COASTLINE
COLLEGE

2019-2020
Annual Program Review

Health Science
(Foods and Nutrition, Gerontology, Health, Kinesiology, Physical Education)

Table of Contents

Section 1: Program Planning:

Internal Analysis: Foods and Nutrition

Productivity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Enrollment	63,485	60,149	61,512
Foods and Nutrition Enrollment	1,244	1,245	1,218
College Student Resident FTES	6,343.35	5,928.76	6,189.62
Foods and Nutrition Resident FTES	117.12	112.00	110.81
Sections	15	16	18
Fill Rate	70.4%	63.3%	70.5%
WSCH/FTEF 595 Efficiency	973	915	856
FTEF/30	2.0	2.0	2.1
Extended Learning Enrollment	135	135	87

The percentage change in the number of Foods and Nutrition **enrollments** in 2017-18 showed a slight decrease from 2016-17 and a slight decrease from 2015-16.

The percentage change in 2017-18 **resident FTES** in Foods and Nutrition credit courses showed a slight decrease from 2016-17 and a moderate decrease in comparison with resident FTES in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the number of **sections** in Foods and Nutrition courses in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a substantial increase from the number of sections in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **fill rate** in 2017-18 for Foods and Nutrition courses showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a minimal difference in comparison with the fill rate in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **WSCH/FTEF** ratio in Foods and Nutrition courses in 2017-18 showed a moderate decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **FTEF/30** ratio for Foods and Nutrition courses in 2017-18 showed a slight increase from 2016-17 and a moderate increase in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2015-16.

There was a substantial decrease in the number of Foods and Nutrition **Extended Learning enrollments** in 2017-18 from 2016-17and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

Comparison of Enrollment Trends	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Enrollment	63,485	60,149	61,512
Foods and Nutrition Enrollment	1,244	1,245	1,218

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Online	59.7%	60.5%	54.8%
Hybrid	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	40.3%	39.5%	45.2%

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	42.0%	43.0%	38.8%
Male	56.7%	55.7%	59.6%
Unknown	1.4%	1.3%	1.6%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	21.4%	17.3%	17.7%
American Indian/AK Native	1.0%	1.2%	0.7%
Asian	16.1%	16.8%	16.6%
Hispanic	16.5%	16.6%	18.1%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%
White	28.0%	30.9%	32.4%
Multi-Ethnicity	15.1%	15.3%	12.5%
Other/Unknown	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	5.9%	7.9%	7.1%
20 to 24	23.3%	21.9%	21.8%
25 to 29	18.2%	17.9%	21.3%
30 to 34	13.2%	15.4%	13.1%
35 to 39	10.3%	11.5%	10.8%
40 to 49	16.5%	14.6%	15.1%
50 and Older	12.6%	10.8%	10.8%

Foods and Nutrition courses made up 2.0% of all state-funded enrollment for 2017-18. The percentage difference in Foods and Nutrition course **enrollment** in 2017-18 showed a slight decrease from 2016-17 and a slight decrease from 2015-16. Enrollment in Foods and Nutrition during 2017-18 showed 0.0% of courses were taught **traditional (face-to-fac**e), 54.8% were taught **online**, 0.0% were taught in the **hybrid** modality, and 45.2% were taught in the **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** modality.

In 2017-18, Foods and Nutrition enrollment consisted of 38.8% **female**, 59.6% **male**, and 1.6% students of **unknown** gender. In 2017-18, Foods and Nutrition enrollment consisted of 17.7% **African American** students, 0.7% **American Indian/AK Native** students, 16.6% **Asian** students, 18.1% **Hispanic** students, 0.6% **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, 32.4% **White** students, 12.5% **multi-ethnic** students, and 1.4% students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity. The age breakdown for 2017-18 enrollments in Foods and Nutrition revealed 7.1% aged **19 or less**, 21.8% aged **20 to 24**, 21.3% aged **25 to 29**, 13.1% aged **30 to 34**, 10.8% aged **35 to 39**, 15.1% aged **40 to 49**, and 10.8% aged **50 and older**.

Awards	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College Awarded Degrees	2,047	2,221	2,213
Foods and Nutrition Degrees	0	0	0
College Awarded Certificates	600	602	628
Foods and Nutrition Certificates	1	0	0

The percentage change in the number of Foods and Nutrition **degrees** awarded in 2017-18 showed no comparative data from 2016-17 and no comparative data from the number of degrees awarded in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the number of Foods and Nutrition **certificates** awarded in 2017-18 showed no comparative data from 2016-17 and showed a substantial decrease in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2015-16.

Success and Retention: Foods and Nutrition

Comparison of Success Rates	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Success Rate	66.7%	68.6%	70.4%
College Institution Set Standard Success Rate	55.6%	56.7%	58.3%
Foods and Nutrition Success Rate	58.5%	57.2%	60.7%

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	-	-	-
Online	66.2%	59.5%	63.5%
Hybrid	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	47.1%	53.7%	57.1%

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	68.9%	61.3%	66.5%
Male	50.1%	54.6%	57.2%
Unknown	88.2%	31.3%	45.0%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	33.7%	37.5%	32.9%
American Indian/AK Native	53.8%	46.7%	100.0%
Asian	80.9%	69.9%	81.1%
Hispanic	52.2%	52.7%	58.1%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	55.6%	57.1%	33.3%
White	66.1%	65.7%	65.5%
Multi-Ethnicity	61.5%	55.8%	60.9%
Other/Unknown	73.3%	37.5%	70.6%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	68.1%	64.3%	70.9%
20 to 24	70.1%	58.2%	65.6%
25 to 29	62.1%	58.3%	58.4%
30 to 34	54.0%	57.3%	57.9%
35 to 39	48.0%	58.7%	57.5%
40 to 49	51.7%	56.6%	57.2%
50 and Older	49.4%	47.0%	59.4%

The percentage difference in the **course success rate** in Foods and Nutrition courses in 2017-18 showed a slight increase from 2016-17 and a moderate increase from 2015-16. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Foods and Nutrition 2017-18 course success rate to the College's overall success average* (70.4%) and the institution-set standard* (58.3%) for credit course success, the Foods and Nutrition **course success rate** was moderately lower than the **college average** and slightly higher than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Foods and Nutrition success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was not applicable for **traditional (face-to-face)** Foods and Nutrition courses, slightly higher for **online** courses, not applicable for **hybrid courses**, and slightly lower for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Foods and Nutrition success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was moderately higher for **female** students in Foods and Nutrition courses, slightly lower for **male** students, and substantially lower for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Foods and Nutrition success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially lower for **African American** students in Foods and Nutrition courses, substantially higher for **American Indian/AK Native** students, substantially higher for **Asian** students, slightly lower for **Hispanic** students, substantially lower for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, slightly higher for **White** students, minimally different for **multi-ethnic** students, and moderately higher for students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Foods and Nutrition success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially higher for students aged **19 or less** in Foods and Nutrition courses, slightly higher for students aged **20 to 24**, slightly lower for students aged **25 to 29**, slightly lower for students aged **30 to 34**, slightly lower for students aged **35 to 39**, slightly lower for students aged **40 to 49**, and slightly lower for students aged **50 and older**.

Comparison of Retention Rates	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Retention Rate	83.4%	83.7%	85.1%
College Institution Set Standard Retention Rate	69.9%	70.9%	71.1%
Foods and Nutrition Retention Rate	81.6%	78.6%	77.1%

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	-	-	-
Online	82.8%	78.6%	73.4%
Hybrid	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	79.8%	78.5%	81.9%

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	83.6%	80.4%	78.0%
Male	79.8%	77.5%	77.2%
Unknown	94.1%	62.5%	55.0%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	76.9%	67.1%	54.1%
American Indian/AK Native	92.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Asian	91.0%	81.3%	89.1%
Hispanic	75.9%	77.3%	78.3%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	100.0%	85.7%	83.3%
White	84.2%	84.2%	81.1%
Multi-Ethnicity	78.1%	80.5%	78.1%
Other/Unknown	80.0%	62.5%	88.2%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	76.4%	88.8%	86.0%
20 to 24	83.7%	79.5%	76.3%
25 to 29	83.7%	77.6%	74.9%
30 to 34	77.9%	78.1%	74.8%
35 to 39	79.5%	83.2%	79.5%
40 to 49	83.4%	80.2%	77.8%
50 and Older	80.1%	64.2%	76.6%

The percentage difference in the **retention rate** in Foods and Nutrition courses in 2017-18 showed a slight decrease from 2016-17 and a moderate decrease from 2015-16. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Foods and Nutrition 2017-18 retention rate to the College's overall retention average* (85.1%) and the institution-set standard* (71.1%) for credit course success, the Foods and Nutrition **retention rate** was moderately lower than the **college average** and moderately higher than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Foods and Nutrition retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was not applicable for **traditional (face-to-face)** Foods and Nutrition courses, slightly lower for **online** courses, not applicable for **hybrid courses**, and slightly higher for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Foods and Nutrition retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was minimally different for **female** students in Foods and Nutrition courses, minimally different for **male** students, and substantially lower for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Foods and Nutrition retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was substantially lower for **African American** students in Foods and Nutrition courses, substantially higher for **American Indian/AK Native** students, substantially higher for **Asian** students, slightly higher for **Hispanic** students, moderately higher for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, slightly higher for **White** students, slightly higher for **multi-ethnic** students, and substantially higher for students of **other or unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Foods and Nutrition retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was moderately higher for students aged **19 or less** in Foods and Nutrition courses, minimally different for students aged **20 to 24**, slightly lower for students aged **25 to 29**, slightly lower for students aged **30 to 34**, slightly higher for students aged **35 to 39**, minimally different for students aged **40 to 49**, and minimally different for students aged **50 and older**.

*Note: College term success and retention averages and institution-set standards are computed annually and recorded in the college Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Scorecard.

Data Source: Banner Student Information System

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%

Internal Analysis: Gerontology

Productivity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Enrollment	63,485	60,149	61,512
Gerontology Enrollment	77	79	68
College Student Resident FTES	6,343.35	5,928.76	6,189.62
Gerontology Resident FTES	6.86	7.04	6.30
Sections	3	3	3
Fill Rate	55.6%	58.5%	50.4%
WSCH/FTEF 595 Efficiency	380	395	344
FTEF/30	0.3	0.3	0.3
Extended Learning Enrollment	12	2	11

The percentage change in the number of Gerontology **enrollments** in 2017-18 showed a substantial decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

The percentage change in 2017-18 **resident FTES** in Gerontology credit courses showed a substantial decrease from 2016-17 and a moderate decrease in comparison with resident FTES in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the number of **sections** in Gerontology courses in 2017-18 showed a minimal difference from 2016-17 and a minimal difference from the number of sections in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **fill rate** in 2017-18 for Gerontology courses showed a substantial decrease from 2016-17 and a moderate decrease in comparison with the fill rate in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **WSCH/FTEF** ratio in Gerontology courses in 2017-18 showed a substantial decrease from 2016-17 and a moderate decrease from 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **FTEF/30** ratio for Gerontology courses in 2017-18 showed a minimal difference from 2016-17 and a minimal difference in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2015-16.

There was a substantial increase in the number of Gerontology **Extended Learning enrollments** in 2017-18 from 2016-17and a moderate decrease from 2015-16.

Comparison of Enrollment Trends	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Enrollment	63,485	60,149	61,512
Gerontology Enrollment	77	79	68

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

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	76.6%	81.0%	82.4%
Male	23.4%	16.5%	16.2%
Unknown	0.0%	2.5%	1.5%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	18.2%	19.0%	27.9%
American Indian/AK Native	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian	19.5%	21.5%	14.7%
Hispanic	10.4%	8.9%	1.5%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
White	33.8%	38.0%	47.1%
Multi-Ethnicity	15.6%	12.7%	7.4%
Other/Unknown	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	5.2%	1.3%	2.9%
20 to 24	14.3%	11.4%	5.9%
25 to 29	13.0%	13.9%	20.6%
30 to 34	7.8%	13.9%	22.1%
35 to 39	2.6%	10.1%	7.4%
40 to 49	19.5%	26.6%	14.7%
50 and Older	37.7%	22.8%	26.5%

Gerontology courses made up 0.1% of all state-funded enrollment for 2017-18. The percentage difference in Gerontology course **enrollment** in 2017-18 showed a substantial decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16. Enrollment in Gerontology during 2017-18 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 2017-18, Gerontology enrollment consisted of 82.4% **female**, 16.2% **male**, and 1.5% students of **unknown** gender. In 2017-18, Gerontology enrollment consisted of 27.9% **African American** students, 0.0% **American Indian/AK Native** students, 14.7% **Asian** students, 1.5% **Hispanic** students, 1.5% **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, 47.1% **White** students, 7.4% **multi-ethnic** students, and 0.0% students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity. The age breakdown for 2017-18 enrollments in Gerontology revealed 2.9% aged **19 or less**, 5.9% aged **20 to 24**, 20.6% aged **25 to 29**, 22.1% aged **30 to 34**, 7.4% aged **35 to 39**, 14.7% aged **40 to 49**, and 26.5% aged **50 and older**.

Awards	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College Awarded Degrees	2,047	2,221	2,213
Gerontology Degrees	6	5	8
College Awarded Certificates	600	602	628
Gerontology Certificates	6	9	11

The percentage change in the number of Gerontology **degrees** awarded in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a substantial increase from the number of degrees awarded in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the number of Gerontology **certificates** awarded in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and showed a substantial increase in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2015-16.

Success and Retention: Gerontology

Comparison of Success Rates	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Success Rate	66.7%	68.6%	70.4%
College Institution Set Standard Success Rate	55.6%	56.7%	58.3%
Gerontology Success Rate	65.8%	72.2%	82.4%

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	-	-	-
Online	65.8%	72.2%	82.4%
Hybrid	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	-	-	-

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	66.1%	75.0%	87.5%
Male	64.7%	61.5%	63.6%
Unknown	-	50.0%	0.0%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	50.0%	73.3%	68.4%
American Indian/AK Native	-	-	-
Asian	73.3%	58.8%	100.0%
Hispanic	57.1%	71.4%	100.0%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	-	-	100.0%
White	61.5%	73.3%	81.3%
Multi-Ethnicity	83.3%	90.0%	100.0%
Other/Unknown	100.0%	-	-

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
20 to 24	100.0%	55.6%	100.0%
25 to 29	70.0%	63.6%	85.7%
30 to 34	60.0%	63.6%	66.7%
35 to 39	50.0%	87.5%	80.0%
40 to 49	33.3%	71.4%	60.0%
50 and Older	65.5%	83.3%	100.0%

The percentage difference in the **course success rate** in Gerontology courses in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a substantial increase from 2015-16. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Gerontology 2017-18 course success rate to the College's overall success average* (70.4%) and the institution-set standard* (58.3%) for credit course success, the Gerontology **course success rate** was substantially higher than the **college average** and substantially higher than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Gerontology success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was not applicable for **traditional (face-to-face)** Gerontology courses, minimally different for **online** courses, not applicable for **hybrid courses**, and not applicable for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Gerontology success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was moderately higher for **female** students in Gerontology courses, substantially lower for **male** students, and substantially lower for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Gerontology success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially lower for **African American** students in Gerontology courses, not applicable for **American Indian/AK Native** students, substantially higher for **Asian** students, substantially higher for **Hispanic** students, substantially higher for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, minimally different for **White** students, substantially higher for **multi-ethnic** students, and not applicable for students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Gerontology success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially higher for students aged **19 or less** in Gerontology courses, substantially higher for students aged **20 to 24**, slightly higher for students aged **25 to 29**, substantially lower for students aged **30 to 34**, slightly lower for students aged **35 to 39**, substantially lower for students aged **40 to 49**, and substantially higher for students aged **50 and older**.

Comparison of Retention Rates	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Retention Rate	83.4%	83.7%	85.1%
College Institution Set Standard Retention Rate	69.9%	70.9%	71.1%
Gerontology Retention Rate	89.5%	82.3%	89.7%

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	-	-	-
Online	89.5%	82.3%	89.7%
Hybrid	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	-	-	-

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	89.8%	82.8%	94.6%
Male	88.2%	84.6%	63.6%
Unknown	-	50.0%	100.0%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	71.4%	86.7%	78.9%
American Indian/AK Native	-	-	-
Asian	93.3%	64.7%	100.0%
Hispanic	100.0%	85.7%	100.0%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	-	-	100.0%
White	88.5%	83.3%	90.6%
Multi-Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Other/Unknown	100.0%	-	-

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
20 to 24	100.0%	77.8%	100.0%
25 to 29	100.0%	72.7%	85.7%
30 to 34	80.0%	72.7%	80.0%
35 to 39	100.0%	87.5%	80.0%
40 to 49	73.3%	85.7%	90.0%
50 and Older	89.7%	88.9%	100.0%

The percentage difference in the **retention rate** in Gerontology courses in 2017-18 showed a moderate increase from 2016-17 and minimal difference from 2015-16. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Gerontology 2017-18 retention rate to the College's overall retention average* (85.1%) and the institution-set standard* (71.1%) for credit course success, the Gerontology **retention rate** was slightly higher than the **college average** and substantially higher than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Gerontology retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was not applicable for **traditional (face-to-face)** Gerontology courses, minimally different for **online** courses, not applicable for **hybrid courses**, and not applicable for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Gerontology retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was slightly higher for **female** students in Gerontology courses, substantially lower for **male** students, and substantially higher for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Gerontology retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was substantially lower for **African American** students in Gerontology courses, not applicable for **American Indian/AK Native** students, substantially higher for **Asian** students, substantially higher for **Hispanic** students, substantially higher for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, minimally different for **White** students, substantially higher for **multi-ethnic** students, and not applicable for students of **other or unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Gerontology retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was substantially higher for students aged **19 or less** in Gerontology courses, substantially higher for students aged **20 to 24**, slightly lower for students aged **25 to 29**, moderately lower for students aged **30 to 34**, moderately lower for students aged **35 to 39**, minimally different for students aged **40 to 49**, and substantially higher for students aged **50 and older**.

*Note: College term success and retention averages and institution-set standards are computed annually and recorded in the college Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Scorecard.

Data Source: Banner Student Information System

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%

Internal Analysis: Health

Productivity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Enrollment	63,485	60,149	61,512
Health Enrollment	1,496	1,336	1,226
College Student Resident FTES	6,343.35	5,928.76	6,189.62
Health Resident FTES	135.36	120.92	111.17
Sections	22	18	20
Fill Rate	82.6%	73.4%	66.6%
WSCH/FTEF 595 Efficiency	1,122	998	917
FTEF/30	2.0	2.0	2.0
Extended Learning Enrollment	190	120	111

The percentage change in the number of Health **enrollments** in 2017-18 showed a moderate decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

The percentage change in 2017-18 **resident FTES** in Health credit courses showed a moderate decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease in comparison with resident FTES in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the number of **sections** in Health courses in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a moderate decrease from the number of sections in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **fill rate** in 2017-18 for Health courses showed a moderate decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease in comparison with the fill rate in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **WSCH/FTEF** ratio in Health courses in 2017-18 showed a moderate decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **FTEF/30** ratio for Health courses in 2017-18 showed a minimal difference from 2016-17 and a minimal difference in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2015-16.

There was a moderate decrease in the number of Health **Extended Learning enrollments** in 2017-18 from 2016-17and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

Comparison of Enrollment Trends	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Enrollment	63,485	60,149	61,512
Health Enrollment	1,496	1,336	1,226

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	6.7%	5.5%	4.5%
Online	49.2%	52.1%	46.2%
Hybrid	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	44.1%	42.4%	48.9%

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	34.8%	37.4%	33.9%
Male	63.9%	61.2%	64.5%
Unknown	1.3%	1.5%	1.5%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	27.1%	20.8%	18.3%
American Indian/AK Native	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%
Asian	10.5%	13.2%	11.3%
Hispanic	21.0%	20.6%	24.0%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	0.6%	1.0%	0.6%
White	26.6%	28.4%	31.2%
Multi-Ethnicity	12.1%	14.2%	12.5%
Other/Unknown	1.2%	1.0%	1.5%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	12.0%	11.0%	9.3%
20 to 24	17.7%	19.8%	14.8%
25 to 29	17.6%	15.8%	17.9%
30 to 34	13.5%	14.0%	12.2%
35 to 39	11.2%	10.9%	13.9%
40 to 49	15.2%	15.7%	17.6%
50 and Older	12.8%	12.7%	14.3%

Health courses made up 2.0% of all state-funded enrollment for 2017-18. The percentage difference in Health course **enrollment** in 2017-18 showed a moderate decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16. Enrollment in Health during 2017-18 showed 4.5% of courses were taught **traditional (face-to-fac**e), 46.2% were taught **online**, 0.5% were taught in the **hybrid** modality, and 48.9% were taught in the **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** modality.

In 2017-18, Health enrollment consisted of 33.9% **female**, 64.5% **male**, and 1.5% students of **unknown** gender. In 2017-18, Health enrollment consisted of 18.3% **African American** students, 0.7% **American Indian/AK Native** students, 11.3% **Asian** students, 24.0% **Hispanic** students, 0.6% **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, 31.2% **White** students, 12.5% **multi-ethnic** students, and 1.5% students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity. The age breakdown for 2017-18 enrollments in Health revealed 9.3% aged **19 or less**, 14.8% aged **20 to 24**, 17.9% aged **25 to 29**, 12.2% aged **30 to 34**, 13.9% aged **35 to 39**, 17.6% aged **40 to 49**, and 14.3% aged **50 and older**.

Awards	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College Awarded Degrees	2,047	2,221	2,213
Health Degrees	16	17	34
College Awarded Certificates	600	602	628
Health Certificates	17	24	44

The percentage change in the number of Health **degrees** awarded in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a substantial increase from the number of degrees awarded in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the number of Health **certificates** awarded in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and showed a substantial increase in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2015-16.

Success and Retention: Health

Comparison of Success Rates	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Success Rate	66.7%	68.6%	70.4%
College Institution Set Standard Success Rate	55.6%	56.7%	58.3%
Health Success Rate	57.1%	64.2%	67.2%

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	79.0%	67.6%	54.5%
Online	50.4%	64.5%	62.5%
Hybrid	-	-	66.7%
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	61.2%	63.4%	72.8%

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	59.1%	68.5%	65.6%
Male	56.1%	61.6%	67.9%
Unknown	52.6%	65.0%	73.7%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	35.2%	45.0%	46.4%
American Indian/AK Native	46.2%	63.6%	87.5%
Asian	72.6%	75.0%	82.7%
Hispanic	59.9%	64.0%	66.4%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	55.6%	30.8%	85.7%
White	68.3%	73.1%	72.4%
Multi-Ethnicity	63.5%	66.8%	72.2%
Other/Unknown	61.1%	71.4%	47.4%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	71.1%	66.7%	64.0%
20 to 24	55.5%	65.3%	70.6%
25 to 29	48.3%	64.0%	64.8%
30 to 34	55.4%	62.0%	63.3%
35 to 39	55.4%	66.4%	66.7%
40 to 49	59.5%	61.0%	67.6%
50 and Older	58.6%	65.3%	72.4%

The percentage difference in the **course success rate** in Health courses in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a slight increase from 2015-16. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Health 2017-18 course success rate to the College's overall success average* (70.4%) and the institution-set standard* (58.3%) for credit course success, the Health **course success rate** was slightly lower than the **college average** and moderately higher than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Health success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially lower for **traditional (face-to-face)** Health courses, slightly lower for **online** courses, minimally different for **hybrid courses**, and moderately higher for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Health success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was slightly lower for **female** students in Health courses, minimally different for **male** students, and moderately higher for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Health success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially lower for **African American** students in Health courses, substantially higher for **American Indian/AK Native** students, substantially higher for **Asian** students, minimally different for **Hispanic** students, substantially higher for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, slightly higher for **White** students, slightly higher for **multi-ethnic** students, and substantially lower for students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Health success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was slightly lower for students aged **19 or less** in Health courses, slightly higher for students aged **20 to 24**, slightly lower for students aged **25 to 29**, slightly lower for students aged **30 to 34**, minimally different for students aged **35 to 39**, minimally different for students aged **40 to 49**, and moderately higher for students aged **50 and older**.

Comparison of Retention Rates	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Retention Rate	83.4%	83.7%	85.1%
College Institution Set Standard Retention Rate	69.9%	70.9%	71.1%
Health Retention Rate	84.4%	85.0%	85.4%

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	80.0%	86.5%	76.4%
Online	80.6%	86.5%	83.6%
Hybrid	-	-	100.0%
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	89.2%	83.0%	87.8%

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	84.1%	88.6%	85.1%
Male	84.9%	83.1%	85.5%
Unknown	63.2%	75.0%	84.2%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	80.0%	78.8%	81.5%
American Indian/AK Native	92.3%	90.9%	100.0%
Asian	86.6%	92.0%	88.5%
Hispanic	81.2%	85.8%	84.8%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	88.9%	76.9%	85.7%
White	88.7%	85.8%	87.4%
Multi-Ethnicity	86.7%	85.8%	85.4%
Other/Unknown	88.9%	78.6%	68.4%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	79.4%	85.0%	85.1%
20 to 24	83.8%	84.9%	88.9%
25 to 29	85.6%	87.7%	89.4%
30 to 34	83.2%	80.2%	82.0%
35 to 39	86.3%	88.4%	85.1%
40 to 49	86.3%	83.8%	79.8%
50 and Older	85.3%	85.9%	86.8%

The percentage difference in the **retention rate** in Health courses in 2017-18 showed minimal difference from 2016-17 and a slight increase from 2015-16. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Health 2017-18 retention rate to the College's overall retention average* (85.1%) and the institution-set standard* (71.1%) for credit course success, the Health **retention rate** was minimally different than the **college average** and substantially higher than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Health retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was moderately lower for **traditional (face-to-face)** Health courses, slightly lower for **online** courses, substantially higher for **hybrid courses**, and slightly higher for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Health retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was minimally different for **female** students in Health courses, minimally different for **male** students, and slightly lower for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Health retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was slightly lower for **African American** students in Health courses, substantially higher for **American Indian/AK Native** students, slightly higher for **Asian** students, minimally different for **Hispanic** students, minimally different for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, slightly higher for **White** students, minimally different for **multi-ethnic** students, and substantially lower for students of **other or unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Health retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was minimally different for students aged **19 or less** in Health courses, slightly higher for students aged **20 to 24**, slightly higher for students aged **25 to 29**, slightly lower for students aged **30 to 34**, minimally different for students aged **35 to 39**, moderately lower for students aged **40 to 49**, and slightly higher for students aged **50 and older**.

*Note: College term success and retention averages and institution-set standards are computed annually and recorded in the college Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Scorecard.

Data Source: Banner Student Information System

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%

Internal Analysis: Kinesiology

Productivity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Enrollment	63,485	60,149	61,512
Kinesiology Enrollment	85	69	72
College Student Resident FTES	6,343.35	5,928.76	6,189.62
Kinesiology Resident FTES	7.59	6.22	6.29
Sections	2	2	3
Fill Rate	94.4%	76.7%	53.0%
WSCH/FTEF 595 Efficiency	637	517	359
FTEF/30	0.2	0.2	0.3
Extended Learning Enrollment	0	0	0

The percentage change in the number of Kinesiology **enrollments** in 2017-18 showed a slight increase from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

The percentage change in 2017-18 **resident FTES** in Kinesiology credit courses showed a slight increase from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease in comparison with resident FTES in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the number of **sections** in Kinesiology courses in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a substantial increase from the number of sections in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **fill rate** in 2017-18 for Kinesiology courses showed a substantial decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease in comparison with the fill rate in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **WSCH/FTEF** ratio in Kinesiology courses in 2017-18 showed a substantial decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **FTEF/30** ratio for Kinesiology courses in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a substantial increase in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2015-16.

There was no comparative data in the number of Kinesiology **Extended Learning enrollments** in 2017-18 from 2016-17and no comparative data from 2015-16.

Comparison of Enrollment Trends	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Enrollment	63,485	60,149	61,512
Kinesiology Enrollment	85	69	72

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

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	56.5%	47.8%	61.1%
Male	42.4%	52.2%	38.9%
Unknown	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	14.1%	11.6%	8.3%
American Indian/AK Native	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian	23.5%	31.9%	27.8%
Hispanic	14.1%	8.7%	9.7%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	1.2%	1.4%	2.8%
White	23.5%	27.5%	33.3%
Multi-Ethnicity	23.5%	18.8%	15.3%
Other/Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	4.7%	10.1%	13.9%
20 to 24	32.9%	37.7%	38.9%
25 to 29	23.5%	17.4%	25.0%
30 to 34	8.2%	4.3%	8.3%
35 to 39	9.4%	4.3%	4.2%
40 to 49	12.9%	10.1%	8.3%
50 and Older	8.2%	15.9%	1.4%

Kinesiology courses made up 0.1% of all state-funded enrollment for 2017-18. The percentage difference in Kinesiology course **enrollment** in 2017-18 showed a slight increase from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16. Enrollment in Kinesiology during 2017-18 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 2017-18, Kinesiology enrollment consisted of 61.1% **female**, 38.9% **male**, and 0.0% students of **unknown** gender. In 2017-18, Kinesiology enrollment consisted of 8.3% **African American** students, 0.0% **American Indian/AK Native** students, 27.8% **Asian** students, 9.7% **Hispanic** students, 2.8% **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, 33.3% **White** students, 15.3% **multi-ethnic** students, and 2.8% students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity. The age breakdown for 2017-18 enrollments in Kinesiology revealed 13.9% aged **19 or less**, 38.9% aged **20 to 24**, 25.0% aged **25 to 29**, 8.3% aged **30 to 34**, 4.2% aged **35 to 39**, 8.3% aged **40 to 49**, and 1.4% aged **50 and older**.

Awards	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College Awarded Degrees	2,047	2,221	2,213
Kinesiology Degrees	0	0	0
College Awarded Certificates	600	602	628
Kinesiology Certificates	0	0	0

The percentage change in the number of Kinesiology **degrees** awarded in 2017-18 showed no comparative data from 2016-17 and no comparative data from the number of degrees awarded in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the number of Kinesiology **certificates** awarded in 2017-18 showed no comparative data from 2016-17 and showed no comparative data in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2015-16.

Success and Retention: Kinesiology

Comparison of Success Rates	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Success Rate	66.7%	68.6%	70.4%
College Institution Set Standard Success Rate	55.6%	56.7%	58.3%
Kinesiology Success Rate	64.7%	66.7%	73.6%

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	-	-	-
Online	64.7%	66.7%	73.6%
Hybrid	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	-	-	-

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	64.6%	72.7%	72.7%
Male	66.7%	61.1%	75.0%
Unknown	0.0%	-	-

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	75.0%	50.0%	33.3%
American Indian/AK Native	-	-	-
Asian	95.0%	68.2%	85.0%
Hispanic	33.3%	66.7%	85.7%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%
White	55.0%	73.7%	79.2%
Multi-Ethnicity	60.0%	61.5%	63.6%
Other/Unknown	-	-	50.0%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	50.0%	85.7%	90.0%
20 to 24	57.1%	73.1%	67.9%
25 to 29	70.0%	66.7%	77.8%
30 to 34	100.0%	33.3%	83.3%
35 to 39	37.5%	100.0%	66.7%
40 to 49	54.5%	57.1%	50.0%
50 and Older	100.0%	45.5%	100.0%

The percentage difference in the **course success rate** in Kinesiology courses in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a substantial increase from 2015-16. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Kinesiology 2017-18 course success rate to the College's overall success average* (70.4%) and the institution-set standard* (58.3%) for credit course success, the Kinesiology **course success rate** was slightly higher than the **college average** and substantially higher than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Kinesiology success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was not applicable for **traditional (face-to-face)** Kinesiology courses, minimally different for **online** courses, not applicable for **hybrid courses**, and not applicable for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Kinesiology success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was minimally different for **female** students in Kinesiology courses, slightly higher for **male** students, and not applicable for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Kinesiology success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially lower for **African American** students in Kinesiology courses, not applicable for **American Indian/AK Native** students, substantially higher for **Asian** students, substantially higher for **Hispanic** students, substantially lower for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, moderately higher for **White** students, moderately lower for **multi-ethnic** students, and substantially lower for students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Kinesiology success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially higher for students aged **19 or less** in Kinesiology courses, moderately lower for students aged **20 to 24**, slightly higher for students aged **25 to 29**, moderately higher for students aged **30 to 34**, moderately lower for students aged **35 to 39**, substantially lower for students aged **40 to 49**, and substantially higher for students aged **50 and older**.

Comparison of Retention Rates	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Retention Rate	83.4%	83.7%	85.1%
College Institution Set Standard Retention Rate	69.9%	70.9%	71.1%
Kinesiology Retention Rate	89.4%	87.0%	84.7%

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	-	-	-
Online	89.4%	87.0%	84.7%
Hybrid	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	-	-	-

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	85.4%	87.9%	84.1%
Male	94.4%	86.1%	85.7%
Unknown	100.0%	-	-

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	100.0%	87.5%	50.0%
American Indian/AK Native	-	-	-
Asian	100.0%	81.8%	85.0%
Hispanic	66.7%	100.0%	85.7%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
White	90.0%	89.5%	91.7%
Multi-Ethnicity	90.0%	84.6%	81.8%
Other/Unknown	-	-	100.0%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	50.0%	100.0%	90.0%
20 to 24	92.9%	100.0%	82.1%
25 to 29	95.0%	83.3%	88.9%
30 to 34	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%
35 to 39	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%
40 to 49	81.8%	85.7%	50.0%
50 and Older	100.0%	54.5%	100.0%

The percentage difference in the **retention rate** in Kinesiology courses in 2017-18 showed a slight decrease from 2016-17 and a moderate decrease from 2015-16. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Kinesiology 2017-18 retention rate to the College's overall retention average* (85.1%) and the institution-set standard* (71.1%) for credit course success, the Kinesiology **retention rate** was minimally different than the **college average** and substantially higher than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Kinesiology retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was not applicable for **traditional (face-to-face)** Kinesiology courses, minimally different for **online** courses, not applicable for **hybrid courses**, and not applicable for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Kinesiology retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was minimally different for **female** students in Kinesiology courses, minimally different for **male** students, and not applicable for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Kinesiology retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was substantially lower for **African American** students in Kinesiology courses, not applicable for **American Indian/AK Native** students, minimally different for **Asian** students, minimally different for **Hispanic** students, substantially higher for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, moderately higher for **White** students, slightly lower for **multi-ethnic** students, and substantially higher for students of **other or unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Kinesiology retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was moderately higher for students aged **19 or less** in Kinesiology courses, slightly lower for students aged **20 to 24**, slightly higher for students aged **25 to 29**, substantially higher for students aged **30 to 34**, substantially higher for students aged **35 to 39**, substantially lower for students aged **40 to 49**, and substantially higher for students aged **50 and older**.

*Note: College term success and retention averages and institution-set standards are computed annually and recorded in the college Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Scorecard.

Data Source: Banner Student Information System

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%

Internal Analysis: Physical Education

Productivity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Enrollment	63,485	60,149	61,512
Physical Education Enrollment	341	337	304
College Student Resident FTES	6,343.35	5,928.76	6,189.62
Physical Education Resident FTES	19.64	19.72	18.53
Sections	11	14	14
Fill Rate	60.5%	44.2%	49.8%
WSCH/FTEF 595 Efficiency	461	374	376
FTEF/30	0.7	0.9	0.8
Extended Learning Enrollment	88	78	75

The percentage change in the number of Physical Education **enrollments** in 2017-18 showed a moderate decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

The percentage change in 2017-18 **resident FTES** in Physical Education credit courses showed a moderate decrease from 2016-17 and a moderate decrease in comparison with resident FTES in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the number of **sections** in Physical Education courses in 2017-18 showed a minimal difference from 2016-17 and a substantial increase from the number of sections in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **fill rate** in 2017-18 for Physical Education courses showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease in comparison with the fill rate in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **WSCH/FTEF** ratio in Physical Education courses in 2017-18 showed a minimal difference from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

The percentage change in the **FTEF/30** ratio for Physical Education courses in 2017-18 showed a moderate decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial increase in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2015-16.

There was a slight decrease in the number of Physical Education **Extended Learning enrollments** in 2017-18 from 2016-17and a substantial decrease from 2015-16.

Comparison of Enrollment Trends	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Enrollment	63,485	60,149	61,512
Physical Education Enrollment	341	337	304

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	9.4%	7.7%	9.9%
Online	90.6%	92.3%	90.1%
Hybrid	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	62.2%	58.8%	64.1%
Male	34.6%	38.0%	34.2%
Unknown	3.2%	3.3%	1.6%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	15.5%	13.4%	14.8%
American Indian/AK Native	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%
Asian	26.7%	22.3%	29.3%
Hispanic	9.1%	13.9%	8.2%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	0.6%	0.3%	1.3%
White	27.6%	31.2%	28.6%
Multi-Ethnicity	18.2%	16.3%	17.4%
Other/Unknown	2.3%	1.5%	0.3%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	6.2%	6.2%	4.9%
20 to 24	29.3%	30.9%	34.5%
25 to 29	22.3%	18.4%	21.7%
30 to 34	9.7%	13.4%	9.9%
35 to 39	7.0%	6.2%	8.2%
40 to 49	10.9%	12.5%	9.5%
50 and Older	14.7%	12.5%	11.2%

Physical Education courses made up 0.5% of all state-funded enrollment for 2017-18. The percentage difference in Physical Education course **enrollment** in 2017-18 showed a moderate decrease from 2016-17 and a substantial decrease from 2015-16. Enrollment in Physical Education during 2017-18 showed 9.9% of courses were taught **traditional (face-to-fac**e), 90.1% 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 2017-18, Physical Education enrollment consisted of 64.1% **female**, 34.2% **male**, and 1.6% students of **unknown** gender. In 2017-18, Physical Education enrollment consisted of 14.8% **African American** students, 0.0% **American Indian/AK Native** students, 29.3% **Asian** students, 8.2% **Hispanic** students, 1.3% **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, 28.6% **White** students, 17.4% **multi-ethnic** students, and 0.3% students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity. The age breakdown for 2017-18 enrollments in Physical Education revealed 4.9% aged **19 or less**, 34.5% aged **20 to 24**, 21.7% aged **25 to 29**, 9.9% aged **30 to 34**, 8.2% aged **35 to 39**, 9.5% aged **40 to 49**, and 11.2% aged **50 and older**.

Awards	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College Awarded Degrees	2,047	2,221	2,213
Physical Education Degrees	0	1	0
College Awarded Certificates	600	602	628
Physical Education Certificates	0	0	0

The percentage change in the number of Physical Education **degrees** awarded in 2017-18 showed a substantial decrease from 2016-17 and no comparative data from the number of degrees awarded in 2015-16.

The percentage change in the number of Physical Education **certificates** awarded in 2017-18 showed no comparative data from 2016-17 and showed no comparative data in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2015-16.

Success and Retention: Physical Education

Comparison of Success Rates	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Success Rate	66.7%	68.6%	70.4%
College Institution Set Standard Success Rate	55.6%	56.7%	58.3%
Physical Education Success Rate	63.6%	65.0%	72.0%

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	87.5%	84.6%	90.0%
Online	61.2%	63.3%	70.1%
Hybrid	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	-	-	-

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	67.0%	70.7%	72.3%
Male	59.3%	56.3%	70.2%
Unknown	45.5%	63.6%	100.0%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	30.2%	31.1%	46.7%
American Indian/AK Native	-	75.0%	-
Asian	72.5%	76.0%	86.5%
Hispanic	61.3%	70.2%	80.0%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	50.0%	0.0%	75.0%
White	72.3%	79.0%	70.1%
Multi-Ethnicity	67.7%	49.1%	67.9%
Other/Unknown	62.5%	40.0%	100.0%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	66.7%	76.2%	46.7%
20 to 24	65.0%	63.5%	78.1%
25 to 29	57.9%	64.5%	71.2%
30 to 34	60.6%	62.2%	66.7%
35 to 39	66.7%	47.6%	64.0%
40 to 49	67.6%	59.5%	69.0%
50 and Older	66.0%	81.0%	79.4%

The percentage difference in the **course success rate** in Physical Education courses in 2017-18 showed a substantial increase from 2016-17 and a substantial increase from 2015-16. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Physical Education 2017-18 course success rate to the College's overall success average* (70.4%) and the institution-set standard* (58.3%) for credit course success, the Physical Education **course success rate** was slightly higher than the **college average** and substantially higher than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Physical Education success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially higher for **traditional (face-to-face)** Physical Education courses, slightly lower for **online** courses, not applicable for **hybrid courses**, and not applicable for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Physical Education success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was minimally different for **female** students in Physical Education courses, slightly lower for **male** students, and substantially higher for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Physical Education success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially lower for **African American** students in Physical Education courses, not applicable for **American Indian/AK Native** students, substantially higher for **Asian** students, moderately higher for **Hispanic** students, slightly higher for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, minimally different for **White** students, slightly lower for **multi-ethnic** students, and substantially higher for students of **other** or **unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Physical Education success rate for 2017-18, the success rate was substantially lower for students aged **19 or less** in Physical Education courses, moderately higher for students aged **20 to 24**, minimally different for students aged **25 to 29**, moderately lower for students aged **30 to 34**, moderately lower for students aged **35 to 39**, slightly lower for students aged **40 to 49**, and moderately higher for students aged **50 and older**.

Comparison of Retention Rates	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
College State-Funded Retention Rate	83.4%	83.7%	85.1%
College Institution Set Standard Retention Rate	69.9%	70.9%	71.1%
Physical Education Retention Rate	85.6%	87.8%	88.2%

Modality	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Traditional	90.6%	92.3%	96.7%
Online	85.1%	87.5%	87.2%
Hybrid	-	-	-
Correspondence (Cable, Telecourse, Other DL)	-	-	-

Gender	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female	87.3%	91.4%	88.7%
Male	83.9%	82.8%	86.5%
Unknown	72.7%	81.8%	100.0%

Ethnicity	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
African American	77.4%	84.4%	80.0%
American Indian/AK Native	-	100.0%	-
Asian	89.0%	92.0%	94.4%
Hispanic	87.1%	91.5%	92.0%
Pacific Islander/HI Native	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
White	83.0%	91.4%	87.4%
Multi-Ethnicity	90.3%	80.0%	83.0%
Other/Unknown	87.5%	40.0%	100.0%

Age Group	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
19 or Less	90.5%	90.5%	80.0%
20 to 24	87.0%	91.3%	93.3%
25 to 29	82.9%	87.1%	86.4%
30 to 34	81.8%	82.2%	80.0%
35 to 39	79.2%	71.4%	76.0%
40 to 49	89.2%	88.1%	86.2%
50 and Older	88.0%	92.9%	97.1%

The percentage difference in the **retention rate** in Physical Education courses in 2017-18 showed minimal difference from 2016-17 and a slight increase from 2015-16. When comparing the percentage point difference in the Physical Education 2017-18 retention rate to the College's overall retention average* (85.1%) and the institution-set standard* (71.1%) for credit course success, the Physical Education **retention rate** was slightly higher than the **college average** and substantially higher than the **institution-set standard** for credit course success.

When comparing the percentage point difference between instructional modalities to the overall Physical Education retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was moderately higher for **traditional (face-to-face)** Physical Education courses, minimally different for **online** courses, not applicable for **hybrid courses**, and not applicable for **correspondence (cable, telecourse, and other distance learning)** courses.

When comparing the percentage point difference between genders to the overall Physical Education retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was minimally different for **female** students in Physical Education courses, slightly lower for **male** students, and substantially higher for students of **unknown** gender.

When comparing the percentage point difference between ethnicity groups to the overall Physical Education retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was moderately lower for **African American** students in Physical Education courses, not applicable for **American Indian/AK Native** students, moderately higher for **Asian** students, slightly higher for **Hispanic** students, substantially higher for **Pacific Islander/HI Native** students, minimally different for **White** students, moderately lower for **multi-ethnic** students, and substantially higher for students of **other or unknown** ethnicity.

When comparing the percentage point difference between age groups to the overall Physical Education retention rate for 2017-18, the retention rate was moderately lower for students aged **19 or less** in Physical Education courses, moderately higher for students aged **20 to 24**, slightly lower for students aged **25 to 29**, moderately lower for students aged **30 to 34**, substantially lower for students aged **35 to 39**, slightly lower for students aged **40 to 49**, and moderately higher for students aged **50 and older**.

*Note: College term success and retention averages and institution-set standards are computed annually and recorded in the college Key Performance Indicators (KPI) Scorecard.

Data Source: Banner Student Information System

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%

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

Table X *SLO Assessment and Plan*

Course	SLO	SLO Description	# of Students Assessed	Method(s) of Assessment	Outcomes (% met)	Recommended Changes
GERO230	1	Determine the impact and implication of aging principles and theories on the frail individual and their family members	30	Written Assignment	100	
	2	Communicate the challenges and adaptations needed to assist the frail in their daily activities.	30	Written Assignment, Discussion Board	100	
	3	Correctly locate and utilize resources and support mechanisms for the frail.	8	Exam	88.9	
HLTH 100	1	Apply valid research principles to back up the use of behavior change models in developing a healthy lifestyle plan.	67	Written Assignment	98.5	Incorporate SLO #2 into another assignment to provide addition opportunities for students to demonstrate this outcome.
	2	Interpret and apply major theories of healthy living to determine their impact on and implications for individuals and society as a whole.	53	Written Assignment, Exam	91.4	
	3	Communicate personal, community, and global health issues and problems.	54	Discussion Board	98.3	
KIN 201	1	Explain the principles of physical fitness.	14	Exam, Discussion Board	100	Consider: SLO's 1 and 2 could be combined.
	2	Assess selected aspects of current level of physical fitness.	14	Activity + Written Assignment	100	
	3	Demonstrate ability to make health related decisions as a consumer	14	Discussion Board	100	SLO 3 is not a primary objective in this course. Could be re-written or removed.
	4	Apply behavior change, nutrition, and fitness principles to the personal fitness program development.	13	Project	100	
PSYC 170	1	Interpret and apply major psychological theories and principles of aging to determine their impact and implication on the individual and society as a whole.	47	Written Assignment	90.4	Revisit large discrepancy in participation with SLO#2 assessment assignment.
	2	Follow directions and communicate the psychological challenges adults face as they age	5	Written Assignment	83.3	
	3	Apply valid research to support conclusions about the psychological challenges adults face during their lifespan.	17	Exam	100	

Table X *PSLO Results*

*Based upon the 2017-2018 data provided on graduate responses, members of the department collaborated on addressing 3 main PSLO's to improve upon.

PSLO	Method(s) of Assessment	Participant(s) in the Planning Discussion	Recommended Changes
Apply major theories and concepts of health, nutrition, and fitness to improve one's overall wellness and to guide others to make healthy lifestyle choices.	Quizzes, exams, skill demonstrations, reports, and other written assignments.	Laurie Runk, Rachel Niehaus, Fabie Albert, Nancy Parent, Judy Schindelbeck, Lorie Eber, Jackie Larson	Increase number of assignments allowing students to work with theory application prior to evaluation.
Support opinions/ideas using solid research principles	Discussions, reports, Q and A, research assignments, and exams	Laurie Runk, Rachel Niehaus, Fabie Albert, Nancy Parent, Judy Schindelbeck, Lorie Eber, Jackie Larson	Require citations for multiple writing assignments to provide students with more practice seeking out reliable sources.
Apply major theories and concepts of kinesiology to make informed decisions about human movement, performance, and function.	Written Project/Program design	Laurie Runk, Rachel Niehaus, Lorie Eber	Incorporate theories/concepts into more courses to increase application practice for students

Collectively, the faculty will be updating assignment directions and rubrics to provide verbiage that more closely parallels that which is in the PSLOs in effort to bring clarity to evaluation methods. Additionally, Individual courses will be more intentional about designing any new assignments with CSLOs and PSLOs in mind.

2015-2016 through 2018-2019 Aggregate Health Sciences Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)

Health Sciences PSLOs	N	Able and Confident	Able and Somewhat Confident	Able and Not Confident	Not Able
Address the physiological, mechanical, and psychological mechanisms that enhance or impair human movement, exercise, and sport.	61	65.6%	31.2%	1.7%	1.6%
Apply major theories and concepts of health, nutrition, and fitness to improve one's overall wellness and to guide others to make healthy lifestyle choices.	61	80.3%	18.1%	0.0%	1.6%
Apply major theories and concepts of kinesiology to make informed decisions about human movement, performance, and function.	60	50.0%	36.7%	8.3%	5.0%
Apply major theories and principles to everyday life and determine the impact of these theories on the individual and/or society as a whole.	61	70.5%	26.3%	1.7%	1.6%
Follow directions and apply effective communication skills in a variety of settings.	62	80.7%	19.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Support opinions/ideas using solid research principles.	62	79.1%	16.1%	3.2%	1.6%

The aggregate post-graduation survey results show that the majority of graduates of the Health Sciences Program were able and confident or somewhat confident in demonstrating the PSLOs. Graduates indicated that their ability and confidence in following directions and applying effective communication skills in a variety of settings was highest. In contrast, confidence and ability was lowest in applying major theories and concepts of kinesiology to make informed decisions about human movement, performance, and function.

Curriculum Review

Table Curriculum Review

Program	Degree/Certificate	Term Reviewed	Status
FN	Nutrition and Dietetics Associate Degree for Transfer	Spring 2019	NEW
GERO	Certificate of Achievement		ACTIVE
GERO	Associate in Arts		ACTIVE
HLTH	Public Health Associate Degree for Transfer	Spring 2019	NEW
HLTH	Health and Fitness		ACTIVE
KIN	Kinesiology Associate Degree for Transfer	Spring 2019	APPROVED

Course	Title	Term Reviewed	Status
FN C160	Food Safety and Sanitation	Spring 2019	NEW
FN C170	Nutrition	Fall 2016	
FN C180	Nutrition and Disease	Spring 2019	NEW
FN C225	Nutrition and Aging	Fall 2016	
GERO C121	Introduction to Gerontology	Spring 2019	Crosslisted w/ SOC
GERO C122	Biology of Aging	Spring 2019	Crosslisted w/ BIO
GERO C131	Home Care	Fall 2016	
GERO C170	Psychology of Aging	Spring 2019	Crosslisted w/ PSYC
GERO C191	Issues in Gerontology	Fall 2016	
GERO C193	Issues in Gerontology	Fall 2016	
GERO C195	Issues in Gerontology	Fall 2016	
GERO C190	Issues in Gerontology	Fall 2016	
GERO C220	Professional Issues in Gerontology	Fall 2016	
GERO C230	Care of Frail Elderly	Fall 2016	
GERO C240	Aging in a Multicultural Society	Spring 2018	Course Number updated from C140to C240, additional updates to SLOs, objectives, content, instructional techniques, assignments, methods of evaluation, textbooks
GERO C273	Careers In Gerontology - A Field Practicum	Fall 2016	
HLTH C100	Personal Health	Spring 2019	Minor Course Revision

		Spring 2018	Change Course from Personal Wellness Lifestyle (variable units) to Introduction to Wellness Coaching (3.0 unit course) additional updates to SLOs, objectives, content, instructional techniques, assignments, methods of evaluation, textbooks
HLTH C120	Introduction to Wellness Coaching		
HLTH C121	Introduction to Health Care Management	Fall 2016	
HLTH C220	Introduction to Public Health	Spring 2019	NEW
HLTH C223	Healthy Aging	Fall 2016	
HLTH C281	Work Based Learning	Fall 2016	
HLTH C282	Work Based Learning	Fall 2016	
HLTH C283	Work Based Learning	Fall 2016	
HLTH C284	Work Based Learning	Fall 2016	
KIN C202	Introduction to Kinesiology	Spring 2019	Course Number Change
KIN C101	Personal Fitness and Wellness	Spring 2018	Changed to KIN 101, additional changes to PSLOS, instructional techniques, methods of evaluation, textbooks
KIN C190	Physiology of Exercise	Fall 2017	Course Prefix Change
KIN C201	Fitness for Life	Spring 2018	Changed to KIN 201, additional updates to course title (Fitness for Life), SLOs, objectives, content, instructional techniques, assignments, methods of evaluation, textbooks to directly articulate with CSU schools
KIN C289	Exercise Assessment and Program Implementation	Spring 2018	Changed to KIN 289, additional updates to instructional techniques, assignments, methods of evaluation, textbooks
PE C102	Lifetime Fitness	Fall 2016	
PE C115	Tai Chi	Fall 2016	
PE C116	Tai Chi Intermediate	Fall 2016	
PE C118A	Introduction to Yoga 1	Fall 2016	
PE C118B	Introduction to Yoga 2	Fall 2016	
PE C119A	Hatha Yoga 1	Fall 2016	
PE C119B	Hatha Yoga 2	Fall 2016	
PE C121A	Power Yoga 1	Fall 2016	
PE C121B	Power Yoga 2	Fall 2016	
PE C126A	Relaxation Movements 1	Fall 2016	
PE C126B	Relaxation Movements 2	Fall 2016	
PE C169A	Self Defense Arts	Fall 2016	
PE C169B	Self Defense Arts 2	Fall 2016	

Progress on Initiative(s)

Table X Progress on Forward Strategies

Initiative(s)	Status	Progress Status Description	Outcome(s)
Update the Health Fitness major to add two career paths- personal trainer and wellness coach, in addition to the existing major.	In Progress	In working with OCC, it has been determined that Coastline will offer a Wellness Coach track but not personal trainer track as this would compete with offerings as OCC. New Initiative added to focus on Wellness Coaching Pathway	Hlth C100 assignments rewritten to emphasize behavior change requirement for the tracks Major Updated to incorporate updates to current courses as well as approving 2 new courses – PE201 Fitness for Life, and HLTH120 Wellness Coaching
Finalize Kinesiology ADT	Completed	-Establish articulation agreements with CSU schools for activity courses -C-ID approval for multiple core courses	ADT will officially be promoted Spring of 2019
Marketing of Kinesiology ADT; Health and Fitness Major and Wellness Coaching Emphasis for the A.A. Degree.	In-Progress	-Developing marketing plan for Department Programs -Collaborating with CSU schools on articulation of more activity courses and promoting ADT -Working with National Certification bodies on partnership for students to take certification exam at Coastline.	Publicity piece for Military CE Health Fitness Major completed -Successful pilot run with course promotions on Social Media and Email Blasts
Maintain vendor approvals for continuing education units from various state agencies and professional organizations Maintain guest access for State CEU auditors on Canvas	In Progress	Maintaining CEU credits for the Gerontology courses with 4 different State Agencies is a continual job. Depending upon the agency, reapplication takes place every two years. State auditors need 24/7 access to course websites. *One of our Adjunct Faculty and members of the Advisory Board will serve as CEU coordinator to maintain current status.	Staff support for this was requested in 2013 and granted in 2014- The Division/Area Coordinator NB Ctr was assigned to assist in tracking and managing the paperwork. -Continuing our vendorship for RCFE; BNHA; LVN/RN (transcript review upon request); and CNA
Establish collaborative model courses to be used by online faculty members teaching the same course in Canvas.	In-Progress	On-going collaboration on Canvas courses between faculty members teaching the same course. Master courses are being developed for new courses in Public Health and Food Safety	Master courses are currently being used for courses in HLTH, FN, and GERO -Faculty members meet to discuss/update the model courses after they have been offered for one semester.

		and Sanitation, and multiple KIN courses	
Continued alignment of course materials and outcomes between the FN C170 Nutrition course and equivalent courses at OCC and CSULB.	Completed	Course materials have been updated to align with what is being used in equivalent courses at other schools. This change has required an integration of Cengage Mindtap (third party LMS) into the Canvas course shells.	Reviewing changes with OCC and CSU affiliates to make sure course changes meet the needs for transfer credit.
Develop curriculum for Gerontology program that has been suggested by Community employers as necessary for best practices in Home Care.	In-Progress	Aging in Multicultural Society is currently being created as a Zero Cost course and will be offered in Fall of 2019	Care of Frail and Elderly course re-designed and new curriculum offered in the Spring of 2018
Build Certified Dietary Manager Program	In-Progress	The accreditation process through ANFP will begin in Fall of 2019 to become an approved CDM-CFPP program.	FN160 Food Safety & Sanitation and FN180 Nutrition and Disease are being offered Fall of 2019
Develop Curriculum for Wellness Coaching Pathway	In-Progress	Additional coursework in health psychology is being created to finalize this program.	Intro to wellness coaching has generated significant interest with strong enrollment numbers.
Develop Community Health Worker Pathway	In-Progress	Coursework is being reviewed by Constituents of the Gerontology Review Board	Pathway will be aligned with the Public Health ADT requirements

Response to Program/Department Committee Recommendation(s)

Table X Progress on Recommendations

Recommendation(s)	Status	Response Summary
Crosslisting courses in multiple disciplines when appropriate to help students find courses in Gerontology and Kinesiology	In Progress	All GERO certificate courses have been crosslisted to appear under the GERO prefix. KIN courses will be submitted for crosslisting in Fall of 2019
Changing Gerontology to Aging Studies	Not Addressed	More research is being collected on what the 4-year institutions are doing with their programs prior to making any name change.

Program Planning and Communication Strategies

Over the course of the Fall and Spring semesters the faculty members held regular meetings to evaluate the curricula within each discipline at both the program and course level to make sure we are effectively assessing the SLO/PSLOs. Additionally, we have solicited feedback from our part-time faculty members within the department to provide feedback on assessment at both all-college meetings as well as regular online interaction. Many issues have been identified by faculty as barriers to student success and effective interpretation of SLOs, including, but not limited to:

- students enrolling late and never getting the textbook for the course

- a correlation between online students who do not log-on and get started the first week and failing grades in the courses
- students being content with a passing grade who stop work when the point total for a C is reached
- students only completing assignments with large point totals and skipping groups of assignments with smaller totals that still add up to percentage of their final grade
- students not responding to communications from the instructor.
- students unable to get their textbooks in a timely manner due to insufficient stock at the bookstore and slow financial aid payments which puts them at a disadvantage.

Outside of the department, the gerontology advisory board met to discuss the curriculum changes and the best methods of assessing student learning in the new courses. The facilities that host our students for their experiential learning courses complete surveys to provide feedback on the skill level of the students as well as any additional missing skills that would better equip the students in the workforce. This information has been used to develop one new course in the Gerontology program (Caring for the Frail and Elderly) as well as updating curriculum as new best practices emerge in the field. Lastly, the outgoing and incoming department chairs both spent time working with the Dean about the challenges with assessment which is also tied to student success rates.

Coastline Pathways

Members of our department have attended meetings and presentations related to guided pathway updates and have participated in some of the Town Hall activities related to Guided Pathway sorting. Our Department participated in the Pathways Marketing and Logo Design process. Members of the department have also met to review and discuss how Health Science Departments at other school have integrated their degree and certificate programs within guided pathways.

Implications of Change

This program review has highlighted some key areas that the Department of Health Sciences can focus on over the next year. There has been a decline in growth rate across many of the Health Science Programs consistent with that seen in other areas of the college. It is probable that numbers in student retention, enrollment, and success are correlated in part to the implementation of Proctorio in all online course sections. Faculty members are working on ways to continue using Proctorio to identify cases of financial aid fraud and cut down on cheating while lessening the perceived barrier the program can pose for students. Additionally, department faculty are continuing to look for ways to increase student enrollment, success, and retention in current courses. This includes utilizing OER resources in more courses when high quality materials are available and utilizing alert systems when student activity drops during the course. Lastly, the Department will continue to evaluate current programs & coursework to increase students' reported confidence in each of the PSLO's.

Section 2: Human Capital Planning

Staffing

Table X Staffing Plan

Year	Administrator /Management	F/T Faculty	P/T Faculty	Classified	Hourly
Previous year	Instructional Dean N B Ctr (1) Instructional Dean DL (1) Dept Chair (1)	Position Title (# of positions) FN/HLTH/KIN (1)	Position Title (# of positions) Bio/Gero (1) Psych/Gero (1) Soc/Gero (1) FN (3) HLTH (4) KIN (2) PE (3)	Position Title (# of positions) Area Facilitator, NB Ctr (1) Division/Area Coordinator NB Ctr* (1) DL Media Coordinator and Staff Aide (1)	Position Title (# of positions) N/A
Current year	Instructional Dean N B Ctr (1) Instructional Dean DL (1) Dept Chair (1)	Position Title (# of positions) FN/HLTH/KIN (1) FN/HLTH (1)	Position Title (# of positions) Bio/Gero (1) Psych/Gero (1) Soc/Gero (2) HLTH/Gero (1) FN (1) HLTH (2) KIN (1) PE (2)	Position Title (# of positions) Area Facilitator, NB Ctr (1) Division/Area Coordinator NB Ctr* (1) DL Media Coordinator and Staff Aide (1)	Position Title (# of positions) N/A
1 year	Instructional Dean N B Ctr (1) Instructional Dean DL (1) Dept Chair (1)	Position Title (# of positions) FN/HLTH/KIN (1) FN/HLTH (1)	Position Title (# of positions) Bio/Gero (1) Psych/Gero (1) Soc/Gero (2) HLTH/Gero (1) FN (1) HLTH (2) KIN (1) PE (2)	Position Title (# of positions) Area Facilitator, NB Ctr (1) Division/Area Coordinator NB Ctr* (1) DL Media Coordinator and Staff Aide (1)	Position Title (# of positions) N/A
2 years	Instructional Dean N B Ctr (1) Instructional Dean DL (1) Dept Chair (1)	Position Title (# of positions) FN/HLTH/KIN (1) FN/HLTH (1)	Position Title (# of positions) Bio/Gero (1) Psych/Gero (1) Soc/Gero (2) HLTH/Gero (1) FN (1) HLTH (2) KIN (2) PE (2)	Position Title (# of positions) Area Facilitator, NB Ctr (1) Division/Area Coordinator NB Ctr* (1) DL Media Coordinator and Staff Aide (1)	Position Title (# of positions) N/A
3 years	Instructional Dean N B Ctr (1) Instructional Dean DL (1) Dept Chair (1)	Position Title (# of positions) FN/HLTH/KIN (1) FN/HLTH (1)	Position Title (# of positions) Bio/Gero (1) Psych/Gero (1) Soc/Gero (2) HLTH/Gero (1) FN (1) HLTH (2) KIN (2) PE (2)	Position Title (# of positions) Area Facilitator, NB Ctr (1) Division/Area Coordinator NB Ctr* (1) DL Media Coordinator and Staff Aide (1)	Position Title (# of positions) N/A

Professional Development

Table X Professional Development

Name (Title)	Professional Development	Outcome
Fabie Albert	Yoga Instructor Training	Opportunity for offering sections of Yoga at different campuses
	Coastline SafeZone training	Gain better interpersonal skills for interacting with students.
	Webinar Integrating Public Health approach into Health and Wellness	Learn about current research in the Public Health Field and how to make it applicable to the courses being offered at Coastline
Laurie Runk	National Health through Fitness Day on Capitol Hill	Gain deeper understanding of Policy issues related to Public Health & the role of Health Care Lobbying for new Public Health Curriculum Development
Jackie Larson	Annual Food and Nutrition Conference	Keep current on relevant research in the field of nutrition to disseminate in current courses and help build curriculum for new CDM program.
Robert Flores	CPR/First Aid Instructor Training	Completion of Instructor Training provides Health Sciences Department with the ability to Offer 1 credit CPF/First Aid course if needed.
Ellis Walker	Completed Continuing Education Information for Certified Nursing Assistants and Residential Care Facilities	Maintained CE certification requirements for the Gerontology Coursework

The Department Chair and faculty members have attended a variety of workshops on the use of technology as well as the development of SLOs. Our faculty members represent us on a variety of Coastline, State and National Committees: Curriculum Committee, EQ Committee, Gerontology Advisory Board, Orange District Home and Community Advisory Group, OC Older Adult Services, Mental Health Division, Members and Board Members of the California Council of Gerontology and Geriatrics (CCGG), CCGG Marketing and Membership Committee, Evidence-Based Health Promotion for Older Adults, the National Association of Professional Gerontologists (NAPG), American Society on Aging (ASA), OC Falls Prevention Consortium, OC Ombudsman Program, the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education (AGHE), Family and Consumer Sciences Collaborative, CSUF Center for Successful Aging and CSUF Ruby Gerontology Center Advisory Boards, Speaker's Bureau Alzheimer's Association, Support Group Leader-Care Connections, Senior Center Advisory Board and Foundation, Board Member and VP of Corporate Relations for the OC Chapter of the National Association of Women Business Owners.

Our faculty members attend conferences and advisory board meetings on a regular basis. Faculty members engage in a variety of staff development activities within their specializations. They also have worked particularly hard to acquire the skills necessary to design and teach effective online courses and utilize a variety of innovative learning tools for exceptional course quality. Our faculty also contribute to research-based literature as contributors for digital and print media such as Lifetime Daily, various

journals, and textbooks. All discipline faculty members have been encouraged to attend Gerontology Advisory Board Meetings and Networking Events; Collaborative meetings with sister college faculty members, as well as a variety of discipline brainstorming sessions to improve curriculum and student outcomes. Faculty members have also taken it upon themselves, at their own expense, to attend meetings and present papers to publicize the program. Where possible the Department tries to financially support its faculty members in attending professional development activities. This is a dedicated group of faculty members that are striving to create nationally-recognized programs for our students.

Section 3: Facilities Planning

Facility Assessment

Traditionally, our programs have been sought out specifically by students looking for distance learning modalities. We have had mixed success offering classroom-based sections in the Health Sciences. We have recently worked within the block scheduling time frames at the Newport Beach Campus and offered a hybrid section of our Health 100 course which was permitted to run with low enrollment in effort to build for the future. Our activity courses such as Yoga have had modest participation, yet we saw a spike in enrollment for these courses in the Fall 2018 semester by bringing on an instructor from OCC that has a strong student following. For the Fall 2019 semester, we added a section of Tai Chi at the Westminster Le Jao Campus to meet course offering requirements for the Kinesiology ADT completion. This course was 100% filled by the end of the Summer session and we will look to increase the number of sections being offered as a result.

Section 4: Technology Planning

Technology Assessment

The Health Sciences are technologically based courses. Our faculty depend on support from the Faculty Success Center to support us in our transition to the Canvas LMS. We depend on BDATS to keep the streamed media in our courses current and ADA compliant. We have all of our faculty members trained on Canvas and have all previous courses & newly approved courses have successfully been developed as Master courses. Two of our Health courses, HLTH100 and HLTH223, are now using OER/zero cost materials. HLTH 223 has seen an increase in enrollment since implementing the change in textbook to OER. We have had multiple faculty members go through the OEI course development process and have KIN190 Physiology of Exercise and FN170 Nutrition courses participating in the OIE exchange system. We are currently working on putting the Health 100 course through the OEI approval process.

Section 5: New Initiatives

Initiative: Develop curriculum that have been approved for the new Wellness Coach pathway. The new courses were approved by the curriculum committee in the Fall 2018.

Describe how the initiative supports the college mission:
Based upon the new funding model, this initiative would provide an additional certificate option for students to complete within the Health Sciences Department. Additionally, corporate wellness coaching is a growing need in the health field. This is pathway that our sister colleges do not currently offer and it would allow our students an additional curriculum track to go along with the Kinesiology AA. One of the course offerings will also meet the Category E GE requirement for transfer to CSU.

What college goal does the initiative support? Select one
X Student Success, Completion, and Achievement
☐ Instructional and Programmatic Excellence
☐ Access and Student Support
☐ Student Retention and Persistence
☐ Culture of Evidence, Planning, Innovation, and Change
☐ Partnerships and Community Engagement
☐ Fiscal Stewardship, Scalability, and Sustainability

What Educational Master Plan objective does the initiative support? Select all that apply
X Increase student success, retention, and persistence across all instructional delivery modalities with emphasis in distance education.
☐ Provide universal access to student service and support programs.
X Strengthen post-Coastline outcomes (e.g., transfer, job placement).
X Explore and enter new fields of study (e.g., new programs, bachelor's degrees).
☐ Foster and sustain industry connections and expand external funding sources (e.g., grants, contracts, and business development opportunities) to facilitate programmatic advancement.
☐ Strengthen community engagement (e.g., student life, alumni relations, industry and academic alliances).
☐ Maintain the College's Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) designation and pursue becoming a designated Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI).

How does this initiative play a part in Coastline Pathways?
This will provide a shorter-term goal for students to work towards that has clear career outcomes. A wellness coaching certificate will feed multiple ADT programs including Kinesiology and Public Health. This certificate will also allow students to transition into the Health and Fitness Major.

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

Describe how the evidence supports this initiative.
BLS data has projected significant growth in careers served by a wellness coaching degree. New offerings, especially when offered in an online modality attract and retain students.

Recommended resource(s) needed for initiative achievement:
The instructors creating a completely new online course needs compensation for doing so. All faculty in our department have historically built Master Courses to share amongst other faculty in the program. The new Master Course design process developed by the DL office provides ample compensation for this undertaking.

What is the anticipated outcome of completing the initiative?
Additional students enrolling and completing courses in the Health Sciences. Increasing the number of pathways offered within the Health Science that could lead to awards granted.

Provide a timeline and timeframe from initiative inception to completion.
Curriculum Development should be complete by Spring of 2019. Marketing of the new curriculum in conjunction with the certificate is targeted for Summer 2019.

Initiative 2: Build Certified Dietary Manager Program to meet the current and future market needs as a result of new regulations. This program would serve individuals in current Food Service Manager positions that are required to achieve the certification to continue in their current position as well as students who are seeking this position for future employment.

Describe how the initiative supports the college mission:
We currently teach nutrition as a supplement to other programs but there are many students looking for Nutrition related careers that they can pursue with their Associate Degree. This particular certification fits the need of these students as well as those currently working in our community that need to meet the changing regulation standards. Additionally, coursework within this program will offer students valuable certifications such as Food Safety and Sanitation which is required nationally for all food handlers.

What college goal does the initiative support? Select one
X Student Success, Completion, and Achievement
☐ Instructional and Programmatic Excellence
☐ Access and Student Support
☐ Student Retention and Persistence
☐ Culture of Evidence, Planning, Innovation, and Change
☐ Partnerships and Community Engagement
☐ Fiscal Stewardship, Scalability, and Sustainability

What Educational Master Plan objective does the initiative support? Select all that apply
X Increase student success, retention, and persistence across all instructional delivery modalities with emphasis in distance education.
☐ Provide universal access to student service and support programs.
X Strengthen post-Coastline outcomes (e.g., transfer, job placement).
X Explore and enter new fields of study (e.g., new programs, bachelor's degrees).
☐ Foster and sustain industry connections and expand external funding sources (e.g., grants, contracts, and business development opportunities) to facilitate programmatic advancement.
☐ Strengthen community engagement (e.g., student life, alumni relations, industry and academic alliances).
☐ Maintain the College's Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) designation and pursue becoming a designated Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI).

How does this initiative play a part in Coastline Pathways?
This will provide a shorter-term goal for students to work towards that has clear career outcomes. A wellness coaching certificate will feed multiple ADT programs including Kinesiology and Public Health. This certificate will also allow students to transition into the Health and Fitness Major.

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

Describe how the evidence supports this initiative.
Based upon data from the ANFP, the credentialing body over the CDM certification, the changing regulations as created an immediate need for programs that can support both new incoming individual's into the field as well as all those that have the need to participate in a program in which they can earn their certificate.

Recommended resource(s) needed for initiative achievement:
To meet the accreditation standards to offer this program, we must utilize the Instructor Curriculum Package which includes all necessary materials for new course designs. The cost of these course materials is $1000. The instructors creating a completely new online course needs compensation for doing so.

What is the anticipated outcome of completing the initiative?
Additional students finding jobs in healthcare after completing courses that provide them with the required training that employers are looking for.

Provide a timeline and timeframe from initiative inception to completion.
The required program curriculum will be completed by the end of 2019. At this time, the accreditation process will begin and will take between 1 and two semesters. The process should be completed no later than Fall 2020.

Initiative 3: Develop curriculum for Public Health ADT and corresponding Community Health Worker Certificate. This curriculum has been suggested by Community employers as necessary for best practices as well as articulation with local 4-year institutions.

Describe how the initiative supports the college mission:
Based upon the new funding model, this initiative would support further development of the newly approved Public Health ADT. This intiative is designed to prepare students in the study of public health science and provide comprehensive preparation for upper-division work. Finalizing a Community Health Worker Certificate will also provide an additional certificate option for students to complete within the Health Sciences Department.

What college goal does the initiative support? Select one
X Student Success, Completion, and Achievement
☐ Instructional and Programmatic Excellence
☐ Access and Student Support
☐ Student Retention and Persistence
☐ Culture of Evidence, Planning, Innovation, and Change
☐ Partnerships and Community Engagement
☐ Fiscal Stewardship, Scalability, and Sustainability

What Educational Master Plan objective does the initiative support? Select all that apply
X Increase student success, retention, and persistence across all instructional delivery modalities with emphasis in distance education.
☐ Provide universal access to student service and support programs.
X Strengthen post-Coastline outcomes (e.g., transfer, job placement).
X Explore and enter new fields of study (e.g., new programs, bachelor's degrees).
☐ Foster and sustain industry connections and expand external funding sources (e.g., grants, contracts, and business development opportunities) to facilitate programmatic advancement.
☐ Strengthen community engagement (e.g., student life, alumni relations, industry and academic alliances).
☐ Maintain the College's Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) designation and pursue becoming a designated Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI).

How does this initiative play a part in Coastline Pathways?
This will increase the number of pathways offered within the Health Sciences that could lead to awards granted. Certificates aligned with the Public Health degree for transfer will provide students with the ability to get entry level jobs in the field while furthering their degree at a 4-year institution should they choose to do so.

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

Describe how the evidence supports this initiative.
BLS data has projected significant growth in Community Health Workers. New offerings, especially when offered in an online modality attract and retain students. Additionally, there is a growing market demand for Home Health Aides, it is important that our students are competitive and well-equipped when applying for these positions. Each of these occupations fall under the Public Health umbrella which would provide students to continue on to a 4-year institution upon completion at Coastline.

Recommended resource(s) needed for initiative achievement:
The instructors creating a completely new online course needs compensation for doing so. All faculty in our department have historically built Master Courses to share amongst other faculty in the program. The new Master Course design process developed by the DL office provides ample compensation for this undertaking.

What is the anticipated outcome of completing the initiative?
Additional students finding jobs in healthcare after completing courses that provide them with the desirable training that employers are looking for with the opportunity to continue their education at a 4-year institution.

Provide a timeline and timeframe from initiative inception to completion.
The ADT is currently in review at the state level and is awaiting the C-ID approval of two courses that are not within the Health Science discipline. While waiting on approval, we will seek to evaluate courses currently being offered in other disciplines that can be incorporated into the Community Health worker certificate prior to designing further curriculum. The target date of completing curriculum review is Spring 2020.

Section 6: Prioritization

Initiative	Resource(s)	Est. Cost	Funding Type	Health, Safety Compliance	Evidence	College Goal	To be Completed by	Priority
Finalize requirements for Wellness Coaching Certificate	Course development stipends when appropriate, Funding for professional networking/ certifications		One time (stipends) On-going (certifications)	NA	External market research, student interest surveys	Student Success, Completion, Achievement	SPRING 2020	2
Build Certified Dietary Manager Program	ANFP Approved Instructor Course Material Package, Course development stipends when appropriate, Funding for professional networking/ certifications	$1000	One time (stipends) On-going (certifications)	NA	External market research, student interest surveys	Student Success, Completion, Achievement	FALL 2020	1
Develop courses for Public Health ADT/Community Health Worker Certificate	Course development stipends when appropriate; funding for community networking events/conference attendance to stay current in best practices		One time (stipends) On-going (certifications)	NA	Community surveys, focus groups	Student Success, Completion, Achievement	SPRING 2020	3

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 service outcomes)
College Goal: Specify what College goal the initiative aligns with
To be completed by: Specify year of anticipated completion
Priority: Specify a numerical rank to the initiative