College of San Mateo

Program Review Submission

2014-2015 Instructional Program Review

Program Name: **History**
Program Contact: **Titus, Michele**
Academic Year: **2014-2015**
Status: **Submitted for review**
Updated on: **04/27/2015 03:07 PM**

1. Description of Program

Provide a brief description of the program and how it supports the college's **College Mission and Diversity Statements**, **Institutional Priorities, 2013/14-2015/16**, **5 in 5 College Strategies, Spring 2011**, and other **Institutional Program Planning** as appropriate.

The History Department offers seven courses that are primarily taken by students who are transferring and/or seeking an AA/AS degree: History of Western Civilization (I & II), History of American Civilization, United States History (I & II), Women in American History, and California History. These are all 3 unit courses, and additional experimental courses and special project courses are also offered.

In 2012-13, the AA-T History transfer major was first offered, and 8 students received the AA-T degree in History in 2014. The History major prepares students for transfer to a baccalaureate institution for a Bachelor's degree in History or a related discipline. History course work in general is helpful to the student who intends to eventually pursue graduate studies in such diverse fields as history, education, and law. Most career opportunities associated with this discipline require the minimum of a B.A. degree. Some business firms and government agencies seek persons with a broad overview and perspective of historical phases and processes of change.

The AA-T in History requires students to complete a 12 unit core consisting of Western Civilization (I&II) (Hist 100&101) and United States History (I&II) (Hist 201&202), with two more courses (6 units) from Group A, which offers a selection of courses in History, Ethnic Studies, Spanish and Chinese. Group B lists courses that fulfill the humanities or social sciences related to history, and students select a specified course from history, administration of justice, anthropology, business, economics, geography, political science, psychology, sociology, or digital media.

2. Student Learning and Program Data

A. Discuss Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

1. Reflect on recent SLO assessment results for courses offered by the program. Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement.

History faculty completed assessments of SLOs for all courses in the Fall semester, 2011 and those results indicate that the faculty was successful in communicating the subject matter. The plan was to reassess using a staggered plan model; History 102 was assessed in 2013; and it was intended that History 100 level courses be assessed in 2014, History 200 level in 2015, and electives in 2016. Unanticipated faculty retirements will require some adjustments to the plan.

Assessment results for 2013-14 for courses not reported in the 2014 program review are as follows: Hist 260, Women in American History, and Hist 310, California History, were surveyed (10/14/2013 and 9/18/2013), with 5 questions which were specific to the SLOs for that course, and although 80-90% of the students surveyed indicated they felt they had achieved the goals (as outlined in TracDat), however, the instructor, Michael Svanevik, felt that in his professional opinion, the students had not actually demonstrated that they had mastered the SLOs. This seems like a logical conclusion, since only 49.2% of students in history courses received a C or better grade.

A direct measure might provide a more accurate method than survey technique and should be included in addition to any survey methods.

Due to the previous and current retirements in the History Dept., SLO creation and assessment will be addressed in the near future by new faculty currently in the interviewing process.

2. Comment on the success rates in the program SLOs that are aligned with specific course SLOs. What do the program SLO and course data reveal about students completing the program? Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement. Is the alignment between course and program SLOs appropriate and informative? See **course-to-program SLO alignment mapping**.

Program SLOs have not been aligned with specific course SLOs due to the previous and current retirements in the History Dept. and will be addressed by the new hire(s). No data is listed in TracDat under "Ad hoc" course SLO alignment to GE and Program SLOs as created by David Locke.

3. Evaluate the program SLOs in relation to survey data from the degree and certificate award earners survey. What does the survey data reveal about the effectiveness of the program SLOs? Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement.

8 AA-T History degrees were awarded in 2014, however since Program SLOs had not been coordinated at that time, History AA-T degree surveys could not be prepared at that time. Program SLOs are not currently present in TracDat data.

4. Describe any additional methods used to assess program SLOs and reflect on the results of those assessments.

In light of the current retirement of the full time faculty of the History Dept., the current hiring for replacement faculty will need to re-examine the SLOs for the department and the assessment methods used previously. The survey method should be combined with an additional direct measure, and alignment with Program SLOs is also needed.

5. For any courses in the program that satisfy a GE requirement, which GE SLOs are supported or reinforced by the course SLOs? What do assessment results for the course SLOs reveal about student attainment of the GE SLOs? See **GE SLO Alignment Summary Report** or **All Courses GE SLO Alignment Data**.

GE SLO alignment is listed under "Related Program and Institutional SLOs" in TracDat data entered by History Dept. faculty and indicate each course SLO and the GE SLO that it is aligned to.

B. Student Success Indicators

1. Review **Student Success and Core Program Indicators** and discuss any differences in student success indicators across demographic variables. Also refer to the **College Index** and other relevant sections of the **Educational Master Plan: Update, 2012**, e.g., Student Outcomes and Student Outcomes: Transfer. Basic Skills programs should also refer to **ARCC** data.

Student Success indicators suggest that the percentages have remained fairly consistent from 2010-11 to 2013-14. 49.6%-52%-51.8%-49.2%, which is generally lower than the CASS division success rates of 68.2% (2013-14). Retention rates have also been fairly consistent, 77.9%-76.3%-76.5%-72.9%, and a bit lower than CASS division retention rates of 85.4% (2012-14). Enrollment has decreased steadily from 1249 students in 2010-11, to 1113, then 1094, then 897 in 2013-14. This may be due, in part, to the loss of esteemed faculty due to retirements, and the offering of online classes in history offered at our sister colleges.

The highest success was reported among Asian students, 67.6%, lowest success was among Pacific Islander students, 33.3%, and both were improved compared to the previous year (2012-13: Asian 59.8%, Pacific Islander 25%). Black students also improved from 30.3% to 45.5% for the same years, similar to Hispanic students who improved from 43.6% to 46%, Filipino students increased from 43.4% to 46.3%, and White students who increased from 56.9% to 58%. There were 3 Native American students with 33.3% success.

Females (50.6%) and males (53.7%) had similar success rates. The highest success rates were among students ages 40+, about 31 students. This may be due to greater maturity and an increased awareness of the significance and relevance of history, compared to younger students.

Summer term was compiled separately, and showed an increase from 166 students (2013) to 207 students (2014), with higher success rates

than fall and spring, although a small decrease from the previous year: 2013-14=77.3% compared to 2012-13=83.1% with 92.8% retention for 2013-14, compared to 90.4% (2012-13). Summer students tend to be more committed and include students from four year universities who are more focused on their goals, and more experienced as students.

2. Discuss any differences in student success indicators across modes of delivery (on-campus versus distance education). Refer to **Delivery Mode Course Comparison**.

The history department has a background of offering distance learning courses. During the 1990s and early 2000s television courses were regularly offered in History 201 and 202. The U.S. History courses tended to have robust enrollment and are currently offered online (listed as "TBA") at our sister colleges, Canada and Skyline. Canada also offers World History online and Skyline offers History of Ethnic Groups online.

More recently History 201 and 202 have been offered online. However, they have not been offered this academic year, primarily because the part-time faculty who taught them retired in 2013.

The History Dept. has seen the retirement of one full time faculty member at the end of 2014 and is anticipating the retirement of the other at the end of 2015 college year. Hiring is in progress for the History Dept., and online experience may be a consideration, for reviving the online versions of 201 and 202.

C. Program Efficiency Indicators. Do we deliver programs efficiently given our resources?

Summarize trends in program efficiency as indicated in the **Student Success and Core Program Indicators** (LOAD, Full-time and Part-time FTEF, etc.)

LOAD (WSCH/FTEF) has increased from 2012-13 (457.4) to 524.7 (2013-14). This was more similar to previous years, 2010-11 (593.9), 2011-12 (519.6). Full time FTEF decreased from 6 to 5 and adjunct FTEF decreased from 1.2 to 0.2, total FTEF =5.2 or 96.2% full time. This did not include summer term, which had a 2013 summer LOAD of 441.1 compared to 546.6 for 2014 summer term.

The History Dept. has been impacted by several retirements, past and present. LOAD (524.7) was comparable to CASS division LOAD of 497.

3. Additional Factors

Discuss additional factors as applicable that impact the program, including changes in student populations, state-wide initiatives, transfer requirements, advisory committee recommendations, legal mandates, workforce development and employment opportunities, community needs. See **Institutional Research** as needed.

The History faculty has been concerned about the ongoing trend of students enrolling with weaker reading and writing skills. In the early 1990s the college adopted as an institutional goal to develop "autonomous, self-directed learners." This was a worthy goal and one that the Reading Department addressed by offering study skills classes linked to specific courses. Unfortunately, these courses were dropped several years ago during a period of financial austerity and to date, have never been revived. The Learning Center does not appear to offer these types of services.

History courses do not have prerequisites, however do have "Recommended Preparation" for all courses, suggesting that students complete English 838 or 848 and a READ 400 level course.

4. Planning

A. Results of Program Plans and Actions

Describe results, including measurable outcomes, from plans and actions in recent program reviews.

The previous program review reported that the results of the first full round of SLO assessments demonstrated that the department was successfully teaching in 2011, however recent retirements have made it difficult to have a complete and thorough result for all courses currently. Comments by department member, Michael Svanevik, based on his SLO surveys for 2012 and 2013, suggested the survey technique was not an accurate means of assessment and a more direct method may need to be developed by the new faculty.

B. Program Vision

What is the program's *vision* for sustaining and improving student learning and success over the next three years? Make connections to the **College Mission and Diversity Statements**, **Institutional Priorities, 2013/14-2015/16**, and other **Institutional Program Planning** as appropriate. Address discussion in the Student Learning and Program Data section: SLO assessment results and trends in student success indicators.
[**Note**: Specific plans to be implemented in the next year should be entered in C of the Planning section.
CTE programs must address changes in the context of completion and employment rates, anticipated labor demand, and any overlap with similar programs in the area as noted in D1 and D2 of the Career Technical Education section.]

Previous program reviews hoped to increase use of the learning center beyond having history tutors and connect with the 5 in 5 plan to "coordinate all learning support services offered in the Learning center." History classes offer a level of rigor which challenges students to develop an intellectual skill which improves students' success as they transfer (as they have found anecdotally from former students) and which promotes academic excellence. The extensive reading assignments in the History Dept. require students to be at a relatively high level in order to succeed. This may explain the relatively low success rates in history courses.

Student success in the History Dept. is an area of concern, 49.2% is well below the CASS division success rate of 68.2% and retention is also lower, at 72.9% compared to 85.4%. The recruitment of new faculty will hopefully address this concern.

1. To guide future faculty and staff development initiatives, describe the professional activities that would be most effective in carrying out the program's vision to improve student learning and success.

Courses offered by the History Department have been taught by experienced predominately full time faculty members who have been active in participating in a host of professional enrichment activities during the past decade.

Due to past and present retirements, new faculty are being recruited. New courses in history could be developed, Skyline College offers a greater variety in areas of ethnic history, Chinese history, etc., for example, as well as online courses.

2. To guide future collaboration across student services, learning support centers, and instructional programs, describe the interactions that would help the program to improve student success.

There needs to be greater discussion between faculty and these groups mentioned above in order to ensure that these groups are addressing the faculty-perceived needs of the students.

3. To guide the **Institutional Planning Budget Committee** (IPBC) in long-range planning, identify any major changes in resource needs anticipated during the next three years. Examples: faculty retirements, equipment obsolescence, space allocation.

See the Resource Requests section below to enter itemized resource requests for next year.
Leave sections blank if no major changes are anticipated.

Faculty

There were three full time faculty in Fall, 2013, two retired and the third will retire at the end of the 2015 college year, leaving one adjunct. Recruitment and hiring is in process.

Equipment and Technology

Instructional Materials

Classified Staff

Facilities

C. Program Plans and Actions to Improve Student Success

Prioritize the plans to be carried out next year to sustain and improve student success. Briefly describe each plan and how it supports the **Institutional Priorities, 2013/14-2015/16**. For each plan, list actions and measurable outcomes. (Plans may extend beyond a single year.)

Plan 1

Title:To be developed by new faculty in hiring process at this time.

Description

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)

Plan 2

4T

Title:
4T

Description
4T

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
4T		4T
4T		4T
4T		4T

5. Resource Requests

Itemized Resource Requests

List the resources needed for ongoing program operation.

Faculty
NOTE: To make a faculty position request, complete **Full-time Faculty Position Request Form** and notify your Dean. This request is separate from the program review.

Full-time faculty requests	Number of positions
Current hiring in progress, additional requests may follow	

Equipment and Technology

Description	Cost

Instructional Material

Description	Cost

Classified Staff

Description	Cost

Facilities

For immediate or routine facilities requests, submit a CSM Facility Project Request Form.

Description	Cost

---

6. Program Maintenance

A. Course Outline Updates

Review the **course outline update record**. List the courses that will be updated in the next academic year. For each course that will be updated, provide a faculty contact and the planned submission month. See the **Committee on Instruction website** for **course submission instructions**. Contact your division's **COI representatives** if you have questions about submission deadlines.
Career and Technical Education courses must be updated every two years.

Courses to be updated	Faculty contact	Submission month
HIST 102 History of American Civilization (last update 3/2006)	to be determined	March
HIST 260 Women in American History (last updated 1/2006)	to be determined	January
HIST 202 United States History II (last updated 3/2010, HIST 201, U.S. History I was updated 4/2012)	to be determined	March

In the spring semester of 2012 the History Department updated most of our G.E. relevant courses in a re-articulation effort with the UC system. These courses included History 100, 101, 201, and 202. In the spring of 2013 History 310 and 315 were updated. History 260 has not been offered this academic year, due in part to the retirement of the adjunct faculty member who formerly taught it. Neither of the remaining faculty had expertise in this field and hence did not feel competent to revise the 260 outline.

B. Website Review

Review the program's website(s) annually and update as needed.

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
to be determined	

The History program's website needs to be updated. It is quite basic in content and could be expanded up. When the current History position is filled, this will be part of the their responsibility.

C. SLO Assessment Contacts

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
to be determined	