

PROGRAM REVIEW Fall 2022

Program: History

Division: Business, Social Science and Learning Resources

Date: Oct. 26, 2022

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 creating Division Summaries, determining College Planning Priorities, and allocating resources. The 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 2022-23 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2023-24.

Sections: There are two 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 focuses on data analysis, including SLOs/SAOs/PSLOs
- The final section is a review of your pathway maps and curriculum, to be filled out only by programs with curriculum offerings.

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.

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 November 1, 2022**

Helpful Links:

[Program Review Home Page](#)

[Fall 2021 Program Reviews](#)

[Frequently Asked Questions](#)

Throughout this document you'll see that equity is a guiding principle.

Here is the LPC definition:

Las Positas College will achieve equity by changing the impacts of structural racism, ableism, homophobia, and systematic poverty on student success and access to higher education, achieved through continuous evaluation and improvement of all services. We believe in a high-quality education focused on learning and an inclusive, culturally-relevant environment that meets the diverse needs of all our students.

LPC Equity Definition: Equity is parity in student educational outcomes. It places student success and belonging for students of color and disproportionately impacted students at the center of focus.

Section One: Your Program In 21-22 – Please check N/A where relevant

A. Accomplishments: Identify accomplishments from the 21-22 AY.

Some areas you may want to note in your explanation are:

- Did your accomplishments support your program's plans identified in 21-22 PR
- Did they relate to guided pathways, and/or
- Did they support areas in the equity definition above

_____ N/A

Accomplishments
1 History Club met on a regular basis remotely.
2 History received half of a FT Faculty Position.
3
4
5
6

Tab to add more lines as needed

B. Challenges, Pain Points, and Needs:

What significant challenges or obstacles did your Program face during AY 21-22 especially related to accomplishing program goals/plans? You may want to consider areas in the equity definition on page 2.

_____ N/A

Challenges/Pain Points/Needs
1. History number of FT Faculty is at its lowest point since 2000. ½ FT position gained.
2. The need still exists to replace the African American History position.
3.The requirement in Spring 2022 to offer a 60%/40% face-to-face/DE ratio resulted in several sections being cut that likely would have ran had we been allowed to offer them DE. We felt that there was student demand for our online courses that were not fully met.
4.A challenge is finding the right of balance of in-person and online course offerings to best serve our student needs and demands

5. In terms of equity related to the course content of our main survey courses (U.S. history, Western Civ., and World history); there is some tension between the sweeping scope of content (measurable objectives) in our course outlines of record and the depth that is often needed to meet our student learning outcomes - especially as they relate to the experiences of diverse populations and the developments of political institutions. Discussions concerning this tension have been taking place within history departments all over the nation, and even within the CSU system as a whole, for years now - this debate is often one framed within the context of the "coverage" model vs. pedagogical approaches that allow for more in-depth analysis of major historical themes and issues (sometimes referred to as "uncoverage"). The latter offers more potential in the way of achieving the college's equity goals while also increasing student success when it comes to achieving our student outcomes. The "coverage" model is not without merit, but the point here is that, since that model dictates our CORs, there is little flexibility for innovation when it comes to adopting new techniques and methodologies that might better suit our students, program, and college. The point here is that our ability to consider such innovative approaches to survey courses are restricted by state requirements, as reflected in the CORs.

6.

Tab to add more lines as needed

C. Reflecting on your program's experiences from 2020 - to 2022, what innovations or new processes did you integrate that you would like to continue?

X N/A

D. Explain one way that your program is connected to the College Mission and/or Educational Master Plan. Identify the specific elements.

- [College Mission](#)
- [Educational Master Plan](#) (see pages 72-76)

_____ N/A

The diversified History course offerings help to develop the knowledge, skills, values, and abilities needed to become engaged participants and leaders in their local and global communities. A History Transfer Degree is also available to students.

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

_____ N/A

Plan	New	Continuing	Short term	Long term
Hire FT faculty		x		
Determine the optimum course offerings to meet both student demand (esp. regarding DE vs. in-person instruction) while also adjusting to the decline in enrollment.	X			

Tab to add more lines as needed

F. 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.

X N/A

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

G. Are there institutional barriers to the equity work that your program would like to engage in, and what suggestions do you have for minimizing or eliminating these barriers? (See page 2, for the equity definition)

_____ N/A

Barrier	Suggestions
Lack of FT faculty	Hire more FT faculty

Section Two: Data Analysis – Quantitative and Qualitative

A. IR Data Review: Discuss any significant trends in the data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (or any other data you use for decision-making 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.)

- IR Data packets are available here (posted Fall 22): <https://bit.ly/2lYaFu7>
- Course Set Standard Overview & Success Rates Dashboard can be found in the middle of this page: <https://bit.ly/2Y9vGpl>

If the decline in enrollment is considered, there surprisingly are not any noticeable trends in the data since the pandemic started (the percent withdrawals dropped significantly in face-to-face courses for spring, but that is likely a reflection of our low enrollment in in-person courses).

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 are 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.

C. SLOs/SAOs: Assessment of Student Learning and Support

Program Review is our major source of data on student learning for the college and is therefore regularly reviewed. *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.*

For assistance with these questions and instructions on how to run the necessary reports in eLumen, [click here](#).

You should complete at least one of the following three sections. Please choose the option(s) below that are appropriate for your program - Go directly to the section(s) you chose.

- [C1: Instructional Programs with PSLOs \(disaggregated PSLOs\)](#)
- [C2: Instructional Programs with CSLOs \(Departments without degrees, non-major courses, and/or other courses up for assessment\)](#)
- [C3: Non-Instructional Programs \(SAOs\)](#)

C1: Instructional Programs with PSLOs (disaggregated PSLOs)

- 1) To assess PSLOs, CSLOs must be correctly mapped to only one PSLO within eLumen and every mapped CSLO must have assessment data. Please insert a checkmark in one of the following options that correctly describes your data and move on accordingly.
 - a. If the CSLOs are mapped correctly and there is data for each CSLO, then continue to question 2.
 - b. If the CSLOs have assessment data and the mapping needs to be completed, then complete the mapping within eLumen ([See SLO Handbook, p. 7](#)) and continue to question 2.
 - c. If not all of the mapped CSLOs have assessment data, then you cannot assess the PSLO. In this case, continue to question C2.
2. Based on your current [3-year plan](#), list the PSLO(s) for the academic year 2021-2022 that your program selected to review and explain why these were chosen.

We reviewed all three this year. Some of our assessments were geared toward out continued review of the following PSLO:

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

Most of our CSLOs align with this PSLO. Last year we assessed most of those CSLOs, but not all. So, in Fall 2021 we reviewed the remaining.

In Spring 2022 we began reviewing our other two PSLOs:

1. Upon completion of the AA-T in History, students are able to analyze and assess various types of historical sources
2. Upon completion of the AA-T in History, students are able to compose an argument using historical evidence

We decided to also review these PSLOs to set up an analysis for the next 3-year cycle. Also, we felt that these particular outcomes were more challenging to accomplish as many of us moved online for the first time during the pandemic, so we were interested in what we could learn, especially as we have begun to move back to in-person instruction. Specifically, many of us felt it was more difficult to adjust to achieving the outcome regarding analyzing and assessing historical sources in an asynchronous online format.

2) What percentage of faculty completed the planned assessments for the selected PSLO? ([run Faculty Participation report](#) from last year). ____78____%

3) Non-disaggregated Analysis of PSLO(s): In general, what conclusions can be drawn about student learning in your program?

In terms of the first PSLO, the non-disaggregated results were almost exactly the same as last year - which suggests little to no difference in our success with the other “content”-based CSLOs we looked at this year compared to the ones examined last year.

For 2020-2021, the percentage of “Mastery/Above Average” was 58%.

For 2021-2022, the percentage of “Mastery/Above Average” was 59%.

For 2020-2021, “Below Average/No Demonstrable Achievement” was 14%.

For 2021-2022, “Below Average/No Demonstrable Achievement” was 16%.

In terms of the other two (“Skills-based”) PSLOs that were reviewed in Spring 2022, we don’t have a good data set with which to compare them. We will plan that into our next 3-year cycle. However, the numbers are almost identical to those for the “content”-based CSLOs/PSLO referred to above.

For those PSLOs in 2021-2022, “Mastery/Above Average” was 58%.
For 2022-2022, “Below Average/No Demonstrable Achievement” was 17%

One other thing to note: In Spring 2022, we returned to in-person instruction. However, enrollment for in-person courses were very low, which makes the sample sizes for those courses too low to draw any clear conclusions.

- 4) Disaggregated Analysis of PSLO(s) to identify potential inequity: Disaggregation allows you to examine inequities in student learning outcomes within sub-populations in your program. [See the Guide](#) for instructions on how to disaggregate PSLO data.

Which variables did you use to disaggregate the data? Mark all the apply.

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| ● Gender | ● First Generation |
| ● Age | ● DE |
| ● Ethnicity | ● Online |
| ● EOPS | ● Hybrid |
| ● Veteran | ● Fact-to-Face |
| ● BOG Recipient | |

- 5) Did your data reveal any patterns of inequity? If so, please explain those patterns.

For this Program Review cycle, we focused on three main areas: Modality, Ethnicity, and Gender. In terms of Modality, we were interested in what the data might reveal in terms of our success in teaching reading/source analysis and historical writing skills in our DE courses compared to in our face-to-face courses. In this, the slight indication of inequity. The data suggests close parity between our DE and in-person courses. For example, the “Mastery”/ “Above Average” for both PSLOs was 57% for our DE classes and 64% for our in-person classes. The “Average” category was 26.39% for DE classes and 24.84% for face-to-face. The “Below Average/No Demonstrated Achievement” was 16% for DE classes and 11.5% for face-to-face classes. This suggests a slight gap between student success in our DE compared to our face-to-face classes (we will be analyzing this for our content-based PSLO in next year’s program review). It should be noted that, because of enrollment patterns, the sample sizes were not equal - we had far more students enrolled in DE courses than in face-to-face courses. Nevertheless, some of us, based on our individual courses, had expected to find some differences. For example, some observed greater student success with analyzing historical sources in our in-person classes (since real-time instruction/discussion can make a real difference), while noticing that students written work was far superior in asynchronous online courses (which, we assume, is because they do much more writing in those courses). This called our attention to a problem when it comes to assessing these particular outcomes - a problem that we probably have realized previously. Most of our courses have one SLO that align with both of these PSLOs - Thus, the CSLOs are actually measuring two distinct skills

(reading/analyzing and writing/developing a historical thesis). This was further confirmed when reading through the reflection templates and speaking with other faculty during our “closing the loop” meeting. Some factually used assessments/activities that either dealt with reading/analyzing sources or writing/developing a historical thesis - even though the CSLO addresses both. Our conclusion has been that, in its current form, we cannot measure this CSLO in a meaningful way (at least not at the program level). There may indeed be some gaps between our DE and in-person instruction, but we are not able to identify them.

In terms of the “Ethnicity” reports, we observed a pattern that was evident last year: that “Hispanic” (I use that term because of its use in Elumen) students seem to struggle the most in our classes. For example, in terms of “Mastery,” those designated “Hispanic” scored the lowest (21% for all three PSLOs examined, when the average score for that category was 29% for our content-based PSLO and 26 % for our skills-based PSLO). In terms of the “below average” and “No demonstrable Achievement” (which generally refers to students who dropped or didn’t submit work), those designated “Hispanic” scored the highest (about 20% for the content-based PSLO and 15% for the skills-based PSLOs, compared to the average, 15% and 13%, respectively).

In terms of Gender, as with last year, we found that female students tend to have more success than male students, but not by much. In the few classes with a noticeable gap, the enrollment was low (and thus we are reluctant to base conclusions on that data).

- 6) Identify any challenges facing your department that may contribute to inequitable outcomes as revealed by your disaggregated PSLO data. (Refer to section 1B if needed)

With regard to our analysis of “modality” - the challenge isn’t so much one concerning an inequity, but rather our inability to determine whether such inequities between DE and face-to-face classes exist (although, we have discussed the challenge of teaching and assessing primary source analysis in asynchronous DE courses). The way that our CSLOs are written for our “skills-based” PSLOs isn’t allowing us to measure the outcomes in a meaningful way.

In terms of the potential inequitable outcome regarding “Hispanic” students, this is something we discussed both last year and this year. Several instructors shared experiences of ESL students inquiring about Spanish-language sources or editions of books in the past. After last year’s program review, we began looking into the availability of a good textbook with a Spanish-language edition but have yet to find one. Primary source readings can be especially challenging for ESL students (they are for students whose first language is English) - particularly those documents created prior to the twentieth century.

- 7) Based on discussion with others in your program, explain potential changes that will improve student learning and address inequities identified through analysis of disaggregated PSLO data.

With regard to the above discussion concerning modality, we have agreed that we need to rewrite the CSLO that we have in each course that covers both source analysis and writing/historical arguments. The single CSLO needs to be divided into two CSLOs, which can then align to the relevant PSLO. Our hope is that this will enable us to achieve more useable/meaningful data for analysis of the two “skills” based PSLOs - especially in terms of equitable outcomes (especially relating to modality). This will help us determine if one part of that CSLO (and thus one of the two PSLOs) was responsible for the inequities in student success - and that will better inform us with how to improve teaching that outcome in our DE courses (our assumption for now is that it is the reading/analytical PSLO).

With regard to the issue relating to student learning among our “Hispanic” population, one of our faculty members is trying out an assignment in a few courses for which there are Spanish-language sources available. We will be looking closely at that instructor’s assessment data next year.

- 8) The 2022-2023 Academic year is the last year in our 3-year assessment cycle. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all of your courses will be assessed by June 2023.

Will all of your courses be assessed by June 2023?

☐xx ☐ Yes ☐ No

If not, please update your 3-year plan to include any courses you missed or if you plan to revise your 3-year plan, then send your updated plan to the [Curriculum and SLO Specialist, and the SLO Chair](#).

- 9) Are you planning on updating any CSLOs or PSLOs?

☐xx ☐ YES ☐ NO

(If yes, then you may do this through eLumen, see the [SLO Handbook](#) if you need instructions on how to do this.)

- 10) If you experienced any challenges in completing your PSLO assessment process please list those in the box below along with any items that would help you improve this process in the future.

--

C2: Instructional Programs With CSLOs - Departments without degrees, non-major courses, and/or other courses up for assessment

1. Based on your current [3-year plan](#), list the CSLO(s) for the academic year 2021-2022 that your program selected to review and explain why these were chosen.

2. What percentage of faculty completed the planned assessments for the selected CSLO? (run [Faculty Participation](#) report from last year). _____%

3. [Using the CSLO data and reflection questions](#), what are some conclusions?

4. List changes that you plan on making to improve student learning.

5. The 2022-2023 Academic year is the last year in our 3-year assessment cycle. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all of your courses will be assessed by June 2023.

Will all of your courses be assessed by June 2023?

____ Yes ____ No

If not, please update your 3-year plan to include any courses you missed or if you plan to revise your 3-year plan, then send your updated plan to the [Curriculum and SLO Specialist, and the SLO Chair](#).

6. Are you planning on updating any CSLOs?

____ YES ____ NO

(If yes, then you may do this through eLumen, see the [SLO Handbook](#) if you need instructions on how to do this.)

7. If you experienced any challenges in completing your CSLO assessment process please list those in the box below along with any items that would help you improve this process in the future.

C3: Non-Instructional Programs (SAOs)

1. Based on your current [3-year plan](#), list the SAO(s) for the academic year 2021-2022 that your program selected to review and explain why these were chosen.

2. What percentage of staff completed the planned assessments for the selected SAO(s)? (run [Faculty Participation report](#) from last year). _____%

3. Based on discussion with others in your area: Using the [SAO data and reflection questions](#) or other sources of data, what conclusions can be made?

* If you used other sources of data, briefly explain below.

4. List changes that you plan to improve outcomes in your service area.

5. The 2022-2023 Academic year is the last year in our 3-year assessment cycle. Please review your [3-year plan](#) and verify that all of your courses will be assessed by June 2023.

Will all of your courses be assessed by June 2023?

____ Yes ____ No

If not, please update your 3-year plan to include any courses you missed, or if you plan to revise your 3-year plan, then send your updated plan to the Curriculum and SLO Specialist, and the SLO Chair.

6. Are you planning on updating any SAOs?

____ YES ____ NO

(If yes, then you may do this through eLumen, see the SLO Handbook if you need instructions on how to do this.)

7. If you experienced any challenges in completing your SAO assessment process please list those below, along with any items that would help you improve this process in the future.

--

Note: There is an opportunity to give feedback on the PR template on the last page if you won't be completing the next sections

Section Three: Guided Pathways & Curriculum Review

(Programs with Courses Only)

For assistance with these questions, contact the [Curriculum Committee Chair](#)

Part One: Guided Pathways: Your program's work with guided pathways

A. Program Maps - [The Program Maps \(degree and certificate course sequences\) are found in Academic & Career Pathways](#)

Up-to-date Program Maps are used by students in your pathway, for data collection to support in-reach to students in your Pathway, predictive scheduling recommendations for Discipline Plans, and may influence the allocation of FTEF.

Please compare each Program Map to your current course offerings and course sequencing. Pay close attention to prerequisite information and to classes that may only be offered particular terms.

1) Are your Program Maps accurate?

- Yes, all of my maps are accurate
 - No. The Program Map for _____ (degree/certificate name) _____
Requires an update
 - Requires a **non-curricular change** (ie: course sequencing) Please consult your [Pathway counseling faculty liaison](#)
 - **Curricular Change** (Program modifications) - Modifications are initiated through the Curriculum Committee. For mapping support contact the [Curriculum & SLO Specialist](#).
-

Part Two: Curriculum Review

For assistance with this section, contact the [Curriculum Committee Chair](#).

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

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]: Do you need to update any courses to stay within the 5-year cycle? List courses requiring 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 (C).

____X____ YES _____ No

Course Name & Number
Hist 1 Western Civilization to 1600
Hist 2 Western Civilization Since 1600
Hist 7 US History Through Reconstruction

B. Degree/Certificate Updates [Curriculum Committee]: Do any programs require modification in this cycle? If yes, list them below.

Reminder: Program modifications sent to the Curriculum Committee for approval require an updated Program Map. For mapping and curriculum support please contact the [Curriculum & SLO Specialist](#).

____ YES _____ No

Certificate or Degree

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

Reminder: Program modifications sent to the Curriculum Committee for approval require an updated Program Map. For mapping and curriculum support please contact the [Curriculum & SLO Specialist](#).

____ YES _____xx_ Not at this time

If yes, explain details, rationale, or any support that might be helpful to the committee.

--

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

Reminder:: New program proposals require a Program Map for Senate approval. Please **contact the Curriculum & SLO Specialist** if you are planning a new program.

_____ YES _____xx_____ No

If yes, please provide details and the rationale

--

E. Are there any courses that you plan to deactivate or sunset?

_____ YES _____xx_____ No

Course Name & Number

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

--