Instructional Annual Program Review and Planning Update Form Fall 2023

BACKGROUND:

Program review is an integral part of the campus planning process. As programs and areas monitor their progress on the current comprehensive four-year program review, changes in need and scope can be expected. This Annual PR Update form is designed to outline and request modifications to the current program review that occur between comprehensive four-year review cycles, as needed.

Examples of a requested change include new information such as action plans, outcomes modifications, personnel changes, technology needs, and capital expenditures requirements. As programs and areas monitor their progress on the previous comprehensive four-year program review, the form provides the basis to suggest a change in plans and processes to improve student success and institutional effectiveness.

DIRECTIONS:

This form shall be completed annually by **all** programs.

- Instructional programs must submit their Annual Program Review Update form to their dean by 5pm on Monday, November 27, 2023.
- Deans will forward the completed form to the Program Review and Planning Committee Chairs by 5pm on Monday, December 4, 2023.
- Questions or concerns?
  - Committee contacts:
    - Co-chairs Mary Bogan (mbogan@fullcoll.edu) and Bridget Kominek (bkominek@fullcoll.edu)
    - Division representatives on the Program Review and Planning Committee
  - Office of Institutional Effectiveness

SUBMISSION:

Program: **History Dept.**   Division: **Social Sciences**   Date: **27-Nov 23**

[X] We have reviewed our most recent self-study and **have not identified** any significant changes that necessitate resource requests for the upcoming academic year. *(Complete part 1 only)*

[ ] We have reviewed our most recent self-study and **have identified** significant changes that necessitate additional resource requests, which are attached in our submission. *(Complete parts 1 and 2)*

Principal Author Signature: Printed Name: **Josh Ashenmiller** Date: **11/27/23**

Dean Signature: Printed Name: **Jorge Gamboa**   Date: **12/4/23**

Part 1: Review of Data

Institution Set Standards (ISS)

1. Use the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) to review your course completion and success rates and provide a comparison to the Institution Set Standards for course completion and success rates.

    > After August 15, you will be able to access PDF copies of your program's ISS data here: ISS_ISLO_Documents. The folder will also include instructions to access Tableau dashboards with the same information. The instruction document will also provide more context about how these standards are calculated. If you have any questions, please reach out to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at ie@fullcoll.edu.

2. If your program meets or exceeds the standard for completion and success, to what do you attribute your success? If your program does not meet this standard, please examine the possible reasons, and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate.

Overall, the History Department (68.5% success, 86.2% completion) exceeded the ISSs (62%, 74.1%) in 2022-23.

The following course fell below *both* ISSs (62% success, 74.1% completion) in 2022-23:
WMNS 100 (49.3%, 61.2%)

For many years, the Women's Studies 100 class has been taught and managed by the Ethnic Studies Dept., not by the History Dept., so we have no comment on those numbers.

The following courses fell below the ISSs for success (62%), but were above the ISS for completion (74.1%) in 2022-23:
HIST 110 (55.9%, 83.8%)
HIST 127 (44.3%, 76.3%)

For many years, HIST 127 sections have been taught online at the request of the instructor. Success rates for online classes are usually much lower than success rates for in-person classes. That being said, a 44.3% pass rate seems excessively low. Those of us who regularly teach U.S. History prefer to teach the two-course sequence, 170 and 171, because covering all of U.S. history in one semester in HIST 127 is just "too much information" for many students. Some members of the department have suggested maybe not offering HIST 127 anymore. The 170-171 sequence might serve them better, but the department has not reached consensus on this.

HIST 110 is just a weird course that seems to attract flocks of "Game of Thrones" fans who are not very serious about studying history.

HIST 112 was left off the provided PDF, even though we taught nine sections of 112 in 2022-23. We looked up the numbers for HIST 112 on Tableau, and for 2022-23 they were 63.6% success and 88.4% completion, above the College ISSs.

The following groups of students underperformed, passing at rates below the ISS of 62% for all History sections combined:
- Black/African American: 50.6%

- Native American: 25%

The following groups of students underperformed, passing at rates below the ISS of 62% in certain History courses:

- Black/African American (33.3% in 110, 33.3% in 112, 40% in 113, 0% in 127, 0% in 165, 60% in 170, 60% in 171, 50% in 190, 0% in 191, 50% in 270, and 0% in 275)
- Filipino (0% in 127)
- Hispanic (43.5% in 110, 61.4% in 112, 38.7% in 127, and 50% in 190)
- Native American (0% in 170, and 0% in 171)
- Pacific Islander (0% in 112, 50% in 171, and 33% in 270)
- Two or More (53.8% in 110, 60% in 112, 50% in 127, 50% in 190, and 50% in 275)
- White (40.2% in 113, 60% in 127, 41.7% in 165, and 55% in 191)

It is difficult to discern patterns in these results. For example, many groups of students struggled to pass HIST 110 and 127 last year, but that was also true for all groups of students. The pass rate for all students who took 110 was 55.9% and for 127 it was 44.3%. For another example, there appears to be an achievement gap between white students and Black/AA students. White students fell below the ISS in only three courses, whereas Black/AA students fell below the standard in eleven courses. But in HIST 113, white and Black/AA students failed the class at almost exactly the same rate.

Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs)--Global Awareness ISLO.

1. Describe your program's participation in assessment of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO's). Specifically, how does your CSLO attainment, for the courses that are mapped to the Global Awareness ISLO, compare to Fullerton College's ISLO attainment?

   After August 15, you will be able to access PDF copies of your program's ISLO data here: ISS_ISLO_Documents. The folder will also include instructions to access Tableau dashboards with the same information. Please reach out to your SLOA representative if you have questions.

2. Does the SLO data show significant achievement gaps among demographic groups in your program? If so, where are the gaps and what steps can your program take to shrink them? If not, to what do you attribute your success in minimizing the achievement gap?

As we understand it, the Global Awareness ISLO is the one on pages 5-6 of the "Collegewide Performance Data_Disaggregated by Race" PDF: "Analyze the interconnectedness of racial, cultural, political, social, economic, and environmental issues from multiple perspectives and recognize the individual agency and collective responsibility necessary for positively influencing those systems."

In Fall 22 74.5% of all our students met expectations for the Global Awareness standard. Collegewide, 85.68% met it. In Spring 23, 80.89% of History students met it. Collegewide, 85.48% met it.

Here are our 2022-23 percentages disaggregated:
- Black/African American (83% Fall, 80% Spring) (72.03% Collegewide)
- American Indian/Alaska Native (0 students Fall, 66.7% Spring) (85.94% Collegewide)

- Asian (95.24% Fall, 83.33% Spring) (91.27% Collegewide)

- Filipino (0 students Fall, 77.78 Spring) (88.57% Collegewide)

- Hispanic (67.11% Fall, 85.85% Spring) (85.24% Collegewide)

- Pacific Islander (0 students Fall, 100% Spring) (84.06% Collegewide)

- Unknown (100% Fall, 100% Spring) (87.22% Collegewide)

- Unspecified (0 students) (75% Collegewide)

- White Non-Hispanic (Fall 78.33%, Spring 80.89%) (85.06% Collegewide)

Overall, students in History classes underperformed the Global Awareness ISLO, with two exceptions: 1) Black/African American, and 2) Pacific Islander students, who overperformed.

Why History students underperformed may be due to the rigor of our department's SLOs. For example, we do not have a CSLO that says "Students will be aware of the world," because that is far too vague. Some courses required students to locate historical events on a map, an increasingly difficult task for students who seldom have to look at a map ever, not even to drive a car to a specific place. Other History courses measured this SLO through subject-matter quizzes or exams, which students might have failed for any number of reasons, not simply because they lacked global awareness. Instructors who use written assignments for this SLO assessment were also determining how well students understood historical events in all their nuance and complexity. We seldom give a student a passing grade just for being "aware" of historical events.

That said, the wording of this particular ISLO comes very close to describing how we teach history in the classroom. Examining "the interconnectedness of racial, cultural, political, social, economic, and environmental issues from multiple perspectives" is exactly what historians do, and to be blunt, it's damn hard. If 85% of our students could master this skill (as the Collegewide ISLO percentage suggests they can), then our overall course success rate would be 85%, but our overall course success rate is much lower than that. Our average success rate for all History classes in 2022-23 was 68.5%. We suggest that our students' overall underperformance on the Global Awareness ISLO says a lot more about the difficulty of studying history than it says about the effectiveness of our pedagogical approaches and curricula.

In terms of numbers, Native American / Alaska Native students underperformed on this ISLO by seventeen percentage points, followed by Filipino students, who underperformed by eleven percentage points, followed by White "Non-Hispanic" students, who underperformed by seven percentage points. "Hispanic" students underperformed by 18 percentage points in the Fall, but performed slightly above the Collegewide rate in the Spring, suggesting that current data collection methods for ISLOs might be irregular and idiosyncratic.

Part 2: Additional Resource Request Reasoning and Support

For each separate resource request, complete steps A, B, and C.

Step A: Briefly describe the request.

Step B: Answer the following questions:

1. Is it imperative that this resource request be processed now rather than during the next comprehensive program review? Why?
2. How will this additional resource allocation specifically enhance your program's services, activities, processes, etc. to continue or improve student learning and achievement?
   - Is the resource request personnel-related? If so, please provide evidence to justify the requested positions such as retirements, program growth or curricular demands, full-time/adjunct ratios, etc.
3. How will this additional resource allocation help you serve the college mission or strategic initiatives, and/or your program's goals for improvement, as stated in your last program review?

Step C: Complete this chart with details of the request:

Type of Resource	Requested Dollar Amount	Potential Funding Source It is only necessary to list potential funding forces if you are aware of specific grants/program funds appropriate to the request, such as Strong Workforce.
Personnel		
Facilities		
Equipment		
Supplies		
Computer Hardware		
Computer Software		
Training		
Other		
Total Requested Amount:		