Instructional Annual Program Review and Planning Update Form Fall 2024

## 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.**
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| --- |
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**Manager Signature:**
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# Part 1: Review of Data

## Use the data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE)--[available in August 2024](https://fullcolledu-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/dberumen_fullcoll_edu/Ejn54PAVVhJLqimOjiLWBBYBPkPdoZEFZxZtScvvyibo6A)--to review your program completion and success rates and compare them to the Institution Set Standards for course completion and success rates. Then, answer these questions:

1. **Where your program meets or exceeds the college-wide standard for completion and success, to what do you attribute your success?**

In 2023-24, History students passed their classes above College’s success standard of 62%. History’s average success rate was 70%. Two demographic categories, Asian and Unknown/Decline to State, exceeded the College’s aspirational goal.

In 2023-24, History classes retained their students above College’s retention standard of 74%. History’s average retention rate was 87%. Three demographic categories – Asian, Two or More, and Unknown/Decline to State – exceeded the College’s aspirational goal.

From 2022-23 to 2023-24, our aggregate success rate inched up from 68.5% to 70% and our aggregate retention rate inched up from 86.1% to 87%.

Finding precise causes for these effects would require a regression analysis, which was not something we historians learned how to do in grad school. Returning closer to “normal” following the pandemic is perhaps one factor, though as historians we hasten to add that “normal” is something that never stays the same over time. Post-pandemic normal is not the same as pre-pandemic normal.

1. **Where your program does not meet this standard, please examine the possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate.**

We are still concerned that the Black/African American success percentage was below the College standard of 70%. In 2023-24, it was 53%. (The retention rate for this group, 74.1%, was slightly above the minimum College standard of 74%.) Last year’s 53% success rate was a slight improvement over the previous year’s 51%, but last year’s Black/African American 74.1% retention rate was a drop from 81.9% the previous year.

In our experience, there are many reasons students fail to complete or pass a course. Sometimes they are not academically prepared and either fail outright or (more often) give up and stop attending or stop turning in assignments. But in most cases the failure to complete the class requirements seems to come down to things happening in their life that make it impossible to dedicate the time and effort necessary to the class. This could be job related, family related, or crisis related. Since these issues tend to hit students lower on the socio-economic scale more frequently, and because in the United States class often corresponds to race and ethnicity, such complicating factors are more likely to hit students of color.

We recognize our responsibility to do whatever we can to help students navigate their way through such difficulties so they can still pass our classes. With a minimum of 200 students per instructor per semester, it is often difficult to stay on top of every student. We recognize it is an institutional failure to ever consider reducing class sizes in order to help professors actually move the needle on success and completion rates. Nonetheless, even without the District implementing meaningful change, we are dedicated to doing whatever is in our power at the class level to improve success rates. This includes paying particular attention to the most vulnerable students (i.e., those who show signs early on of not completing work or coming to class), proactively reaching out to students when they appear to be falling behind in order to encourage them to get back on track before it becomes too late, being as flexible as possible with due dates and make-up work, ensuring our content and assignments are relevant to all who enroll in our courses, better guiding students on the basic skills that will be necessary to pass our class, finding ways to instill confidence in students who doubt themselves or feel out of place, and ensuring our adjunct professors are also aware of and on board with these efforts. None of these approaches are fool-proof, easy, or even possible in many cases in which students disappear. But we believe if they (and other approaches) are seriously and consistently implemented we can begin to meaningfully improve our success rates.

Going course-by-course, here is where groups fell below the 62% success standard or the 74% retention standard.

112: White success was 57%

113: Latinx success was 60%

113: White success was 54%

127: Latinx success was 43%

127: White success was 53%

171: Black/African American success was 55%

270: Asian success was 53%

270: Two or More success was 48%

275: White success was 53%

275: White retention was 53.3%

These numbers show some exceptions to the hypothesis that students suffer from poor grades when they do not “see themselves” in the course content. HIST 275 is California History, and the only group with sub-standard rates of success and retention was White. It’s hard to argue that there aren’t enough white people in the California History curriculum. The White group also under-succeeded in HIST 112 and 127, World Civilizations and US Survey, which are also courses with long lists of white names in the textbook index.

HIST 270 had low success rates for Asian and Two or More. Those sections were all online in 2023-24. The only two other groups who showed up in the Tableau graph (because Tableau is set up to not report on groups with fewer than 10 students) were Latinx (63% success, 90.5% retention) and White (75% success, 80.3% retention). We are at a loss to say what it was about this class that led to a differential outcome for Asian or Two or More students compared to Latinx and White students, who performed above the College’s benchmarks, especially because we did not see this combination of results in other classes.

In 171, Black/African American success in 2022-23 was 60%. In 2023-24, it went down to 55%. Latinx success in 113 was 67% in 2022-23, then it went down to 60% in 2023-24. As we noted, the overall trend for all students was in the opposite direction, i.e., success and completion rates ticked up slightly. Also as we said above, students in these two categories who struggle to pass often come up short not because of ability, but because “life gets in the way,” and they stop attending or stop turning in work.

1. **Compare your data analysis in questions 1 and 2 to the review of data in your 2023 Annual Program Review update (available on the** [**Program Review and Planning Committee**](https://committees.fullcoll.edu/program-review/) **website). Are there significant changes? Do you notice any patterns from year to year?**

There were two common results. Last year’s PRAU showed that 44.3% of HIST 127 students succeeded, below the 62% standard. This year’s data shows almost the same: a 43.7% success rate.

The other course that showed a below-standard success rate on last year’s PRAU was HIST 110, which 55.9% of students passed in 2022-23. The 2023-24 data shows an overall success rate of 63.3%, slightly above the 62% standard.

Last year’s PRAU showed that 49.3% of students passed and 56.5% completed WMNS (Women’s Studies) 100, well below the College’s standards of 62% and 74%, respectively. This year’s data shows 43% success and 61.2% completion, so there seems to be a persistent issue with that course. We honestly do not have an explanation for this because we honestly do not know who is teaching WMNS 100. It has not appeared on our schedule for years.

# Part 2: Additional Resource Request Reasoning and Support

**We have reviewed our most recent self-study and have not identified any significant changes that necessitate resource requests for the upcoming academic year.**

**We have reviewed our most recent self-study and have identified significant changes that necessitate additional resource requests.**

**For programs that have identified significant changes that necessitate additional resource requests, answer the following questions for each separate resource request:**

1. **Briefly describe your resource request.**

Request #1:

Renew our subscription to Screenflow software, which has a $250 annual fee: Screenflow allows instructors to make customized, original instructional videos for their classes.

Request #2:

New subscription to Adobe Acrobat Pro for creating custom course readers for HIST 170 and 171. It is a little bit difficult to figure out from Adobe’s blizzard of marketing materials exactly how much the subscription costs. It’s either $14.99 per month or $19.99 per month, so let’s call it $180 to $240 per year.

1. **Is this request related to an essential safety need?**

No

**Why must this resource request be processed now rather than during the Fall 2025 comprehensive self-study?**

They are annual subscriptions, so waiting until next year will be too late.

**How will this additional resource allocation specifically enhance your program’s services, activities, processes, etc. to continue or improve student learning and achievement?**

Screenflow is essential for our instructors who make custom videos for Canvas. We do not rely on publishers' pre-packaged materials. We use Screenflow to customize our instruction for our students and help them feel connected to this specific instructor and this specific FC class.

The College recently stopped offering general access to Adobe Acrobat for faculty, but it is needed in order to create custom (and zero-cost) course readers for students. This allows professors to ensure that course readers contain material that is relevant to our diverse students as well as offer it for free as a downloadable and/or printable PDF. Since some of us update our course readers every semester, and we don’t know when our current access to Adobe Acrobat will expire (although if history gives a clue it will happen at the worst possible time), we need to ensure steady and ongoing access to it. If the College reverses course and buys the subscription for the whole College, that would be lovely. But if not, we'd like our own subscription.

**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.**

Neither request is personnel-related.

**How will this additional resource allocation help you serve the college mission or strategic initiatives, and your program’s goals for improvement, as stated in your last self-study?**

Both requests allow us to customize our course content for our specific courses and student populations. Customizing videos on Canvas creates a personal connection to the students. Customizing course readers helps ensure that professors can properly scaffold the readings with the other material in the class in order to improve student engagement, comprehension, and success. It will also allow those of us who use it to continue offering our course readers at no cost to students.

**For each separate resource request, complete this chart with details of the request:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Resource** |  |
| Personnel |  |
| Facilities |  |
| Supplies |  |
| Computer Hardware |  |
| Computer Software | Screenflow subscription, $250/year.  Adobe Acrobat Pro subscription, $180-$240/year. |
| Training |  |
| Other |  |
| **Total Requested Amount:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Is the funding requested ongoing or one-time funding?**  One-time funds |
| **Is the funding requested for**[**enrollment and reengagement activities?**](https://ie.fullcoll.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/27/2024/05/ER-2.0-Program-Review-Guide.pdf)  Yes |