TO: The Academic Senate

FROM: The Committee on Academic Planning and Resources (CAPR)

SUBJECT: Five-Year Program Review for History

PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate

ACTION REQUESTED: Acceptance of the Five-Year Program Review of the History Programs and approval of the continuation of the program without modification

BACKGROUND INFORMATION/ Executive Summary:
The History Department consists of twelve regular faculty members, four lecturers with regular contracts and one administrative support person. In Fall Quarter 2004, the quarter with the most recent statistics, the department had 169 majors and offered 35 course sections. The department offers two degrees: History B.A. and History M.A., and runs five programs: undergraduate history major, undergraduate history minor, history master’s program, liberal studies history option, and history social/science single subject preparation program.

Beyond its majors and minors the department serves the broad sweep of CSUEB students with the numerous courses fulfilling the C-2, C-3 and C-4 General Education requirements in upper division humanities, several courses meeting the Cultural Groups and Women requirement, and the U.S. survey fulfilling the American Institutions requirements. The department offers 4 PACE courses annually and a course for nursing majors. Courses are regularly taught at both the Hayward and Contra Costa campuses.

The History Department scored 90% (52/58) on the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan Rubric from the WASC Campus Outcome Team. In its Self Study the department painted a picture of itself as sustaining quality and variety in its educational programs, participating in university governance and developing a sense of community for its students against the obstacles of heavy teaching loads, inadequate resources and rising enrollments. The current picture cannot be sustained without additional faculty to share the load. CAPR concurs with this conclusion.

The History Department has ambitious plans for expansion in three areas: new courses on the Hayward campus, an increased number of teacher preparation courses, and a major on the Concord campus. CAPR endorses the planned expansion, particularly considering the department’s substantial contribution to GE courses. Expansion cannot occur without additional permanent faculty.

The department has made a commendable initial effort toward collecting and using assessment data. Several recommendations for additional data collection are identified in the review.

CAPR RECOMMENDATION FOR CONTINUATION OF THE PROGRAM
CAPR recommends the continuation of the BA and MA degree programs in History without modification. The next CAPR review will take place 2009 – 2010.
1. BACKGROUND

• **Overview description of the program:** See Executive Summary, page 1

• **Overview of the documents submitted to CAPR**

   The following documents were submitted by the history department for the five year program review:
   Document 1: Reply to the Outside Reviewer for History Five Year Self-Study and Plan; Report of the History Department External Visitation; Transmittal Sheet for Supporting Materials for Five Year Review; History Department Self-Study and Plan (initial and two revisions, including attachments: Four Tenure Track Position Announcements; 2005-2006 Tenure Track Position Request; Mission and Outcomes Statements; Academic Performance Review Statistics), and Data from the Self-assessment for Students, and Faculty Assessment of Students for HIST 1000, 3010, 4030 and 4031.


• **Summary of specific areas of the Self-Study**

   The History Department is to be commended for the thoroughness of the material presented to the Committee on Academic Program Review for the five-year review. The program clearly characterized its recent and current status with respect to faculty and lecturer staffing, student enrollment, and administrative support. The department identified twelve proposals for material support it views as essential to allow the department to sustain its programs at high levels of quality and build new programs. The extensive outside review concurred with the program’s self study and twelve proposals.

   The review of the History Program is presented in two parts. The first part is the ratings of program elements as guided by the *Suggested Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan Rubric* from the *Academic Review Outcome Team Recommended Assessment Plan Rubric* (December, 2003). The second part is a narrative review.

   **Ratings from the Suggested Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan Rubric**

   All ratings are on a four point scale, with four being the highest rating, unless otherwise noted. (Ratings appear below as follows: Scale item – CAPR Reviewer’s rating; See attached *Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan Rubric* appended to this document for the location of supporting documentation)

   1. Mission. Goals, and Objectives
      A. Department mission - 4
      B. Department and university missions - 3
      C. Content-centered description - 4
      D. Program SLOs - 4
      E. Link SLOs and courses - 4

   2. Developing and Implementing Assessment Methods
      F. Program level assessment - 5 (out of 5)
      G. Course level assessment - 5 (out of 5)
      H. SLO assessment results - No (Y/N choice)
      I. Other assessment results - 4

   3. Using Assessment Results
      J. Conclusions - 3
      K. Conclusions and planning - 3
      L. Plan -
      M. SLOs and planning - 3
      N. Credible representation of SLOs - 4

   4. Synthesis
      O. SLOs and curriculum revision - 3

   5. Total = 52/58 = 90%
Narrative review

The department Self-Study contains six sections that will be summarized below.

Section I – Summary of 2000 Five-year Review

The five-year review completed in 2000 and the department’s response to it identified four areas of focus for the program: increase proportion of regular faculty to lecturers; expand curricular offerings; improve advising; sustain consistency in courses.

Faculty. The department successfully completed four tenure-track searches. However, due to retirements, History is “holding steady” rather than increasing the proportion of tenure track faculty to lecturers.

Curriculum. The History Program has expanded curricular offerings in the past five years. It introduced ten new courses, discontinued fourteen specialty courses previously taught by now-retired faculty, modified 24 courses, and made major modifications to three courses. The program offers a wide range of graduate courses as well as a breadth requirement of a course outside U.S. History. The graduate history research seminar is offered every 18 months rather than every year, a plan that may result in a backlog of student enrollments.

Advising. In a revised advising procedure, new undergraduate majors are assigned a faculty advisor. The position of Undergraduate Coordinator has been replaced by an Advising Coordinator who is responsible for alerting students to advising information. The History Graduate Coordinator continues to advise all graduate students.

Course consistency. The department is proud of the number of approvals it received for course proposals and modifications, and considers this an indicator of quality instruction. The department has completed its missions and outcomes for assessment which when fully operational will also address the consistency issue. Instructional standards were established through the department’s Lecturer Committee and while this has helped reduce inconsistency across lecturers, concern remains in this area.

Impact of changes. The proportion of FTES taught by regular faculty has gradually increased and the number of majors has increased from 116 to 169.

Section II – Tenure-Track Requests and Appointments, 2000-2005

The History Department is in the midst of a revival, having successfully completed several searches to produce a diverse faculty. They anticipate submitting an additional request in 2005 and continue building the department.

Section III – Assessment for B.A. and M.A. Programs

The department has completed a mission statement, learning outcomes, and performance indicators for its B.A. and M.A. programs. In 2002 the department formed an Assessment Committee to create outcomes rubrics and compile questionnaire surveys for each of the major’s four skills courses: HIST 1000 (Introduction to History), 3010 (Historical Writing), 4030 (Historiography), and 4031 (Historical Research). The surveys followed the main goals for each course, with an initial self-assessment survey completed by students at the start of each course, the same final surveys completed for comparative purposes at the end of the course. The final survey was completed by students and faculty. The surveys were anonymous and the emphasis was on aggregated information to avoid mixing program assessment with individual evaluation of students and instructors, in keeping with the general guidelines in the professional assessment literature.

Each survey was divided into sections with several questions per section. For example, sections of the HIST 1000 survey were: Overall goal of the course; Analysis; Composition; Oral Expression; and Library and internet skills. Questions in the Analysis section were 1) I now understand the distinction between a primary and secondary source; 2) I can now evaluate an historical argument; and 2) I can now interpret a primary source. Respondents rated a statement as strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, and disagree.

Final survey data from students’ self-perception and faculty evaluation were available for HIST 1000, 3010 and 4030. The sample size ranged from 27 (students in HIST 3010) to 42 (students in HIST 4030). A
similar response pattern appeared across all courses and respondents, showing that approximately 85% of all responses were agree or strongly agree. For HIST 4031 initial and final survey data were available for a sample of 27 and 24 students, respectively, and 34 faculty. Two patterns appeared in the data. First, as with the other courses, approximately 85% of all responses from students and faculty were agree or strongly agree. Second a learning effect was apparent between the initial and final student surveys. In the initial student self-assessment the majority of responses were somewhat agree or agree, with several responses of disagree. On the final student self-assessment the majority of responses were agree or strongly agree, with few responses in the other two categories.

The results of the surveys for the 2002 – 2004 academic years revealed several trends that the department faculty have discussed: 1) the tendency for beginning History majors to be uncertain regarding the meaning of academic honesty; 2) problems in all classes with oral expression; 3) problems with understanding correct source citation; and 4) students’ difficulty interpreting primary sources, which in part accounts for the tougher evaluations of student achievement in HIST 4031, our research class. The department will pay close attention to these areas, and will work to have consistent data collection in machine-readable form in the future.

In AY 2005 – 2006 the department will move expeditiously to gather information on the rest of our B.A. program and on the M.A. program, particularly exit surveys for pending B.A. and M.A. graduates. The department will also move forward with review of the Master’s program. One faculty member has been appointed Assessment Coordinator to better organize department efforts. The History Department expects to have one cycle of assessment – student and faculty surveys, evaluation of evidence, and implementation of an instructional improvement - completed in Spring 2006.

Section IV – Program Data

Indicators of the department’s success are the rising number of majors, steady enrollment and a rising SFR and average section size.

Majors. The number of undergraduate majors has increased by 46% in the past five years and the number of graduate students by 32%. The graduation rate does not yet match this increase but is expected to in the near future.

Enrollment. History is a mainstay of FTES in CLASS (second highest) and the University (ninth highest). This is the case despite a decrease in the number of course sections. The main source of steady enrollments is in the upper division courses.

SFR and section size. SFR and class size have risen; SFR from 27.2 to 30.1 and average class size from 33.8 to over 40. This is mixed news to the department. While growth is desirable, the increase has come largely from the escalating number of students coupled with an unchanging number of faculty.

Impact of changes. The interaction of rising number of majors, increased enrollment, and rising SFR has placed unusual and potentially unsustainable pressure on the department. The department developed several “fall back plans” to implement in the case of budgetary constraints, lack of faculty and the ongoing enrollment needs. For example, the department agreed to retain the number of U.S. History Survey sections to attract new freshmen but to limit sections in World History. This is a short-term solution that cannot be sustained over time and continued department growth. The department believes it has much to celebrate in recent hiring and tenure and promotion decisions and in the increasing popularity of the major. However without additional faculty and staff this growth cannot be sustained.

Section V – Comparison to Other C.S.U. and U.C. History Programs

The department compared itself to History Departments at Sonoma State University, San Francisco State University, UC Berkeley, and UC Davis. CSUEB History Department compared favorably to each of these. It has similar or more economical programs than each of these programs and is sensitive to its student body in ways that the other universities may not be. For example, CSUEB History Department has an added skill course that is appropriate for its frequently under-prepared students.
Section VI – Achievements Since 2000

The department enumerated its achievements in the areas previously mentioned (i.e. faculty hiring). In addition, individual faculty have distinguished themselves and, in turn, the department in many ways. For example, the department has provided financial support for outstanding majors; students have won prizes in research competitions; members of the department have organized various conferences; and faculty members have participated liberally in college and university governance. Several faculty members have received awards for scholarly activities and have presented at professional conferences.

Summary
The department has painted a picture of itself as sustaining quality and variety in its educational programs, participating in university governance and developing a sense of community for its students against the obstacles of heavy teaching loads, inadequate resources and rising enrollments. The current picture cannot be sustained without additional faculty to share the load.

• Summary of supporting data

Several documents reporting data were appended to the self-study: Academic Performance Review Statistics for 1998 - 2004; Degrees Conferred by Program; Headcount Enrollment for History; and Degrees Conferred for History. These documents show the following trends:

Performance Review Statistics
1. increase in number of majors, both undergraduate and graduate
2. decrease in number of courses and sections taught coupled with increase in average section size
3. relatively stable FTES, FTEF and SFR (except Graduate SFR)
4. increase in diversity of student population

Degrees Conferred
5. an increase followed by a decrease in undergraduate degrees awarded and slight increase in graduate degrees awarded

Headcount
6. approximately even number of students from Contra Costa County and other California counties
7. more junior and senior majors than freshmen and sophomore majors
8. majority of the student body is continuing students

Overall Degrees Conferred
9. data on ethnicity, gender and geographic origin support the claim of a diverse student body who complete the History degree

3. OUTSIDE REVIEWER’S COMMENTS & THE DEPARTMENT’S RESPONSE

The program review visitation took place on February 1 and 2, 2005. The reviewer was Dr. Stanley M. Burstein, Professor Emeritus of History, California State University, Los Angeles. The reviewer spent two days on campus, meeting with History Department permanent and part-time faculty, department chair, administrative coordinator, undergraduate and graduate students, the Dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, and the University Librarian.

Summary of Dr. Burstein’s comments

Permanent faculty. Dr. Burstein praised the History faculty for their dedicated teaching, scholarship and service activities. Dr. Burstein cited enrollment data showing an increase in undergraduate and graduate majors (43% and 32%, respectively) and increasing enrollment in history courses (the second highest FTES in the college at the end of 2004). He further suggested that these figures might understate enrollment at the graduate level by half or more, given timing of institutional reporting. He particularly noted that these achievements occurred during a period of budgetary constraint leading to fewer course sections and higher class size, for instance. He further reported that any additional plans the History Department has, such as offering a major at the Concord campus, while desirable, will strain the faculty resources.

Adjunct faculty. The percent of courses instructed by lecturers has decreased over the review period from 76% to 40%, to the benefit of the department. The department monitors lecturers, and both the faculty and
students agree that the quality of these courses is high. The department has shown high regard for its lecturers through such actions as assigning them permanent offices and hiring two former lecturers as full time faculty.

Curriculum. The design of the History undergraduate and graduate majors showcases the strength of its faculty and has undergone modification reflecting the changing nature of the faculty. While this is admirable, the outside reviewer suggested that the department may want to adopt a proactive curricular revision plan rather than a reactive process. Dr. Burstein highlighted the department’s M.A. program and department thesis option. The department thesis is a “...creative attempt to serve the needs of students by requiring them to apply their M.A. program learning to the development of a large scale instructionally related project, usually a complete curriculum for teaching some aspect of history.” Dr. Burstein cautioned that this option may pose a burden on department faculty as it requires significant resources.

Advisement. In response to the previous five-year review the History Department reorganized its advisement procedures. Each undergraduate student is assigned a faculty advisor; single-subject option students are advised by a single subject coordinator; and graduate students are advised by the graduate coordinator. Dr. Burstein noted that while students he interviewed were satisfied with the advising procedure, in the face of internal factors such as continued enrollment growth, and external factors such as requirements from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the procedure will be difficult to sustain.

Department management. Dr. Burstein reported having positive interviews with students. He stated that while the students had no complaints, they would prefer a wider range of course offerings each quarter. Students also noted that they would like to have courses in areas in which there currently are none, such as 19th century U.S. History.

Responses to department suggestion for action. Dr. Burstein noted that the department has, “...followed aggressively...” the recommendation of the 2000 program reviewer to rebuild the permanent faculty. Dr. Burstein further listed twelve recommendations the department made to support what it calls the “invisible aspects of faculty work”. These recommendations were for faculty and administrative support such as photocopying and assigned time.

In conclusion, Dr. Burstein stated that he found the History Program to be “strong and effective” and that it has “coped well with a period of severe budgetary constraints”. It is his opinion that the recommendations for actions are well considered and worthy of support. In particular, he noted that the following requests are of greatest importance: rebuilding the faculty; adding office support; providing release time for advisors; augmenting the department’s Supplies and Services budget; and refreshing faculty computers.

Response of the Department
The department acknowledged Dr. Burstein’s comments and agreed with all his conclusions, save one – the conclusion regarding curriculum development. While Dr. Burstein suggested that the department has been largely reactive responding to changes in faculty, the department believes it has been proactive in curricular development, having requested 45 course changes in 2004-2005 alone and carefully requesting its new tenure track positions.

The department agrees with Dr. Burstein’s conclusion that it is operating at near full capacity in all faculty activity areas. The department sees its fundamental challenge for the next five years as, “...sustaining programs at high levels of quality while making every effort to build them...”. The department is pleased that Dr. Burstein recognized this challenge.

4.  PROGRAM’S FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN (2005 - 2009)

Curriculum
The department identified three factors that it believes will predicate the direction of its curriculum in the next five years: development of new fields; rising enrollments in teacher preparation programs; and rising enrollment in history courses at the Concord campus. In each of these areas the department has identified three to five specific areas of curricular development. For example, the department had identified the following areas
it would like to develop: History of Science, Modern Colonialism, South Asia, the Islamic world; and History of Social Work.

**Students**

The department expects that its enrollment will increase in the next five years, as will the diversity of its student body. The department does not expect the career opportunities for history graduates to change, yet enrollment is expected to rise, which is laudable in the current economic climate. The department will continue to recruit students from high schools and community colleges. The only area of learning outcomes it expects to modify is to adapt the program to students who lack proper preparation for college-level liberal arts program. Of course, others may come to light through assessment data. The program considers itself “ahead of the curve” in teaching history as humanities with emphasis in reading, writing and interpretation.

**Faculty**

The department’s five-year plan is to continue to build the faculty in several specific areas on the Hayward and Concord campuses. For instruction, it would like to depend more on permanent faculty and less on short-term hires. As indicated previously, the department sees a great difficulty in sustaining the “invisible work of the faculty” at the current high levels without additional faculty resources.

**Resources**

The program concluded its five-year plan with a list of support staff, faculty assigned time or extra-quarter-for-pay, and equipment that it would like to acquire.

5. CAPR ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAM'S FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

a. **Program**

The History Program conducted a thorough and balanced self-review. The data and documentation included in the review package clearly supported the claims and conclusions of the department and outside reviewer. The curriculum appears to be sound, with a clear direction for future growth. Student enrollment is growing for both majors and non-majors and is predicted to continue to do so. The department has plans to offer a major at the Concord campus, if feasible. The department has written a mission statement, identified student-learning outcomes, and conducted assessment surveys for two academic years; it plans to continue regular assessment activities with the recently appointed Assessment Coordinator.

The History Department has ambitious plans for expansion in three areas: new courses on the Hayward campus, an increased number of teacher preparation courses, and a major on the Concord campus. CAPR endorses the planned expansion, particularly considering the department’s substantial contribution to GE courses. Expansion cannot occur without additional permanent faculty.

Recently class sizes in the program have increased. CAPR recommends that the department closely monitor class size and endorses a cap on class size. Many of the history classes have extensive writing requirements that cannot be adequately maintained with increasing class sizes.

The History Department is to be exuberantly commended for the assessment activities it completed in the past year. The department has made an excellent beginning to the assessment process. CAPR has several recommendations for the department for continued assessment activities that should be addressed in the next Annual Report to CAPR.

1) Outcome Indicators for undergraduate and graduate students include portfolios, yet there is no objective measurement of the goals or quality of the portfolios. The department should develop a rubric for each Outcome to evaluate the associated portfolio projects and demonstrate student learning for the respective outcome. Creation of a portfolio is the evidence of a student’s learning; the rubric is an evaluation of the quality of that evidence.
2) Primary and direct outcome data to show the distribution of student performance on the Outcome rubrics should be included in each Annual Report.

3) Formative assessment activities used as Outcome Indicators are not supported by data from clearly identified direct measurements of student learning outcomes. The department is requested to review its Outcome Indicators and determine a method of direct measurement for each indicator. Data from these measurements should be collected over the coming year and included in the Annual Report.

4) The department identified some trends in its limited assessment data. It is encouraged to examine future data for trends in parallel outcomes in the undergraduate or graduate programs in order to support potential instructional changes.

5) The department indicated that it has current collaborations with other departments and has plans for future collaboration. CAPR recommends that the department continue to forge alliances with other departments to increase enrollment in the future.

b. Resources
The department has been vigorous and careful in faculty searches, thus having twelve successful searches out of thirteen. However, several faculty have resigned or retired leaving the remaining faculty inadequate to complete the multiple tasks of research, teaching, university governance, university service and student advising. Given the program’s plans to expand course offerings, its desire to offer a major at the Concord campus, its collaboration with other departments, its courses in teacher preparation, and its role in the GE program, approving additional tenure track searches for permanent faculty is critical. CAPR fully supports additional tenure track faculty requests by the History Department.

The list of supplies and equipment the department requested is reasonable for it to maintain a quality program. CAPR supports the department’s requests.

6. CAPR RECOMMENDATION FOR CONTINUATION OF THE PROGRAM
CAPR recommends the continuation of the BA and MA degree programs in History without modification.

DATE OF THE PROGRAM’S NEXT FIVE-YEAR REVIEW
2009 - 2010