2026-27 Comprehensive Program Review

Program: Welding Technology

Division:PATH

Writers: S. Miner

SLO/SAO Point-Person: S.Miner

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.

- *High School Engagement through multiple channels, including, but not limited to, CCAP course and certificate delivery to SRVUSD High Schools for four years. Delivery of our after-school WLDT 70 course at Livermore High School, engagement with TEC Tri-Valley Educators forum, as well as hosting over 125 students in our welding lab for a Manufacturing Day gathering.*
- *Embedded tutoring in Welding lab courses*
- *REAP NNSA Community Ed course delivery. Topics included were Additive Manufacturing, Welding Technology and the first in California NonDestructive Examination (NDE) community Ed course.*
- *Continued strong enrollment at or near 100%*
- *Students continuing to get jobs from local and regional employers*

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

- Price increases for commodities such as steel, aluminum and stainless steel driving by increased tariffs.

- Price for gasses used in almost every course. This is an intangible object that cannot be offset by student materials fees.
- Unstructured Classified Time
- Banner System 9 used by faculty and students
- 40+ accommodation letters/semester, with increasing numbers every subsequent semester.

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

- Continue what we are doing. We have good enrollments, good course success rates, low withdrawal rates, as well as favorable DEIAB metrics.
- Continue the focus on safety as an underpinning of everything we do.
- Focus on course work consistent with standardized unbiased industry compliant certification testing.
- Increase the numbers of system impacted students currently incarcerated at SRJ.

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?

- The value and quality of our Safety instruction
- The quality course work consistent with standardized unbiased industry compliant certification testing.

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?

- One of the most important aspects of welding training is the ability to operate, safety and welding workplace environment. Based on the data, our safety effort continue to serve the needs of students.

We have had a nonexistent history of lost time work by students in classes. Considering that our courses occur in a room that could be described as a red, hot, razor blade factory. It's impressive that our faculty keep the students safe and uninjured throughout their time within the department. There is a tremendous amount of equipment in our laboratories that can make and build and create wonderful and amazing things. There are also is a tremendous amount of equipment in our laboratories that can turn on you in a moments notice and cause you to get injured, hurt or even worse. It is imperative of our instructors to make sure that the latter does not occur. This only happens through constant student engagement.

- Students perform consistently well on standardized, industry compliant certification tests. The data shows overt ime that students have increased their success rate on certification testing due to the change in class format we made a few years ago. A few years ago, every lab course contained skills attainment in two different welding processes. A few years ago, we modified the courses to contain only one welding process. The student focuses now on becoming comfortable and confident in the one welding process rather than trying to digest more than they could swallow as previously delivered. We have tried to move in the direction of a competency based instruction system where students do not advance to the higher difficulty work until they have successfully mastered the simpler tasks.

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

- *Continue delivery of our lab courses that contain just one welding process as opposed to two in the past.*
- *When available provide additional opportunities for students to practice and solidify their skills.*
- *Continuing with the embedded tutoring model that has been very successful with peer to peer discussions and tutoring.*

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

- *No obstacles encountered that were noteworthy.*

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

- *The trend of increased Latino students and a decrease in white students continues in the local community demographic as well as course enrollment.*
- *Consistent African-American course enrollments overtime that match the demographics of the surrounding community.*
- *Increase overall student headcount of almost 100% over the last 10 years. Greater increases were seen with the advent of CCAP coursework.*
- *Significant increases in female headcount in courses traditionally male dominated. We have seen an almost 100% increase in female students over the last 3 to 5 years. This could be from a combination of factors, including program awareness thru campus tours, decreases in traditional employment pathways for females, our embedded tutor Florence has also built a great rapport with the women in our program.*
- *Low Asian and Filipino student population in WLDT courses based on the community demographics.*

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.

- The DEIAB dashboard for welding faculty members shows that our program has consistently provided excellent instruction across the entire DEIAB demographic spectrum. We will continue to do what we do. The only low point in the data appears to be a slight decrease (<5%) in first time college students. That one can be challenging to address in the fact that all first time students have different support systems in place to increase success rates. Furthermore, it's challenging to determine which students are first time college students and what their specific needs are on a case by case basis

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 rate and withdraw rates for both our lecture and lab courses are relatively consistent over time. There was a slight dip when the full time instructor was on sabbatical and all classes were staffed by adjuncts.*
- *The success rate of our face-to-face courses closely mimic the success rate of our online course content. Students continuously give instructors positive feedback about the instruction they are receiving.*

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.

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

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

- *We continue to offer lifelong learning for a diverse array of student populations. We offer courses for high school students that have yet to graduate, and also have students that are well past their retirement age and are taking classes for personal enrichment.*
- *We support completing students transfer, degree and career technical goals with engaging, challenging and enriched educational coursework and opportunities.*
- *Responding to the needs of an ever changing workplace and society.*
- *Demonstrating civic, social and environmental responsibility.*
- *Holding firm to the belief that each of us makes an astonishing difference.*

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)
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)
X	Other [explain]: many of our online students are also taking face-to-face lab courses that complement their online coursework. Instructors frequently talk to students about the online content in a face-to-face conversation.

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?

- *Understanding what exactly was required to meet the specific standards. We developed a deeper understanding for what is required by taking the TLC faculty courses over the summer of 2026.*
- *The TLC staff has done a tremendous effort to try to educate instructors as to what is required, and how to accomplish the requirement. I feel like I am now able to successfully meet the minimum standards required, while being somewhat, unsure in the past.*

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

---