

Basic Program Information

Department Name: LINC (Learning in New Media Classrooms) / Krause Center for Innovation

Program Mission(s):

The LINC program mission is to offer innovative professional development education with an emphasis on educational technology integration that supports educators and trainers in the workforce and prepares students with the skills and literacies needed to compete in the knowledge economy. The LINC/KCI Core Values are *Innovate, Educate, Empower*.

Program Review team members:

Name	Department	Position
Steven McGriff	LINC / KCI	Teacher in Residence

Total number of Full Time Faculty:	1
Total number of Part Time Faculty:	13

Existing Classified positions:

Program Coordinator

Programs* covered by this review

Program Name	Program Type (A.S., C.A., Pathway, etc.)	Units**
LINC (Learning in New Media Classrooms)	N/A	

*If you have a supporting program or pathway in your area for which you will be making resource requests, please analyze it within this program review. For example, ESLL, Math My Way, etc. You will only need to address those data elements that apply.

**Certificates of 27 or more units must be state approved (transcriptable). A Certificate of Achievement is state approved (transcriptable)

Section 1. Data and Trend Analysis

1.1. Program Data:

Data will be posted on <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/programreviewdata.php> for all measures except non-transcriptable completion. Please attach all applicable data sheets to the final Program Review document submitted to your Dean. You may use the boxes below to manually copy data if desired.

Transcriptable Programs	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
Example: A.S Degree	N/A	N/A	
Example: Certificate of Achievement			

Please provide any non-transcriptable completion data you have available. Institutional Research does not track this data.

Non-Transcriptable Program	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
Example: Career Certificate	N/A	N/A	

1.2 Department Data

Dimension	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
Enrollment	1833	1445	-21%
Productivity (Goal: 546)	587	389	-34%
Success	98%	98%	0
Full-time FTEF	1.4	0.9	-37%
Part-time FTEF			

Department Course Data (Attach data provided by IR or manually complete chart below)

Course	2010-2011			2011-2012		
	Enroll.	Prod.	Success	Enroll.	Prod.	Success
Ex. ART 1						
Ex. ART 2						

1.3 Using the data and prompts, provide a short, concise narrative analysis of the following indicators.

1. Enrollment trends over the last two years: Is the enrollment in your program holding steady, or is there a noticeable increase or decline? Please comment on the data and analyze the trends.

RESPONSE: Enrollment trends show a noticeable decline from 2010-11 to 2011-12. Reasons may include insufficient variety of new LINC courses, saturation of the market of teachers who are interested in technology topics, and the confusing complexity of the admissions process for adult learners sometimes stops enrollments.

2. Completion Rates (Has the number of students completing degrees/certificates held steady, or increased or declined in the last two years? Please comment on the data and analyze the trends.
 - a. AA, AS, AA-T, AS-T, Certificates of Achievement
 - b. Local, non-State approved certificates- Certificates less than 27 units: All certificates less than 27 units without state approval should be reviewed carefully to determine if the certificate provides a tangible occupational benefit to the student, such as a job or promotion or higher salary, and documentation should be attached.

RESPONSE: N/A

3. Productivity: Please analyze the productivity trends in your program and explain factors that affect your productivity, i.e. GE students, seat count/facilities/accreditation restrictions. For reference, the college productivity goal is 546.

RESPONSE: The noticeable decline in productivity could be due to fewer courses offered and the implementation of non-repeatability.

4. Course Offerings: (Comment on the frequency, variety, demand, pre-requisites.) Review the enrollment trends by course. Are there particular courses that are not getting the enrollment or are regularly cancelled due to low enrollment?)

RESPONSE: A few courses are offered multiple times per year. The variety of courses is limited. In 2011, the once-free-to-teachers Adobe courses reverted back to fee courses because of the loss of the grant that subsidized the courses, thus enrollments dropped dramatically in all, except Photoshop. Most Adobe classes in the LINC catalog do not get enough enrollments. The trend shows increasing low-enrollments force cancellation of LINC classes.

- a. Please comment on the data from any online course offerings.

RESPONSE: The data trend is zero, showing a close balance with increases in enrollment in one course a decline in another from one year to the next.

5. Curriculum and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

- a. Comment on the currency of your curriculum, i.e. are all Course Outline of Record (CORs) reviewed for Title 5 compliance at least every three years and do all prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories undergo content review at that time? If not, what is your action plan for bringing your curriculum into compliance?

RESPONSE: The LINC CORs have been reviewed and revised in total in 2011 and 2012 to better comply with Foothill and Title 5 requirements.

- b. Comment on any recent developments in your discipline which might require modification of existing curriculum and/or the development of new curriculum?

RESPONSE: The establishment of the new discipline, Instructional Design & Technology (IDT) allows for new courses that covers the field of instructional design, educational technology, and instructional technology.

- c. Discuss how the student learning outcomes in your courses relate to the program learning outcomes and to the college mission.

RESPONSE: The KCI mission is directed to professional development of educators (e.g., teachers, administrators, technology staff, administrative staff, educational staff trainers), who form a significant percentage of the workforce.

The KCI believes a well-prepared educator is a life-long learner and serves a critical role in the development of the next generation of global citizens. The KCI commits itself to providing excellent educational opportunities and training for the educational community in the general area of educational technologies and specifically, technological pedagogical content knowledge (how to teach any knowledge domain using technology).

The KCI believes its mission is well aligned with that of Foothill College and is appropriate for the globally enriched culture and technologically innovative climate of Silicon Valley and California.

- d. As a division, how do you ensure that all faculty are teaching to the COR and SLOs?

RESPONSE: LINC part-time faculty are trusted to teach to the COR and SLOs.

6. Basic Skills Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Basic Skills, see the Basic Skills Workgroup website: <http://foothill.edu/president/basicskills.php>
 - a. Please discuss current outcomes or initiatives related to this core mission.
7. Transfer Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Transfer, see the Transfer Workgroup website: <http://foothill.edu/president/transfer.php>
 - a. Please discuss current outcomes or initiatives related to this core mission.
8. Workforce/Career Technical Education Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Workforce, see the Workforce Workgroup website:
<http://foothill.edu/president/workforce.php>
 - a. Please discuss current outcomes or initiatives related to this core mission.

RESPONSE: LINC students are teachers, who comprise a significant workforce in Silicon Valley and the surrounding region. LINC curriculum has been selected for inclusion in the WFE partnership with Year Up. CTE has tapped the KCI to develop a teacher professional development program for the Philippines.

 - b. Please attach minutes from your advisory board meeting(s).

RESPONSE: N/A
9. Student Equity: Foothill-De Anza Community College District Board policy and California state guidelines require that each California community college submit a report on the college's progress in achieving equity in five specific areas: access, course completion, ESL and basic skills completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer. For the latest draft of the Student Equity Report, please see the ESMP website:
<http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/ESMP/index.php>
 - a. To better inform the Student Equity efforts at Foothill College, please comment on any current outcomes or initiatives related to increasing outreach, retention and student success of underrepresented students in your program.

RESPONSE: One major initiatives of the KCI is The Faculty Academy for Mathematics Excellence (FAME), which selects 35 teachers in schools with students who are identified as low-SES and underrepresented in STEM careers and college tracks. The teachers (students in LINC courses) are representative of these populations.

Section 2. Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

2.1. Attach 2011-2012 Program Level – Four Column Report for PL-SLO Assessment from TracDat, please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

RESPONSE: No data available

Unit Assessment Report - Four Column			
Foothill College			
Program (BHS-DA) - Dental Assisting AS/CA			
PL-SLOs	Means of Assessment & Target / Tasks	Assessment Findings	Action & Follow-Up
Program (BHS-DA) - Dental Assisting AS/CA - 1 - Upon completion of the Dental Assisting Program graduates will demonstrate entry-level competency skills mandated by the Commission on Dental Accreditation and the Dental Board of California.			
PL-SLO Status: Active			
Program (BHS-DA) - Dental Assisting AS/CA - 2 - Upon completion of the Dental Assisting Program graduates will value and implement proper radiation safety for patients, self, and others.			
PL-SLO Status: Active			

2.2 Attach 2011-2012 Course-Level – Four Column Report for CL-SLO Assessment from TracDat

RESPONSE: No data available

Section 2 Continued: SLO Assessment and Reflection

2.3 Please provide observations and reflection below.

2.3.a Course-Level SLO

1. What findings can be gathered from the Course Level Assessments?

2. What curricular changes or review do the data suggest in order for students to be more successful in completing the program?
3. How well do the CL-SLOs reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities students need in order to succeed in this program?
4. How has assessment of course-level student learning outcomes led to improvement in student learning in the program?
5. If your program has other outcomes assessments at the course level, comment on the findings.

2.3.b Program-Level SLO

1. What summative findings can be gathered from the Program Level Assessments?
2. How has assessment of program-level student learning outcomes led to certificate/degree program improvements?
3. If your program has other outcomes assessments at the program level, comment on the findings.

Section 3: Program Goals and Rationale

Program goals should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate some sort of measurable action and should connect to Foothill's core missions, [Educational & Strategic Master Plan \(ESMP\)](#), the division plan, and SLOs.

3.1 Previous Program Goals from last academic year (2009)

Goal	Original Timeline	Actions Taken	Status/Modifications
1 Implement Certificate of Achievement	Fall 2011	Started	need advisory group meeting
2 Establish IDT discipline	Fall 2010	CTIS Division faculty discussion and consensus	Completed
3			

3.2 New Goals: Goals can be multi-year (in Section 4 you will detail resources needed)

Goal	Timeline (long/short-term)	How will this goal improve student	Action Steps

		success or respond to other key college initiatives	
1 Complete Certificate of Achievement	Fall 2013	Build a Community of Scholars	Hold advisory group meeting; complete the form
2 Convert 20% of LINC courses to effective online courses	Spring 2014	DE Objective 5: New Markets DE Objective 6: Integrate Emerging Technology DE: Objective 7: Support best practices	Select courses most likely to succeed for online; develop instructional approach and activities for online learning; train faculty to teach it online
3 Increase part-time faculty pool	Winter 2013	Expanded faculty skill set increases course offerings. Improved faculty skills increases engagement and retention in courses.	Review applications Initiate hiring Inculcuate to Foothill/KCI Coach initial year

Section 4: Program Resources and Support

4.1 Using the tables below, summarize your program's unfunded resource requests. Refer to the Operations Planning Committee website: <http://foothill.edu/president/operations.php> for current guiding principles, rubrics and resource allocation information.

Full Time Faculty and/or Staff Positions

Position	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

Unbudgeted Reassigned Time (calculate by % reassign time x salary/benefits of FT)

Position	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

One-time B Budget Augmentation

Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

Ongoing B Budget Augmentation

B Budget FOAP	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

Facilities and Equipment

Facilities/Equipment Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

Section 5: Program Strengths/Opportunities for Improvement

5.1 Address the concerns or recommendations that were made in prior program review cycles.

RESPONSE: None made

5.2 What statements of concern have been raised in the course of conducting the program review by faculty, administrators, students, or by any member of the program review team regarding overall program viability?

RESPONSE: Without new courses every year, LINC will close down. Move course to online delivery. Establish more customized course offerings to captured populations (cohorts) in school districts. Need the Certificate of Achievement in IDT to remain viable.

5.3 After reviewing the data, what strengths or positive trends would you like to highlight about your program?

RESPONSE: The data for 2011-12 does not show the growth in online LINC courses offered in 2012-13.

Section 6: Feedback and Follow Up

This section is for the Dean to provide feedback.

6.1 Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:

The LINC Program is new to the Fine Arts & Communication Division, in fact, this is their first Program Review. LINC, as noted, provides a valuable resource for K-12 teachers in our service area, and in this regard, they are outstanding.

LINC offers short courses; these are excellent for working educators as a full 12 week course is impossible to complete with the demanding schedule of the K-12 educator.

The LINC Program (and the KCI) work in collaboration with Adobe Systems, Inc., the leading provider of educational software such as Photoshop, Illustrator, etc. They sponsor Adobe Days every year, where Adobe representatives work one-on-one with area educators.

The establishment of Instructional Design & Technology is noteworthy, and is in tandem with the development of the new History of Industrial Design in the Art History Department.

6.2 Areas of concern, if any:

The precipitous drop in enrollment noted above is due in part to the loss of the grant that subsidized tuition. This points to the fact that these classes may, in fact, be more appropriate for community based education, as are many of the courses at the college that have traditionally been subsidized by state funding. In addition, changes in repeatability will dramatically affect LINC courses beginning Fall 2013. However, the idea that without new courses every year LINC must close is questionable.

6.3 Recommendations for improvement:

Rather than depending 100% on new courses (although new courses are always welcome and encouraged), developing an expanded student base may be the solution to enrollment problems. More short term online courses, along with reaching out to teachers coming into the system may be a viable solution.

6.4 Recommended next steps:

Proceed as planned on program review schedule

1/3/13

Foothill College

Learn in New Media Classr-FH

Fine Arts & Communications

Enrollment Trends

	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Inc
Unduplicated HC	553	505	-9%
Enrollment	1,833	1,445	-21%
Numb Sections	91	65	-29%
WSCH	2,479	1,041	-58%
FTES	55	23	-58%
FTEF	1.4	0.9	-37%
Productivity	587	389	-34%

Course Success

All Students				
	2010-2011	2011-2012		
Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	
Success	1,728	98%	1,281	98%
NonSuccess	24	1%	24	2%
Withdrew	6	0%	2	0%
Total	1,758	100%	1,307	100%

Full and Part Time Faculty Load

	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Inc
FT Load	0.0	0.0	-100%
FT Percent	2%	0%	-100%
OV Load	0.0	0.0	
OV Percent	0%	0%	
PT Load	1.4	0.9	-36%
PT Percent	98%	100%	2%
Total FTEF	1.4	0.9	-37%

Release/Re-assign Time

FTEF

Course Success by Targeted Ethnic Groups

Targeted Groups				
	2010-2011	2011-2012		
Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	
Success	221	97%	199	96%
NonSuccess	7	3%	8	4%
Withdrew	1	0%		
Total	229	100%	207	100%

Not Targeted Groups				
	2011-2012	2010-2011		
Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	
Success	1,082	98%	1,507	99%
NonSuccess	16	1%	17	1%
Withdrew	2	0%	5	0%
Total	1,100	100%	1,529	100%

Distribution by EthnicityGenderAgeHighest Degree

2011-2012		
	Enr	Percent
African American	23	2%
Asian	231	16%
Decline to State	87	6%
Filipino	32	2%
Latino/a	186	13%
Native American	16	1%
Pacific Islander	2	0%
White	868	60%
Total	1,445	100%

2011-2012		
	Enr	Percent
Female	1,160	80%
Male	285	20%
Total	1,445	100%

2011-2012		
	Enr	Percent
19 or less	19	1%
20-24	41	3%
25-39	567	39%
40 +	818	57%
Total	1,445	100%

Success Rates by Gender

2011-2012								
	Success	NonSuccess	Withdrew	Total		Grades	Percent	Grades
	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent
Female	1,040	98%	16	2%	2	0%	1,058	100%
Male	241	97%	8	3%			249	100%

Success Rates by Age Group

2011-2012								
	Success	NonSuccess	Withdrew	Total		Grades	Percent	Grades
	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent
19 or less	13	100%				13	100%	
20-24	23	79%	6	21%		29	100%	
25-39	507	98%	7	1%	1	0%	515	100%
40 +	738	98%	11	1%	1	0%	750	100%

Success Rates by Ethnicity (multiple years)

		Success	NonSuccess	Withdrew	Total		Grades	Percent	Grades
		Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent
African American	2011-2012	15	79%	4	21%			19	100%
	2010-2011	30	86%	5	14%			35	100%
Asian	2011-2012	204	99%	3	1%			207	100%
	2010-2011	232	98%	3	1%	2	1%	237	100%
Decline to State	2011-2012	72	97%	2	3%			74	100%
	2010-2011	436	100%	1	0%			437	100%
Filipino	2011-2012	25	100%			25	100%		
	2010-2011	55	98%	1	2%			56	100%
Latino/a	2011-2012	159	98%	4	2%			163	100%
	2010-2011	136	99%	1	1%	1	1%	138	100%
Native American	2011-2012	13	100%			13	100%		
	2010-2011	13	100%			13	100%		
Pacific Islander	2011-2012	2	100%			2	100%		
	2010-2011	8	100%			8	100%		
White	2011-2012	791	98%	11	1%	2	0%	804	100%
	2010-2011	818	98%	13	2%	3	0%	834	100%

Notes and Definitions

Data is for the fiscal year, including summer (and Foothill's early summer in 2011-12).

Figures include Apprenticeship.

Enrollment trends include students counted for apportionment for those report years.

Success data excludes students that dropped after census.

Ethnic data reporting prioritizes multi-ethnic students to targeted groups.

Cross-listed courses are included in home department.

WSCH:

Sum of quarterly
End-of-Term Weekly
Student Contact Hours. 4 Quarters.

FTES:

Fulltime equivalent students,
(WSCH * 11.67) / 525.

FTEF:

Sum of teaching load
factors for Summer, Fall, Winter,
and Spring quarters,
excluding all release/re-assignments.

FT and PT Load:

FT - Fulltime assignment types
0 and 3 (on load, paid and nonpaid).
PT - Parttime all other assignment types.
OV - Includes assignment type 2.

Productivity:

4-term total WSCH /
4-term total FTEF,
excluding all release/re-assignments.

Success %:

Number of students
receiving an A,B,C or P
grade / total number of
students receiving a grade.

Targeted Groups:

African Americans, Latinos, Filipinos

Release / Re-assign Time:

NonTeaching - 994 - Sick Leave

Teaching: -

991 - BHES

995 - PDL

996 - Release-Division

999 - Faculty Release-Contractual

Enrollment Trends by Course (multiple years)

			2010-2011	2011-2012	% Inc
LINC	F050.	Enrollment	159	106	-33%
		Productivity	785	501	-36%
F050A	Enrollment	88	98	11%	
		Productivity	888	478	-46%
F050B	Enrollment	93	66	-29%	
		Productivity	709	514	-27%
F050F	Enrollment	50	21	-58%	
		Productivity	511	318	-38%
F053.	Enrollment	30	32	7%	
		Productivity	888	483	-46%
F053B	Enrollment	30	31	3%	
		Productivity	888	483	-46%
F054.	Enrollment	22		-100%	
		Productivity	343		-100%
F058A	Enrollment	37	37	0%	
		Productivity	561	561	-0%
F058B	Enrollment		22		
		Productivity		343	
F060K	Enrollment		20		
		Productivity		280	
F062A	Enrollment	1		-100%	
		Productivity			
F063B	Enrollment	15		-100%	
		Productivity	234		-100%
F064S	Enrollment	12		-100%	
		Productivity	374		-100%
F066.	Enrollment	48	19	-60%	
		Productivity	538	#INF	#INF
F066A	Enrollment	21	39	86%	
		Productivity	654	273	-58%
F066B	Enrollment		78		
		Productivity		570	
F066D	Enrollment	16		-100%	
		Productivity	249		-100%
F066E	Enrollment	19	55	189%	
		Productivity	280	358	28%
F070A	Enrollment	17	35	106%	
		Productivity	530	244	-54%
F072B	Enrollment	39	16	-59%	
		Productivity	389	199	-49%

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA

10/09/12

		2010-2011	2011-2012	% Inc
F072C	Enrollment	58	61	5%
	Productivity	520	334	-36%
F072D	Enrollment	60	10	-83%
	Productivity	613	156	-75%
F073.	Enrollment	43	18	-58%
	Productivity	319	249	-22%
F073A	Enrollment	107	42	-61%
	Productivity	605	327	-46%
F073B	Enrollment	80	18	-78%
	Productivity	538	156	-71%
F073E	Enrollment	40		-100%
	Productivity	592		-100%
F073I	Enrollment	36	41	14%
	Productivity	547	436	-20%
F073J	Enrollment		18	
	Productivity		265	
F074A	Enrollment		20	
	Productivity		296	
F076A	Enrollment		44	
	Productivity		631	
F080.	Enrollment	43	45	5%
	Productivity	#INF	701	#NAN
F080A	Enrollment	25		-100%
	Productivity	688		-100%
F080B	Enrollment	15		-100%
	Productivity	234		-100%
F081A	Enrollment	2		-100%
	Productivity			
F083A	Enrollment	38	9	-76%
	Productivity	592		-100%
F083F	Enrollment	44		-100%
	Productivity	413		-100%
F085A	Enrollment	72	14	-81%
	Productivity	374	203	-46%
F085B	Enrollment	23		-100%
	Productivity	358		-100%
F085C	Enrollment	59	22	-63%
	Productivity	558	218	-61%
F086A	Enrollment		27	
	Productivity		179	
F090B	Enrollment	30	45	50%
	Productivity	452	701	55%
F090C	Enrollment		21	
	Productivity		318	

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA

10/09/12

		2010-2011	2011-2012	% Inc
F095A	Enrollment	21	26	24%
	Productivity	318	394	24%
F095C	Enrollment	79	74	-6%
	Productivity	1,165	384	-67%
F098.	Enrollment	82	109	33%
	Productivity	614	266	-57%
F098A	Enrollment	69	62	-10%
	Productivity	436	483	11%
F098B	Enrollment	40	44	10%
	Productivity	623	670	7%
F72AS	Enrollment	18		-100%
	Productivity	561		-100%
F76AS	Enrollment	38		-100%
	Productivity	561		-100%
F95CS	Enrollment	14		-100%
	Productivity	436		-100%

Success Rates by Course (multiple years)

		Success		NonSuccess		Withdraw		Total		
		Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	
LINC	F050.	2010-2011	152	99%	2	1%		154	100%	
		2011-2012	104	100%				104	100%	
	F050A	2010-2011	86	100%				86	100%	
		2011-2012	92	100%				92	100%	
	F050B	2010-2011	91	100%				91	100%	
		2011-2012	66	100%				66	100%	
	F050F	2010-2011	44	90%	1	2%	4	8%	49	100%
		2011-2012	17	81%	3	14%	1	5%	21	100%
	F053.	2010-2011	29	100%				29	100%	
		2011-2012	31	100%				31	100%	
	F053B	2010-2011	29	100%				29	100%	
		2011-2012	31	100%				31	100%	
	F054.	2010-2011	21	95%	1	5%		22	100%	
	F058A	2010-2011	20	71%	6	21%	2	7%	28	100%
		2011-2012	26	70%	10	27%	1	3%	37	100%
	F058B	2011-2012	22	100%				22	100%	
	F060K	2011-2012	18	100%				18	100%	
	F063B	2010-2011	15	100%				15	100%	
	F064S	2010-2011	11	100%				11	100%	
	F066.	2010-2011	45	100%				45	100%	
		2011-2012	18	100%				18	100%	
	F066A	2010-2011	19	100%				19	100%	
		2011-2012	37	100%				37	100%	
	F066B	2011-2012	76	100%				76	100%	
	F066D	2010-2011	15	94%	1	6%		16	100%	
	F066E	2010-2011	18	100%				18	100%	
		2011-2012	22	100%				22	100%	
	F070A	2010-2011	17	100%				17	100%	
		2011-2012	31	100%				31	100%	
	F072B	2010-2011	37	100%				37	100%	
		2011-2012	13	100%				13	100%	
	F072C	2010-2011	58	100%				58	100%	
		2011-2012	43	100%				43	100%	
	F072D	2010-2011	58	100%				58	100%	
		2011-2012	10	100%				10	100%	
	F073.	2010-2011	43	100%				43	100%	
		2011-2012	17	100%				17	100%	
	F073A	2010-2011	106	100%				106	100%	
		2011-2012	21	100%				21	100%	
	F073B	2010-2011	79	100%				79	100%	
		2011-2012	10	100%				10	100%	
	F073E	2010-2011	38	100%				38	100%	
	F073I	2010-2011	34	97%	1	3%		35	100%	
		2011-2012	28	100%				28	100%	
	F073J	2011-2012	18	100%				18	100%	

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA

10/09/12

		Success		NonSuccess		Withdrew		Total	
		Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent
F074A	2011-2012	20	100%					20	100%
F076A	2011-2012	41	93%	3	7%			44	100%
F080.	2010-2011	42	100%					42	100%
	2011-2012	45	100%					45	100%
F080A	2010-2011	20	87%	3	13%			23	100%
F080B	2010-2011	13	100%					13	100%
F083A	2010-2011	38	100%					38	100%
F083F	2010-2011	43	100%					43	100%
F085A	2010-2011	72	100%					72	100%
	2011-2012	13	100%					13	100%
F085B	2010-2011	20	100%					20	100%
F085C	2010-2011	55	100%					55	100%
	2011-2012	14	100%					14	100%
F086A	2011-2012	24	100%					24	100%
F090B	2010-2011	29	100%					29	100%
	2011-2012	45	100%					45	100%
F090C	2011-2012	18	86%	3	14%			21	100%
F095A	2010-2011	15	71%	6	29%			21	100%
	2011-2012	23	88%	3	12%			26	100%
F095C	2010-2011	76	100%					76	100%
	2011-2012	74	100%					74	100%
F098.	2010-2011	79	100%					79	100%
	2011-2012	109	100%					109	100%
F098A	2010-2011	56	100%					56	100%
	2011-2012	62	100%					62	100%
F098B	2010-2011	39	98%	1	3%			40	100%
	2011-2012	42	95%	2	5%			44	100%
F72AS	2010-2011	17	94%	1	6%			18	100%
F76AS	2010-2011	36	100%					36	100%
F95CS	2010-2011	13	93%	1	7%			14	100%