

## PROGRAM REVIEW Fall 2021

---

**Program:** History

**Division:** BSSL

**Date:**

**Writer(s):** Dr. Teri Ann Bengiveno and Dr. John Rosen

**SLO/SAO Point-Person:** Dr. John Rosen

---

**Audience:** Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

**Uses:** This Program Review will be used to inform the campus and community about your program. It will also be used in the processes of creating Division Summaries, determining College Planning Priorities and allocating resources. A final use is to document fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

**Please note:** Program Review is NOT in itself a vehicle for making requests. All requests should be made through appropriate processes (e.g., Instructional Equipment Request Process) or directed to your Dean or supervisor.

**Time Frame:** This Program Review should reflect on program status during the 2021-22 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2022-23.

**Sections:** There are three sections to this document. Sections and questions identify the name of the committee or office that will use the information and where you can get additional help.

- The first section focuses on general program reflection and planning.
- The second section is a review of curriculum, to be filled out only by programs with curriculum.
- The third section is a review for CTE programs, to be filled out only by these programs.

**Topics:** The Program Review Glossary defines key terms. Writers should review this glossary before writing: <https://bit.ly/2LqPxOW>

**For Help:** Contact Nadiyah Taylor: [ntaylor@laspositascollege.edu](mailto:ntaylor@laspositascollege.edu).

A list of contacts for help with specific sections is provided on the Program Review website under the “tools for writers” tab. [<https://bit.ly/3fY7Ead>]

### Instructions:

- 1) Please respond to each question with enough detail to present your information, but it doesn't have to be very long.
- 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, write “Not Applicable.”
- 3) Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.
- 4) Send an electronic copy of this form to Nadiyah Taylor and your dean by when?

### Links:

[Program Review Home Page](#)

[Fall 2020 Program Reviews](#)

[Frequently Asked Questions](#)

---

## Section One: Your Program In 20-21 – Please check N/A where relevant

**A. Accomplishments: How did your Program's accomplishments during AY20-21 support the newly revised college mission, the goals of the Educational Master Plan, and/or the President's Call to Action on anti-racism?** Areas to consider include impacts to students by race/ethnicity, gender, sexuality, age, or disability status, or those disproportionately impacted by the shift to remote instruction and services.

- [College Mission](#)
- [Educational Master Plan](#)
- [Presidential Task Force: Call to Action](#)

| Description                          | Mission | Master Plan | Presidential Task Force |
|--------------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------------------|
| 1 First offerings of History 3 and 4 | xx      |             | xx                      |
| 2 History Club (remote meetings)     | xx      |             |                         |
| 3                                    |         |             |                         |
| 4                                    |         |             |                         |
| 5                                    |         |             |                         |
| 6                                    |         |             |                         |

Tab to add more lines as needed

**B. Challenges, Obstacles and Needs: What significant challenges or obstacles did your Program face during AY20-21 in supporting the newly revised college mission, the goals of the Educational Master Plan, and/or the President's Call to Action on anti-racism?** Areas to consider include impacts to students by race/ethnicity, gender, sexuality, age, or disability status, or those disproportionately impacted by the shift to remote instruction and services.

\_\_\_\_N/A

| Description                             | Mission | Master Plan | Presidential Task Force |
|-----------------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Faculty Hire paused – then cancelled  | xx      | xx          | xx                      |
| 2 Two FT replacement positions unfilled | xx      | xx          | xx                      |
| 3                                       |         |             |                         |
| 4                                       |         |             |                         |
| 5                                       |         |             |                         |
| 6                                       |         |             |                         |

Tab to add more lines as needed

**C. Planning: What are the most important plans, either new or continuing, for your Program?**

\_\_\_\_N/A

| Plan                   | New | Continuing | Short term | Long term |
|------------------------|-----|------------|------------|-----------|
| Curriculum Development | XX  |            |            | XX        |

|                   |  |    |    |    |
|-------------------|--|----|----|----|
| FT Faculty Hiring |  | XX | XX | XX |
|                   |  |    |    |    |
|                   |  |    |    |    |
|                   |  |    |    |    |

Tab to add more lines as needed

***D. How have your program's interactions with the larger campus systems benefitted your students? For example, working with allocation committees, participation on committees, etc.***

\_\_\_\_N/A

|                            |                                                 |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Campus system or Committee | How has it benefitted your students?            |
| UndocuAlly Task Force      | LatinX/Hispanic Heritage Month                  |
| History Club               | Bimonthly opportunities for students to connect |

***E. If you have outreached to students in your department, program or classes, please share information about what you discovered and how you have used the feedback***

xx N /A

|                                                                                                         |  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Describe student outreach used to gather feedback?<br>For example, through surveys, conversations, etc. |  |
| What did you learn?                                                                                     |  |
| How will you use the feedback?                                                                          |  |

## Section Two: Data Analysis – Quantitative and Qualitative

***A. IR Data Review: Describe any significant trends in your program's data provided by the office of Institutional Research and Planning. (Note: Not all Programs have IR data available; if your program does not have a data packet or dashboard data, you may note that in the response box.) You may also discuss any other data used by your program for decision-making and planning.***

- IR Data packets are available here: <https://bit.ly/2IYaFu7> - will be updated with fall 21 data
- Course Success Rates Dashboard can be found at the bottom of this page: <https://bit.ly/2Y9vGpl>

**Success rate for all courses with the exception of Hist 32 are the highest they've been in years. Enrollment declined between 2016 and 2020. There are still more women than men enrolled in History courses. No significant change in race/ethnicity, enrollment status, unit load or student educational goals.**

***B. Program-Set Standard (Instructional Programs Only): The program-set standard is a baseline that alerts programs if their student success rates have dipped suddenly. There may be many valid reasons a program does not meet the Program Set Standard; when a program does not meet this standard, they are simply asked to examine possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate.***

[Program-set standard data can be found on this page:](#)

- *Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion?*  
*X* ☒ *yes* ☐ *no*
- *If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.*

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

## SLOs/SAOs:

For assistance with these questions, contact the SLO Committee Chair. [<https://bit.ly/3fY7Ead>]

*Each year programs must discuss how their PSLOs, CSLOs, or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) support the College Mission. This helps us to see how our students are progressing in their learning.*

You should complete ONE of the following three sections. Please choose the option that is most appropriate for your program:

- C1: Instructional Programs with PSLOs
- C2: Instructional Programs without PSLOs or with Special Circumstances
- C3: Non-Instructional Programs

Go directly to the section you chose. If you are not sure which option to pick, contact the SLO Committee Chair or Program Review Committee Chair for assistance.

### ***C1: Instructional Programs with PSLOs***

#### PSLO Assessments:

- (1) Please list the PSLO(s) that were reviewed in this last cycle and explain why these were chosen.

**“Upon completion of the AA-T in History, students are able to explain major historical developments in United States and World History.”**

**The PSLO was chosen for a few reasons. The main one being that multiple CSLOs feed into it, as it accounts for a greater portion of our course objectives than do the other two PSLOs (so, half of the CSLOs that feed into it were assessed in the Fall and the other half in the Spring). The other reason is that we felt that the other two PSLOs were more disrupted/affected by the switch to asynchronous online teaching and learning as a result of the pandemic. Most instructors felt it was easier to transfer the methods/materials/assignments related to our content-based CSLOs and PSLO than it has was for our Skills-based CSLOs and PSLOs. We decided to hold off on assessing the skills-based PSLOs in anticipation that we would be returning to the classroom during the 2021-2022 academic year – but also that our instructors would by that time also have developed methods for achieving those objectives through asynchronous DE as well.**

- (2) What percentage of faculty completed the planned assessments? (run Faculty Participation report from last year). \_\_\_\_76\_\_\_\_%
- (3) Did you get the assessment data that you needed to complete this report? If not, then describe the barriers that you can identify. \_\_X\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_No

Our answer here is really “yes” and “no.” On the one hand, the 76% faculty response rate was a significant improvement for our program over the previous several years. So, we had much more data to work with than previously has been the case. However, when it comes to analyzing that data in accordance with the the questions in this section, we did encounter barriers that limited the conclusions that we were able to draw from the data.

Although 76% of our SLO assessments were completed for the academic year, it turns out that only about half of the instructors who entered their assessment data into elumen also completed the reflection template. While this doesn’t impact the actual data, it does make it more difficult to fully interpret that data in a meaningful way. The qualitative information in those reflections is useful because of the variables across the courses in our program. First, all of our instructors select their own materials, create their own assignments and rubrics, and choose how they go about assessing the SLOs. For example, in a typical semester there will be 4-5 different instructors covering roughly 12 sections of History 7. Those 4-5 instructors may be using different books and course materials, and they assess student learning in different ways that best fit their teaching style and methods. Moreover, in our program assessments are often qualitative; that is, they consist of essay exams and written assignments (as opposed to multiple-choice type assessments, which can provide more concrete quantitative results). When evaluating such assessments, there is likely to be some inconsistencies – for example, what one instructor considers “mastery,” another might classify as “above average” in terms of the SLO rubric. Knowing what each instructor did to assess an SLO, and how/why they did it (which is where the reflection template comes in handy), is useful in terms of cutting through some of the variables and potential inconsistencies.

An additional variable is that during the past academic year several of our faculty were adapting to teaching fully online for the first time. Some were experimenting with new pedagogical strategies that they might bring back to the physical classroom, while others may have adopted teaching methods that they consider more stop-gap measures; in other words, methods/assignments/etc. that they don’t plan to use once they return to face-to-face teaching. While we think the uniqueness of the past academic year will yield useful data, that usefulness might be more apparent when we can compare it to the data we collect from upcoming semesters that will feature a return to face-to-face classes.

- (4) Discuss the findings of the PSLO(s) that were up for review last year (according to your 3-year planning template). What conclusions can be drawn about student learning?

On the whole and based on the elumen data, student learning in the History program has not been greatly affected by our transition to online (and almost entirely asynchronous) instruction. When compared to data from Fall 2019 (the last time we offered face-to-face courses, there was a slight decrease in the percentage of students who fell within the category of “Mastery.” In the Fall of 2019, 37% of students in our face-to-face courses achieved “mastery,” compared with 29% for Fall 2020 and 31% for Spring 2021. But that was the only general sign of a decrease in student achievement. When it came to the “Above Average” category, there was an increase in the past academic year. In Fall 2019, 24% of students in face-to-face courses were “above average,” compared with 31% and 32% for Fall 2020 and

Spring 2021, respectively. In Fall 2019, 20% of students in face-to-face classes fell in the “Average” category, compared with 24% and 29% for Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, respectively. In fact, when it came to those students who fell in the “No Demonstrated Achievement” category, there was a noticeable decrease in the past academic year – 10% for Fall 2019 Face-to-Face classes were in that category, compared with 5% for Fall 2020 and 3% for Spring 2021. We think that the expanded withdrawal policies that the college adapted in consideration of the Covid-19 pandemic are partly responsible for this difference. But instructors did make a concerted effort to reach out to absent students during the pandemic.

Lastly, we noticed that there was an improvement between the Fall and Spring semesters in terms of students who were in the bottom two categories. In the Fall, those categories combined for approximately 15% of students, compared with about 8% in the Spring. This may likely be a result of our instructors being more effective in online teaching by the Spring (especially for those who had little or no prior experience before the pandemic). We obviously prefer the Spring number. This is something that we will be looking at when we examine data from the current academic year.

- (5) Was the data disaggregated and, if so, on what parameters? What, if any, equity issues emerged?

We disaggregated the data based on veteran/non-veteran, gender, and ethnicity. With regards to the first two, there were no evident equity issues. Our veteran students performed at a higher level than our non-veteran students. Female students were more successful than male students (noticeably in terms of the “mastery” category).

One equity issue that the data points toward concerns “Hispanic” students (we are using that term here because it is the term used in the elumen reports). This is most evident when we compared “Hispanic” students who achieved “mastery” with the PSLO under consideration in Fall 2019 with those in the 2020-21 academic year. In Fall 2019, 36% of “Hispanic” students achieved mastery compared with 23% in Fall 2020-Spring 2021. By comparison, the highest achieving demographic in Fall 2020-Spring 2021 were Asian Americans (32% mastery). However, it is worth noting that the percentage of “Hispanic” students in the bottom two categories actually decreased, from 25% in Fall 2019 to 15% in Fall 2020-Spring 2021. This was closer to other demographic groups that ranked higher in “mastery” – Asian Americans (14%) and whites (13%). So, it seems the main equity issue in this case concerns helping our students reach the highest level of learning.

Another equity issue suggested by the data concerns African Americans. When looking at the percentage of demographic groups in the bottom two categories, African-American students were the highest – 23% in Fall 2020-2021 (compared with 17% in Fall 2019). And while the percentage of African American students was comparable to students in other demographic groups when it came to the “Above Average” and “Average” categories, it was among the lowest in terms of “Mastery” (22.5%).

- (6) List changes that you plan on making to improve student learning and address inequities.

**We have not decided on any concrete plans as of yet. We think that a return to in-person instruction in the Spring will help improve student learning and mitigate some inequities. So, we will be looking closely at data from the Spring. We are also encouraging our instructors to participate in the Persistence Project – as some of the practices that the PP suggests, and the discussions that take place among the instructors using them, should help in both face-to-face and online modalities. In order to address the trends that elumen data suggests regarding “Hispanic” students, we have asked the instructor who still uses the *People’s History of the United States* as a textbook for History 7 and 8 to list the Spanish-edition on their syllabus (we have had students ask about Spanish-language editions of textbooks in the past, and this edition recently has become available). We will look at this particular instructor’s SLO data for the next few semesters to determine whether this has a positive impact.**

**In order to address some of the issues and variables that we have encountered with the elumen data, we are discussing modifying the reflection template and possibly circulating a questionnaire among all faculty members to help gain a better understanding of how each instructor assessed student CSLO’s and how they are teaching their classes (in terms of materials, assignments, etc.).**

- (7) Discuss the challenges, if any, to improving student learning and equity. You may refer back to items listed in Section 1B.

**The issues that we raised in our answer to question 3 above make identifying issues with student learning and equity (at least based on elumen SLO data) a challenge. We do think that the data we are able to collect for this year, and especially for Spring 2022, will help us make better sense of the 2020-2021 data.**

**Another challenge, addressed in Section 1B, is that we have had two faculty replacements go unfilled in the past three years. With only two full-time faculty members, it is more difficult to work on these issues.**

- (8) Are you planning on revising on your 3-year planning template? If so, describe.  
\_\_XX\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ No

**When we completed the 3-year planning template last year, we left year 2 blank. This was in part because we were modeling our template off another program’s that was doing that, but also because we felt it made sense to use the year to discuss the data and the conclusions that we could draw from it. We will be still discussing the data (and have done so in order to produce this Program Review), but we now realize the importance of gathering more data this year (as explained in the above sections). And since now we know that we will be able to resume face-to-face teaching in the spring, it makes more sense to assess our skills-based PSLOs (which were not included in the original template). So, we will be revising and submitting the Template with those to PSLOs being assessed in the Spring 2022 semester, along with the content-based PSLO in the Fall 2021 semester.**

## C2: Instructional Programs without PSLOs or with Special Circumstances

### CSLO Assessments:

#### Student Learning

- (1) List the CSLO(s) that were up for review last year (according to your 3-year planning template) and explain why your department selected these CSLOs for review.

- (2) What percentage of faculty completed the planned assessments? (run Faculty Participation report from last year). \_\_\_\_\_%

- (3) Discussion-based analysis of student learning: Using the CSLO data and answers to the reflection questions, what type of conclusions can be made about student learning?

- (4) Describe the pertinent findings. What, if any, equity issues emerged?

- (5) List changes that you plan on making to improve student learning.

#### Assessment Process: To be completed by the department/program or the SLO Coordinator

- (1) List changes that you plan on making to improve student learning and address inequities.

- (2) Discuss the challenges, if any, to improving student learning and equity. You may refer back to items listed in Section 1B.

(3) Are you planning on revising your 3-year planning template? If so, describe.

\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_No

### C3: Non-Instructional Programs

#### **SAO Assessments:**

##### Support of Student Learning

(1) List the SAO(s) that were up for review last year (according to your 3-year planning template) and explain why your department selected these SAOs for review.

(2) What percentage of faculty completed the planned assessments? (run Faculty Participation report from last year). \_\_\_\_\_%

(3) Discussion-based analysis of student learning: Using the SAO data and answers to the reflection questions, what type of conclusions can be made about student learning?

(4) Describe the pertinent findings. What, if any, equity issues emerged?

(5) List changes that you plan on making to improve student learning.

Assessment Process: To be completed by the department/program or the SLO Coordinator

(6) List changes that you plan on making to improve student learning and address inequities.

(7) Discuss the challenges, if any, to improving student learning and equity. You may refer back to items listed in Section 1B. Are you planning on revising on your 3-year planning template and, if so, describe?

(8) Are you planning on revising on your 3-year planning template? If so, describe.

\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_No

Program Review Suggestions (optional): What questions or suggestions do you have regarding this year's Program Review forms or process?

## Section Three: Curriculum Review (Programs with Courses Only)

For assistance with this section, contact the Curriculum Committee Chair. [<https://bit.ly/3fY7Ead>]

**The following questions ask you to review your program's curriculum. To see the last outline revision date and revision due date:**

- 1. Log in to CurricUNET**
- 2. Select "Course Outline Report" under "Reports/Interfaces"**
- 3. Select the report as an Excel file or as HTML**

- A. Title V Updates [Curriculum Committee]: Are any of your courses requiring an update to stay within the 5-year cycle? List courses needing updates below.** *Reminder: updates to course title or units, and course deactivations, will require updating any program they are associated with. List programs requiring updating in question (B).*

X YES \_\_\_\_\_ No

|                                       |
|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Course Name &amp; Number</b>       |
| Hist 8 US History Post Reconstruction |
| Hist 25 American Indian History       |
| Hist 28 History of the American West  |
| Hist 32 US Women's History            |

- B. Degree/Certificate Updates [Curriculum Committee]: Are there any programs requiring modification? If yes, list them below.**

\_\_\_\_ YES      X No

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| <b>Certificate or Degree</b> |
|                              |
|                              |
|                              |

**C. Are there any courses or programs for which a non-mandatory update is planned?**

\_\_\_\_YES      X Not at this time

**If yes, explain details, rationale, or any support that might be helpful**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

**D. Does your program plan to create any new courses or programs this year?**

\_\_\_\_YES \_XNo

**If yes, please provide details and the rationale**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

## Section Four: CTE Updates

*(CTE Programs Only)*

*Vicki Shipman will provide you with or support any data needs*

**A. Labor Market Conditions: Examine your most recent labor market data (within the last 2 years).**

**1) Does your program continue to meet a documented labor market demand?**

\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_No

**2) Does this program represent a training need that is not duplicated in the college's service area?**

\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_No

**Please explain**

**B. Advisory Boards: Has your program complied with advisory board recommendations?**

\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_No

**If not, please explain.**

**C. Strong Workforce Program Metrics: Utilizing LaunchBoard, review the Strong Workforce Program Metrics. Review the data and then answer the following questions.**

**C1. Does your program meet or exceed the regional and state medians for increased enrollments, completions, and/or transfer since your last program review?**

\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_No

**If not, what program improvements may be made to increase this metric?**

C2. Does your program meet or exceed the regional and state medians **for students gaining employment in their field of study?**

\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_No

If not, what program improvements may be made to increase this metric?

C3. Does your program meet or exceed the regional and state medians **for student employment rates after leaving the college?**

\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_No

If not, what program improvements may be made to increase this metric?

C4. Does your program meet or exceed the regional and state medians **for increased student earnings and median change in earnings?**

\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_No

If not, what program improvements may be made to increase this metric?