

PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE 2015-2016

Program: History

Division: ALSS

Date: October 12, 2015

Writer(s): Stuart McElderry

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Stuart McElderry

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Purpose: To document significant program accomplishments, plans and needs between Triennial Program Reviews. This update should provide a snapshot of your program.

Time Frame: This update should reflect on program status during the 2014-15 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2016-17.

Topics: The first section of this Program Review Update focuses on general program reflection and planning. The second and third sections focus on reflection and planning regarding Student Learning Outcomes.

Scope: While this Program Review Update does ask for some analysis of data, detailed data reports in the form of appendices should be reserved for the Triennial Program Review.

Instructions:

- 1) Please fill in the following information as completely as possible.
 - 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, please write "No Changes Since the Program Planning Update."
 - 3) Send an electronic copy of this form to the Program Review Committee Chair and your Dean by _____.
-

Part One: Program Snapshot

A. Have there been any significant changes to your program, your program's data or your program's needs since the previous Program Planning Update?

If there are any changes, describe the relevant information and its significance in the space below.

These changes might have originated from within the program or because of an external source (the institution or the state, for example). Possible sources of relevant information might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Data generated by your program
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research
- CEMC Data
- Retirements
- State Mandates
- Labor Market Data

The most significant change has been the retirement of Jane McCoy bringing the number of full-time faculty from three to two. The History program needed a new full-time hire for several years (see previous program reviews) and now, more than ever, needs to be prioritized in the colleges hiring process. Not only is it imperative to replace Jane McCoy, but the History program also needs to hire an additional full-time faculty member in order to meet state mandates and to better serve the students of Las Positas College.

B. What objectives, initiatives, or plans from the 2014 Program Planning Update (PPU) have been achieved and how?

N/A. The History program did not submit a 2014 Program Planning Update. This failure was due to a lack of communication between Jane McCoy, the program coordinator at the time, and the other full-time faculty—Dr. Bengiveno and Dr. McElderry—who believed Ms. McCoy was handling the task of writing the update. Only after the deadline had passed did Drs. Bengiveno and McElderry learn that the PPU had not been submitted.

C. What obstacles has your program faced in achieving objectives, initiatives, or plans?

The primary obstacle faced by the History program is a failure of communication among the full-time faculty members. Unfortunately, there has been little in the way of departmental coordination and collegiality over the past two or three years. We believe this problem will be corrected through greater effort at communication on the part of the remaining full-time faculty and the addition of a new full-time colleague.

D. What are your most important plans (either new or continuing) for next year?

1. To hire at least one (hopefully two) new full-time faculty member(s) to bring the program into state compliance with respect to FT/PT ratio and to inject new life and collegiality into the department
2. To get the program up to speed on SLOs and other program coordination and maintenance issues.

E. Do plans listed under question (D) connect to this year's planning priorities (listed below)? If so, explain how they connect.

Planning Priorities for 2015-16

- ***Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards***
- ***Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance***
- ***Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes***
- ***Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses.***

Yes. The hiring of new full-time faculty will enable improved communication, coordination, and collegiality within the program and better enable it to meet ACCJC standards. It will also help increase the number of SLOs assessed and evaluated in an ongoing manner by program faculty.

F. Instructional programs: Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion? yes no

(This data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/y9ZBmt>)

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

N/A (see response to B)

G. How have students been impacted by the work of your program since the last Program Planning Update (PPU)?

N/A (see response to B)

Part Two: SLO/SAO Assessment Review

Review your program's SLO assessment results for AY 2014-2015 and respond to the following questions.

- A. Discuss how assessment results in at least one course in the program indicate success in student learning (OR) Discuss how assessment results of at least one SAO in the program indicate success in service to students.**

History 7 & 8 assessment results in those sections where SLO data was assessed indicate success in the critical thinking SLO in which students are asked to use historical evidence to make cogent historical arguments in essay form. In Dr. McElderry's sections of both 7 and 8 students showed measurable improvement in understanding how historians use evidence to advance particular interpretive arguments.

- B. Discuss assessment results that indicate a need for improvement.**

In Dr. McElderry's History 2 sections for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015, students did not show the same degree of learning how to use historical evidence to make critical judgements of historical interpretation as the students in the History 7 and 8 sections for the same period.

- C. Instructional Programs: For the course(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program, or someone in your program, made changes or plans to make changes in pedagogy as a result of SLO assessment results.**

Non-Instructional Programs: For the areas(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program made changes or plans to make changes as a result of SAO assessment results.

Beginning in Fall 2015, Dr. McElderry has addressed the assessment results from History 2 by altering the reading requirements (more short, non-fiction readings as opposed to longer works of fiction) so as to enable students to better see the connection between evidence and historical interpretation.

- D. Instructional Programs Only: Give an example of a change in the number of units and/or lab hours based on assessment data, if applicable.**

N/A

- E. Instructional Programs: Discuss how distance education course assessment results compare to face-to-face courses, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program has distance education courses.)**

Non-Instructional Programs: Discuss how SAO assessment results for online services compare to face-to-face services, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program provides services online.)

Distance education course assessment results compare favorably to face-to-face courses.

F. Did your program discover the need for additional resources (for AY 15-16 or 2016-17) based on the assessment results? YES X NO

If yes, please explain.

While this may not relate in any measurable way to assessment results, the History Program continues to need a fully funded Library in order to maximize teaching and learning. The program has a constant need for updated CDs, DVDs, books and journals. Additionally, discipline faculty routinely schedule course time in the library where library faculty teach students how to access research materials for the purpose of term papers and other projects.

Part Three: SLO/SAO Continuous Improvement Process

A. SLO Planning through AY 2016-17

As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program's plans starting now and continuing through the academic year 2016-17. Focus on how the program's SLO process will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.

1. SLO/SAO assessments: How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning or services? (*NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. Each program must assess at least 25% of its courses every semester. Programs with SAOs should assess at least 50% of their SAOs every year.*)

Examples might include (Your responses may vary.):

- changing number of units/lab hours
- changing pedagogy/curriculum
- changing assessments
- changing service hours
- changing modes of service delivery

As a program, History is behind in the development and annual assessment of course and program level SLOs. This is partly due to the program's slow start in developing department-wide means of communicating the need to do so, especially for the many adjunct faculty who teach in the program, and to a lack of coordination among the full-time faculty (caused in part by retirements and recent sabbatical and workload banking leaves). We understand this is really no excuse and mean to make SLOs a program priority moving forward, especially now with more district support to achieve these goals among adjunct faculty. More specifically, we intend to add additional SLOs to our courses and to create more particular SLOs for each course, rather than using one for every course in the program.

2. Have your assessment results shown a need for new/revised SLO/SAOs? YES NO

If yes, complete the table below:

Estimated number of courses for which SLOs will be written or revised:	8
Estimated number of SAOs that will be written or revised:	

- a. What courses or SAOs will your program assess during this academic year (2015-16)?

History 7, History 8, History 2, History 32

- b. Instructional programs only: In order to budget to pay part-time faculty to work on SLOs during the academic year 2015-16, estimate the number of part-time faculty in your program who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

Number of Part-Time faculty who will participate in the SLO process (creating, assessing or discussing SLOs)	
Fall 2015	4
Spring 2016	8