**Department/Program Review Summary**

**2013-14**

**Department:** CFE (Child & Family Education)

**Programs:** ASL (American Sign Language) and ECE (Early Childhood Education)

**Date of Review:** April 4, 2014

**Review Team Members and Titles:**

Dave Collins, Provost

De Lena Aungst, Associate Professor, Business Information Systems

Jenna Beck, Chair, Paralegal, Law and Real Estate

Mary Cox, Professor, Nursing

Jared Cutler, Assistant Provost of Accreditation and Assessment

Karla Knepper, Academic Advisor, Academic Advising

Bruce Clayton, Research Analyst, Research, Analytics & Reporting

Sue Merrell-Daley, Dean, Business and Public Services

Donna Ruhland, Director of Professional Services, Ohio Child Care Resource

And Referral Association

Kim Schlatter, Deaf Education Specialist/Teacher, St. Rita School for the Deaf

John Tomoser, Academic Coach, Distance Learning Programs & Support

Richard Wourms, Professor, Computer Aided Manufactruing

**Department Members Present:**

Shari Rethman, Interim Dean, Liberal Arts, Communication and Social Sciences

Phyllis Adams, Chair, American Sign Language and Child & Family Education

Faculty/Staff:

Diane Drummer

Deanna Hill

Casey Jenkins

Gwen McNeal

Jessica Minor

Carla Rhodes

Cynthia Rippie

Kim Pasene

Connie Salvador

Nancy Sikora

**Commendations**:

* Despite the fact that the Child and Family Education Department is an amalgamation of two completely different disciplines, the Review Team noted a sense of unity, a “sense of family” almost. During the meeting with the Review Team the word “we” was used repeatedly in a way that underscored the sense of community and togetherness the department exhibits. The department has done a great job regrouping after a change in leadership and some key faculty retirements. The department is able to accomplish much with its limited faculty resources.
* The self-study prepared by the department was excellent – the organization was superb, and the preparation of the document obviously involved the input of the entire department. What was particularly impressive was the way that the department handled issues that had not been fully addressed as it began working on the self-study. It was clear that as the department began preparing the self-study they became aware of outstanding issues from the previous self-study and other things that had not yet been addressed, and rather than just hoping that the Review Team wouldn’t pick up on them, they developed and implemented strategies to address these issues. As a result, while there may have been sections in the self-study where the department didn’t yet have data, there were strategies underway to begin collecting that data. The department seemed to make a sincere, concerted effort to address deficiencies, and had the foresight implement those efforts well before submission of the self-study. Any lack of information in some sections of the self-study was fully compensated for with ongoing plans to get that information in the near future, and was indicative of the kind of continuous improvement that the Program Review process is designed to foster.
* Almost without exception, recommendations are given following the Program Review meeting for departments to increase assessment efforts. However, this will not be the case with this particular Program Review. In the self-study the department shared an excellent example of assessing some general education outcomes – oral and written communication – noting areas where improvement were needed, and implementing changes designed to make those improvements. This is an excellent example of assessment in action. The Review Team was also extremely impressed by the program outcomes assessment work the department is doing and the results that were shared. The department’s assessment work is outstanding, and so long as the department continues (and perhaps expands) doing what it is doing, no recommendation on assessment is necessary.
* The number of ASL faculty who are Nationally Certified relative to the number in the area is truly impressive – a substantial percent of Nationally Certified sign language interpreters in the area serve as faculty at Sinclair.
* The department is very involved in academic advising for its students – it has built connections with the Academic Advising office on campus, and does a considerable amount of its own advising with its students also. In fact, this was really just an indication of the level of student-centeredness in the department overall.
* Strong connections have been built between the department and the community. The department’s involvement with “Ready Set Soar” and “Learn to Earn” are highly commendable, as are its work with Project Read. The ASL component of the department renders valuable service and has excellent relationships with the local Deaf community.
* The Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC) is a truly impressive facility – in addition to providing childcare services to students, employees, and others, it also provides a lab for the ECE program, giving students valuable real-world experience in their chosen field. The ECEC fosters collaborations with other departments, including Dental Hygiene, Physical Education, Dietetics, and others.
* The use of one lab to serve both the ECE and ASL components of the department rather than having separate labs is exemplary.
* The department’s adoption of the eSyllabus is highly commendable – as the self-study states “all ECE teaching syllabi were converted to eSyllabi”. The benefits of this tool are clear, and the willingness to adopt it across the board in the department is impressive.
* Converting ASL 1101 to an online course was no small task – the department deserves commendations for its work in moving this course into an online format.
* The Review Team was especially impressed with the Student Professional Dispositions Assessment. There are a number of other departments on campus that would likely be interested in doing something similar.

**Recommendations for Action**:

* The department is strongly encouraged to find a way to share the Student Professional Dispositions Assessment – there would likely be strong interest from some other departments. Other departments should be made aware of this process so that they have the opportunity to adapt it for their own use. Perhaps this “best practice” could be shared in a workshop for Faculty Learning Day – some means should be found for sharing this with others.
* The name of the department - “Child and Family Education Department” – is not inclusive of the American Sign Language component of the department, and may be confusing for students who don’t where ASL is housed at the institution. The Review Team strongly recommends that the department explore a name change that would incorporate the ASL component of the department and help inform students that ASL is part of the department.
* As was mentioned in the commendations, the department was very proactive in developing strategies to address what it believed would be weak points in the self-study. The department is strongly encouraged to continue these strategies and gather data that can be shared in the next Program Review self-study in five years, as well as in the Annual Update submissions in the time intervening.
* The need for marketing materials was mentioned in the meeting with the Review Team. The Marketing Department has created some excellent promotional materials for other departments – the department should begin working with the Marketing Department to produce promotional materials that can be shared with the public.
* Inconsistencies among sources on the website was mentioned as a concern during the meeting with the Review Team – the department is strongly encouraged to review the pages where it has edit access to ensure consistency in information that is shared there. Where the department finds inconsistencies on pages where it doesn’t have the access to make changes, these inconsistencies should be documented and forwarded to the owner of that part of the Sinclair website.
* The Review Team questioned why the department’s students aren’t used by Disability Services as sign language interpreters for hearing-disabled students. Apparently there are currently no collaborations between the department and Disability Services, although there has been some outreach in the past in attempt to establish collaborations. The department is encouraged to work with the Provost to make another attempt at offering its students as interpreters for Disability Services. There may be an opportunity to take advantage of some efficiencies in ways that would benefit both the department and Disability Services.
* The department is encouraged to explore using social media to market its programs. It may be that digital marketing expertise from faculty in the Business and Public Services division could be of assistance.
* The Review Team recommends that the department make a focused effort to cultivate future adjunct faculty from the pool of current students. Can students be made aware of that opportunity in the future and coached on what they would need to do to qualify? How can the department find ways to maintain contact with promising graduates who might one day teach for us?
* The department is encouraged to develop more articulation agreements with four-year institutions where appropriate.
* The issue of tracking graduates for transfer and employment was mentioned in the meeting with the Review Team. Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR) has resources that can help departments track their students. The department is encouraged to work with the Director and Assistant Director of RAR to develop a strategy for obtaining and maintaining employment and transfer data on the department’s graduates. This strategy should include an annual timeline for getting information from RAR so that the information need can be met in a way that allows RAR to accommodate the request in their workload.
* During the meeting with the Review Team the department mentioned the possibility of extending the age range of children served by the Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC) to infants and toddlers. The department is encouraged to explore this possibility, with close attention to the costs in terms of additional staff and facilities that this would entail. Also, will there be a developing need for a similar center at the Courseview Campus as that location expands, and if the need arose what would the department need to do to develop and maintain a similar center at that location?

**Overall Assessment of Department’s Progress and Goals**:

The Child and Family Education Department produced an excellent self-study, one that was not only very well-written and well-organized, but also one that was a very honest appraisal of the department’s strengths and weaknesses. What’s more, the department had planned ahead to where it was able to implement strategies to begin addressing many of the weaknesses prior to submission of the self-study. While the self-study submitted was very strong, if the department follows through with the strategies it has begun to put in place, the self-study that is submitted in five years will be even more outstanding.

Through transitions in leadership and the retirements of key faculty members this department has maintained a sense of cohesion and maintained its direction moving forward. It is a department that has developed some valuable relationships with the outside community, notably with the Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC) and with the sign language interpreting services that the department’s students provide.

The department is doing excellent work in the assessment of program outcomes, and has implemented many innovative approaches for student learning that should be shared with other departments (“hot seats” and the Student Professional Dispositions Assessment are two excellent examples). It is a department that is doing some exciting things, and is truly a credit to Sinclair.

**Institutional or Resource Barriers to the Department’s Ability to accomplish its Goals, if any**:

The meeting with the Review Team raised a couple of issues that are not unique to the CFE Department, and that may need to be explored at an institutional level:

* A concern was raised in the meeting with the Review Team regarding students at different locations having equivalent experiences. This is not unique to the CFE department, and in fact is an issue that has been raised by other departments undergoing Program Review this year. As our Courseview location continues to expand, we will need to think ahead to find ways to ensure that students’ experiences are comparable to what they would have received at the Dayton Campus.
* Given that some of the same issues are seen in multiple departments undergoing Program Review, this should be used to inform the orientation for departments undergoing Program Review the following year. What issues multiple times this year that could be shared with departments undergoing Program Review next year – and thereby perhaps be avoided?