

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Program Name: Political Science
Faculty Contact: Lee Miller

Academic Year: 2012-2013
Program Review Submission Date: March 25, 2013

I. Description of Program

Provide a brief description of the program and how it supports the college's [College Mission and Diversity Statements](#), [Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#), [5 in 5 College Strategies, Spring 2011](#), and other [institutional planning documents](#) as appropriate.

The program offers a variety of courses, which are taken primarily by students who are transferring and/or seeking an AA/AS degree. Most of the courses emphasize the challenges faced by the diverse groups that make up society, and the impact of politics and public policy on those groups. The program actively collaborates with the Learning Center's peer tutoring program, with the aim of enhancing student success.

II. Summary of Student and Program Data

A. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Summarize recent SLO assessments, identify trends, and discuss areas in need of improvement.

SLOs have been assessed for 3 of the 7 courses offered by the department. The 3 courses assessed are the courses taught by the one full-time faculty member in the department. The lack of assessment of the other courses reflects difficulty in gaining the cooperation of part-time faculty in SLO assessment.

For the 3 courses assessed, success rates have improved significantly. For example, success rate on SLO #1 for PLSC 210 rose from 57% in fall 2008 to 67% in spring 2010. Similar gains were observed in all SLOs in all 3 courses. This may reflect success of efforts to improve student success on the SLOs. Continued efforts in this regard will hopefully yield continuing improvements.

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.

Students success % increased slightly from 60.8% in the 2009-10 academic year to 62% in the 2011-12 academic year. This may be explained by a slight increase in the withdrawal rate over the same period, from 14.9% to 16.1%, and a slight drop in retention rate over the same period, from 85.1% to 83.9%. Success rates increased across all ethnic groups besides Asians and Filipinos. In the case of Filipinos, the drop may merely reflect volatility associated with a small sample size (60 students in 2011-12). In the case of Asians, the drop should not be a cause for alarm, in that the success rate of Asian students (63.8% in 2011-12) remains only slightly lower than that of the group with the highest success rate, white students (65.6% in 2011-12).

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

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

The success rate of traditional classes continues to exceed that of distance education classes by some 20 percentage points. There are a number of potential explanations for this:

- (a) Selection bias (students choosing distance education over traditional classes under the mistaken belief that it will be easier).
- (b) Inherent challenges associated with distance education. (Success in distance education may require students to be more self-motivated than traditional courses.)
- (c) Skill level of the instructor to teach distance education courses. (Distance education courses have been taught primary by a single instructor, while traditional courses have been taught by multiple instructors).

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 decreased over the period from 2009-10 to 2011-12, from 519.3 to 466.7. This was primarily due to the fact that WSCH declined a more rapid rate (3704 to 3111.3) than FTEF (7.1 to 6.7) over the period in question. The decline in WSCH seems to have ended, based on anecdotal evidence reported by faculty members in the department that the enrollment in their classes has increased markedly in the 2012-13 academic year.

D. 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
None		
		Tab to add rows

E. Website Review

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

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
Lee Miller	3/2014
	Tab to add rows

F. Additional Career Technical Education Data – CTE programs only. (This information is required by California Ed. Code 78016.)

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

1. Review the program's [Gainful Employment Disclosure Data](#), [External Community](#), and other institutional research or labor market data as applicable. Explain how the program meets a documented labor market demand without unnecessary duplication of other training programs in the area. Summarize student outcomes in terms of degrees, certificates, and employment. Identify areas of accomplishment and areas of concern.

[Click here to enter Gainful Employment Disclosure Data narrative](#)

2. Review and update the program's Advisory Committee information. Provide the date of most recent advisory committee meeting.

[Click here to update the Advisory Committee information](#)

III. Student Learning Outcomes Scheduling and Alignment

A. *Course SLO Assessment*

Explain any recent or projected modifications to the course SLO assessment process or schedule.

The full-time instructor in the program has assessed SLOs for all courses that he teaches. It does not appear that the part-time instructors have been assessing SLOs. The full-time instructor has consulted with the dean regarding this issue, but no remedy was suggested.

The full-time instructor in the program has modified his method of instruction to include the use of WebAccess online assignments and quizzes. The instructor plans to employ this tool to automate the assessment of SLOs. This process will be phased in over the next academic year.

B. *Program SLO Assessment*

Explain any recent or projected modifications to the program SLO assessment process or schedule.

In 2012, the department gained approval for program SLOs (designed to align with GE SLOs) and also completed the required course outline updates for 3 courses. For those 3 courses, the SLOs were modified to align with the program SLOs. As the scheduled course outline updates are completed for additional courses, the SLOs of those courses will also be modified to align with program SLOs.

C. *SLO Alignment*

Discuss how Course SLOs support Program SLOs. Discuss how Course and/or Program SLOs support Institutional/GE SLOs. Refer to [TracDat](#) related Program and Institutional SLO reports.

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Program SLO language was drafted to match the language in the GE SLOs:

1. Effectively communicate the impact of state and non-state actors on the development and implementation of policy. (Effective Communication)
2. Critically analyze political theories and ideologies. (Critical Thinking)
3. Discuss the impact of ethnic, cultural and economic diversity on political issues and policy. (Social Awareness and Diversity)
4. Evaluate ethical issues and conflicts inherent to political issues. (Ethical Responsibility)

Course SLOs for 3 courses have been modified to align with the program SLOs. Additional courses will be modified to align during the scheduled course outline update process.

IV. 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 program has been experiencing upheaval associated with major changes to the curriculum. In the past, political science students fulfilled two CSU requirements (US Constitution, California State and Local Government) by taking 3 units of PLSC 210 (US Constitution) and 2 units of PLSC 310 (California State and Local Government) or 5 units of PLSC 200 (both requirements).

In Fall 2010, at the request of the dean, the course outline for PLSC 210 (American Politics) was modified to include state and local politics. As a result, this course began to meet two CSU requirements (both US Constitution and California State and Local Government), rather than just 1 (US Constitution). Based on the premise that 3 units of PLSC 210 fulfill the same requirements as 5 units of PLSC 200, the dean ceased offering PLSC 200 and PLSC 310. This resulted in significant challenges in the scheduling of PLSC courses.

In addition, the fact that PLSC 210 now meets 2 requirements has led to a steep decline in student interest in PLSC 215, which is very similar to PLSC 210, but meets only 1 requirement. For example, a course in PLSC 215 scheduled for spring 2013 was cancelled due to enrollment in the single digits.

This has resulted in a significant reduction in political science course offerings available to students.

V. Institutional Planning

A. Results of Plans and Actions

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

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

The 2012 program review indicated plans to develop an AA-T degree in political science. This goal was accomplished with the approval of the AA-T degree in political science by the Committee on Instruction in fall 2012.

In addition, in the previous academic year, we began the process of articulation of all of our courses with 13 comparable courses at our 6 primary transfer institutions: San Francisco State, San Jose State, CSU East Bay, Sonoma State, UC Berkeley, UC Santa Cruz, and UC Davis. As of this date, 5 additional courses have been articulated and the remaining 8 are under review by the transfer institution.

B. Program Vision

What is the program's vision for sustaining and improving student learning and success during the *next six years*? Make connections to the [College Mission and Diversity Statements](#), [Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#), and other [institutional planning documents](#) as appropriate. Address trends in the SLO assessment results and student success indicators and data noted in Section II. Summary of Student and Program Data.

[Note: 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 Sections II.F.1 and II.F.2.]

[Note: Specific plans to be implemented in the *next year* should be entered in Section V.C.]

The Department of Political Science is committed to improving student success (Institutional Priority #1), promoting academic excellence (Institutional Priority #2), and being a relevant, high-quality program (Institutional Priority #3). The curriculum in all political science courses emphasizes the values stated in the Diversity Statement: "a policy of inclusiveness that recognizes, values and reflects the diversity of the community we serve." Political Science strives to "foster a dynamic learning and working environment that encourages multiple perspectives and the free exchange of ideas. We abide by the principle of equal opportunity for all without regard to gender, color, race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, age, economic background, sexual orientation, and physical, learning, and psychological differences." These are core values in the instruction provided by the Department of Political Science. We will continue to follow these goals and promote these values over the next 6 years.

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

Distance education students are currently underserved by the department. After the program lost to retirement one of our two distance education faculty, the distance education course offerings were reduced to one course per semester. If the remaining full-time instructor were to receive STOT training for teaching distance education courses, it would be possible to offer additional distance education courses, enabling the department to better serve the needs of distance education students.

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.

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Political Science currently collaborates with the Learning Center's peer tutoring program. Continuing this collaboration will help the program to improve student success.

3. To guide the [Institutional Planning Committee](#) (IPC) in long-range planning, discuss any major changes in resource needs anticipated in the *next six years*. Examples: faculty retirements, equipment obsolescence, space allocation. Leave sections blank if no major changes are anticipated. Specific resource requests for the next academic year should be itemized in Section VI.A below.

Faculty: Over the past decade the department has lost 3 full-time faculty members to retirement but hired only 1 full-time faculty member. As a result, the department currently has only 1 full-time faculty member; the majority of courses are taught by part-time faculty. This presents significant challenges. For example, part-time faculty have not participated in assessing SLOs. The department requests that an additional full-time faculty member be hired.

Equipment and Technology: N/A

Instructional Materials: N/A

Classified Staff: N/A

Facilities: N/A

C. 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, 2008-2013](#). For each plan, list actions and measurable outcomes.

Plan 1

Title:

Automate SLO assessment

Description

Assess course SLOs via WebAccess. This will facilitate the collection of data on student success, making it easier to assess what modifications in instruction need to take place in order to enhance student success.

Action(s)

Completion Date

Measurable Outcome(s)

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Assess SLOs for one course per year via WebAccess	Choose Year or Semester/Year	Course SLO assessment data for one course uploaded to TrackDat
4T		4T
4T		4T

Plan 2

Title:

4T

Description

4T

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

For additional plans, cut/paste from above and insert here. Or add an additional page. Number your additional plans accordingly.

[Note: Itemize in Section VI.A. Any additional resources required to implement plans.]

VI. Resource Requests

A. Itemized Resource Requests

List the resources needed for ongoing program operation and to implement the plans listed above.

Faculty

Full-time faculty requests (identify specialty if applicable)	Number of positions
Specialties in American Politics plus Methodology or Political Theory	1

Complete [Full-Time Faculty Position Request Form](#) for each position.

Description of reassigned or hourly time for prioritized plans	Plan #(s)	Cost
N/A		

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Equipment and Technology

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost
N/A	

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan #s)	Cost

Instructional Materials

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost
N/A	

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan #s)	Cost

Classified Staff

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost
N/A	

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan #s)	Cost

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Facilities

For immediate or routine facilities requests, submit a [CSM Facility Project Request Form](#).

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan #(s)	Cost
N/A		

B. Cost for Prioritized Plans

Use the resources costs from Section VI.A. above to provide the total cost for each plan.

Plan #	Plan Title	Total Cost
1		
2		
	For additional plans, add rows and number accordingly.	