizes are small, statewide data shows that Puente and Umoja programs boost academic success, retention and transfer rates for underrepresented students. The college should identify other sources of collaboration or professional development related to these programs to see if similar strategies can be used for students not officially enrolled in these programs.*
- *Students who identify in the intersection of two demographic areas demonstrate larger gaps in success rates compared to the overall LPC population. For example, students who identify as African American and low-income had a success rate of 49% in the 2025-26 academic year, compared to 56% for African Americans overall and 67% for the whole student body. This shows the need for a multi-pronged approach, including continual investment in basic needs for our students who are struggling in a high cost of living area.*

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).

- *Our success rates in distance education have improved over the last few years, to the point that they are now close to those of face-to-face classes, though success rates have been significantly lower in hybrid classes. The instruction delivery of our hybrid classes are similar to that for asynchronous except that testing occurs on campus with face-to-face proctoring.*
- *The distance education rates when we enacted in-person exams in Math 1 dropped significantly from 73% in Spring 2025 to 35% in Spring 2026, which may indicate some issues with distance education having a higher rate of cheating on exams*
- *As noted in earlier sections, the department has already made the decision to make all of our algebra-based classes hybrid (tests on campus). Statistics will be decided on based on what the assigned instructor is comfortable with, but there may be enough pressure from the transfer institutions to implement on-campus testing that we will make that a department policy.*

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__X__ 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.

- *N/A*

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

- *The department provides free supports and materials:*
    - *Over the past three years, the math department has expanded our offerings of Concurrent Support courses, including more dedicated sections of certain courses with attached Concurrent Support.*
        - *These courses support students' learning by offering individualized help from LPC mathematics instructors at a variety of times.*
        - *The opening of the Math Learning Center in Building 2100 has been advantageous for the program, giving us a dedicated space for support courses.*
        - *The sections with attached Concurrent Support allow us to provide extra support to our most impacted classes such as Math 1 and Stat C1000, and our specialized learning communities such as Puente and UMOJA.*
    - *Tuition-free mathematics support options also include Math Jam preparation courses before the Fall semester starts, and a drop-in tutoring class that can be joined at any point during the semester.*
    - *Increased the availability of zero-cost textbook options across many mathematics courses, reducing students' educational expenses, and removing financial barriers to learning.*
        - *Currently the following courses use open-source textbooks Math 1, 2, Math 21, Math 39, math 34 and Stat C1000.*
    - *The department has 3 classroom sets of TI calculators that instructors check out for exam days and in-class demonstrations removing the need for students to buy the expensive device. We are working on getting funding for a couple of classroom sets of Scientific calculators as well.*

- *Continued Collaboration with other disciplines and service areas:*
    - *We have offered a STAT C1000 and Math 21 Puente/Umoja course for the past three Falls.*
    - *Collaboration with the tutorial center to provide embedded tutoring in some concurrent support classes as well as our Math 21 for the Puente and UMOJA programs.*
    - *Increased involvement in the Honor's Program. Fall 2025 and Spring 2026, Math was asked to offer honors sections of in-demand courses. This trend has continued into this academic year. Many math faculty are working towards being "honors trained" in order to mentor the many, many students seeking honors credit as that program grows.*

    - *Continued offering Math 27 for our ECE cohort students even though it is an optional elective since it is no longer part of their degree due to losing its "math credit" status. This class comes out of Math's FETF allotment and is not the most productive course for the department/college, but as long as ECE has students who are interested in taking it, we would like to keep offering it.*
- *Departmental Collaboration:*
    - *Department-led professional development activities for Full and Part-Time faculty members throughout the last academic year. Topics included creating a welcoming syllabus, using Universal Design and Accessibility strategies to update Canvas courses, AI Discussion, and Equitable Grading strategies.*
    - *Offering multiple instructional formats, including traditional instruction, self-paced learning through the Math Emporium, fully online courses in statistics, and Hybrid options in statistics, calc I and calc II.*

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)
	Provides direct instruction over Zoom (e.g. regularly scheduled live online class sessions in synchronous/hybrid/hyflex courses)
	Provides direct instruction through instructor-created videos (e.g. lecture videos created using Studio in asynchronous courses)
	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 Speed grader; 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?

- *RSI can be a challenging time investment for some instructors, particularly our adjunct colleagues who are spread thin by teaching at different colleges.*
    - *The time spent on RSI is not always a direct conversion to time that would have been spent interacting with students face to face.*
    - *It might be beneficial to revive some of our Communities of Practice in the Math Department so instructors of the same course can share ideas, rubrics, and best practices for their online classes. However, full-time faculty are also spread too thin right now and lack the bandwidth to take on additional commitments.*
- *AI usage in asynchronous courses can cause a lack of investment from both students and instructors.*
    - *Work that is clearly generated by AI, or assignments that are completed entirely too quickly to be genuine, can be frustrating to grade.*
    - *The lack of personal connection can take a toll on the maintenance of RSI: When faculty feel like students aren't truly learning, and/or students feel like faculty are farther removed, it is harder to continue to pour effort into regular and substantive interactions.*
- *Balancing the time required for meaningful instructor-student interaction with other teaching responsibilities.*
- *Providing timely, individualized feedback to students in large online classes which have been made even larger by the recent enrollment increase per the new contract.*
- *Encouraging participation and engagement from students who are less active in online courses.*
- *Identifying and reaching out to struggling students before they fall significantly behind.*
    - *Made even more challenging by the removal of personal student emails to reach them.*
- *Finding effective ways to build a sense of classroom community in asynchronous courses.*
- *Ensuring consistent RSI practices across different course formats and instructors.*
- *Learning and keeping up with Canvas tools and technology that support student interaction.*
- *Determining how to document and demonstrate RSI to meet college and accreditation requirements.*

Section 5: Program Review Feedback

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

- *Write responses here*
- *Add or remove bullets as needed*

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