2018-2019 PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

SPEECH COMMUNICATION

The Program Review Report assesses the viability and quality of credit and non-credit instructional programs to support program improvement through Area Improvement Plans, as established by College Procedure 2.03.01.18: Program Review. The Office of Institutional Research provides the data, which are by academic year as of August 31, 2018; the Office of Institutional Effectiveness produces the report, which presents the data by program. Standards are marked as “Met” or “Not Met” based on DISTRICT (“D”), not site, performance. Data by site are shown where available (if unavailable, boxes are blank). After the standard, the phrase “in red” followed by “No” or a number preceded by “<” (less than) or “>” (greater than) denotes critical thresholds, which identify especially unacceptable performance (and if not met, are marked "Not Met-Critical"). Results are color-coded, as follows:

- **STANDARD MET**
- **STANDARD NOT MET**
- **STANDARD NOT MET - CRITICAL**

Overall Viability Indicator score 50% or lower prompts formal review by the Program Review Committee. The Committee's authority concerning program continuation is limited to recommending that the senior instructional administrators review the program's capacity to improve its service to students and the community. The final decision on program continuation rests with the President.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type: Credit Transfer Program</th>
<th>Report’s Recommendation Last Year: No Formal Review</th>
<th>Program Review Committee Action required this year: No Formal Review - Viability above 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE PROGRAM’S RECENT PERFORMANCE SCORES</strong> (Citation of a year such as &quot;1718&quot; or &quot;2018&quot; refers to the 2017-2018 academic year.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECENT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCES**
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The EPCCCD does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, gender, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, or gender identity.
## VIABILITY

(Overall viability score 50% or lower prompts formal review by the Program Review Committee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>1516 Rpt</th>
<th>1617 Rpt</th>
<th>1718 Rpt</th>
<th>1819 Rpt (District Data as of Aug. 31, 2018)</th>
<th>ASC</th>
<th>FT, BLISS</th>
<th>MdP</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>RG</th>
<th>TM</th>
<th>VV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Contact/Credit Hours per FT Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Class Fill Rate</td>
<td>D: 76.8%</td>
<td>1) D: 72.3%</td>
<td>2) D: 72.3%</td>
<td>3) Dist. Seat Count: 86.1%</td>
<td>1) D: 67.1%</td>
<td>2) D: 67.1%</td>
<td>3) Dist. Seat Count: 80.2%</td>
<td>1) D: 63.7%</td>
<td>2) D: 63.7%</td>
<td>3) Dist. Seat Count: 78.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Full-Time Faculty in Discipline</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## QUALITY

### STAKEHOLDER SATISFACTION/PROGRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>1516 Rpt</th>
<th>1617 Rpt</th>
<th>1718 Rpt</th>
<th>1819 Rpt (District Data as of Aug. 31, 2018)</th>
<th>ASC</th>
<th>FT, BLISS</th>
<th>MdP</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>RG</th>
<th>TM</th>
<th>VV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Student Satisfaction with Program</strong> Based on fall/spring percent of students satisfied with labs &amp; technology averaged for the last 3 years. (Surveys scored 1 or 0 based on combined on averaged of responses: “Excellent”: 1, “Good”: 1, “Acceptable”: 1, “Weak”: 0, “Unacceptable” = 0. Average of 1=Satisfaction) Source: 9 Standard: 80%</td>
<td>D: 93.7%</td>
<td>D: 94.2%</td>
<td>D: 94%</td>
<td>D: 94.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Student Evaluation of Faculty</strong> Percent of satisfaction in fall/spring averaged for last 3 years, based on question: &quot;Would you recommend instructor?&quot; Source: 9 Standard: 80%</td>
<td>D: 95.7%</td>
<td>D: 96.7%</td>
<td>D: 97%</td>
<td>D: 97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>1516 Rpt</th>
<th>1617 Rpt</th>
<th>1718 Rpt</th>
<th>1819 Rpt (District Data as of Aug. 31, 2018)</th>
<th>ASC</th>
<th>FT, BLISS</th>
<th>MdP</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>RG</th>
<th>TM</th>
<th>VV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Full-Time Faculty Development</strong> For most recent year, percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during the fall semester (1st day of fall Faculty Development Week (FDW) through last day of final exams) and percent of FT teaching Faculty at 2 such activities during spring semester (1st day of spring FDW through last day of final exams). If FT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: 14 Standard: 100%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Part-Time Faculty Development</strong> For most recent year, percent of PT teaching Faculty at 1 prof. development activity during fall semester (1st day of fall Faculty Development Week (FDW) through last day of final exams) and percent of PT teaching Faculty at 1 such activity during spring semester (1st day of spring FDW through last day of final exams). If PT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: 14 Standard: 75%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Sections taught by Full-Time Faculty</strong> Percent of sections taught by FT Faculty for last 3 years, excluding MILS (UTEP ROTC), MUAP (independent Music study), MUSR (recitals), Independent Study, Virtual College of Texas, NCBO, classes whose instructors are not paid by EPCC. Source: 7 Standard: 50%</td>
<td>D: 55.5%</td>
<td>D: 58.4%</td>
<td>D: 57.3%</td>
<td>D: 57.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Course Syllabus</strong> Reviewed/revised within the last 3 years, based on no. of course syllabi in the program and the revision date of each syllabus. Source: 16 Standard: Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>