2020-21
Annual Program Review

Emergency Management/Homeland Security

Table of Contents

Section 1: Program Planning

Internal Analysis and Program Effectiveness: Emergency Management

Productivity	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
State-Funded Enrollment	61,279	63,824	60,164	61,368	59,444
Subject State-Funded Enrollment	346	303	303	211	242
State-Funded Resident FTES	6,073.30	6,343.88	5,929.28	6,189.33	6,104.88
Subject Resident FTES	31.09	27.06	27.25	19.53	22.49
Sections	11	10	11	10	11
Fill Rate	70.1%	67.1%	60.8%	47.6%	48.9%
WSCH/FTEF 595 Efficiency	473	453	410	325	334
FTEF/30	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.1
Extended Learning Enrollment	316	356	314	180	161

The percentage change in the number of Emergency Management **enrollments** in 2018-19 showed a substantial increase from 2017-18 and a substantial decrease from 2014-15.

The percentage change in 2018-19 **resident FTES** in Emergency Management credit courses showed a substantial increase from 2017-18 and a substantial decrease in comparison with resident FTES in 2014-15.

The percentage change in the number of **sections** in Emergency Management courses in 2018-19 showed a moderate increase from 2017-18 and a minimal difference from the number of sections in 2014-15.

The percentage change in the **fill rate** in 2018-19 for Emergency Management courses showed a slight increase from 2017-18 and a substantial decrease in comparison with the fill rate in 2014-15.

The percentage change in the **WSCH/FTEF** ratio in Emergency Management courses in 2018-19 showed a slight increase from 2017-18 and a substantial decrease from 2014-15.

The percentage change in the **FTEF/30** ratio for Emergency Management courses in 2018-19 showed a moderate increase from 2017-18 and a minimal difference in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2014-15.

There was a substantial decrease in the number of Emergency Management **Extended Learning enrollments** in 2018-19 from 2017-18 and a substantial decrease from 2014-15.

Calculation Categories

Language	Range
Minimal to No Difference	< 1.0%
Slight Increase/Decrease	Between 1.0% and 5.0%
Moderate Increase/Decrease	Between 5.1% and 10.0%
Substantial Increase/Decrease	> 10.0%

Comparison of Enrollment Trends	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
State-Funded Enrollment	61,279	63,824	60,164	61,368	59,444
Subject State-Funded Enrollment	346	303	303	211	242

Modality	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Traditional	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Online	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hybrid	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Gender	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Female	41.0%	45.5%	46.5%	55.0%	53.7%
Male	58.4%	50.8%	50.2%	44.1%	45.9%
Unknown	0.6%	3.6%	3.3%	0.9%	0.4%

Ethnicity	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
African American	24.6%	30.4%	26.7%	12.3%	9.5%
American Indian/AK Native	1.7%	2.0%	1.7%	1.4%	0.8%
Asian	9.0%	12.2%	13.5%	10.9%	13.2%
Hispanic	8.1%	10.2%	5.0%	7.6%	15.7%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	2.4%	2.5%
White	42.8%	33.3%	36.6%	48.3%	44.6%
Multi-Ethnicity	11.8%	11.6%	12.9%	16.1%	12.8%
Other/Unknown	0.3%	0.3%	2.0%	0.9%	0.8%

Age Group	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
19 or Less	3.5%	4.3%	4.0%	2.8%	2.9%
20 to 24	19.1%	15.5%	15.8%	23.2%	16.6%
25 to 29	19.9%	11.2%	17.5%	14.2%	19.4%
30 to 34	15.0%	7.3%	10.6%	10.9%	12.8%
35 to 39	9.0%	13.9%	12.9%	16.6%	14.0%
40 to 49	20.2%	23.1%	15.5%	16.1%	21.5%
50 and Older	13.3%	24.8%	23.8%	16.1%	14.9%
Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Emergency Management courses made up 0.4% of all state-funded enrollment for 2018-19. The percentage difference in Emergency Management course **enrollment** in 2018-19 showed a substantial increase from 2017-18 and a substantial decrease from 2014-15. Enrollment in Emergency Management during 2018-19 showed 0.0% of courses were taught **traditional (face-to-fac**e), 100.0% were taught **online**, 0.0% were taught in the **hybrid** modality, and 0.0% were taught in the **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** modality.

In 2018-19, Emergency Management enrollment consisted of 53.7% **female**, 45.9% **male**, and 0.4% students of **unknown** gender. In 2018-19, Emergency Management enrollment consisted of 9.5% **African American** students, 0.8% **American Indian/AK Native** students, 13.2% **Asian** students, 15.7% **Hispanic** students, 2.5% **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, 44.6% **White** students, 12.8% **multi-ethnic** students, and 0.8% students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity. The age breakdown for 2018-19 enrollments in Emergency Management revealed 2.9% aged **19 or less**, 16.6% aged **20 to 24**, 19.4% aged

25 to 29, 12.8% aged **30 to 34**, 14.0% aged **35 to 39**, 21.5% aged **40 to 49**, 14.9% aged **50 and older**, and 0.0% **unknown**

Success and Retention: Emergency Management

Comparison of Success Rates	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
State-Funded Success Rate	65.4%	66.7%	68.6%	70.9%	72.2%
College Institution Set Standard Success Rate	55.4%	55.5%	56.7%	58.3%	59.8%
Subject Success Rate	44.1%	45.9%	50.5%	58.8%	57.9%

Modality	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Traditional	-	-	-	-	-
Online	44.1%	45.9%	50.5%	58.8%	57.9%
Hybrid	-	-	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	-	-	-	-	-

Gender	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Female	46.1%	52.2%	51.1%	51.7%	52.3%
Male	42.1%	39.6%	52.0%	68.8%	64.9%
Unknown	100.0%	54.5%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Ethnicity	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
African American	16.5%	26.1%	24.7%	42.3%	17.4%
American Indian/AK Native	83.3%	83.3%	80.0%	66.7%	50.0%
Asian	61.3%	40.5%	56.1%	56.5%	53.1%
Hispanic	48.1%	48.4%	61.5%	56.3%	63.2%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	16.7%	-	20.0%	40.0%	16.7%
White	56.8%	62.4%	70.4%	64.7%	66.7%
Multi-Ethnicity	36.6%	48.6%	44.4%	61.8%	64.5%
Other/Unknown	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%

Age Group	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2018-19	2018-19
19 or Less	25.0%	38.5%	22.2%	33.3%	57.1%
20 to 24	42.4%	34.0%	60.4%	59.2%	48.6%
25 to 29	39.7%	32.4%	29.4%	60.0%	55.3%
30 to 34	51.9%	50.0%	58.1%	69.6%	74.2%
35 to 39	41.9%	35.7%	61.1%	51.4%	44.1%
40 to 49	58.6%	52.9%	37.8%	61.8%	71.2%
50 and Older	28.3%	58.7%	62.0%	58.8%	50.0%
Unknown	-	-	-	-	-

The percentage difference in the **course success rate** in Emergency Management courses in 2018-19 showed a slight decrease from 2017-18 and a substantial increase from 2014-15. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Emergency Management 2018-19 course success rate to the College's overall success average* (72.2%) and the institution-set standard* (59.8%) for credit course success, the Emergency Management **course success rate** was substantially lower than the **college average** and slightly lower than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Emergency Management success rate for 2018-19, the success rate was no comparative data for **traditional (face-to-face)** Emergency Management courses, a minimal difference for **online** courses, no comparative data for **hybrid courses**, and no comparative data for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Emergency Management success rate for 2018-19, the success rate was a moderate decrease for **female** students in Emergency Management courses, a moderate increase for **male** students, and a substantial decrease for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Emergency Management success rate for 2018-19, the success rate was a substantial decrease for **African American** students in Emergency Management courses, a moderate decrease for **American Indian/AK Native** students, a slight decrease for **Asian** students, a moderate increase for **Hispanic** students, a substantial decrease for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, a moderate increase for **White** students, a moderate increase for **multi-ethnic** students, and a moderate decrease for students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Emergency Management success rate for 2018-19, the success rate was a minimal difference for students aged **19 or less** in Emergency Management courses, a moderate decrease for students aged **20 to 24**, a slight decrease for students aged **25 to 29**, a substantial increase for students aged **30 to 34**, a substantial decrease for students aged **35 to 39**, a substantial increase for students aged **40 to 49**, a moderate decrease for students aged **50 and older**, and no comparative data for students of unknown age.

Comparison of Retention Rates	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
State-Funded Retention Rate	82.3%	83.4%	83.7%	85.1%	86.1%
College Institution Set Standard Retention Rate	70.1%	70.0%	70.9%	71.1%	72.3%
Subject Retention Rate	82.6%	81.5%	76.3%	76.3%	73.1%

Modality	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Traditional	-	-	-	-	-
Online	82.6%	81.5%	76.3%	76.3%	73.1%
Hybrid	-	-	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	-	-	-	-	-

Gender	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Female	81.6%	79.7%	77.4%	74.1%	70.8%
Male	83.2%	83.1%	76.4%	80.6%	76.6%
Unknown	100.0%	81.8%	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Ethnicity	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
African American	85.9%	85.9%	62.3%	65.4%	52.2%
American Indian/AK Native	83.3%	83.3%	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Asian	83.9%	64.9%	85.4%	82.6%	71.9%
Hispanic	85.2%	77.4%	61.5%	62.5%	76.3%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	50.0%	-	80.0%	60.0%	16.7%
White	86.5%	83.2%	84.3%	81.4%	76.9%
Multi-Ethnicity	63.4%	85.7%	77.8%	76.5%	80.6%
Other/Unknown	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%

Age Group	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2018-19	2018-19
19 or Less	83.3%	92.3%	66.7%	66.7%	71.4%
20 to 24	78.8%	78.7%	79.2%	75.5%	71.4%
25 to 29	77.9%	85.3%	60.8%	70.0%	72.3%
30 to 34	88.5%	86.4%	83.9%	91.3%	90.3%
35 to 39	67.7%	81.0%	80.6%	71.4%	61.8%
40 to 49	92.9%	78.6%	75.6%	82.4%	78.8%
50 and Older	82.6%	81.3%	81.7%	73.5%	63.9%
Unknown	-	-	-	-	-

The percentage difference in the **course retention rate** in Emergency Management courses in 2018-19 showed a slight decrease from 2017-18 and a substantial decrease from 2014-15. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Emergency Management 2018-19 course retention rate to the College's overall retention average* (86.1%) and the institution-set standard* (72.3%) for credit course retention, the Emergency Management **course retention rate** was substantially lower than the **college average** and minimal to no difference than the **institution-set standard** for credit course retention.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Emergency Management retention rate for 2018-19, the retention rate was no comparative data for **traditional (face-to-face)** Emergency Management courses, a minimal difference for **online** courses, no comparative data for **hybrid courses**, and no comparative data for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Emergency Management retention rate for 2018-19, the retention rate was a slight decrease for **female** students in Emergency Management courses, a slight increase for **male** students, and a substantial decrease for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Emergency Management retention rate for 2018-19, the retention rate was a substantial decrease for **African American** students in Emergency Management courses, a substantial increase for **American Indian/AK Native** students, a slight decrease for **Asian** students, a slight increase for **Hispanic** students, a substantial decrease for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, a slight increase for **White** students, a moderate increase for **multi-ethnic** students, and a substantial increase for students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Emergency Management retention rate for 2018-19, the retention rate was a slight decrease for students aged **19 or less** in Emergency Management courses, a slight decrease for students aged **20 to 24**, a minimal difference for students aged **25 to 29**, a substantial increase for students aged **30 to 34**, a substantial decrease for students aged **35 to 39**, a moderate increase for students aged **40 to 49**, a moderate decrease for students aged **50 and older**, and no comparative data for students of **unknown** age.

Equity

There are performance gaps in overall retention primarily African America and Asian students. There will be focus on retention strategies to engage students early and throughout the course.

Achievement

Degrees are continuing to increase and there is an anticipation for enrollment to continue to grow with the upcoming recession.

Program Efficiency

While enrollment and FTES have increased over time, there has been a decline in fill rates and efficiency ratios. There will need to be retention efforts made to ensure students complete the term.

Student (SLOs) and Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

CSLO	Semester	Assessed	Outcome
EMGT C101	Spring 2020	21	SLO 1: 76.2% Met
EMGT C102	Fall 19	17	SLO 1: 83.3% Met
		16	SLO 2: 100% Met
		17	SLO 3: 100% Met
	Spring 2020	24	SLO 1: 79.2% Met
		23	SLO 2: 78.3% Met

		23	SLO 3: 78.3% Met
EMGT C105	Fall 19	02	SLO 1: 50.0% Met
		02	SLO 2: 50% Met
		00	SLO 3: N/A
	Spring 2020	06	SLO 1: 100% Met
		06	SLO 2: 100% Met
		06	SLO 3: 100% Met
EMGT C110	Spring 2020	21	SLO 1: 96.2% Met
			SLO 2: 96.0% Met
EMGT C130	Fall 19	03	SLO 1: 100% Met
		03	SLO 2: 100% Met
		03	SLO 3: 100% Met
	Spring 2020	18	SLO 1: 100% Met
		18	SLO 2: 83.3% Met
		18	SLO 3: 100% Met
EMGT C150	Spring 2019	14	SLO 1: 85.7% Met
		13	SLO 2: 84.6% Met
CJ C110	Spring 2020	08	SLO 1: 87.5% Met
		08	SLO 2: 87.5% Met
CJ C140	Spring 2020	12	SLO 1: 83.3% Met
		12	SLO 2: 83.3% Met
CJ C148	Spring 2020	10	SLO 1: 100% Met
		10	SLO 2: 100% Met
		10	SLO 3: 100% Met
		10	SLO 4: 100% Met

A review of the Department Course Student Learning Outcomes (CSLOs) showed evidence that students were meeting course learning outcomes. The foundation courses, EMGT C101 and EMGT C102, indicated a need to review assignment directions to ensure clarity. EMGT C105 increased CSLOs from 50% to 100% between the Fall and Spring semesters. No further recommendations were made.

Aggregate Emergency Management/Homeland Security Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

Emergency Management/Homeland Security PSLOs	N	Able and Confident	Able and Somewhat Confident	Able and Not Confident	Not Able
Classify the roles, functions and interdependency between local, state, federal and international law enforcement to effectively coordinate disaster events.	21	76.2%	23.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Demonstrate effective skills using well established problem-solving, communication and interpersonal techniques.	21	95.2%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Develop effective communication skills and appreciation for diverse communities to effectively provide leadership during critical incidents.	21	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Identify, describe and analyze the wide range of threats to national security, including transportation, border and cyber-security.	21	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%

The aggregate post-graduation survey results show that the majority of graduates of the Emergency Management/Homeland Security Program were able and confident or somewhat confident in demonstrating the PSLOs. Graduates indicated that their ability and confidence in demonstrating effective skills using well established problem-solving, communication and interpersonal techniques was highest.

Program Awards

Awards	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Degrees (Coastline Total)	1,609	1,893	2,074	2,025	2,188
Subject Degrees Awarded	33	33	23	33	36
Certificates (Coastline Total)	692	600	602	628	709
Subject Certificates Awarded	0	2	10	3	2

The percentage change in the number of Emergency Management degrees awarded in 2018-19 showed a moderate increase from 2017-18 and a moderate increase from the number of degrees awarded in 2014-15.

The percentage change in the number of Emergency Management certificates awarded in 2018-19 showed a substantial decrease from 2017-18 and showed no comparative data in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2014-15.

Curriculum Review

Curriculum Review

Course	Title	Term Reviewed	Status
CJ C110	Criminal Investigation	Eff. Spring 2013	Active
CJ C140	Introduction to Criminal Justice	Eff. Spring 2013	Active
CJ C148	Multicultural Studies in Criminal Justice	Eff. Spring 2013	Active
EMGT C101	Introduction to Emergency Management	Eff. Fall 2015	Active
EMGT C102	Introduction to Homeland Security	Eff. Fall 2015	Active
EMGT C105	Emergency Preparedness	Eff. Fall 2015	Active
EMGT C110	Emergency Response	Eff. Fall 2015	Active
EMGT C120	Disaster Recovery	Eff. Fall 2015	Active
EMGT C130	Hazard Mitigation	Eff. Fall 2015	Active
EMGT C140	Crisis Response for Responders (CRR)	Eff. Fall 2015	Active
EMGT C150	Crisis Management of Special Populations	Eff. Fall 2015	Active
EMGT C160	Introduction to Public Information Officer (PIO)	Eff. Fall 2015	Active
EMGT C172	Intelligence Analysis and Security Management	Eff. Fall 2015	Active
EMGT C174	Transportation and Border Security	Eff. Fall 2015	Active

The Department's progress of upgrading both the Emergency Management/Homeland Security and Criminal Justice courses was limited last semester by the onslaught of COVID-19. A review of our courses

showed there was no great need for major revisions, just minor modifications and the updating of textbook information.

External Analysis: Market Assessment

Total People Employed in the Region ⓘ

On-The-Job Training, No College Required	Current Year (2015)	5 Years Ago (2010)	5 Year Change (2010-2015)	5 Year Trend
Bailiffs (333011)	167	168	-1	⬇
Detectives and Criminal Investigators (333021)	683	709	-27	⬇
Police and Sheriff's Patrol Officers (333051)	3,918	3,969	-51	⬇
Private Detectives and Investigators (339021)	1,315	1,098	216	⬆

Projected Regional Job Openings ⓘ

On-The-Job Training, No College Required	Projected 5 Year Openings (2015-2020)	Projected Average Annual Openings (2015-2020)
Bailiffs (333011)	27	5
Detectives and Criminal Investigators (333021)	96	19
Police and Sheriff's Patrol Officers (333051)	799	159
Private Detectives and Investigators (339021)	198	39

Median Regional Annual Salary ⓘ

On-The-Job Training, No College Required	Entry Level Salary	Median Salary
Bailiffs (333011)	$21,112	$34,320
Detectives and Criminal Investigators (333021)	$73,445	$101,628
Police and Sheriff's Patrol Officers (333051)	$69,222	$96,200
Private Detectives and Investigators (339021)	$29,952	$41,371

In order to protect the identity of individual students, asterisks are displayed when fewer than ten students are in the data set.

The Los Angeles/Orange County Center of Excellence (COE) provided regional labor market data for the program recommendation of homeland security. Their report examined whether there is demand in the local labor market that is not being met by the supply from programs of study. Occupations that revolve around emergency medical services, law enforcement, fire services, and information security were included in this report. Below are a few important notations from the data gathered in April 2018, the most recent report for the LAOC region:

* In 2017, there were 720 ads related to jobs that are associated with homeland security in Orange County.

* Students interested in one of the fields that is often associated with homeland security, can enroll in one of seven community college programs: information technology, emergency medical services,

paramedic, administration of justice, industrial and transportation security, police academy, and fire technology. Between 2014 and 2017, these programs have conferred and average of 739 awards.

* Of the eight occupations related to homeland security, half typically require a high school degree or equivalent as the entry-level education, while the other half require a postsecondary certificate. Between 35% and 68% of the current workforce has completed some community college education as their highest level of education.

ONET indicates that several emergency management/homeland security employment areas show a bright outlook, including security management specialists forensic science technicians, business continuity planners, business intelligence analysts, and remote sensing technicians. In addition, there is rapid growth in the fields of information security analysis, and forensic science technicians (above 11%). Wage and employment trend information for California shows a bright outlook for Information Security Analysts (ONET: 15-1122.00). The projected growth through 2028 is much faster than average (11%). High salaries can be found in the areas of business continuity planning and security management ($120,000+).

During the March 9, 2020, Emergency Management/Homeland Security CTE Advisory Committee meeting, the following discussions ensued:

Dr. "Nash" Flores reported on a recent homeland security program he developed at Rio Hondo with an emphasis on quality and leadership. They are offering their training on the professional/management side of the emergency management training programs. If people have a background that will prevent them from meeting all the "points" necessary for them to be hired as a police officer, they can still take this academic background and work in other areas. This provides them some flexibility and additional opportunity in their career choices.

Dr. Linda Martinez stated that many students register for classes based on the quality of an instructor. We need to make sure that our popular instructors are covering the basics rather than "entertaining" the students. The discussion turned to basic skills homeland security students need to possess – skills that employers are looking for to meet entry-level employment. This includes a basic understanding for ICS, NIMS, SEMS, etc. We need to make sure that the students know the basics

Wayne Windman discussed the importance of developing writing skills. Instructors need to make sure that they assign appropriate "writing" assignments, and establish writing as an important component of the course.   We must develop the student's writing and oral communication skills and develop their critical thinking ability. The group agreed that community colleges were responsible for getting students prepared for entry level jobs in the field or to prepare them for transfer to the university level. Writing and critical thinking skills need to be developed at a higher level.

Todd DeVoe noted the importance of quality report writing in both the criminal justice and emergency management fields. He said that about 80% of what we do is writing reports that may appear in court or in the records.

Sean Ward talked about the need to develop volunteer management skills. Managers must have skills to work with local and county emergency management teams, CERT teams, the Red Cross, and other groups of volunteers. Volunteers are not employees and can't be managed as such. Sean noted that volunteers need to be handled differently or they will leave to find another organization. He stated that

having a course that would train people how to communicate and work with volunteers would be very beneficial. It would help with communication, public speaking, as well as conflict resolution. Kevin reminded the group that Nash had previously mentioned the FEMA Independent Study Courses. These courses are a great way to introduce students to working with volunteer teams. In our program, it is required that students have at least one course in management, leadership and/or organizational development. At Coastline, we encourage an interdisciplinary approach to your degree and certificate programs that coordinate with our college's management/supervision program.

Lt. Thomas Graham suggested that we may want to reach out to the junior high and high school levels as well as to people in criminal justice programs to help grow recruiting for our program.

Dr. Gus Frias stated that FBI/Infragard is working with the universities to develop a plan requiring anyone working a teacher, counselor, or administrator to take a organizational safety class. At this time, there is no requirement for such training in the workplace. Legislation is currently on hold. Courses like these would include active shooter response training. He suggested the collaboration of community colleges in this area. Kevin suggested the development of academic certificates for such training. This would help to meet the needs of fire departments, police departments, as well as teachers.

Matt Ankley asked whether Coastline had a way to track student employment development after they leave the college. **Todd DeVoe** discussed his interaction with students who graduate. **Dr. Sampson** stated that there is an evaluation that is done at the end of the program, but there is no systematic approach whereby contact with the student is being accomplished.

Dr. Sampson stated that internships come available with FEMA on a fairly consistent basis. The students are notified of this and can contact FEMA.

Wayne Windman suggested that it might be beneficial to develop a short video that could be shared with junior high and high school students that would help them find out about our program is about and what kind of jobs would be available within this field.

Progress on Initiative(s)

Progress on Forward Strategies

Initiative(s)	Status	Progress Status Description	Outcome(s)
Gain institutional approval to increase EM/HS course offerings	Completed	Currently keeping the same course load for faculty. The program requests to increase the number of sections	Increase course offerings
Develop a marketing plan to build awareness of the EM/HS program and increase enrollment.	In-progress	Working with team and ROP on public safety programs. The college website is being updated	Marketing is being completed between CCCCO marketing through the state
Continue collaboration between California Community Colleges and the California State University system to develop an AD-T for transfer in Emergency Management/Homeland Security.	In-progress	Working with the CCCCO, CSU and advisory board to increase EM/HS across the state. Grant obtained and courses model has been developed.	

Initiative(s)	Status	Progress Status Description	Outcome(s)
Explore offering CJ courses to the state-funded population	In-progress	Discuss the schedule with the Associate Dean	

Response to Program and Department Review Committee Recommendation(s)

Progress on Recommendations

Recommendation(s)	Status	Response Summary
Investigate ways to increase enrollments in the program.	Addressed	The enrollment has stayed the same while college enrollment has decreased
Explore the need for a full-time faculty member.	In-process	Exploring options for faculty
Coordinating institutional support for more seamless planning.	In-process	Working on strategies to increase enrollment

Program Planning and Communication Strategies

Describe the communication methods and interaction strategies used by your program faculty to discuss programmatic-level planning, SLO/PSLO data, institutional performance data, and curriculum and programmatic development. The program faculty meet on a bi-annual basis to discuss planning, SLO, and course development. Every March the advisory board meets to discuss market trends and outcomes data.

Coastline Pathways

Institutionally, the program is now structured under the **Safety and Law** area. In addition, the program has clear pathways and will work with the Guided Pathways to build program maps online.

The program chair is working with Statewide Public Safety Advisory committee, National Council on Homeland Security to develop course outlines of record for the state through a state-approved grant program.

Implications of Change

There continues to be a major demand in the industry for individuals to have a credential related to homeland security and with the planning for new AD-Ts. There is a need to increase program viability and increase enrollment. This is anticipated to improve graduate completion as reflected in an increase in awards and PSLO results.

Based on the review of internal data and external trends the following opportunities exist:

- Offer CJ courses to the general student population
- Increase marketing efforts to build enrollment
- Strengthen course retention efforts
- Update curriculum

Section 2: Human Capital Planning

Staffing

Staffing Plan

Year	Administrator /Management	F/T Faculty	P/T Faculty	Classified	Hourly
Previous year	Dean of CTE	0	5	0	0
Current year	Dean of CTE	0	4	0	0
1 year	Dean of CTE	0	6	0	0
2 years	Dean of CTE	0	6	0	0
3 years	Dean of CTE	0	8	0	0

There is a need to increase the number of part-time faculty to meet the anticipated growth based on student demand and new strategies of program awareness.

Professional Development

Professional Development

Name (Title)	Professional Development	Outcome
Kevin Sampson	CCC Chancellor's Office PSEAC Council	Labor Study Grant
Ygnacio Flores	FBI/Infragard, Cyber-security, Disaster Mgmt.	Knowledge & Skill Development
Teresa Irvin	COVID-19 pandemic response, riot training	Knowledge & Skill Development

Section 3: Facilities Planning

Facility Assessment

The Emergency Management/Homeland Security program is 100% is online and does not currently require physical facilities.

Section 4: Technology Planning

Technology Assessment

No hardware (lap-tops, tablets, phones) are requested at this time. Department Chair and key faculty should be assisted with technology/software/access when the program experiences any change in its current status.

Classroom:

The EM/HS program currently offers no onsite classes; 100% of the department's classes are offered online. During the previous program review evaluation period, the only classes offered onsite were scheduled at the Newport Beach Center as part of Coastline's Contract and Military Education TSA

Program. Both faculty and students in the TSA program were both satisfied and impressed with the instructional resources provided by the Newport Center. Their classrooms provide up-to-date instructional technology for the participants (*The TSA contract has since been canceled due to the movement to a national contract with another educational institution*).

Online Learning:

Emergency Management/Homeland Security faculty made the transition to the new Canvas LMS during this program review evaluation period. All EM/HS faculty received Faculty Service Center (FSC) training and completed at least one of their courses in the new learning management system. Faculty members expressed frustration with the deep learning curve that Canvas presented, but, overall, faculty expressed satisfaction with the system's amenities. Both faculty and our EM/HS CTE advisory committee members were glad to see that FSC utilized a specific verification checklist to review courses, focusing on both the development of more rigor in our online courses and regular substantive instructor-student interaction. Both faculty and CTE advisory committee members commented that other colleges were not instituting similar quality processes, leading to the potential for accreditation problems for those colleges in the future. Local constituents expressed satisfaction in our college's current progression. Faculty were also satisfied with new instructional tools that Canvas provided, including Course Analytics, Speed Grader, Moodle and Turnitin. Suffice to say that our instructors are moving forward with the continued development of their courses in Canvas and look forward to building dynamic courses that meet both increased rigor and greater instructor-student communication. The "Introduction" courses in our program (i.e., EMGT C101 and EMGT C102) were developed as "model" courses, with the intent that these courses would be used as a template to develop other Canvas EM/HS courses. As faculty continue to develop their Canvas LMS skill-set, we anticipate the inclusion of additional "model" EM/HS courses. An RSI checklist has been in use by department faculty members to ensure regular and effective contact with students on Canvas.

Section 5: Ongoing/New Initiatives

Initiative: Finalize the offering of CJ courses to the state-funded population.

Describe how the initiative supports the college mission:
The initiative strengthens access to new programs.

What college goal does the initiative support?
X Reduce all student equity gaps regarding access and achievement (Equity)
X Increase student completion and achievement outcomes by 20% (Achievement)
☐ Strengthen College collaboration, communication, continuous learning, and community engagement (Engagement)
X Further develop, adopt, and adapt innovative practices and technologies that advance student success and institutional effectiveness (Innovation & Effectiveness)

How does this initiative play a part in Coastline Pathways?
It created more career focused pathways for students to enter the workforce.

What evidence supports this initiative? Select all that apply
☐ Learning or Service Area Outcome (SLO/SAO) assessment
☐ Internal Research (Student achievement, program performance)
X External Research (Academic literature, market assessment, audit findings, compliance mandates)

Describe how the evidence supports this initiative.
There is a growing need to train CJ officers based on industry demand.

Recommended resource(s) needed for initiative achievement:
Add sections and hire part-time instructors.

What is the anticipated outcome of completing the initiative?
Increased enrollment and program graduates.

Provide a timeline and timeframe from initiative inception to completion.
Offer courses in fall 2021.

Section 6: Prioritization

List and prioritize initiative requests.

Initiative	Resource(s)	Est. Cost	Funding Type	Health, Safety Compliance	Evidence	College Goal	Complete By	Priority
Offer CJ courses to state-funded population	No additional resources necessary; add classes		Ongoing	N/A	External Research	Equity; Achievement; Innovation & Effectiveness	2021-22	

Prioritization Glossary

Initiative: Provide a short description of the plan

Resource(s): Describe the resource(s) needed to support the completion of the initiative

Est. Cost: Estimated financial cost of the resource(s)

Funding Type: Specify if the resource request is one-time or ongoing

Health, Safety Compliance: Specify if the request relates to health or safety compliance issue(s)

Evidence: Specify what data type(s) supported the initiative (Internal research, external research, or learning outcomes)

College Goal: Specify what College goal the initiative aligns with

Complete By: Specify year of anticipated completion

Priority: Specify a numerical rank to the initiative

Data Glossary

Enrolled (Census): The official enrollment count based on attendance at the census point of the course.

FTES: Total **full-time equivalent students** (FTES) based on enrollment of resident and non-resident students. Calculations based on census enrollment or number of hours attended based on the type of Attendance Accounting Method assigned to a section.

FTEF30: A measure of productivity that measures the number of **full-time faculty** loaded for the entire year at 30 Lecture Hour Equivalents (15 LHEs per fall and spring terms). This measure provides an estimate of full-time positions required to teach the instruction load for the subject for the academic year.

WSCH/FTEF (595): A measure of productivity that measures the weekly student contact hours compared to full-time equivalent faculty. When calculated for a 16 week schedule, the productivity benchmark is 595. When calculated for an 18-week schedule, the benchmark is 525.

Success Rate: The number of passing grades (A, B, C, P) compared to all valid grades awarded.

Retention Rate: The number of retention grades (A, B, C, P, D, F, NP, I*) compared to all valid grades awarded.

Fall-to-Spring Persistence: The number of students who completed the course in the fall term and re-enrolled (persisted) in the same subject the subsequent spring semester.

F2S Percent: The number of students who completed a course in the fall term and re-enrolled in the same subject the subsequent spring semester divided by the total number of students enrolled in the fall in the subject.