

The Program Review process should serve as a mechanism for the assessment of performance that recognizes and acknowledges good performance and academic excellence, improves the quality of instruction and services, updates programs and services, and fosters self-renewal and self-study. Further, it should provide for the identification of weak performance and assist programs in achieving needed improvement. Finally, program review should be seen as a component of campus planning that will not only lead to better utilization of existing resources, but also lead to increased quality of instruction and service. A major function of program review should be to monitor and pursue the congruence between the goals and priorities of the college and the actual practices in the program or service.

~Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

INSTRUCTIONS

For information about cycles for *Comprehensive Program Review and Planning*, see Instructional and Student Services program review rotation schedules posted online in their respective sections of the program review webpage: http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/program_review.php)

Resources for Supporting Documentation:

A listing of resources and documents which provide data or information for each section is included at the end of this document, after the final signature page. These resources are posted online and their URLs are listed at the end of this document.

(You may delete this section, when you submit your final program review.)

Next Steps:

Program Review and Planning reports are due March 25, 2012. This date is aligned with CSM's *Integrated Planning Calendar*. (See: <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/planning.asp>)

Upon its completion, please email this *Program Review and Planning* report to the Vice President of Instruction, the Vice President of Student Services, the appropriate division dean, the CSM Academic Senate President, and the Dean of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE).

James Carranza, Academic Senate President, carranza@smccd.edu
Susan Estes, Vice President of Instruction, estes@smccd.edu
Jennifer Hughes, Vice President of Student Services, hughesj@smccd.edu
John Sewart, Dean (PRIE), sewart@smccd.edu

DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM: Political Science

DIVISION: Creative Arts & Social Sciences

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

The program offers a variety of courses, which are taken primarily by students who are transferring and/or seeking an AA/AS degree. There were 44 students who declared political science majors in Fall 2010 (the most recent semester for which data are available).

II. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs)

- a. Please list the courses, if any, for which SLOs have not been assessed. What assessment is planned for these courses? What assistance or resources would help to complete assessment?

The full-time faculty have assessed all SLOs for the courses that they teach: PLSC 110, 210, and 215.

SLOs have not been assessed for the courses taught by part-time faculty:

- PLSC 100
- PLSC 130
- PLSC 150
- PLSC 200
- PLSC 250

The dean has indicated his intention to bank PLSC 200 and 250. We suggest that the dean contact the part-time instructors assigned to teach PLSC 100, 130, 150, and urge them to assess SLOs.

- b. Please list any degrees offered. Have SLOs been identified for each degree? Briefly describe the department's plan for assessment.

None. Currently developing an AA-T degree. No SLOs have been identified yet.

- c. Please list any certificates offered. Have SLOs been identified for each certificate? Briefly describe the department's plan for assessment.

None.

- d. Based on assessment results, 1) what changes will the department consider or implement to improve student learning; and 2) what, if any, resources will the department or program require to implement these changes? (Please itemize these resources in section VII of this document.)

Assessment results indicate good progress on student learning. No obvious changes come to mind.

- e. Below please update the program's SLO Alignment Grid below. The column headings identify the General Education (GE) SLOs. In the row headings (down the left-most column), input the course numbers (e.g. ENGL 100); add or remove rows as necessary. Then mark the corresponding boxes for each GE-SLO with which each course aligns.

If this *Program Review and Planning* report refers to a vocational program or a certificate program that aligns with alternative institutional-level SLOs, please replace the GE-SLOs with the appropriate corresponding SLOs.

GE-SLOs→ Program Courses ↓	Effective Communication	Quantitative Skills	Critical Thinking	Social Awareness and Diversity	Ethical Responsibility
PLSC 100	X		X	X	X
PLSC 110	X		X	X	X
PLSC 130	X		X	X	X
PLSC 150	X		X	X	X
PLSC 200	X		X	X	X
PLSC 210	X		X	X	X
PLSC 215	X		X	X	X
PLSC 310	X		X	X	X

III. DATA EVALUATION

- a. Referring to the Enrollment and WSCH data, evaluate the current data and projections. If applicable, what programmatic, course offering or scheduling changes do trends in these areas suggest? Will any major changes being implemented in the program (e.g. changes in prerequisites, to-be-arranged hours (TBA), lab components. etc.) require significant adjustments to the Enrollment and WSCH projections?

Enrollment and WSCH both declined. We speculate that the substantial reduction in course offerings by the program may have led students to look elsewhere for courses offered by other programs.

LOAD in the department is quite high, and increased from 532 in 2008-09 to 553 in 2010-11.

Retention percentage remained stable in the 82%-85% range. Success % remained a stable 61%-62% during the two year period, 2008-10 but then dropped substantially to 54% in 2010-11. In other words, the rate at which students withdrew from courses remained stable, but a greater percentage of students got grades below a C.

We propose two possible explanations:

- Increased LOAD (larger class sizes and therefore less individual attention to students).
- Substantial reduction in the number of sections taught by part-time faculty (who have a reputation giving students less work and higher grades than the full-time faculty). We lost 1 adjunct FTEF (a 33% reduction).

As for the projections, they should be taken with a grain of salt. It's unclear whether current trends will continue. Will enrollment continue to fall? Will we lose another part-time FTEF?

- b. Referring to the Classroom Teaching FTEF data, evaluate the current data and projections. If applicable, how does the full-time and part-time FTEF affect program action steps and outcomes? What programmatic changes do trends in this area suggest?

We speculate that the reduction in adjunct FTEF by 33% is at least partly responsible for the decline in success %. Fewer students will view political science as a discipline in which they can earn an "easy A." As students adjust their expectations, some self-selection is inevitable, meaning that students who don't want to do substantial reading and writing assignments may shun political science, leading to a recovery in the success %. Time will tell.

The change in PLSC 210 to cover two different CSU transfer requirements has by necessity required making the course more rigorous. The dean has instructed that the 3-unit PLSC 210 course is to be considered a replacement for the 5-unit PLSC 200. This may depress success % further.

It might be helpful to recall some history. For the past several years, the course offerings of the department have been substantially reduced by removing courses from catalog and schedule. Recently, under instruction from the dean, the content of PLSC 210 was changed to include California government and politics, to conform to changes at other institutions such as Skyline College and SFSU. The previous dean has indicated that it would have been appropriate to have worked with Skyline to choose a different course number for Skyline's new version of PLSC 210. It was also suggested years ago that we would lose many students because of CSM's requirement of 5 or 6 units for the two subjects. But there is no evidence to support this.

Political science is an analytical discipline. CSM's department has a history of high standards and quality, a reputation that has been recognized by 4-year institutions. The political science faculty past and present unanimously believes that to only offer a 3-unit class combining PLSC 210 and 310 effects a deterioration of the quality of learning for students. We suggest that we maintain the option of a straight American politics course as well as the new hybrid version of 210. Numbering may need to be changed. Having both

options assures that our students can be prepared to transfer to CSUs and to colleges other than CSUs if and when they change the institutional requirement again.

- c. Referring to the Productivity (LOAD) data, discuss and evaluate the program's productivity relative to its target number. If applicable, what programmatic changes or other measures will the department consider or implement in order to reach its productivity target? If the productivity target needs to be adjusted, please provide a rationale.

LOAD has been increasing, and at 553, it is well above target of 525. Faculty have responded to student demand by overriding enrollment caps on courses. If more sections were offered, there would be less need for this, and LOAD might fall closer to the target level.

IV. STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS

- a. Considering the overall "Success" and "Retention" data, briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs relative to current, past, and projected program and college student success rates.

We speculate that a 33% reduction in adjunct FTEF has depressed Success %. See Section III, above.

Discuss distance education (online and hybrid modes) success and retention data and, where possible, compare with data for on campus sections.

The retention rates and success rates for distance education sections of PLSC 200, 210 and 310 were significantly lower than the rates for the traditional versions of the courses. However, the data reveal the same pattern for distance education courses college-wide. In other words, retention rates and success rates for political science distance education classes are consistent with those in other programs at CSM.

We speculate that many students may lack the degree of self-motivation necessary for success with a distance education course. Perhaps CSM should make greater efforts to inform students of this when they consider enrolling in a distance education course.

Enrollments in distance education classes vary greatly (ie; 75-25). Students come from a wide range of educational levels. Some come from other areas of the state and even other states. The expectation of an undemanding or easy course seems to be pervasive, though the college schedule may indicate otherwise, and the instructor strongly emphasizes the standards and demands of the class. Evidently, few students read the schedule narrative. Perhaps additional information from the instructor in a class

email, in addition to personal and online contacts, would help. The instructor can also continue to experiment with different online modes to help stabilize enrollment and success.

A second concern relates to student complaints regarding the unpredictability of the online class schedule. Students report hearing that online courses were to be eliminated. After PLSC 310, and then 200 were taken out of the schedule, students indicated that some were looking elsewhere for a more reliable online schedule. In addition, when students fear cancellation of classes, they are less likely to sign up for them. It is hoped that that a more stable online schedule can be established

If applicable, identify unmet student needs related to student success and describe programmatic changes or other measures the department will consider or implement in order to improve student success. (*Note that item IV b, below, specifically addresses equity, diversity, age, and gender.*)

- b. Briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs specifically relative to equity, diversity, age, and gender. If applicable, identify unmet student needs and describe programmatic changes or other measures the department will consider or implement in order to improve student success with specific regard to equity, diversity, age, and gender.

Educating students on issues of equity and diversity fall within the core mission of political science program, and its curriculum.

There is not a significant gender disparity in student success rates. However, white and Asian students do have significantly higher success rates than other ethnic groups. Anecdotal evidence suggests that there is a lower percentage of white and Asian students taking remedial English classes, but there we have no rigorous data to support this.

Political science courses have rigorous reading and writing requirements. For this reason, "Recommended Preparation" for political science courses listed in the CSM course catalog is "eligibility for ENGL 838/848 and completion of READ 400 or 405 with a grade of C or higher...." We suspect that large numbers of students are ignoring this recommendation. Perhaps it is time to consider making this required preparation.

V. REFLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND PROGRAM/STUDENT

- a. Using the matrix provided below and reflecting on the program relative to students' needs, briefly analyze the program's strengths and weaknesses and identify

opportunities for and possible threats to the program (SWOT analysis). See page 10 for definition of SWOT). Consider both external and internal factors. For example, if applicable, you might consider changes in our community and beyond (demographic, educational, social, economic, workforce, and, perhaps, global trends); look at the demand for the program; program review links to other college and District programs and services offered; look at similar programs at other area colleges; and investigate auxiliary funding.

	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
Strengths	Experienced, committed faculty	Politics and government are in the news
Weaknesses	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increasing LOAD and reduction in FTEF mean greater workload for faculty and less individual time for students. 2. Reduced number of courses offered to students decreases student interest in program. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bad economy require students to work more 2. State budget cuts have reduced resources overall.
Opportunities	Developing a political science AA-T.	Presidential election campaign in fall 2012 should increase interest in program.
Threats	College budget cuts leading to additional reductions in course offerings and FTEF.	State budget cuts leading to additional reductions in course offerings and FTEF.

- b. If applicable, discuss how new positions, other resources, and equipment granted in previous years have contributed towards reaching program action steps and towards overall programmatic health. If new positions, equipment, or other resources have been requested but not granted, discuss how this has impacted overall programmatic health. (You might reflect on data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators for this section.)

Not applicable.

VI. Goals, Action Steps, and Outcomes

- a. Identify the program's goals. Goals should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate some sort of measurable action and should connect to CSM's *Educational Master Plan, 2008 (EMP); Data Updates to EMP, 2011-12; College Index, 2008/9-2011/12; Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011; 5 & 5 College Strategies; GE-SLOs; SLOs.*)

Educate students to think critically about politics and government, and prepare students for transfer and degrees.

- b. Identify the action steps your program will undertake to meet the goals you have identified.

Continue to Evaluate SLOs and make modifications as appropriate. Develop an AA-T degree in political science.

- c. Briefly explain, specifically, how the program's goals and their actions steps relate to CSM's *Educational Master Plan, 2008 (EMP)*; *Data Updates to EMP, 2011-12*; *College Index, 2008/9-2011/12*; *Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011*; and *5 & 5 College Strategies*.

Evaluating SLOs is included in the Educational Master Plan.

- d. Identify and explain the program's outcomes, the measurable "mileposts" which will allow you to determine when the goals are reached.

Approval of AA-T.

VII. SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH PROGRAM ACTION STEPS

- a. In the matrices below, itemize the resources needed to reach program action steps and describe the expected outcomes for program improvement.* Specifically, describe the potential outcomes of receiving these resources and the programmatic impact if the requested resources cannot be granted.

* *Note:* Whenever possible, requests should stem from assessment of SLOs and the resulting program changes or plans. Ideally, SLOs are assessed, the assessments lead to planning, and the resources requested link directly to those plans.

A new full-time instructor should be requested in the next few years, as the phase-in retirement instructor retires. Program growth requires commitment of at least 2 full-time instructors.

Full-Time Faculty Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
N/A		

Classified Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based

		on SLO assessment.
N/A		

- b. For instructional resources including equipment and materials, please list the exact items you want to acquire and the total costs, including tax, shipping, and handling. Include items used for instruction (such as computers, furniture for labs and centers) and all materials designed for use by students and instructors as a learning resource (such as lab equipment, books, CDs, technology-based materials, educational software, tests, non-printed materials). Add rows to the tables as necessary. If you have questions as to the specificity required, please consult with your division dean. Please list by priority.

Resources Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
Item: N/A Number: Vendor: Unit price: Total Cost: Status*:		

*Status = New, Upgrade, Replacement, Maintenance or Repair.

VIII. Course Outlines

- a. By course number (e.g. CHEM 210), please list all department or program courses included in the most recent college catalog, the date of the current Course Outline for each course, and the due date of each course's next update.

Course Number	Last Update Date	Six-year Update Due Date
PLSC 100	2010	2016
PLSC 110	2006	2012
PLSC 130	2006	2012
PLSC 150	2011	2017
PLSC 200	2007	2013
PLSC 210	2010	2016
PLSC 215	2006	2012
PLSC 250	Not on file	Not on file
PLSC 310	2011	2017

IX. Advisory and Consultation Team (ACT)

- a. Please list non-program faculty who have participated on the program's Advisory and Consultation Team. Their charge is to review the *Program Review and Planning* report

before its submission and to provide a brief written report with comments, commendations, and suggestions to the Program Review team. Provided that they come from outside the program's department, ACT members may be solicited from faculty at CSM, our two sister colleges, other community colleges, colleges or universities, and professionals in relevant fields. The ACT report should be attached to this document upon submission.

List ACT names here.

David Danielson, Professor of Philosophy, College of San Mateo

Attach or paste ACT report here.

ACT Report
2012 Political Science Comprehensive Program Review

Dave Danielson
Department of Philosophy, College of San Mateo

- I. There is a good basic description of the program.
- II. The section on SLOs shows that the work on assessment is begun and shows a plan to address the courses which have yet to be assessed.
- III. Analysis of the data seems reasonable. Loss of classes explains WSCH drops. They are to be commended for increasing LOAD at the same time. The drop in success is explained by a plausible and reasonable explanation.
- IV. a.) Good analysis of on-line versus traditional class success.
b.) The explanations of the differences in various groups are consistent with over all trends.
- V. Good assessment of the strengths and weaknesses facing the program. The particular focus on budget concerns is solid.
- VI. The section identifies its goals and links them to broader mandates.
- VII. No resources are asked for although there is the awareness that an additional full-time position will be needed in the near future. The department may want to find ways to increase LOAD, where appropriate, to make the case for an additional position stronger in years to come.
- VIII. Three course outlines will need to be updated in the fall. The department ought to get to work on those early in the fall is not too great a burden.

b. Briefly describe the program's response to and intended incorporation of the ACT report recommendations.

We agree with the recommendations and will get to work early on updating the course outlines.

X. PROGRAM REVIEW PARTICIPANTS AND SIGNATURES

Date of Program Review evaluation:

Please list the department's *Program Review and Planning* report team:

Primary program contact person: **Kathryn O'Connell**

Phone and email address: **ext. 6381, oconnell@smccd.edu**

Full-time faculty: **Lee R. Miller**

Part-time faculty: **Frank Damon**

Administrators: **Kevin Henson**

Classified staff:

Students:

Primary Program Contact Person's Signature

Date

Full-time Faculty's Signature

Date

Part-time Faculty's Signature

Date

Classified Staff Person's Signature

Date

Student's Signature

Date

Dean's Signature

Date

**Comprehensive Program Review
RESOURCES FOR SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

Section 1

This section contains a listing of sources for data and key documents referred to in Section 2 along with other resources. Contact information for relevant people is also included.

Academic Senate

<http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/academicsenate/>

Contact: csmacademicsenate@smccd.edu

James Carranza, Academic Senate President, carranza@smccd.edu, (650) 574-6568

College Catalogs and College Class Schedules are archived online:

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/schedule/archive.asp>

Course Outlines are found at:

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/articulation/outlines.asp>

Committee on Instruction

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/committeeoninstruction/>

Contact: Teresa, Morris, morrist@smccd.edu, (650) 574-6617.

Program Review Resources (includes forms, data, and completed program reviews for both instructional and student services program review)

Note: PRIE has a new website as of 2/15/2012; Program Review resources will temporarily be housed at "old" site as we make the transition to a new site:

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/program_review.php

Core Program and Student Success Indicators (See links for "Quantitative Data for Instructional Programs")

Distance Education Program Review Data

Glossary of Terms for Program Review

Listing of Programs Receiving Program Review Data from PRIE

Rotation Schedule for Instructional Program Review, 2008-2014

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/program_review.php

Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE)

(Note: PRIE has a new website as of 2/15/2012; the URL will remain the same.)

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/>

Contact: John Sewart, Dean, sewart@smccd.edu, (650) 574-6196

Contact: Milla McConnell-Tuite, Coordinator, mcconnell@smccd.edu, (650)574-6699

At PRIE Website

College Index, 2008/9-

2011/12, <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/institutionalresearch/collegeindex.asp>

Educational Master Plan, 2008, <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/planningdocs.asp>

Educational Master Plan, Data Updates, 2011-

12 <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/institutionalresearch/>

Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/planningdocs.asp>

Five in Five College Strategies, <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/planningdocs.asp>

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) website:

<http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/sloac/>

Contact: David Locke, SLO Coordinator, Locke@smccd.edu, (650)574-6624

Also see PRIE site for SLO assessments' support: <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/slos.asp>

Section 2

This section contains the references that serve as data sources for the individual sections of the Comprehensive Program Review Form. Explanatory notes are included.

DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM:

To identify programs on the comprehensive program review cycle, see *Rotation Schedule for Instructional Program Review, 2008-2014* at PRIE

website: http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/programReview_forms.php

Also see *Listing of Programs Receiving Program Review Data from PRIE*.

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

- "Number of Sections" data from *Core Program and Student Success Indicators* (published by PRIE for each program)
- CSM Course Catalog
- Department records

II. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

- SLO records maintained by the department
- CSM SLO Coordinator
- SLO Website: <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/sloac>
- The definitions for the General Education (GE) SLOs can be found on the CSM SLOAC website.

III. DATA EVALUATION

- Enrollment, WSCH, FTEF, and productivity data for each program can be found in *Core Program and Student Success Indicators*. (Published by PRIE.)
- Productivity is also commonly known as "LOAD." See *Glossary of Terms for Program Review* for definitions of key terms.
- Faculty Load: the ratio of the weekly contact hours (WSCH) of enrolled students and a faculty's hours of instruction per week. In other words, WSCH divided by FTE. ?
- The College's general target productivity will be recommended by the Budget Planning Committee.

IV. STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS

- *Educational Master Plan, 2008*
- *Educational Master Plan, Data Updates, 2011-12*
- *College Index, 2008/9-2011/12*
- *Five in Five College Strategies*
- *Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011*
- *Student Success (course completion and retention) data from the "Core Program and Student Success Indicators";*
- *Other reports published by PRIE regarding student success*

- Previous Program Review and Planning reports
- other department records

V. REFLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND PROGRAM/STUDENT SUCCESS

- Educational Master Plan, 2008
- Educational Master Plan, Data Updates, 2011-12
- College Index, 2008/9-2011/12
- Five in Five College Strategies
- Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011
- Student Success (course completion and retention) data from the "Core Program and Student Success Indicators";
- Other reports published by PRIE regarding student success
- Previous Program Review and Planning reports
- Other department records

a. About SWOT Analysis:

SWOT Analysis is a strategic planning tool used to evaluate the **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats** involved in a project or initiative. It involves specifying the objective of the venture or project and identifying the internal and external factors that are favorable and unfavorable to achieving that objective. SWOT analysis considers both internal and external conditions.

Strengths: attributes of the organization that are helpful to achieving the objective.

Weaknesses: attributes of the organization or that are harmful to achieving the objective.

Opportunities: external conditions that are helpful to achieving the objective.

Threats: external conditions that are harmful to achieving the objective

b. Reflect on data from "Core Program and Student Success Indicators"

VI. Action Steps and Outcomes

- Educational Master Plan, 2008
- Educational Master Plan, Data Updates, 2011-12
- College Index, 2008/9-2011/12
- Five in Five College Strategies
- Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011
- GE- or Certificate SLOs
- College Index, 2009-2010
- Course SLOs
- Department records
- Core Program and Student Success Indicators
- Previous Program Review and Planning reports
- Division work plan

VII. SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH PROGRAM ACTION STEPS

- Educational Master Plan, 2008
- Educational Master Plan, Data Updates, 2011-12
- College Index, 2008/9-2011/12
- Five in Five College Strategies
- Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011
- GE- or Certificate SLOs
- Course SLOs

- *Department records*
- *Core Program and Student Success Indicators*
- *previous Program Review and Planning reports*

VIII. Course Outlines

- *Department records*
- *College Catalog*
- *Committee On Instruction*
- *Course Outlines (online)*
- *Office of the Vice President of Instruction*
- *Division Dean*