2026-27 Comprehensive Program Review

Program: History

Division: BSSL

Writers: John Rosen, Stuart McElderry

SLO/SAO Point-Person: John Rosen

Email your completed form to Karin Spirn and your dean by November 2, 2026.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts and info for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Discipline Data Packets – institutional research about disciplines and student services
- ★ Course Success Rates Dashboard – allows you to research your program's success rates

Detailed information and instructions appear at the end of this form. For help, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu.

Section 1: Program Reflection and Planning

These questions appear on all Program Reviews including comprehensive and updates.

1. Please describe your program's most important **achievements** in year 25-26.

- The History program added a full-time faculty member in Fall 2025 - Stuart McElderry - bringing to three the number of FT faculty in the discipline for the first time since 2019.
- The History program offered its first-ever Honors course in History 7, a well-enrolled and successful course taught by Professor John Rosen.
- The program successfully offered 54 sections of History during the 2025-2026 academic year serving the general education and major requirements of approximately 2000 students.
- In Fall 2025, program success rates for F2F sections improved by 7 percentage points over Fall 2024; in Spring 2026, DE sections saw an identical 7 percentage point improvement over Spring 2025.

2. Please describe your most important **challenges** in year 25-26

- The program's primary challenge was the loss to retirement of a full-time faculty member, Professor TeriAnn Bengiveno. Dr. Bengiveno's specialty in Women's history and Women's studies are areas where the program will need to rely on part-time faculty to fill until a full-time faculty member can be hired.

- Developments in AI continue to create challenges that go well beyond issues relating to academic honesty. The increased use of AI, as well as the promotion of AI in our wider culture, has challenged us to rethink how we construct and teach our courses in both in-person and DE modalities. These rapid technological developments have prompted us to rethink pedagogical approaches to our curriculum as well as how we assess student learning.

3. What are your upcoming **plans**? Please note any ways that these support student achievement and equity.

- While there is no immediate plan to replace the retired full-time faculty member mentioned above, this will eventually be something the program needs to do in order to maintain its robust, diverse, and high-quality course offerings.
- We will be offering another Honors section in the Spring 2027 semester.
- As a two-person department, we haven't held many meetings in the past few years. But we plan to meet more often (and to include as many as our part-time faculty as possible) to discuss issues relating to AI and History (which would include considerations relating to student achievement and equity).

Section 2: SLOs/SAOs

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review, with brief annual check-ins on the Program Review Updates. The following resources will be useful when completing this section:

- Three-Year Assessment Template
- Aggregated and Disaggregated Data from the following sources:
  - ELumen (if saved--no longer available online)
  - CurrlQunet
  - Student Success Dashboard

1. During the 2023-2026 three-year assessment cycle that just concluded, what did your program set out to learn through your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessments?

- *We set out to focus on our Program Learning Outcome relating to source analysis and the use of evidence to compose historical arguments. We had focused on this PLO during the first assessment cycle as a result to the shift to Distance learning during the Covid pandemic (prior to the pandemic we only had limited DE offerings). We identified the source and thesis related SLOs for our courses as the most challenging to teach in an asynchronous online modality. That is still something we are interested in learning more about, but the advent of AI has created a new host of challenges – which is why we decided to focus on this PLO once again. We are still trying to get a sense of how effective we are teaching these skills (centered on critical reading, thinking, and writing) in both an in-person and asynchronous online setting – especially as our instructors, in the past 1-2 years, have begun to experiment with new methods and modes of assessment.*

2. Based on your analysis of your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessment data, what conclusions did you draw about student outcomes and equity in your program?

- *On the whole, a majority of our students complete the classes with competency in the SLOs we assessed – the numbers generally correspond to our overall student success rate per the college's student success dashboard.*
- *We noticed that Female students tend to have more success than male students (in our SLO data, the gap was more conspicuous in some semesters than in others. We are not sure why this is the case.*
- *African-American students stood out as the one demographic group that had a noticeably lower rate of success when it came to meeting these particular SLOs – the success rate for the past academic year in particular stood out – with about 50% meeting the SLO (which is about 15 percentage points below the success rate for African American students in our classes as a whole). The sample size for this group is much lower than others, but it is something that as a program we plan on discussing – based on some qualitative comments on the SLO assessment, some of this could result from assignments not being submitted.*
- *Asian American students tend to be most successful in terms of meeting the SLO (as well as with the overall course success rates). In some semesters, "Hispanic" students perform on par with white students, while in other semesters there is a bit of a gap (which was the case in Fall 2025). That is something we will need to monitor as well.*
- *Based on the SLO data, success is higher in our DE courses, especially in the past academic year. But it is difficult to draw conclusions from these results, because the increased use of AI and the challenges it presents when it comes to assessing student learning in an asynchronous online class raise questions about some of these results.*
- *When assessing their SLO data, many of our instructors in the past few semesters have pointed out that there appears to be an increasing number of students who just do not submit any work. This is something that we need to discuss as a program.*

3. Explain potential plans to improve student outcomes and close equity gaps.

- *We plan to have increased discipline meetings to discuss these issues. Such discussions need to consider ways to make our courses and assignments meaningful and relevant to our students. These meetings also need to address assessments for our online courses.*
- *Through continued SLO assessments, we will continue to monitor the equity gaps relating to African American and male students that we noticed in the most recent assessment cycle.*

4. Describe any obstacles that you encountered in your assessment process and any supports that would be helpful.

- *SLO data was a bit more difficult to obtain for the cycle since we had data from two different systems (eLumen and Curriqunet).*
- *Because our faculty have the freedom to develop their own assignments and assessments, I think we need to coach them a bit more clear when explaining the criteria that they used to assess SLOs when*

entering their data. Without sufficient explanation of how they went about assessing student learning and what criteria they used to determine whether a student has indeed met the SLO, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from the data.

- *The Common Course Numbering for History 7/C1001 and 8/C1002 will create some issues moving forward, as we feel compelled to change our SLOs to conform to the CCN template.*

Section 3: Data Discussion

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review. Workshops and office hours will be offered in Fall 2026 to support Program Review writers.

1. RPIE Data Review: Discuss any significant trends in the data provided by the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (or any other data you use for decision-making and planning).

*(**Note**: Not all Programs have RPIE data available; if your program does not have a data packet or dashboard data, you may note that in the response box and reach out to the RPIE team.)*

Data may come from:

- RPIE Data Packets
- Transfer data
- Succes Rates Dashboard (scroll down on page)
- Requested data from the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE)
- SLO/SAO data
- Data from program-created surveys or investigations
- Any other relevant source of quantitative or qualitative data

- Course enrollments remained strong in History for the second consecutive year. The 1,138 in total course enrollments for Fall 2025 was the highest recorded since before the pandemic. The '25-'26 enrollment total of 2,082 was only 56 enrollments shy of the '24-'25 total of 2,138, which was the highest total of the decade.
- Student's use of distance education compared to F2F has settled in the past two years with approximately 25-30% of students preferring DE options in History with around 60-63% of students option for a combination on DE and F2F, and 10-12% opting for F2F only.

2. Equity: Did your data reveal any patterns of inequity? If so, please explain those patterns and any actions that should be taken at the program or college level.

- *The History program's equity data – related to course success rates – does not differ in any substantial way from the patterns found across the institution and, in fact, shows promising, multi-point equitable gains across demographic groups for '25-'26.*

3. Course Modality (Instructional Programs Only): In reviewing your program's data packet and Succes Rates Dashboard, are there differences in success rates by modality (i.e. face-to-face, asynchronous, synchronous, hybrid, or hyflex)? If so, reflect on what might account for differences and any actions that should be taken. (Non-instructional programs may also choose to reflect on online vs. in-person services if applicable).

- There are very slight differences in success rates by modality. In Fall 2025, for example, F2F sections saw 76% of students achieve success compared to 74% of students in DE sections. Modalities flipped in spring 2026 when 76% of DE students achieved success compared to 71% in F2F sections. These differences in success by modality are so slight, and inconsistent with respect to modality, that the program does not see any need for action.

4. Program-Set Standard (Instructional Programs Only): The program-set standard is a baseline that alerts programs if their student success rates have dipped suddenly below 95% of the rolling 5-year average. There is no punishment for not meeting the standard, and many valid reasons this may occur. When a program does not meet this standard, they are asked to examine possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate. | Program-set standard data can be found on this page

5a. Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion in AY25-26?

Yes **X** No____

5b. If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests. Success rates for individual courses can be found on the Success Rates Dashboard.

Section 4: Special Topics

These questions have been chosen for this year's Comprehensive Program Review to meet reporting mandates (for accreditation, Ed. Code, or other sources).

1. Mission: Describe 1-3 examples of how your program's work has aligned with the college's mission, vision, values, and/or educational master plan over the past three years. (Possibilities might include new initiatives, resource allocation/use, program improvements, or other activities).

- Mission, Vision, and Values
- Educational Master Plan

- The History program's work, in the form of classroom and online instruction on the roles of "the people" in shaping government expectations and decisions via the Constitutional process, and in the modeling and encouraging of collegial and respectful interaction among students from different backgrounds and perspectives, aligns with the following items from LPC's Values Statement:

3. Demonstrating civic, social and environmental responsibility

4. Promoting ethical behavior, mutual trust, equity, and respect within our diverse community

2. Regular Substantive Interaction (Instructional Programs Only)

To meet our college, ACCJC, state, and federal standards, **all online instructors** must demonstrate "**regular and substantive interaction**" (RSI) with students. That is, we must be clearly providing instruction and interacting with our online students, just like we would in an on-campus class. The following reflection questions allow us to capture how RSI is occurring in our classes.

The following documents explain requirements and best practices for RSI:

- ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education
- Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements

2a. If your program offers DE courses, how are Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements met in your area? Examples appear on the DE addendums of your Course Outlines of Record. Place an X next to each method used in your courses.	
X	Course materials make clear to students how often and when the instructor will interact with students (e.g. syllabus/home page lists email/office hours/other ways to communicate and typical response times)
	Provides direct instruction over Zoom (e.g. regularly scheduled live online class sessions in synchronous/hybrid/hyflex courses)
X	Provides direct instruction through instructor-created videos (e.g. lecture videos created using Studio in asynchronous courses)
X	Provides additional information from various sources/mediums to engage students with course content (e.g. instructor-curated content in Canvas pages that help deepen students understanding of course content)
X	Facilitates discussions (e.g. through Canvas discussion boards, Pronto, Studio, or Hypothesis)
X	Provides feedback on students' coursework (e.g. through detailed rubrics and/or assignment comments in Speedgrader; note: a grade alone does not quality as RSI, nor does auto-graded feedback students may get through completing publisher content)
X	Responds to students' questions (e.g. through timely responses to student messages in Canvas Inbox, discussion boards, social annotation assignments)

	Facilitates student success through ongoing outreach (e.g. posts announcements; uses "Message Students Who" to encourage struggling students to attend office hours or access free tutoring)
	Other [explain]:

2b. What challenges if any have you faced in implementing RSI? What additional training or resources might instructors in your program need to increase the quality of RSI in online courses?

- The History program does not have any particular challenges to report at this time on the implementation of RSI. The current training opportunities and resources available to LPC instructors are sufficient.

Section 5: Program Review Feedback

What questions or suggestions do you have about this year's Program Review forms or process?

- No questions or suggestions.

Detailed Instructions

Instructions

1. Send an electronic copy of this form to Program Review chair, Karin Spirn, and your Dean by Monday, November 2.
2. Please respond to questions with enough detail to present your information; it doesn't have to be long.
3. If the requested information does not apply to your program, write "Not Applicable."
4. Even if you don't have much to report, we want to hear from you, so your voice is part of the college planning process.
5. Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.

Sections: There are five sections to the document:

1. Program Reflection and Planning
2. SLO/SAO Review
3. Data analysis
4. Special topics
5. Feedback on the PR template and process

Time Frame: This Program Review should reflect your program status during the 25-26 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2026-27. It is fine to discuss topics beyond these time frames, but please specify the time frame in your responses.

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Uses: This Program Review will inform the audience about your program. It is also used in creating division summaries, determining college planning priorities, and determining the allocation of resources. The final use is to document the fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

Equity: Here is the LPC definition of equity, which is a guiding principle in reviewing programs: "Equity is parity in student educational outcomes. It places student success and belonging for students of color and disproportionately impacted students at the center of focus."

Please note: Program Review is NOT a vehicle for making requests. All requests should be made through appropriate processes (e.g., Instructional Equipment Request Process) or directed to your dean or supervisor.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Fall 2023 Program Reviews
- ★ Program Review FAQs

For help with your program review, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu