Program: History

Division: BSSL

Date: November 1, 2024

Writer(s): John J. Rosen

SLO/SAO Point-Person: John J. 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 inform the audience about your program. It is also used in creating division summaries, determining college planning priorities, and determining the allocation of resources. The final use is to document the fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

Please note: Program Review is NOT 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 your program status during the 23-24 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2024-25.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Fall 2023 Program Reviews
- ★ Program Review FAQs

For help with your program review, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu

---

Sections

There are four sections to the document:

1. Review your program, including curriculum updates, accomplishments, challenges, and planning.
2. Data Analysis
3. SLO/SAO Review
4. Feedback on the PR template and process

Instructions

1. Please answer each question with enough detail to present your information, but it doesn't have to be 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 Program Review chair, Karin Spirn, and your Dean by Monday, Nov. 4, 2024

5. Even if you don't have much to report, we want to hear from you, so your voice is part of the college planning process.

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 1: Your Program In 2024-2025

Please place an X next to N/A where relevant

A. Accomplishments: Identify your main accomplishments from the 23-24 academic year.

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

- Did your accomplishments support your program's plans identified in recent PRs?
- Did they relate to guided pathways?
- Were they in support of the colleges equity definition?
- Did they connect to any of the college planning priorities?
- Did you receive any positive/negative feedback from students?
- Are there any innovations or new processes you'd like to integrate?
- Has your program changed in response to the SCFF model of college funding? (completions, increasing enrollment, offering certificates, degrees, etc.)?

N/A_____

We have few accomplishments to report for this past academic year due to a lack of full-time faculty – the program has mostly been treading water. Our most notable achievement was getting the History Club relaunched. After being moribund for a year, we were able to get the club started again in the Fall semester. The club's membership is higher than it has ever been since the Club was started back in 2017.

B. Challenges, Pain Points, and Needs

What significant or ongoing challenges or obstacles did your Program face during the 23-24 academic year, especially related to accomplishing program goals/plans? Consider funding, staffing, materials, facilities, outside requirements such as legislative mandates, working on equity gaps, etc. Highlight/identify any challenges mentioned in previous reviews.

N/A_____

The Program's main obstacle is the lack of full-time faculty. For the past five years we have been trying to replace one of the two full-time positions that we lost since 2018, but the program still only has two full-time faculty (one of whom is only able to teach online). The program coordinator serves on two college committees, one of which he chairs, advises two clubs, and teaches four courses per semester. This hasn't left sufficient time to pursue program goals, such as revising and creating new curriculum. Because most of our classes are taught by part-time faculty who also teach at other colleges in the region, it has been difficult to find times to have department meetings to discuss issues relating to pedagogy, curriculum, and equity. When we have tried to schedule meetings, only one or two faculty attended. We have planned to shift more of our courses back to in-person, but for some – such as World History, we don't feel comfortable doing this without a full-time faculty (as it is easier to find a qualified instructor for those courses if they are offered DE). Additionally, we were exploring ways to revise the curriculum for our History 7 and 8 courses to better meet best pedagogical practices. However, we were advised that we should put those plans on hold because of the state's move to common course numbering.

C. Planning: What are your program's most important plans, either new or continuing?

N/A_____

The program's most important plans involve curriculum. We plan on developing a new critical thinking course, something that would benefit our students. And although we have had to put our plans to revise History 7 and 8 on hold, we do plan on working towards new ways to teach History 8 within the confines of the existing course outline so that it better meets the course learning objectives while also advancing the college's commitment to equity.

Another plan/goal is to discuss ways to meet the challenges posed by AI (such as Chat GPT). The challenges here are two-fold. First, there is the challenge relating to academic honesty. Second, and more important, is how the advent of AI programs have prompted history teachers to rethink how we teach and assess source analysis and the constructing of historical arguments. As our in-person enrollments continue to improve, we plan to bring more courses back to an in-person modality (as our students are more successful in-person compared with DE).

D. Identify any college, district, or legislative barriers to your program's equity work. What suggestions do you have for minimizing or eliminating these barriers?

Barriers: One barrier, as stated above, is lack of full-time faculty – our faculty are stretched thin, which makes it hard to find the time to do meaningful equity work. We also don't necessarily have the tools that would help us carry out meaningful equity work. For example, as will be evident in other parts of this program review, we don't have training in data analysis, which would be helpful.

Suggestions:

N/A_____

E. Curriculum Updates

Reasons for updating include that it is required every two (CTE) or five (non-CTE) years, there is a program or college need, starting a new program, or new legislation.

1. Are you planning to update any curriculum in 24-25?
   Yes___XX_   No____

2. Comments (Optional): We have already submitted updates for Hist 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7.

3. Please review your program maps. Do you need to make any modifications?
   Yes____   No___XX_

4. *If yes, compare each Program Map to your current course offerings and sequencing. Pay close attention to prerequisite information, and classes offered only during certain semesters.*
   a) If your map requires a **non-curricular change** (i.e., course sequencing), consult your **Pathway counseling faculty liaison** to initiate changes.
   b) **If your map requires a curricular change** (Program modifications) - these are initiated through the Curriculum Committee.
   Any questions? Contact the Curriculum Chair or the Curriculum and SLO Specialist.

Section 2: Data Analysis – Quantitative and Qualitative

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 and reach out to the IR team.)*

Here are a few samples of data to review and reference if that's helpful.

- IR Data packets are available here (Posted Fall 24)
- Academic & Career Pathway Specific data (Posted Fall 24)
- Your program's survey data
- Transfer data
- Course Set Standard Overview & Success Rates Dashboard are in the middle of this page

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. 95% of the rolling 5-year average. There are valid reasons a program does not meet the Program Set Standard; when a program does not meet this standard, they are 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.

1. Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion?

    Yes_XX___   No____

2. If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.

Section 3: SLOs/SAOs: Assessment of Student Learning and Support

Program Review is the college's major data source on student learning and support and is, therefore, regularly reviewed. *Each year, programs must discuss their PSLOs, CSLOs, or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs.) This helps us to see how our students are progressing in their learning.* For assistance with these questions and instructions on running reports using eLumen, click here.

Please complete at least one of the following three sections based on what is appropriate for your program.
Check at least one below:
- ☐ XX 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)

To assess PSLOs within eLumen, CSLOs must be correctly mapped to only one PSLO, and every mapped CSLO must have assessment data. Please review the items below and proceed accordingly.

- If the CSLOs are mapped correctly and there is data for each CSLO, then continue to question 2.
- 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.
- If not all mapped CSLOs have assessment data, then you cannot assess the PSLO. In this case, continue to section C2.

1. Please review your 3-year plan and verify that all courses will be assessed by June 2026. (between Fall 2023 – Spring 2026)

   Will at least one SLO be assessed in each course by June 2026?
   Yes___XX_   No____

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

2. Based on your 3-year plan, list the PSLO(s) for the academic year 2023-2024 that your program selected to review and explain why these were chosen. "Upon completion of the AA-T in History, students are able to analyze and interpret historical sources and to compose an argument that uses them, as appropriate, for support."

3. What percentage of faculty completed the planned CSLO assessments? (In eLumen, run a Faculty Participation report for 23-24).
   - _____95____%

4. Analysis of PSLO(s): What conclusions can be drawn about student learning and equity in your program based on eLumen and/or other data? You may want to consider disaggregated data. When using eLumen See the Guide for instructions on how to disaggregate PSLO data.

It is difficult to draw clear conclusions based on the eLumen data alone. We are focusing on this specific PSLO because of the advent of AI, which has heightened the importance of the CSLOs that map up to this PSLO. Also, as we began to offer more DE courses during COVID – and especially as we were only teaching online during COVID, we noticed more challenges in achieving these skills-based learning outcomes. We have been focusing on comparing success rates in learning outcomes in our DE and face-to-face classes. As our initial impressions were that we were more successful at teaching these particular outcomes in face-to-face classes. For the 23-24 academic year there was relative parity. In our DE courses 86% of students scored "average" or above on the rubric, while in face-to-face classes the number was 90%. Curiously, far more students scored in the "Mastery" range in DE classes (37.45%) than in face-to-face classes (23%). But this gets to the problem using this data. When looking at the reflection questions, it seemed evident that the in-person classes are doing more direct hands-on work on these outcomes, and the assessments appear to be more direct and rigorous (some of the instructors teaching online did not

complete the reflection questions, and some used assessments/criteria that did not clearly address the outcomes). Although we suspect that students are achieving these outcomes at a higher rate in our face-to-face classes, we will need to have department meetings and discussions to try to understand how these skills are being taught in the different modalities and what adjustments we could make to how we teach them in DE courses.

Even though it was difficult to come to any conclusions on the general Elumen data because in the different ways our instructors are teaching and assessing these outcomes, we did identify an equity gap – one that likely seems to be more of a program-level gap (as opposed to being limited to the specific learning outcomes we assessed). For this particular SLO, 24% of African American students didn't meet the SLO (rating either "below average" or "no demonstrated achievement"). This was significantly higher than the next two lowest ethnic groups, whites and "Hispanics," (each of which were at about 12%). The eLumen data corresponded to the more general numbers in the Institutional data. In terms of student success rates, our program experienced a noticeable drop in success among African American students – from 62% in 2022-2023 (which was one point above the college percentage) to 51% in 2023-2024 (which was 10 points below the college percentage). Of the 82 African American students who enrolled in History courses in the past year, most took DE courses (72%), and success rates were eight points lower in DE courses compared to in-person classes. Lack of access to on-campus resources could partially explain the low number. We also noticed that the "non-success" rate was higher for in-person classes (35% - which was just 8 students) than for DE classes (22% - 13 students). This appears to be related to the fact that only two students (9%) withdrew from in-person classes, while 29% of students (17) withdrew from DE classes. Based on the eLumen data showing that ten African American students scored as "No Demonstrated Achievement" (which means they likely did not complete the assessment), we assume that while African American students who struggled withdrew from online classes, they appear to have continued attending in-person classes.

We had noticed a slight gap among "Hispanic" students in last year's program review. However, that gap appears to have closed. Student success among Hispanic students improved from 62% to 68% (just two points under the program's total student success rates). This improvement was also reflected in the eLumen assessment data.

5. <u>Based on discussions with others in your program,</u> explain potential changes designed to improve student learning and close any equity gaps identified through the analysis of PSLO data. Please also note if you decide to update any CSLOs or PSLOs based on this analysis (If updating, then you may do this through eLumen, see the [SLO Handbook](#) if you need instructions on how to do this). We have yet to develop any concrete changes to address student learning with regard to our skills-based PSLO and the equity-gap we have noticed among African American students. Our general U.S. history courses already place an emphasis on African American history, and some of our instructors added more readings by and about African Americans in the past year. Clearly, we will need to have department discussions on how to address this gap – especially in online courses, but also among those students who remain enrolled in face-to-face courses but do not successfully complete the course. In terms of the learning outcomes and equity gap addressed in this section, a discussion of our DE curriculum and pedagogy is overdue.

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

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

1. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all courses will be assessed by June 2026. (between Fall 2023 – Spring 2026)

   Will all courses be assessed by June 2026?
   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.](#)

2. Based on your [3-year plan](#), list the CSLO(s) for the academic year 2023-2024 that your program selected to review.

3. What percentage of faculty completed the planned assessments for the selected CSLO? (In eLumen, [run a Faculty Participation report](#) for 23-24).

4. What conclusions can you draw from the CSLO data and reflections in eLumen. If you used any additional evidence or methods to answer this question, please explain.

5. Explain potential program changes designed to improve student learning. Please also note if you have decided to update any CSLOs or PSLOs based on analysis (If updating, then you may do this through eLumen, see the [SLO Handbook](#) if you need instructions on how to do this).

6. 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. [Please review your 3-year plan](#) and verify that all courses will be assessed by June 2026. (between Fall 2023 – Spring 2026)
   Will all courses be assessed by June 2026?

   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.](#)

2. Based on your [3-year plan](#), list the SAO(s) for the academic year 2023-2024 that your program selected to review.

3. Based on discussion with others in your area, what conclusions can be drawn from the SAO data and reflection questions from eLumen or other sources of data?

4. Explain any planned changes to improve outcomes in your service area. Please note if you have decided to update any SAOs based on this analysis.

5. 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.

Section 4: Suggestions for the Program Review Committee (optional)

What questions or suggestions about this year's Program Review forms or process do you have?