

Program: History

Division: BSSL

Writer(s): Stuart McElderry, John Rosen

SLO/SAO Point-Person: John Rosen

Email your completed form to Karin Spirn and your dean by November 3.

Helpful Links:

- ★ [Tools for Writers](#) - with contacts and info for help with specific sections.
- ★ [Program Review Glossary](#) - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ [Discipline Data Packets](#) – institutional research about disciplines and student services
- ★ [Course Success Rates Dashboard](#) – allows you to research your program’s success rates

Detailed information and instructions appear at the end of this form. For help, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu.

1. Please describe your program's most important **achievements** in year 24-25.

- Enrollment growth was the program’s most important achievement. Headcount grew by 321 and overall course enrollment increased by 335, the equivalent of 8 full sections. In terms of FTES, the program saw an increase of 31.8 for the year; in terms of productivity (WSCH/FTEF), the program’s average for the year was 642.5, a significant uptick from the previous year’s productivity number of 577.
- The FHPC ranked the program’s Full-Time Faculty Request in the top 3 which allowed the program to hire a new full-time faculty member. Dr. Stuart McElderry, who had served as a dean since January 2018, exercised administrator retreat rights to return to the program after 7.5 years as the new full-time faculty member.

2. Please describe your most important **challenges** in year 24-25.

- The program’s most important challenge was operating with increased student demand and productivity expectations with only two full-time faculty, down from a high of four full-time faculty during the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Addressing/incorporating the use of AI tools, such as ChatGPT. The advent and use of these tools have presented new challenges in terms of academic honesty (especially in asynchronous online classes) while also challenging us to rethink our pedagogies, methods of assessment, and making our courses more relevant for our students.

3. What SLO(s) or SAO(s) if any did your program assess or discuss since your last program review? Please describe any findings and planned actions.

- Overall student success rate in History held steady at 70%, above the set standard but also below the college-wide average (76%). There are three specific courses (Hist 14, 28, and 32), all taught online, that had success rates at or below 60% and high withdrawal rates (over 30%). We will keep an eye on those courses during the current academic year.
- SLO Data aligned less with the overall student success data for History than in previous years. It also varied significantly between Fall and Spring in almost every demographic category. It is always difficult to analyze this data for History, but even more so this year because the eLumen reports I ran before the college lost access do not include the instructors reflection/analysis questions and answers – so I don't have any context with which to situate the data.
- On the whole, the SLO success (students who were rated “average” or above in the eLumen rubric), was much higher than the overall student success rate. For most groups, successful demonstration of the outcome was much higher in the Spring than in the Fall – the exception being African American students, in which the opposite was the case. In order to determine both why the SLO success was notably higher than the overall history success rate, and why success was notably higher in the Fall than in Spring, we would really need to instructor's reflection answers to go along with the data. We hope that the SLO assessment tool in CurrlQunet will help address some of this ambiguity, but we will also need to ask our instructors to be more precise when explaining the criteria that they use to determine student achievement of an SLO. In terms of the gap between overall student success and the SLO data, one possible explanation, however, could relate to persistence. It is possible that students complete the assessment (whether it be an exam, essay, etc.) but do not complete other coursework, which could result in some not successfully completed the course while demonstrating competency in a learning outcome. This is something that we will have to explore through discussions.
- Some of the trends that we identified in the previous program review in terms of equity gaps are still present. While SLO data for Fall showed African Americans as one of the highest achieving demographic groups, they were among the lowest in the Spring. Moreover, the overall student success rate for African-American students, while up a bit from the previous year (56% compared to 51%) was still roughly 10% below the college-wide average (67%). This is something that we will continue to track and discuss at the completion of the 3-year assessment cycle next year.
- Whereas the previous year SLO success was better in face-to-face courses, the opposite was the case for 24-25. This may be because the SLOs assessed were related to one of our content-related PLOs, as opposed to the skills-based PLO (source analysis and making arguments). The content-based SLOs are likely easier to teach and learn in an asynchronous format, whereas the skills-based SLOs are much more difficult to do in that setting compared

to a face-to-face classroom. With regard to content-related SLOs and asynchronous online classes, we also have to consider the problems presented by the availability and use of AI (such as ChatGPT), and how that could be distorting the data. We will also be discussing these issues when we close the loop on our three-year cycle.

4. What are your upcoming plans? Please note any ways that these support student achievement and equity.

- In Spring 2026, History will be offering its first section of an Honors course (Hist 7).
- With the board-approved resignation of Dr. TeriAnn Bengiveno, effective January 2026, the program will need to replace this position soon to maintain program vibrancy. Given that full-time faculty members are more available to students via office hours, participation in campus initiatives and life (e.g. club advising), committee involvement and shared governance, hiring a replacement full-time faculty member will support student achievement and equity.
- Implementation of new course numbers to replace History 7 and History 8 in compliance with the statewide common course numbering process.

CTE REPORT (CTE DISCIPLINES ONLY)

1. Does this program continue to meet a labor market demand?

- Yes or No:
- Explanation/evidence:

2. Are there similar programs in the area? If yes, list the programs and their institutions.

- Yes or No:
- Explanation/evidence:

3. Has the program demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the employment and completion success of its students? Provide employment and completion success based on Perkins Core Indicator Report.

- Yes or No:
- Explanation/evidence:

4. Does the program provide opportunities for review and comments by local private industries? Attach most recent Advisory Committee meeting minutes.

- Yes or No:
- Explanation/evidence:

Detailed Instructions and Information

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 completed form to Program Review chair Karin Spirn and your Dean by November 3.
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.

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 24-25 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2025-26. It is okay to include information outside of these time windows as needed.

Program Review Process: Comprehensive Program Reviews will be completed every three years, in alignment with the SLO/SAO cycle. On the other years, programs will complete an update.

SLO/SAO Process: SLOs and SAOs should be assessed according to a three-year plan, with comprehensive reporting on the third year. For more information, contact SLO chair John Rosen: jrosen@laspositascollege.edu

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.