

2022-23 Program Review Template

Directions for Lead Writers: Please use this template to complete your Unit’s Program Review for this cycle. Instructions for submitting your completed template at the end of the spring semester will be provided in a few weeks. Click [here](#) to view our Glossary of Terms.

Other Resources:

[Program Review Handbook](#)

[Acronym Dictionary](#)

[Resource Link Library](#)

[Mesa 2030](#)

[Program Review Archives](#)

DEI Discussions: as part of your reflection with your unit, a workgroup has developed a Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Discussion Guide. Please use this in your unit-level discussions as we move toward becoming more diverse, equitable, inclusive, and accessible through intentional and ongoing campus-wide reflections and revisions of policies and practices.

View the guide [here](#). Have reflections or feedback to share? Click [here](#).

| <i>Program Information & Executive Summary</i> | | |
|--|----------|--|
| Prompt | Guidance | Program Response |
| Describe the successes and challenges your unit has faced since the last comprehensive review. | | <p>Discipline faculty have continued to work to improve instruction, student enrollment/retention, and to contribute to the function of Mesa College as a whole. Discipline faculty serve on many of the major committees on campus and are heavily involved in several aspects of equity and student success initiatives on campus. Program faculty have rallied to address the needs of students through the COVID years and to continue to develop, revise, and deliver quality discipline courses to students in various modalities to both serve the mission of the two-year college and the specific vision of Mesa College.</p> <p>Challenges are multitudinous and not unique to this discipline. Weathering the transitions to, and out of, COVID protocols has had an overall damaging effect to the discipline. While faculty have worked to adapt courses to serve student needs through these transitions, the reality is that there are far fewer students in the past</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | three years. As is true generally, enrollment has declined substantially over the past few years. The return to on-campus course offerings has been quite uneven. Even with a limited palette of live courses compared to pre-COVID numbers, enrollments have been soft overall. Anecdotally, student persistence and attendance in live courses has been noticeably poorer than in the pre-COVID classroom. Many classrooms sit empty for substantial portions of the day due to far fewer live courses in the discipline, department, school, and college overall. Online enrollment remains fairly strong, but challenges also have emerged in that modality (false enrollments, student retention patterns, etc.). |
| If applicable, describe any major curricular or service changes your unit has engaged in and the impact of those changes since the last comprehensive review. | Optional | No major changes to curriculum in the past cycle. |
| If applicable, describe the impact of any new resources (human, fiscal, etc.) on the unit and/or action plan implementation. | Optional | Not applicable in the past cycle. |
| Please confirm that the department has reviewed the Course Learning Outcomes listed in CurricuNet for each course and verify accuracy. | Select One | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reviewed and accurate <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed not accurate, update in progress <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed not accurate, need support |
| Data Reflection | | |
| Prompt | Guidance | Program Response |
| Describe the trends you see in your program/service area's data. | Instructional Data you may consider: enrollment trends, course & program learning outcomes, Institutional Learning Outcomes, course success and retention rates, degree completion, transfer, employment, labor market analysis, other data relevant to your unit's work | Enrollment: Looking at the data for the History discipline over the past four years, the following data emerge. Measuring per four terms (Summer, Fall, Intersession, Spring) each year, the following represents History enrollment data: 19/20: 3895; 20/21: 3552; 21/22: 3116; 22/23: 3454. Decline during the COVID period emerges, with a bit of a rebound |

Service/Admin Area Data you may consider - service usage, service access, demand for services, student service/administrative unit outcomes, types of services offered and used, headcount of services usage, trends in reason for service use, other data relevant to your unit's work

during the past year, though not to pre-pandemic levels.

Course Success Rates:

Success rate data over the past three available years reflects a variable trending. In the 19/20 year, History courses saw a 68% success rate. For 20/21, the success rate increased to 71%. During the 21/22 year, the success rate dipped to 67%. The Mesa success rates over this span were 73%, 75%, and 73% respectively. While lower than the college success rates, the discipline data follows a similar variable trend to the overall college rate.

Course Retention Rates:

The Mesa retention rate averages for the three years were: 19/20: 84%; 20/21: 88%; 21/22: 87%. For the discipline, the numbers were identical each year to the college average: 19/20: 84%; 20/21: 88%; 21/22: 87%.

Program GPA:

Over the three-year data window analyzed, the GPA for the History discipline was as follows: 19/20: 2.77; 20/21: 2.82; 21/22: 2.72. Comparatively, the Mesa overall GPAs were as follows: 19/20: 2.98; 20/21: 2.99; 21/22: 2.94. Again, the variability in these data follow a similar pattern at the discipline level compared to the college level.

Program Learning Outcomes:

The most recent data available for measuring program learning outcomes come from the 2021-22 academic year, when the following were measured: Personal Action and Civic Responsibilities (measured across three courses), Global Awareness (measured across three courses), Communication (one course), and Critical Thinking (one course). The school target is a 70% Satisfactory rate minimum, with 75% and above being ideal. All measures exceeded the target as follows: Personal Action and Civic Responsibilities (93%); Global Awareness (89%); Communication (87%); and Critical Thinking (87%).

Awards:

Over the past three measurable academic years, a total of 72 degrees have been awarded in the discipline. Of that number, 58 degrees were Associate of Arts for Transfer degrees, 12 Associate of Arts Degrees, and two (2) Liberal Arts and Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences History degrees. The yearly breakdown is as

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | <p>follows: 19/20: 29 (25 AA-T, 4 AA); 20/21: 19 (14 AA-T, 5 AA); 21/22: 24 (19 AA-T, 5 AA).</p> |
| <p>Describe any equity gaps you see in these data. Are there differences and/or patterns observed by demographics (e.g. race/ethnicity, gender, age, etc.)?</p> | <p>Equity gaps refer to disparities in educational outcomes and student success metrics across race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, and other demographic traits and intersectionalities.</p> | <p>By viewing the History discipline data using the Equity Gap Analysis tool in the Data Dashboard, several trends emerge. Retention rates in History courses for Black (83.8%), Latinx (84.0%), and Native American (72.7% for 33 total students) students lag behind those for other subgroups, though are not far from the overall retention rate (86.3%). Success rates for the same three racial/ethnic groups reflect larger gaps compared to the overall success rate of 68.5% (Black 52.6%, Latinx 62.9%, Native American 51.5%). The overall calculation of the equity gap data reveals that Black students have a -6.7% gap, Latinx a -8.6% gap, and Native American students a -7.0% gap in History courses using the past three years student data. A focus on only the past four academic terms (Summer 21, Fall 21, Intersession 22, Spring 22) reveal related short-term trends. The equity gap for Black students was much larger in this short-term period (-19.0%), but it is fair to note that the student number was comparatively small to other groups. Native American enrollment in this period was too small to yield viable data. The Latinx gap actually shrank (-4.2%) compared to the three-year trend.</p> <p>In terms of Age, equity gaps only proved disproportionate for one age group (18-24) over the three-year timespan, with a -3.6% equity gap. Other groups (especially under 18 and the 40-49 range) had highly positive equity gap numbers.</p> <p>When looking at trends by DSPS status, DSPS recipients reflected a positive equity gap (4.9%), while non DSPS students had a -4.9% equity gap.</p> <p>First generation students over the three-year span had a negative equity gap (-11.6%). Equity gaps by gender were negligible statistically, though students identifying as non-binary did have a -15.2 gap (based on 15 students over three years).</p> <p>In terms of students earning degrees in the discipline, negative gaps over the past three years exist in terms of age (-12.4% 18-24; -1.2% 25-29), gender (-14.1% Female); and ethnicity (-6.8% Asian/Pacific</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | Islander, -1.6% Native American, -.0.8 Filipino, -3.3% Latinx). These gaps generally mirror those for the discipline nationally. |
| Describe the discussion(s) that took place about the unit's learning outcomes assessment data. | Department Outcomes Coordinators (DOCs) facilitate a department wide discussion on learning outcomes data each year during "Outcomes Across Campus". DOC's may helpful in supporting this section. | The Social Science Outcomes Coordinator held a discussion of Outcomes before our department meeting. During that discussion, data were presented for each outcome and broken down by course number/description. Students are meeting (and often exceeding) expectations established for learning outcomes. Ongoing discussion about the appropriateness of learning outcomes and target data points ensued, with the decision to retain current outcomes targets for the next measurement cycle. |
| <i>Practice Reflection</i> | | |
| Prompt | Guidance | Program Response |
| Describe current practices your unit has engaged in that you believe impact the above data trends and equity gaps. | Items to consider: new actions specifically focused on issues of equity, major curricular changes, professional learning, policy or process changes, data-informed unit dialogue, community outreach. | We have undertaken a number of initiatives as History discipline faculty over the past few years to address equity gaps. Discipline faculty have all engaged in a variety of trainings, workshops, curricular revision discussions, and other initiatives designed to both identify and work to remedy equity gaps rooted in the intersections of race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, income, and other factors that impact our student body, particularly students who are impacted by multiple equity gap factors. All faculty work to consistently evaluate both instruction and assessment approaches to address the various needs of our students, as well as to reflect Mesa's commitment to equity and accessibility for all students. In future semesters, a detailed analysis of equity gap data will be central to discipline discussions of solutions for closing (and then eliminating) equity gaps, focusing on discussions of curriculum, assessment methods, planning for development of future courses, and further engagement with student outreach. Discipline faculty have been active for years in outreach efforts on campus (tabling, Mesa Cruise, advertising courses on campus through digital boards, flyers, etc.) and will continue to engage in these efforts to connect to the diverse body of students on our campus. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>What other factors (internal or external) might also impact the above data trends and equity gaps?</p> | <p>Items to consider: legislative changes, fiscal changes, staffing changes, recruitment, hiring, and retention practices.</p> | <p>As in any public-serving institution, changes (and proposed changes) in legislation, decisions made at the statewide level for both community colleges and the four-year systems we feed into, and, to put it bluntly, the availability of students who choose to enroll are all factors that impact the data trends and existing equity gaps. As the data show, certain student populations (for example Black and Native American student groups) enroll in very low numbers in our courses. A multitude of factors impact these trends (overall low student numbers, student choice to enroll in other disciplines that address the same transfer requirements, etc.). Much of this is beyond the purview or influence of discipline faculty. Recent legislative changes (such as the creation of the Area F designation) will undoubtedly have some impact on future enrollments in the discipline as some students gravitate to courses offered in other disciplines to fulfill the new requirement. Additionally, the History discipline has lost multiple veteran full-time faculty in the past five years, with most positions going unreplaced. This had hampered the ability of full-time faculty to more fully address some of the data trends. Additionally, due to scaling back of course offerings, several energetic and highly-regarded adjunct faculty members have departed due to lack of available courses.</p> |
|---|--|--|

Unit Goals and Action Plans

| Prompt | Guidance | Program Response |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Unit Goals</p> | <p>Goals should connect to Data and Practice Reflections. Goals should be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound.</p> | <p>Goal 1: Develop strategies to increase History enrollment and student success rates over the next three years. Goal 2: Evaluate and adapt course offerings in History to better serve student needs over the next three years. Goal 3: Explore options to increase student accessibility and affordability for History course offerings over the next three years.</p> |
| <p>Mesa2030 Roadmap Strategic Objective (SO) Alignment</p> | <p>Review Mesa2030 and the Roadmap to Mesa2030, only link to SO's that your goal clearly and intentionally is meant to contribute to, each goal should link to 1 or more SOs</p> | <p>Goal 1: SO: Design and promote programs and services that intentionally target a reduction in equity gaps in completion outcomes. SO: Expand the use of innovative and high-quality teaching, learning, and support practices that achieve equitable</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p>outcomes and increase student success. SO: Evaluate and improve Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion practices in classroom environments, campus activities, departments, schools, and administrative units.</p> <p>Goal 2: SO: Evaluate and improve Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion practices in classroom environments, campus activities, departments, schools, and administrative units. SO: Expand the use of innovative and high-quality teaching, learning, and support practices that achieve equitable outcomes and increase student success</p> <p>Goal 3: SO: Expand the use of innovative and high-quality teaching, learning, and support practices that achieve equitable outcomes and increase student success. Reduce costs associated with instructional materials to support the elimination of equity gaps.</p> |
| <p>Identify specific actions your program/service area will engage in to accomplish this goal.</p> | <p>Examples may include: policy or practice changes; unit initiatives, curricular changes, etc.</p> | <p>Goal 1 1. Develop new methods for advertising courses and reaching students once enrolled at Mesa to attract more enrollees. Market courses with a more focused emphasis on issues of cultural diversity and connectivity to modern societal concerns. 2. Faculty evaluation of course design, course assessment, and program goals with an intentionality to increase student success rates and attainment of educational goals.</p> <p>Goal 2 1. Examine the course outlines of current course offerings and consider the merits of changes (if appropriate) to those courses. 2. Consider the possibilities of creation of new courses/reimagining of past courses to address the needs of our diverse student population and to increase interest and enrollment in discipline courses.</p> <p>Goal 3 1. Collectively weigh the benefits and pitfalls of the ever-expanding vista of OER materials available in our discipline. Consider whether</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>free/reduced cost course materials serve the needs of students and maintain the academic standards and rigor of the discipline.</p> <p>2. Consider the access difficulties many of our students have to technology (computers, Internet access, printers, etc.) to help inform decisions for course design and material usages to ensure student accessibility and potential for success in discipline courses.</p> |
| Does this Action Plan require resources | if yes, complete resource request form | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Lead Writer and Manager Information | | |
| Lead writer Name(s) | Michael L. Cox | |
| Name of Program/Unit | History | |
| Manager Name | Pearl Ly, Dean | |
| Submission Date of Program Review Draft to Manager for feedback | 5/3/23 | |
| Submission Date of Program Review Final Draft to Office of Institutional Effectiveness | 5/21/23 | |