

LMC Comprehensive Program Review

Instructional Units

2017-2018

Journalism Program

The following provides an outline of the required elements for a comprehensive unit/program review for Instructional Programs and Units. Upon completion of this report, please upload your document in the unit/program review application data/documents tab.

1. Program Changes

- 1.1. How have your degree and certificate offerings changed over the last 5 years? (e.g. new programs, discontinued or major changes to existing programs)

We added an AAT in Journalism that has more than doubled the number of degrees awarded each year. Historically, LMC had awarded one or two Journalism AA degrees a year. The 2012-17 data is consistent with that number — 10 AAs were awarded during that time frame for an average of two per year. But during the same five-year period, 18 AATs were awarded, making the total 28 Journalism degrees conferred.

- 1.2. What changes are you planning to your degree and certificate offering over the next 5 years? What is the rationale for the anticipated changes? Will these changes require any additional resources?

When we created the AAT in Journalism, we wrote a new course in Photojournalism that transfers as an undergraduate major requirement at the CSUs. To mitigate expected lower enrollment it was written as a course cross-listed with Documentary Photography in the Art Department. We are jointly experimenting with a change in scheduling from offering it once a year in the spring to once a year in the fall. Additionally, once the state-level review of the Journalism AAT degree is completed by the Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) later this year we will compare it with our Journalism AAT degree at LMC to see whether any changes have been made that necessitate revision locally. At this time we don't anticipate a need for additional resources but it depends on whether there are substantive changes instituted at the state level.

2. Degree and Certificate Requirements

Please review the data provided on all degree/certificate completions in your program, including locally approved College Skills Certificates from Fall 2012—Spring 2017.

2.1. For each degree/certificate offered, map a pathway to completion of courses within the major in a maximum of 4 semesters, assuming a maximum of 6-10 units of major courses within a semester. Use the following format:

Name of Degree or Certificate				
Semester	Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 3	Semester 4
List Courses Needed for Degree or Certificate in each semester.	AAT Journ 110	AAT Journ 130 Non-J elective*	AAT Journ 131 or 160 Non-J elective*	AAT Journ100*
	AA Journ 110	AA Journ 130 and 115A or 116A and Non-J elective* (*any semester)	AA Journ 131 and 115B or 116B and Non-J elective* (*any semester)	AA Journ 100 and 115C or 116C or 115A/116A (*any semester)

Frequency of Course Offerings

Please review the data provided on frequency of all courses offered in your discipline in the last 2 years (Fall 2015-Spring 2017).

2.2. If a course has not been offered in the past two years, but is required for a degree or certificate, please explain why it has not been offered, and what the plan is to offer it in the future.

Not applicable

2.3. If the course is not required for a degree or certificate, is the course still needed in the curriculum or is the department considering deleting it?

Not applicable

2.4. For the next two years, project how frequently your program intends to offer each course. Please provide a rationale for any major changes from the last 2 years that you anticipate.

Course	Estimated Number of Sections Offered by Semester			
	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
JOURN 100	3	3	3	3
JOURN 110	1	1	1	1
JOURN 115	1 (ABC multiples)	1 (ABC multiples)	1 (ABC multiples)	1 (ABC multiples)
JOURN 161	0	1 (ABC multiples)	0	1 (ABC multiples)
JOURN 129	1 (multiple w 130)	1 (multiple w 130)	1 (multiple w 130)	1 (multiple w 130)
JOURN 130	1 (multiple w 131)	1 (multiple w 131)	1 (multiple w 131)	1 (multiple w 131)
JOURN 131	2 (multiple w 132)	2 (multiple w 132)	2 (multiple w 132)	2 (multiple w 132)
JOURN 132	2 (multiple w 131)	2 (multiple w 131)	2 (multiple w 131)	2 (multiple w 131)
JOURN 160	1	0	1	0
Rationale for any Major Changes				
<p><i>This is consistent with past offerings except that Journalism 160 and 161 are being swapped from spring to fall /fall to spring for Art Department scheduling purposes since Journalism 160 is cross-listed with Art 75. Please note that Journalism 129-131 are leveled lab courses considered multiples and all sections offered comprise a single course load for faculty.</i></p>				

3. Existing Curriculum Analysis

3.1. Course Outline Updates

Please review the data provided on the status of COORs in your discipline. (Note: This data does not reflect courses submitted after May 2017.) For each COOR that has *not* been updated since Spring 2012, please indicate the faculty member responsible for submitting the updated COOR to the Curriculum Committee by April 18, 2018.

Course	Faculty Responsible for COOR Update
COURSE 001	
COURSE 002	
COURSE 003	

Although the report indicates Journalism 110 was last updated April 29, 2010, it was rewritten by Cindy McGrath and approved by the Curriculum Committee March 15, 2017 on its consent agenda. Vice President Kevin Horan signed it on March 27, 2017. So all courses have dates newer than Spring 2012.

3.2. Course Offerings/Content

How have your courses changed over the past 5 years (new courses, significant changes to existing courses)?	<i>Journalism 110, 115ABC, 129-132 each have been revised to include new online and social media components to maintain currency with the changing media landscape.</i>
How have these changes enhanced your program?	<i>Students are learning and practicing these skills through the student online news site. Pushing the online news site through social media has started to increase online readership somewhat thereby expanding the reach of the Journalism Program's key educational news products.</i>

4. New Curriculum Analysis

4.1. If you are creating new degrees or certificates in the next 5 years: (Indicate N/A if no new degrees or certificates are planned.)

What additional courses will need to be created to support the new degree or certificate?	N/A
What significant changes to existing course content would need to be made to support the new degree or certificate?	N/A

5. Advisory Board Update (For all CTE TOP coded programs)

Give an overview of the current purpose, structure, and effectiveness of your Advisory Board. Include: membership, dates of last meetings over the past two years.

In 2013, LMC collaborated with Diablo Valley and Contra Costa colleges to develop a district-wide advisory board, which met several times in 2013, 2014 and 2015. In 2014 the district journalism advisory board worked through the Journalism Association of Community Colleges to create a regional journalism advisory board that has met consistently since the fall of 2014 at the annual Northern Regional Conference of JACC. Scheduling meetings that work both for the academic schedule and the schedules of professionals who need to react to daily news is tricky, and we have often faced situations where professionals had to cancel at the last minute. Because most community journalism programs offer similar curriculum to meet both articulation standards and professional needs, we have found a regional approach is a more efficient and effective strategy. By pairing a regional CTE advisory board meeting with a journalism conference, we can also make use of professionals and four-year faculty who are already at the conference site to speak and/or offer workshops and have had fewer attendance problems. Advisory board meeting discussion has recently centered on the changing media landscape and how college journalism education can prepare students both to transfer and to work in a dynamic industry. That discussion always includes both curriculum and technology needs. The pros let us know what new skills our students should be developing and the equipment required to train them. Four-year faculty members inform community college faculty about new transfer requirements in the pipeline and share how well community college students have been succeeding when they transfer to their institutions. Former students working the field can give a unique perspective about how well their education at both levels prepared them for the world of work. Current students offer insights about how current curriculum is working for them. In the previous two academic years we met Nov. 7, 2015 and Oct. 15, 2016. Board members have included community college faculty, journalism faculty from four-year transfer institutions, journalism professionals, community college students and community college alumni. The following list of names include those who participated in either the 2015 or 2016 regional journalism advisory board meetings, or both:

Cristina Azocar, San Francisco State University
Gina Baleria, John F. Kennedy University
Tara Cuslidge-Staiano, San Joaquin Delta College
Farideh Dada, San Jose City College
Cecilia Deck, DeAnza College
Samanda Dorger, multimedia editor, Dow Jones Marketwatch
Charleen Earley, publisher and editor, Delta Living Magazine; LMC alum
Juan Gonzales, publisher El Tecolote, and City College of San Francisco
Rubina Gulati, Cosumnes River College
Judy House, College of the Sequoias
Rachele Kanigel, San Francisco State University
Nancy Kaplan-Biegel, Skyline College
Melissa Korber, Las Positas College
Robert Luhn, Communications Director, National Center for Science Education
Mary Mazzocco, Diablo Valley College
Kellie McCown, ABC10 Sacramento, Los Medanos College alum
Cindy McGrath, Los Medanos College
Abby Peterson, Santa Rosa Junior College
Kimberly Stelly, Los Medanos College journalism student
David Thigpin, UC Berkeley Graduate School of Journalism
Jos Wirt, California Newspaper Publishers Association

6. Assessment Effectiveness:

6.1. Course Level Assessment

Please review data provided on assessment status of courses in your discipline in Cycle 1 (2012-17).

6.1.1. If there were any courses that were not assessed in Cycle 1, please explain why they were not assessed. *Not applicable because all courses were assessed.*

6.1.2. If a course was not assessed in Cycle 1 because it was not offered, what is the future of that course? *Not applicable because all courses were assessed.*

- a. Delete the course
- b. Market/promote the course to gain enrollments
- c. Other

6.1.3. Course level assessment should be meaningful, measurable and manageable. Overall, reflecting on the course level assessment, please rate the degree to which you feel your assessments meet these 3M's.

Meaningful: *2.5 — some changes were made to course content, but since I am the only journalism full-timer, I mainly dialog with myself ;-)*

1	2	3
The assessment was not meaningful in collecting data or information that supported course improvement or pedagogical changes.	The intent was understood, but the outcome fell short of meeting the objective of course assessment, which is to improve student learning. The changes to the course or pedagogy to support the course were not clear.	Changes were made to the course content or delivery to improve course effectiveness. The process promoted pedagogical dialog within the department, and changes were adopted accordingly.

Measurable: *2 — some results were either interesting and/or informative and led to minor changes.*

1	2	3
The data collected did not inform teaching and learning.	The assessment produced some measurable information, but created more questions than answers.	Results were straightforward and easy to interpret. The course of action to improve the course or its delivery was clear from the data that was collected.

Manageable: *2 — Most courses are taught and assessed by a single instructor. In the case of Mass Communication, which often has three sections, it was assessed by a full-timer— me — with no participation of part-time faculty. That could be an area of improvement going forward.*

1	2	3
Assessment was not manageable.	The assessment process was somewhat manageable, but posed challenges to implement across the program.	The assessment was easily scaled across the department so that full- and part-time faculty could participate with meaningful outcomes.

6.1.4. What changes in the assessment process itself would result in more meaningful data to improve student learning?

Student learning outcome assessment is probably most effective for courses with a large number of sections taught by multiple instructors to create dialog around norming standards. For those in small departments with one-section courses, assessment is little more than the standard ongoing classroom assessment techniques (CAT) and resulting reflection that most teachers do instinctively and regularly. So for me it just adds more paperwork.

Additionally, since assessment has been situated in student learning **outcomes**, which are generally measured toward the end of the semester, it mostly seems to parallel final course grades except for a few outliers. We have always collected that data in the final grade report. So it would seem a more efficient use of funds to research instead why we lose the students who don't persist long enough to be assessed for learning outcomes. What would be helpful to me is to know why students drop so I can take appropriate action where the reasons involve pedagogy or personnel.

6.1.5. Share an outcome where assessment had a positive impact on student learning and program effectiveness.

Interestingly, the assessments that have been the most notable for me have not been directly tied to the assessment of a single specific learning outcome, but to SLOs as a whole and to integrating the process of assessment itself in a way that informs students. As a result, my assessment experience has been more meta at its core. Perhaps it is because when I facilitated the TLP and lead the revision of the assessment process on campus I was aware that the next step required by accreditation was student understanding of the assessment process. So I mixed the two in my assessment of Journalism 100: Mass Communication in 2014.

To do this, I tried to focus the students themselves on SLOs as more than a list of objectives on a syllabus that gets read and forgotten. So on a take-home portion of the final exam I asked them to reflect on their own learning by scoring themselves on a five-point numerical scale for each of the five SLOs in the course. I also asked them to assign themselves a course grade and defend it based both on their own SLO proficiency and on their performance on graded class assignments.

I hoped to find out whether student and instructor perceptions of the mastery of SLOs were consistent and in line with the final grade awarded to the student at the conclusion of the class. While mastery of SLOs and grades can be different — for higher performing students who fail to turn in work, or lower performing students who complete a lot of extra credit work — for most students there should be a relationship between grades and SLO proficiency levels. The Mass Communication Course Outline of Record (COOR) suggests that each of the five SLOs should be roughly equivalent as taught, weighted at about 20 percent each. So I averaged the five individual SLO numerical scale scores and compared them to final student grades.

Overall, I learned that most students have a reasonably good sense of their own performance, including strengths and weaknesses. Where there was a difference, students usually underestimated their final grade. Only one student overestimated performance. It is difficult to know why. In most cases it was the A students who gave themselves a B grade. They could be

harder on themselves — a form of intellectual humility — or it could be a hedge against possible disappointment. Extra credit opportunities may also come into play.

By integrating SLOs not only into the syllabus but also into the course itself, and specifically on the final exam as a reflective exercise, I believe it made students more actively aware of their own learning. It also allowed me to focus my own thinking around course assessment and grading in a deeper way. This self-reflective assessment is now a permanent part of every Mass Communication final exam I give. I also added the assignment as an assessment example when I updated the Mass Communication COOR. In addition, I have tried to integrate student understanding of SLOs through reflective exercises and self-evaluation in a variety of ways in other Journalism courses I teach.

6.2. Program Level Assessment

- 6.2.1. In 2016-2017, units engaged in program level assessment. **Please submit all Program Level Assessment Reports using the link provided.** Describe one important thing you learned from your program level assessment.

I learned that many students, including those who are academically stellar, struggle with some fine motor skills that children usually master in kindergarten and first grade. One of the major assessment tools for journalism is creating a stringbook — a portfolio of published work that is commonly used when applying and interviewing for a job. Presentation is critical in giving the portfolio a professional look, and more students than you might expect fall down on this standard. I am not sure why, but many who are exacting in their reporting and writing fall down when it comes to using precision in cutting and pasting their own news clippings into a work portfolio. It is an interesting phenomenon that I need to research further for scholarly purposes. But in terms of finding solutions right now, a couple possibilities come to mind: Although I have used models of portfolios students should strive to emulate, I can reinforce that although they have to collect the content for their own stringbook, they don't have to physically create it themselves, but can farm it out to a professional or ask someone with precise cutting, pasting and organizational skills to put it together for them. Or I can offer them the option of creating an electronic portfolio instead of a physical stringbook. I am considering both of these options for the future.

- 6.2.2. What was the biggest challenge in conducting program level assessment?

Finding the time to do it!

- 6.2.3. What resource needs, if any, were identified in your program level assessment?

None at this time.

7. Course Success/Retention Analysis

Please review the data provided on course retention and success, which has been disaggregated by as many elements as district can provide in their SQL Report

One of our college goals as stated in our Integrated Plan is to “Increase successful course completion, and term to term persistence.” Our Equity Plan identifies African- American and low income students as disproportionately impacted in terms of successful course completion. (Foster youth are also disproportionately impacted on this indicator, but numbers are too small to disaggregate by discipline/program) Please indicate how well students in these groups are succeeding in your discipline.

	African-American	Low Income Students	All students in program/discipline
Completion Rate Journalism	F14-75.0% S15-92.0% F15-78.4% S16-83.3% F16-76.0% S17-90.3%	F14-81.7% S15-95.4% F15-81.3% S16-87.4% F16-86.3% S17-94.8%	F14-85.5% S15-94.7% F15-83.1% S16-90.1% F16-88.9% S17-92.8%
Success Rate Journalism	F14-53.1% S15-64.0% F15-64.9% S16-66.7% F16-60.0% S17-74.4%	F14-64.6% S15-81.6% F15-71.4% S16-77.0% F16-75.3% S17-80.5%	F14-70.2% S15-83.5% F15-73.2% S16-78.9% F16-75.4% S17-77.0%

Additional measure: Successful retention

	African-American	Low Income Students	All students in program/discipline
Successful retention (success/completion)	F14-70.8% S15-69.6% F15-82.8% S16-80.1% F16-78.9% S17-82.4%	F14-79.1% S15-85.5% F15-87.8% S16-88.1% F16-87.3% S17-84.9%	F14-82.1% S15-88.2% F15-88.1% S16-87.6% F16-84.8% S17-83.0%

Additional measure: College data for relative comparison (not same data set)

	African-American	Low Income Students	All students at Los Medanos College
Successful persistence (degrees/persist)	Degrees-42.3% Persistence-60.2% Successful P-70.3%	unavailable breakout	Degrees-47.0% Persistence-65.9% Successful P-71.3%

So what's in these numbers?

It is difficult to make any real sense of them without comparative data as I am not sure what is a good number and what is an acceptable range in terms of gaps. Since I am, in effect, a one-person program and don't have anyone to chew over these numbers with, I tried to make use of the college program review work sessions to dialog with those more statistically savvy. At one session in the fall, a math colleague looked at my data and said, "Your numbers are good." I asked, "How do you know?" "They're better than ours," was her response. At another session during the recent spring flex where our individual data sets were distributed, I shared mine with a science colleague and asked for help in trying to see something in them that I could discuss in this document. He echoed the earlier colleague's comment and said "Your numbers look fine." Again I asked, "How do you know?" to which he also replied, "They're better than ours." Then he schooled me on what he said was a more accurate measure to analyze — something he called "successful retention," a number derived by dividing the percent of success by the percent of retention. So I ran those numbers and added them to a second chart labeled "successful retention." But still, I am at a loss to explain what the numbers really mean for Journalism.

Overall, it would enrich the program review process if, in addition to providing statistics to evaluate, we were also given substantive professional development on how to interpret statistical data ;-). It would also be helpful if the printed information provided at the program review work sessions included college-wide and district-wide data with which to compare our program numbers. Because I did not have such data, I went fishing and although I was unable to find an exact comparison, I looked online at the 2017 Student Success Scorecard (scorecard.cccco.edu/scorecardrates). It includes overall persistence and completion rates for LMC as tracked based on degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2010-11 tracked for six years through 2015-16. In the scorecard, persistence is defined as the percentage of those tracked students who enrolled in the first three consecutive terms. Completion is defined as the percentage of those tracked students who completed a degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes. I entered the data into a third chart I labeled "successful persistence." Although the information is across time rather than semester by semester at the course level, it gave me some idea of the average persistence and completion rates of LMC students: 47% completion of degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes and 65.9% persistence over three consecutive terms. It is slightly less for African-Americans. However, the "successful persistence" numbers I generated are relatively close: 70.3% for African-Americans and 71.3% overall. If the scorecard numbers give any indication about what college-wide numbers might be, then except for an outlier year, 2014-15, Journalism numbers are likely to be above college-wide numbers.

7.1. In looking at disaggregated data on success/retention, is there anything else that stands out?

I note an interesting pattern in the data but don't know if it is unique to Journalism or is a college-wide phenomenon: In each academic year, there is both a higher completion rate and a higher success rate in the spring semester than in fall. That same pattern does not hold up, however, when you look at the data using the "successful completion" metric. I can't say what this means.

7.2. What are some strategies that might help students, particularly African-American, foster youth, and low income students successfully complete courses in your discipline? What resources would be needed to implement these strategies?

Before I can identify strategies to help close success gaps, I first need to gather more information that points to why there is a gap in the first place. It would help a lot if the college collected data when students drop a class about why they are dropping it. We used to regularly collect this data on paper drop slips, but have not done so since we went to an electronic enrollment system. One of the best resources for all of us is for the college to reinstate such a process in an electronic format.

In addition, I can start logging attendance more regularly and comparing it with course grades and then try to pair that data with demographic information. I can also survey students and document who has access to the course textbook and who doesn't. Once I have this additional information, I can identify possible successful strategies.

Past pedagogical strategies have included adding mastery quizzes that all students can retake as needed to improve their performance, as well as guided note-taking. Although I added these approaches to my course to bolster the success rate of students at risk, I offer the opportunity to all students. I have not done a formal assessment of these strategies recently, but I have noted anecdotally that they have done more to improve the grades of already successful students and that some at risk students do not take advantage of the opportunities.

8. Goals

8.1. Review your program’s goals as listed in response to the final question of your 2012-2013 Comprehensive Program Review posted in the Data Repository of the PRST.

<p>Highlight some of the key goals that were achieved over the past 5 years. What were the key elements that led to success?</p>	<p>A. Here are achievements from the 2012-13 Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transfer degree. A new AAT degree in Journalism was written, approved and implemented. As a result of this success, we awarded 18 AAT degrees between 2012 and 2017 in addition to 10 for the already existing AA degree, for a total of 28. 2. Journalism Lab remodel, Phase 1 equipment. A successful RAP proposal was written to fund instructional technology for the Journalism Lab teaching wall that had been constructed in 2012. The purchase of a TV, DVD-VHS player and wireless teacher workstation has improved teaching and learning in the lab. 3. Journalism Lab remodel, Phase 2. The two-phase remodel of the Journalism Lab has been completed. As a result of this success we have improved lab instruction by making more efficient use of square footage that already existed. This has allowed for a less cramped learning environment in which we were also able to create a conference table space for instructional and newspaper editorial board meetings. We also added a newspaper archive in unused space in front of the Campus Complex stairway, giving journalism students immediate access to an organized physical archive for journalism assignments. A formal display space was also built and populated with awards and memorabilia to give the Journalism Program higher visibility on campus. <p>B. Here are achievements from the 2012-13 long-term goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete Phase II of the Journalism Lab remodel. Done, see A.3 above. 2. Improve communication with local media organizations, feeder high schools and transfer institutions. With help from the K-12 Program Coordinator and the K-12 Partnership Program Assistant, we met with three feeder high schools in spring 2017 and created articulation agreements for Journalism 129. Two agreements took affect Fall 2017 and one is in the pipeline for Fall 2018. We can expect to see enrollment results of those agreements beginning Fall 2018. We also actively participate in the Regional Journalism Advisory Board, created in 2014, which has increased regular connections with transfer institutions and members of the media regionally.
<p>Were there any goals that did not go according to plan? What were the key elements that impeded the progress on these goals?</p>	<p>Here are the impediments from achieving 2012-13 long-term goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>3. Explore creating a tutoring/mentoring component to the Journalism Program.</i> <i>4. Explore establishing a summer publishing institute/camp.</i> <p>For a program with one full-time faculty member, we were probably a bit too optimistic about what we could achieve. We spent the first few years of the five-year cycle focusing on the lab remodel and communication with media, high schools and transfer colleges, and were going to turn our attention to long-term goals 3 and 4 after that. Two things happened:</p>

	<p>First, Art-Drama-Journalism Instructional Assistant Eric Sanchez was temporarily reassigned to an Equity position and his position was filled with classified hourly. As a result, the nature of the support provided by that position changed and we focused on other shorter-term tasks with the help of the temporary classified hourly employees.</p> <p>Second, I took on a statewide leadership role in the Journalism Association of Community Colleges that enhanced my abilities to work on long-term goal 2 and communicate regularly with media professionals and journalism faculty at transfer institutions. However, it also ate up my time such that I wound up putting long-term goals 3 and 4 on a back burner.</p> <p>Eric Sanchez is now back full-time and I will be completing one of my JACC commitments in March, so we will be able to turn our attention to long-term goal 3 in the upcoming academic year. I am hopeful that with recent experience working on the Equity initiative he will be able to offer insights and support in brainstorming a tutoring/mentorship program that might help reduce identified achievement gaps.</p>
--	--

8.2. Consider the College’s Strategic Directions along with our Integrated Planning Goals listed here:

College Strategic Directions 2014-2019	Integrated Planning Goals
<p>1. Increase equitable student engagement, learning, and success.</p> <p>2. Strengthen community engagement and partnerships.</p> <p>3. Promote innovation, expand organizational capacity, and enhance institutional effectiveness.</p> <p>4. Invest in technology, fortify infrastructure, and enhance fiscal resources.</p>	<p>1. ACCESS: increase access through enrollment of students currently underserved in our community.</p> <p>2. IDENTIFYING PATHWAYS: Increase the number of students that define a goal and pathway by the end of their first year.</p> <p>3. COLLEGE-LEVEL TRANSITION: Increase the number of students successfully transitioning into college level math and English courses.</p> <p>4. PERSISTENCE & COMPLETION: Increase successful course completions, and term to term persistence.</p> <p>5. EQUITABLE SUCCESS: Improve the number of LMC students who earn associates degrees, certificates of achievement, transfer, or obtain career employment.</p> <p>6. LEARNING CULTURE: Enhance staff, faculty and administration’s understanding and use of culturally inclusive practices/pedagogy, demonstrating empathy and compassion when working with students.</p>

List 3 – 5 longer term (5 year) new goals for your program. For each goal, pick 1 – 2 College Strategic Directions and/or 1 – 2 Integrated Planning Goals to which your new goal aligns.

Goals	Aligned College Strategic Direction(s)	Aligned Integrated Planning Goal(s)
<p>Goal 1: Maintain currency in the field by updating technology in the Journalism Lab and providing professional development to faculty and staff.</p>	<p>3. Promote innovation, expand organizational capacity, and enhance institutional effectiveness. 4. Invest in technology, fortify infrastructure, and enhance fiscal resources.</p>	
<p>Goal 2: Engage with local media organizations, feeder high schools, transfer institutions and professional journalism organizations.</p>	<p>2. Strengthen community engagement and partnerships.</p>	
<p>Goal 3: Explore creating a tutoring/mentoring component to the Journalism Program.</p>	<p>1. Increase equitable student engagement, learning, and success.</p>	<p>4. PERSISTENCE & COMPLETION: Increase successful course completions, and term to term persistence.</p>

OPTIONAL

9.3 Resource needs to meet five-year goals

Operating Resource Request	
Department/Unit Goal - Reference #	Strategic Objective - Reference #
Goal 1: Maintain currency in the field by updating technology in the Journalism Lab and providing professional development to faculty and staff.	3. Promote innovation, expand organizational capacity, and enhance institutional effectiveness. 4. Invest in technology, fortify infrastructure, and enhance fiscal resources.
Department/Unit Name	Resource Type
Journalism (Note: The boxes to the right did not allow me to electronically check them. I am requesting equipment and IT hardware/software.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment <input type="checkbox"/> IT Hardware/Software <input type="checkbox"/> Supplies <input type="checkbox"/> Facility Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Service/Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Other
General Description	Est. Expense
Before IT Manager Mike Becker left, he told us we were on the list for a computer lab refresh. We want to make sure that happens, and so are documenting here what we need. We currently are supposed to have 16 working student computer workstations, a smart-classroom workstation and two instructor computers. One of the student workstations was removed for repair by IT last academic year but has not yet been brought back into service so we are one short. We will also need updated software (Adobe Creative Suite and MS Office) installed on new computers purchased. In addition, we would like to purchase drone/s for news photography instruction and use by the student newspaper staff.	18 Macs: @ \$36,000 Creative Suite @ \$6,000 per year Drones: @ \$1,500
Justification:	
1. Computers: While the Macs in the lab have been updated with RAM, and a few have been added, many of them are approaching eight years old. One was purchased in 2009, 13 in in 2010 and the remaining four were added in succeeding years. 2. Software: Software packages are updated regularly and we are still using Creative Suite that is a generation or two behind. 3. Drones are becoming an important aspect of newsgathering and visual storytelling.	

Professional Development Resource Request	
Department/Unit Goal - Reference #	Strategic Objective - Reference #
<p>Goal 1: Maintain currency in the field by updating technology in the Journalism Lab and providing professional development to faculty and staff.</p> <p>Goal 3: Engage with local media organizations, feeder high schools, transfer institutions and professional journalism organizations.</p>	<p>2. Strengthen community engagement and partnerships.</p> <p>3. Promote innovation, expand organizational capacity, and enhance institutional effectiveness.</p> <p>4. Invest in technology, fortify infrastructure, and enhance fiscal resources.</p>
Department/Unit Name	Resource Type
<p>Journalism <i>(Note: The boxes to the right did not allow me to electronically check them. I am requesting funding for conference/meeting.)</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Conference/Meeting <input type="checkbox"/> Materials/Supplies</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Online Learning <input type="checkbox"/> IT Hardware/Software</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other</p>
General Description	Est. Expense
<p>Funding for faculty/staff to attend annual conferences/conventions of the Journalism Association of Community Colleges and Associated Collegiate Press/College Media Advisers.</p>	<p>JACC events \$5,150</p> <p>ACP/CMA \$1,000</p>
Justification:	
<p>One of the goals/objectives of the Journalism Program includes professional development. It also supports the college's strategic directions and integrated planning goals around strengthening partnerships, promoting innovation, enhancing institutional effectiveness, and fortifying infrastructure (in this case faculty/staff). Attending these conferences gives program faculty/staff the opportunity to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. improve the teaching and learning process by integrating curricular and pedagogical innovation b. keep current in an evolving field c. create broader networking capabilities among colleagues from two-and four-year colleges essential to articulation d. connect with professionals in the industry 	