

Form: "2019/20 Program Review Outcomes and Assessment Section"

Created with : Taskstream

Participating Area: Dean, Social and Behavioral Science and Multicultural Studies Office

(REQUIRED) Program name

Social/Behavioral Sciences & Multicultural Studies

(REQUIRED) Are you on target with your assessment schedule?

Yes - we are on target with scheduling assessments for the following AUO's be completed by Spring 2022:

Dean's provision of intellectual and administrative leadership, intended to help students achieve success in pursuing their educational goals, and to help faculty in providing the most informed, effective instruction. **(Continuing)**

Promotion of an academic and social environment that is encouraging of equity-based discussion and practice. **(Continuing)**

Coordination and monitoring of course scheduling. **(Continuing)**

Exercise of right of assignment, in consultation with chairs and faculty. **(Continuing)**

Monitoring, scheduling, and participation in the evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty; review of adjunct faculty evaluations; evaluation of non-academic staff. **(Continuing)**

Review of and commentary on all twelve discipline Program Reviews in School. **(Continuing)**

Monitoring and review of curriculum updating. **(Continuing)**

Prompt response to faculty and student questions, suggestions, and complaints. **(Continuing)**

Management of SB100. **(Continuing)**

Maintaining access to faculty and students who ask to meet with the Dean. **(Continuing)**

Encouragement of office staff independence within the parameters of managerial authority. **(Continuing)**

(REQUIRED) What have your assessments revealed about your courses/programs/service area/school/division/office?

Several discussions resulted in agreement that building maintenance has improved, and AUO's are adequate and have been generally met; however, assessment of all AUO's requires continual monitoring. More specifically (with "revelations" in **bold**):

Course scheduling has proceeded well considering the slowness of obtaining roll forwards and the cuts we've had to make in course offerings. **Faculty have been very cooperative, though adjuncts are complaining about losing assignments.**

Fall evaluation of probationary faculty has consumed a significant amount of time, but the results have been most positive. **Probationary evaluation indicates that our hiring decisions have been very effective.**

Last year, twelve program reviews were completed in a timely enough manner that I was able to review and provide meaningful feedback. **Faculty take Discipline Program review seriously.**

I closely monitored curriculum, and faculty reviewed and updated as required. **All courses in the School are current or are in the process of review.**

Faculty and students have registered satisfaction with my responses to any questions and/or complaints. My responses are generally provided in less than 24 hours. **Collegial relations are generally very positive in our School.**

Faculty are aware of the importance of equity and of finding ways to support it. I know this based on my many discussions about the issue with faculty. **Pursuit of equity is a major goal in our School.**

I believe I met the goal of approachability and collegiality, since I have had no comments indicating otherwise. But one would have to ask others for their input.

(REQUIRED) Based on your assessments, what resource needs have you identified?

There is no critical need for resources at the moment.

Please provide any other comments.

As I have noted in the past, I think we are tasked to devote far too much time to revision and assessment of outcomes that have marginal impact on the quality of instruction and School operation. Although I am not wholly opposed to outcomes assessment or spending many hours writing Program Reviews, I do resent spending considerable time assessing AUO's and pretending that Administrative Program Reviews are manifestations of a "culture of evidence" when we have a greater responsibility as academic leaders. As educators, scholars, and concerned human beings – we need to tell our students and our public about the fundamental limitations our political, social, and economic system imposes upon student success. We must build our own culture of evidence, one that uses data appropriately but that also focuses upon critical discourse and coherent argument; one that demonstrates the inequality of American life and explains how that inequality is destroying public higher education for all but the most fortunate. Assessing "AUO's" tells us very little about the effectiveness of our instructional efforts.

Form: "2019/20 Program Review Schools and Divisions Analysis Section"

Created with : Taskstream

Participating Area: Dean, Social and Behavioral Science and Multicultural Studies Office

School/Division Name

(REQUIRED) Type your School/Division name.

Social/Behavioral Sciences & Multicultural Studies

Part A: In this section, please analyze your School or Division in terms of student success metrics as well as your contribution to the College's identity of being an Hispanic Serving Institution.

(REQUIRED) A1. What metric(s) are you following most closely?

I most closely follow course success rates, outcomes by ethnicity and race, and enrollment data by discipline.

(REQUIRED) A2. Have you identified any racial/ethnic groups that are experiencing equity gaps in any of these metrics?

Equity Gap: When a group of students who share a common characteristic (e.g. race/ethnicity) have lower access and/or outcome rates than their peers. The size of the equity gap along with the size of the group determine whether that gap is significant. Larger groups should, statistically, have smaller gaps and therefore when gaps are present (even small ones) they may be significant. Smaller groups will see wider variation in outcomes, therefore gaps should be seen consistently over time and/or reviewed by looking at multiple years in aggregate to determine if they are significant.

Regarding success and equity, our School has a mixed record. From summer 2012 through fall 2017, success rates by ethnicity were above the Mesa average (70.0%) in Anthropology (70.5%), Architecture (76.5%), Black Studies (80.3%), Building Construction Technology (82.3%), Interior Design (77.8%), and Sociology (73.3%). They were generally comparable to the Mesa average in Philosophy (69.5%) and Psychology (69.2%). Political Science (59.3%), Geography (61.2%), History (63.0%), and Chicana/o Studies (65.8%) all fell below the Mesa average success rate by ethnicity. In spring 2018, the last semester for which I have data, there was some improvement. Success rates by ethnicity were above the Mesa average (73%) in Building Construction Technology (85%), Black Studies (80%), Interior Design (78%), Architecture (75%), and Sociology (75%). They were generally comparable to the Mesa average in History (72%), Psychology (71%), Geography (71%), Anthropology (70%), and Political Science (70%). Only Philosophy (69%) and Chicana/o Studies (65%) fell significantly below the Mesa average success rate by ethnicity.

For last year's comprehensive PR, I compiled a table showing percentage success rates by ethnicity for seven ethno-racial-cultural groups. Four disciplines (BLAS, BLDC, INTE, SOCO) had percentages above the Mesa averages for every cohort. One discipline (PSYC)

had percentages no more than 3 points below the Mesa average for every cohort. One discipline (ARCH) had one cohort (African American) 4 points or more below the Mesa average. Three disciplines (CHIC, GEOG, POLI) had two cohorts 4 points or more below the Mesa averages (Asian and LatinX respectively). Two disciplines (ANTH, HIST) had three cohorts 4 points or more below the Mesa averages (Asian, African American, and Filipino respectively). One discipline (PHIL) had four cohorts 4 points or more below the Mesa averages (Asian, African American, Filipino, and Latinx).

From another perspective, success rates for Asians fell below the Mesa average in 6 disciplines; African Americans in 5; Filipinos in 3; Latinx in 2, and Native Americans in 1. Only whites rate above the Mesa average in all twelve disciplines.

Statistics on Equity Gaps by Demographics related to Course Success Rates (SU2014-SP2019) demonstrate that for the four largest ethnno-racial cohorts in the School, the distribution is as expected: African Americans (-10.4%); Latinx (-4.1%); Whites (+5.0%); and, Asians (+5.2%). The comparable statistics for Mesa College during the same time period are: African Americans (-9%); Latinx (-5%); Whites (+5.0%); and, Asians (+8%). Equity gaps in the School vary significantly by discipline: Anthropology: African American (-12%); Asian (+9%); Latinx (-5%); White (+6%). Architecture: African American (-14%); Asian (+7%); Latinx (-5%); White (+4%). Black Studies: African American (-2%); Asian (+7%); Latinx (-1%); White (+5%). BLDC: African American (-1%); Asian (-8%); Latinx (-1%); White (+1%). Chicana/o Studies: African American (-8%); Asian (+10%); Latinx (-1%); White (+8%). Geography: African American (-18%); Asian (+7%); Latinx (-6%); White (+8%). History: African American (-14%); Asian (+4%); Latinx (-6%); White (+5%). Interior Design: African American (-17%); Asian (-4%); Latinx (-4%); White (+3%). Philosophy: African American (-11%); Asian (+5%); Latinx (-5%); White (+5%). Political Science: African American (-9%); Asian (+7%); Latinx (-6%); White (+5%). Psychology: African American (-11%); Asian (+11%); Latinx (-5%); White (+6%). Sociology: African American (-8%); Asian (+7%); Latinx (-4%); White (+4%).

(REQUIRED) A3. What action, if any, has been taken to address these equity gaps?

Equity Gap: When a group of students who share a common characteristic (e.g. race/ethnicity) have lower access and/or outcome rates than their peers. The size of the equity gap along with the size of the group determine whether that gap is significant. Larger groups should, statistically, have smaller gaps and therefore when gaps are present (even small ones) they may be significant. Smaller groups will see wider variation in outcomes, therefore gaps should be seen consistently over time and/or reviewed by looking at multiple years in aggregate to determine if they are significant.

Attempting to narrow equity gaps in a society in which they are increasing is difficult. Although there may be some instructional changes that might shorten equity gaps, focusing primarily on those implies that the major failure rests on the shoulders of the faculty. This assertion ignores the impact of 246 years of color-specific slavery in American history, followed by 100 years of Jim Crow laws and customs, ethnically and racially biased immigration restrictions, and by the recent growth of white nationalism. Faculty, though aware of this reality, regularly discuss different teaching methods, topical focuses, and issues of cultural awareness. My role is to support their efforts.

(REQUIRED) A4. What actions, if any, have you taken as a result of the School Equity Reports?

Please see A3 above.

(REQUIRED) A5. How does your School or Division contribute to the College's identity of being a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI)?

Our School offers a robust program in Chicana/o Studies. I have recently discussed broadening the focus of that program to include several courses on non-Chicano Latinos. The response of the department chair was positive. We also offer a Sociology course on Latino issues, and we include the experiences of Hispanics in all of our courses in the History of the United States. The percentage of Latinos in all of the courses taught in our School (fall 2018) is approximately 41%, which is two percentage points above the Mesa average.

Part B: In this section, look at the area of focus you identified in last year's program review and answer the following questions.

(REQUIRED) B1. How have you developed this focus? Are you seeing any results? What are your next steps?

In last year's PR, I wrote that our School is focusing on increasing success rates and narrowing ethnic gaps in our courses and disciplines. It is, of course, the faculty who must find methods to help all students, particularly those traditionally marginalized, to achieve academic success. They are working on doing so without sacrificing academic standards and without yielding their assessment authority. My role is in discussing their progress with as many as my time allows, and placing that progress (or lack thereof) in a broader context.

I have seen some results in increasing success rates for traditionally marginalized students; but these are limited. Next steps? We are going to continue doing what we are doing. We cannot significantly narrow equity gaps in our School without broader changes in racial and ethnic status and resource redistribution in our society.