

**Resolution Honoring the Contributions of our Distinguished Senator and  
Founding Faculty K. Brooks Reid**

WHEREAS, Professor K. Brooks Reid joined the faculty of California State University San Marcos in 1989 as one of 12 Founding Faculty; and

WHEREAS, Brooks Reid served as a dedicated Senator in the Academic Senate of CSUSM since the first Senate in 1990 and for most of the years since, with a well-earned reputation of carefully reading the Senate's thick, multicolored agenda packets; and

WHEREAS, Brooks Reid served the university in a variety of other ways including his service on the P&T committee, fueled by his passion for peer review, and his service to the honors program; and

WHEREAS, Brooks saved the Senate on several occasions from passing policies with loopholes and other inconsistencies; and

WHEREAS, Brooks managed to endure the academic environment of CSUSM longer than any of his fellow Founding Faculty, and so his retirement marks the end of the inaugural phase in the history of the institution; and

WHEREAS, Brooks Reid's expertise, wisdom, and institutional memory will be missed by the Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS, Brooks Reid has had a particularly varied and successful career as marked by his status as Professor Emeritus at two institutions; and

WHEREAS, Brooks and his wife Marion are, and will remain, passionate friends of CSUSM; and

WHEREAS, Professor Reid has made many contributions to graph theory and combinatorics, founded and fostered the mathematics department at CSUSM, and mentored several students who have gone on to successful careers in mathematics; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM recognize Professor K. Brooks Reid for his decades of service to the Senate and the campus; and be it

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM thank him and salute his many accomplishments on this campus and beyond; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM wish its friend and colleague, Brooks Reid, all the best as he embarks on his well-earned retirement from CSUSM.

## **Resolution Honoring the Contributions of Dr. Peter Zwick**

WHEREAS, Dr. Peter Zwick has the distinction of being among the select group of California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) Confounding Faculty; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Peter Zwick was a major contributor to building shared governance at CSUSM through his active involvement with the Academic Senate dating back to his service as founding Parliamentarian in the Senate's first year, and as vice chair in its second year; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Peter Zwick was the Founding Faculty member in the Political Science Department at CSUSM; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Peter Zwick was the founding director of Global Affairs at CSUSM; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Peter Zwick has been instrumental in recruiting international students to CSUSM's academic program and to the American Language and Culture Institute, in increasing our students' participation in study abroad programs, and in supporting faculty international initiatives; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Peter Zwick has helped the School of Nursing to distinguish itself as a leader in global health education by actively engaging faculty and students in international exchanges in places as near as Mexico and Belize and as far away as Vietnam and Africa; and

WHEREAS, Through his efforts, Dr. Peter Zwick has most likely earned more frequent flyer miles than any of his colleagues at CSUSM; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of California State University San Marcos acknowledge Dr. Peter Zwick's substantial contributions to helping the institution realize its global mission and thank him for his hard work; and be it further


RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of California State University San Marcos wish him the very best as he retires and moves onto many new adventures in his life.



Date: April 30, 2012

To: George Vourlitis, Ph.D.  
Chair, Biological Sciences Department

Tracy K. Brown, Ph.D.  
Program Review Lead, Biological Sciences Department

From: Linda Shaw, Chair   
Program Assessment Committee

For the Program Assessment Committee: Donna Goyer, Olaf Hansen, Moses Ochanji, Toni Olivas, David Barsky, Gerardo Gonzalez, Jennifer Jeffries, and Karen Irwin

Subject: Biological Sciences B.S. and M.S. Program Review

The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) has reviewed the Program Review documents for the Biological Sciences (BS) B.S. and M.S. programs. In what follows, PAC summarizes findings from the BS Self-study Report, the Library report, the review of the Self Study by the Dean of IITS, external reviewers, and the Dean of Science and Mathematics. Based on its review, PAC also offers recommendations for consideration by the Biological Sciences faculty and those who will participate in the MOU process.

## I. Achieving Educational Outcomes

### B.S. and M.S. Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Annual Assessment Activities

The BS program consists of four concentrations for the B.S degree (Ecology, Physiology, Cell and Molecular Biology, and General) as well as a M.S. degree and Biotechnology degrees (not considered in this review). The last program review was conducted six years ago, and the Self Study indicates that the program has struggled with assessment, that it does well with course assessment but has “much work to do in the area of program assessment.” While the Self Study discusses various approaches that have been taken to assessment, for example, working with consultants to develop questions associated with yearly assessments, it does not appear that the program has conducted yearly assessments. Nonetheless, faculty have reviewed various aspects of the BS B.S. and M.S. programs during

the period since their last review and implemented the program-level changes indicated below.

**A. Changes to the B.S. Program Since the Last Program Review:**

**1. SLO development:**

- Worked with consultant to streamline SLOs in response to recommendations from the last program review;
- Inclusion of course-specific SLOs on all syllabi;
- Added Department SLOs to website; and
- Developed SLO matrix to highlight where SLOs are introduced, developed, and mastered.

**2. Curricular development:**

- Started a five-year program to increase the quantitative and computational skills among their students;
- Made the evolution course with a writing component a requirement and dropped second semester of organic chemistry in order to increase communication skills;
- Added physiology as a concentration; and
- Increased the prerequisites of upper-division core courses for greater preparation for upper-division work.

**B. Changes to the M.S. Program since the Last Review:**

**1. Development of SLOs:** Developed and revised program SLOs.

**2. Curriculum:**

- Dual listing of undergraduate/graduate courses to increase graduate offerings;
- Enhanced computational and quantitative skills as well as communication skills and teacher preparation by discontinuing BIOL 610 and 611 and requiring BIOL 600 and another computational skills course;
- Allowed only three units of undergraduate work; and
- Removed subject GRE as entrance requirement and replaced it with the General GRE.

***Additional Biological Sciences B.S. Program Strengths and Accomplishments in Support of Achieving Educational Outcomes***

A. The **Program Self Study** noted the following additional strengths and program accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

**1. Curriculum development:**

- The lab-intensive curriculum is one of the most distinguishing characteristics of the B.S. program; and
- A great deal of cooperation with other departments in the design of classes for undergraduate biology majors.

**2. Student research opportunities:**

- As part of their emphasis on the teacher-scholar model, students have the opportunity to put theories into practice through independent research with over three times as many students engaged in supervised research as in the next closest department;
- Many students participate in the annual campus and statewide Student Research Competition; and
- Faculty often co-author publications with students.

**3. Student access and retention, including underrepresented minorities:**

- The number of undergraduate students continues to grow;
- The one-year retention rates for undergraduates have improved dramatically (one year retention rate is 80% and the program graduates 60-80% of its majors);
- Fall 2009 and 2010 saw a large jump in enrolled Latino students; and
- The program works closely with CSUSM's office of Biomedical Research and Training (OBRT) to increase opportunities for underrepresented minorities in science and to increase students' success in historically difficult classes.

**4. Faculty research:** Faculty have an active publication record with 129 peer reviewed journal articles in the last five years.

**5. Advising:** The faculty are approachable and attempts to get every undergraduate student in contact with a tenure track faculty once a year for advising.

B. The **external reviewers** noted the following additional program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

**1. Accomplishment since the last program review:** The Department's accomplishments and trajectory since the previous review are excellent. The program is functioning smoothly in a fiscally thoughtful manner; there is a sense of unity of purpose; and the faculty are energetic teachers.

**2. SLOs:** SLOs have been streamlined.

**3. Curriculum:**

- The program has among the most lab-intensive biology curricula in the nation;
- Students are well served and provided with a significant background in biological training;
- The recent infusion of mathematics in the curriculum is forward thinking; and
- The department has worked hard to support STEM education for minorities as a key partner with OBRT.

**4. Research:** The high level of research activity and research involving students is a distinctive feature of the biology program.

C. The **Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics** noted the following program strengths and accomplishments regarding achieving educational outcomes:

**1. SLOs:** Great strides made in articulating SLOs.

**2. Curriculum:**

- Solid and contemporary lab-intensive curriculum that rivals programs nationally;
- Infusion of quantitative and computational skills in the biology curriculum;
- Strong alignment with the University's core values; and
- Thoughtful examination of curriculum to provide a quality learning environment.

**3. Research:**

- High level of research among faculty; and
- Faculty secures external funding that engages students in research activities.

***Additional Biological Sciences Strengths and Accomplishments in Support of Achieving Educational Outcomes Specific to the M.S. Program***

A. The **external reviewers** noted the following program M.S. program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

**1. Curriculum:** Changes to the graduate program are thoughtful, fiscally pragmatic improvements to the curriculum.

***Biological Science B.S. Program Challenges to Achieving Educational Outcomes***

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following program challenges to achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Student readiness:** A large proportion of students require remediation, especially in writing.
2. **Graduation rates:** Only a small number of students whose last known major was Biology actually obtained degrees.

B. The **external reviewers** identified the following challenges related to achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Curriculum:**

- Some biology courses are not available to biology majors; and
- There are only a few explicitly organismal courses, and the extent of curriculum-based field experience could be increased.

2. **Student research:** More students would like to obtain research experience.
3. **Student progress through the major:** The time to completion seems to be a primary challenge.
4. **Faculty:** There is no faculty whose primary specialty is evolution.
5. **Assessment:** Institutional concern with assessment is more focused on accountability than on program improvement.

C. The **Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics** identified the following challenges related to achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Student access to research:** The access to research experience and courses in general could be improved.

***Biological Sciences M.S. Program Challenges to Achieving Educational Outcomes***

A. The **Program Self Study** noted the following additional Biological Sciences M.S. program challenges:

1. **Lack of support for graduate students:** Working M.S. students without program support take longer and need more time to graduate. The lack of fiscal support for graduate students is the largest impediment to increasing the overall graduating success.

## II. Developing and Applying Resources

### *Biological Sciences B.S. and M.S. Program Strengths and Accomplishments*

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:

1. **External funding:** Faculty acquired over \$10.5 million in internal and external grant monies and created opportunities for student research.
2. **Technology:** Excellent level of technical support from IITS.
3. **Library:** Library faculty and staff work well with the program; an increase in the availability of online journal access.
4. **Lab facilities:** Equipment available to the students is almost unsurpassed at comparable undergraduate institutions.
5. **Staff:** Cooperative staff with a good attitude.
6. **Relations with outside institutions:** Close ties with colleagues at local community colleges.
7. **Lecturer faculty:** Talented long-term adjunct faculty allow for consistency in the delivery of courses.

B. The **external reviewers** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:

1. **External funding:** Faculty work hard to secure external funding to support their research.
2. **Lab facilities:** Excellent and well-utilized and funded facilities.
3. **Faculty and staff:** Faculty and staff comprise an enthusiastic team.

C. The **Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:

1. **Faculty actively seek external funding:** Wise selection and regular applications for external funding to promote research productivity are an integral part of the Department's culture.
2. **Faculty hires:** Careful hiring results in committed and talented faculty.



3. **Curriculum:** Innovative curriculum development.
4. **Collaboration within and outside of the campus:** Collaboration with other departments and institutions helped BS to become the largest program in the College of Science and Mathematics.

***Biological Sciences Program B.S. and M.S. Program Weaknesses and Challenges Regarding Developing and Applying Resources***

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following weaknesses and challenges regarding developing and applying resources:

1. **Research resources:** Need for Web of Science.
2. **Faculty:** Loss of three faculty members, combined with growth in the number of students served by the program and the growth of the degree in Biotechnology, has put a strain on faculty resources.
3. **Staff:** Insufficient staff support since the academic coordinator has to manage numerous grants and spends a large amount of time on the training of student assistants.
4. **Curriculum:** Expensive service courses add to demands on support staff and mean that core courses cannot be offered in sufficient numbers; budget uncertainties force cancellation of courses and delay graduation.
5. **Lab equipment and space:** Lack of lab space is an impediment to future hires, student research, and curriculum expansion; equipment is in need of repair and maintenance while the cost of repairs and maintenance are rising and old and/or broken equipment increases faculty workload.

B. The **external reviewers** noted the following weaknesses and challenges regarding developing and applying resources:

1. **Support to apply for external funding:** Little incentive to apply for external grants.
2. **Lab space and staff:** Staffing and lab space limitations limit access to courses.
3. **Student research opportunities:** Time and space limitations limit student research opportunities.
4. **Faculty workload:** Insufficient teaching credit relative to workload and a workload burden on faculty teaching lab classes.
5. **Curriculum:** Some biology courses are not available to biology majors.

6. **Space and grant overhead:** Policies regarding space allocation and grant overhead should be clear and transparent.
7. **Assessment:** Insufficient funding for assessment.

C. The **College Dean** noted the following challenges and weaknesses related to developing and applying resources:

1. **Faculty:** Faculty lines have already been associated with an approved environmental studies program.
2. **Grant overhead:** Current practices regarding grant overhead allocation have been disseminated.

### ***Biological Sciences M.S. Program Challenges and Weaknesses Related to Developing and Applying Resources***

A. The program **Self Study** noted the following additional M.S. program challenges and weaknesses related to developing and applying resources:

1. **Resources for Graduate Students:** Lack of fiscal support.

## **III. Additional Themes/Special Issues**

### ***Biological Sciences B.S. and M.S. Program Strengths and Accomplishments Related to Additional Themes/Special Issues***

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding additional themes/special issues:

1. **Diverse faculty:** A diverse faculty with nearly equal number of women and men and several Latinos as tenure-track faculty.
2. **External resources and collaborations:** A perfect location for a biological sciences program with many habitats, local collaborations, and partnerships with many local agencies and companies; strong ties to local biotechnology firms; internship possibilities for undergraduates with local companies and government agencies; and well established community projects with local companies, state and federal agencies, local schools, conservation groups, senior groups, and city officials.
3. **Student research:** Student research is highly valued and the greatest proportion of faculty involved in student research which contributed to CSUSM's selection to participate on NSF's Institute for Institutionalizing Undergraduate Research Council of Undergraduate Research.

4. **Quantitative and computational (Q&C) skills:** Q&C skills became part of program SLOs; part of a five-year MARC Curriculum Improvement “Q&C” grant which lead to course modifications, assessment of prerequisite skills of upper division students, and assessment of Q&C skills at three points in each student’s undergraduate development; the program shares Q&C modifications with local community colleges.

### ***Biological Sciences Strengths Related to Additional Themes and Special Issues Specific to the M.S. Program***

- A. The program **Self Study** noted the following program strengths and accomplishments related to additional themes and special issues:
  1. **Graduate Teaching experience:** All graduate students teach at least one semester.

### ***Biological Sciences B.S. and M.S. Program Challenges Related To Additional Themes/Special Issues***

- A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following program challenges regarding additional themes/special issues:
  1. **Faculty workload:** Undergraduate and graduate student research, independent study courses, and lab instruction are not adequately recognized and accounted for in faculty workload.
- B. The **external reviewers** noted the following weaknesses and challenges regarding additional themes/special issues:
  1. **Curriculum:** The program has strong ties with local community colleges, but the reviewers did not learn if course offerings are closely coordinated.
  2. **Student Research:** More students would like research experience.

### ***Biological Sciences Challenges Related to Additional Themes/ Special Issues Specific to the M.S. Program***

- A. The program **Self Study** noted the following program challenges related to additional themes and special issues:
  1. **Independent Study Graduate Course Offerings:** Most BIOL 685 units are given through independent study, which results in a lack of TA training, supervision, evaluation, and no compensation for faculty.

## IV. Biological Sciences Program Future Plans and Recommendations

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following future plans and recommendations:

1. **Time to graduation:** Ongoing assessment of graduation time for transfer students.
2. **New center and program development:**
  - Explore if there should be a separate BIOT Department; and
  - Explore development of a STEM center.
3. **Increased staff and equipment support for labs:** Of critical importance is the increase in funding and staff support for the delivery of lab intensive curriculum, including additional instructional support technician, and an increased budget for repair and maintenance of equipment and wet lab space for new hires.
4. **Assessment:** Develop a long-term plan for program-level assessment, including longitudinal knowledge surveys to improve program level assessments.
5. **Faculty hires:** If the 2011 hire is successful, the program plans to hire three new positions in physiology, behavioral ecology, and biotechnology with an emphasis on increasing faculty diversity.
6. **Faculty workload:** Address the workload issue for faculty supervising undergraduate and graduate student research, internships, and for the development of teaching labs.
7. **Staff hire and reclassification:** Hire a permanent part-time assistant for the AC; if the program AC would oversee adjunct faculty contracts, efficiency would be improved, and the AC could be reclassified as budget analyst.
8. **Support for student research:** Support for supplies to support student research is needed along with recognition for faculty of support for student research.

B. The **external reviewers** noted the following future plans and recommendations:

1. **Student research:** Increase student access to field research.
2. **Faculty workload:** The University should recognize and support faculty engaged with OBRT.
3. **Faculty and student development:** The program is encouraged to offer a colloquium series with invited speakers.
4. **Chair compensation:** The Department Chair should be on a 12-month salary.

5. **Assessment:** IPA can be helpful to efficiently assess SLOs; assigned time for the Assessment Coordinator should be explored.
  6. **Budget priorities and decentralization:** Priorities should be assigned to desired improvements which require additional monetary support; the program needs sufficient control over budget to prioritize to determine trade-offs in expenditures.
  7. **Space allocation:** Priorities over space allocation should be clear and transparent.
- C. The **Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics** noted the following future plans and recommendations:
1. **Prioritize resource needs:** Prioritize program needs which require additional resources; the Dean notes that the program has been given increased control over its budget to prioritize trade-offs in expenditures to reflect its mission and priorities.
  2. **Planning for instructional capacity:** Address instructional capacity needs with sound strategic planning.
  3. **Planning for infrastructure needs:** Seek new and creative ways to maintain and expand infrastructure.
  4. **Assessment:** Utilize annual assessment plans as a vehicle to improve programmatic assessment over the next five years.
  5. **Faculty and student development:** The Dean concurs with the external reviewers that invited speakers will invigorate the academy.
- D. The **Dean of IITS** recommends the following future plans and recommendations:
1. **Utilize external resources:** Attend EDUCAUSE Learning Institute conference and utilize MERLOT as a resource for new courses.
  2. **Consult with IITS to plan for BS:** Meet with IITS representatives to discuss online services such as the Degree Process Report; make sure the IITS three-year rolling plan includes provisions to help the BS program.
  3. **Consult with IITS staff to insure ATI compliance:** Meet with IITS instructional developer to discuss assistance in creating new courses to better comply with the CSU Adaptive Technology Initiative guidelines.
  4. **Utilize Instructional support:** Be aware that instructional support is available at no cost.
  5. **Multi-media support:** Identify funds for multimedia support needs outside the M-F 8-5 schedule.

## ***The Following Additional Future Plans were Identified for the Biological Sciences M.S. Program***

A. The **Self Study** noted the following future plans and recommendations for the M.S. program:

1. **Curriculum:**

- Assign one faculty to BIOL 685 for TA supervision; and
- Develop new guidelines for thesis committees.

2. **Assessment:**

- Update the GVAR assessment; and
- Develop a survey system to assess the graduate program.

3. **Enhance research capacity:** Purchase access to Web of Science.

4. **Graduate Coordinator:** Secure resources for graduate coordinator.

5. **Graduate assistants:** Secure funds for the graduate assistants.

- Employ graduate assistants for lab courses to relieve lab workload and provide graduate student support; and
- Increase assistantships for graduate students.

6. **Alumni Outreach:** Establish mechanism by which M.S. alumni can become a source of information to improve the M.S. degree.

B. The **Science and Mathematics Dean** noted the following future plans and recommendations for the M.S. program:

1. **Decrease time to graduation:** Explore ways to shorten the time to degree for M.S. students through scheduling and utilizing graduate students to teach labs, which might also relieve faculty workload; explore other methods to utilize graduate students to assist with teaching.

## **PAC Summary and Conclusions**

The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) thanks the faculty of the Biological Sciences Department for the successful completion of their Program Review. The BS program provides outstanding contributions to student and faculty research, the acquisition of external funding, and outreach to local schools, colleges, agencies, and companies. PAC

acknowledges that the Biological Sciences Department, like many others, realizes these accomplishments despite a severe shortage of faculty and other resources.

Contributors to this program review have offered thoughtful observations on the current state of the program as well as a rich array of suggestions for future planning for the Biological Sciences B.S. and M.S. programs. In what follows, PAC highlights recommendations from the Program Review, and based on its own review, offers recommendations for consideration by the BS Department faculty and those who will participate in the MOU process:

1. **Annual Assessment of SLOs:** PAC strongly encourages the Department of Biological Sciences to follow its plan to conduct annual assessments of its B.S. program and to develop and implement appropriate long-term, program-level change based on assessment data. PAC also supports the Department's plan to assess the graduate program and to institute appropriate program change based on these data.
2. **Graduate T.A.s:** PAC encourages the Department to explore the possibility of employing graduate students as assistants for lab courses to relieve workload for faculty, give graduate students another source of support, and add a teaching experience to the graduate program.
3. **Graduation rates:** Students who initially identify as Biology majors do not finish the program and transfer out to other programs. The Department needs to follow-up on what is happening to their students. In addition, they should clarify what they will be doing in their future plan to address these challenges.
4. **Prioritize Future Plans:** One challenge will be for the BS faculty is to prioritize their short and long-term goals for growth and development. Since many of the future plans and recommendations require additional monetary support, we encourage the Department to use their prioritized requests to inform their three-year rolling plan based on an analysis of needs for future curricular and research developments.

Finally, PAC's overall assessment is that the Biological Sciences B.S. and M.S. programs are both Programs of Quality and Promise with a recommendation for a five-year review cycle. In the absence of a previous MOU, PAC bases this recommendation on the following three criteria contained in the Program Review Guidelines:

- the degree to which the annual assessments have generated useful data and whether assessment results have been used to make appropriate changes;
- the degree to which the five-year plan explicitly and appropriately addresses program challenges and enhances or preserves program strengths; and
- the strengths and challenges identified by the review of educational effectiveness and capacity.

Based on these criteria and its review of all material received, the PAC thinks that there is an urgent need for the Biological Sciences B.S. and M.S. programs to conduct annual assessments. The PAC further thinks that the Biological Sciences B.S. and M.S. programs will benefit from a review within the next five years during which faculty will reflect on its assessment efforts and, where appropriate, use assessment data to create program-level change.

PAC congratulates the Biological Sciences Department on its completion of this Program Review. In particular, PAC thanks the faculty for their ongoing commitment to student achievement while responding to significant challenges. PAC wishes the Biological Sciences Department faculty success in their continuing efforts to meet these challenges and in realizing its plans for the future development of the Biological Sciences programs.

cc: Wayne Aitken, Chair, Academic Senate  
Marcia Woolf, Coordinator, Academic Senate  
Emily F. Cutrer, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Katherine Kantardjieff, Dean, College of Science and Mathematics  
Program Assessment Committee





Date: April 29, 2012

To: Rika Yoshii, Ph.D.  
Chair, Computer Science and Information Systems Department

Rocio Guillen, Ph.D.  
Program Review Lead, Computer Science and Information Systems  
Department

From: Linda Shaw, Ph.D. *Linda Shaw*  
Chair, Program Assessment Committee

For the Program Assessment Committee: Donna Goyer, Olaf Hansen, Moses Ochanji, Toni Olivas, David Barsky, Gerardo Gonzalez, Jennifer Jeffries, and Karen Irwin

Subject: Computer Science and Information Systems B.S. and M.S. Program  
Reviews

The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) has reviewed the Program Review documents for the Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) Department B.S. and M.S. programs. In what follows, PAC summarizes findings from the B.S. and M.S. program Self-study Report, the Library Report, the letter from the Dean of IITS, the External Reviewers' Report, and the Dean's response to the Program Review. Based on its review, PAC also offers recommendations for consideration by the CSIS faculty and those who will participate in the MOU process.

## **IA. Achieving Educational Outcomes: Computer and Information Systems B.S. Program**

### **Annual Assessment Activities: CSIS B.S. Program**

The CSIS faculty have developed Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) designed to meet the goals of the B.S. program, and since 2007, they have conducted annual assessments of SLOs to measure progress in achieving program goals. Matrices for Program Student Learning Objectives (PSLOs) have also been developed, and SLOs are introduced in core courses and built upon as students progress through the program. Importantly, SLOs for courses have been aligned with PSLOs, and syllabi have been reviewed to ensure the clear articulation of learning objectives.

Since 2007, CSIS faculty have conducted annual assessments for the following B.S. program SLOs:

- Design, implement, and test software to meet a given set of requirements (2007-2008; 2008-2009);
- Document software to facilitate software maintenance activities (2007-2008; 2008-2009);
- Analyze the effects of different choices of algorithms and data structures (2008-2009);
- Mathematical readiness (spring 2009);
- Demonstrate effective oral and written communications (2009-2010);
- Develop documentation to meet clients' needs (2009-2010); and
- Demonstrate self and team management (2009-2010).

For each annual assessment from 2007-2009, several courses were selected, and instructors gave assignments designed to measure student success in achieving SLOs at the beginning and again toward the end of the courses. The 2009-2010 assessment involved student presentation of ideas in meetings, creation of documents, and working in teams using a project management tool.

#### **Findings and Uses of Assessment Data to Create B.S. Program Change:**

- **2007-2008:** Faculty reported that the results of the 2007-2008 assessment focused on programming and software development were encouraging, concluding that by the end of the semester, students showed significant improvement, and "With these results, we were confident that students were going to be well prepared in the assessed areas by the time they graduated from our program." No changes to the program were discussed in response to these assessment results;
- **2008-2009:** While results of the 2008-2009 assessments were not extensively discussed in the Self Study, course-level changes were initiated that focused on findings related to analytical abilities and mathematical readiness in B4 courses in which student mathematical background was found to be weak: [faculty] "are working on designing a course to better prepare incoming students in mathematics" and "working with all faculty members to make sure Unix and other required knowledge is covered in CS 111 and CS 211;" and
- **2009-2010:** Data focused on increasing oral and written communication and working as a team to complete a project using a project management tool revealed some improvement, but the degree of improvement was not clear, and no program changes based on assessment data were noted.

#### ***B.S. Program Additional Strengths and Accomplishments in Support of Achieving Educational Outcomes***

A. The CSIS B.S. program **Self Study** identified the following additional strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

**1. Curriculum:** The CSIS Department offers a B.S. degree modeled after the Breadth-First Implementation of the 1991 ACM/IEEE recommendations. The Department also offers a Computer Information Systems (CIS) option within the B.S. program that emphasizes data processing and programming to solve business-related problems. The **B.S. program is distinguished by:**

- Its low SFR;
- A curriculum that emphasizes both breadth and depth;
- Internships that provide students experience working in local companies;
- Students who are well integrated into Departmental activities (faculty research, professional organizations, etc.); and
- Students who are prepared for careers in applications programming, system analysis, commercial business, software engineering, and advanced graduate study.

**2. Student satisfaction:** Exit surveys (the period included in these surveys is not stated) reveal that:

- **Most students have found employment;**
- Most feel prepared in the following areas: documenting programs, transferring knowledge into new languages and systems, ability to work in a team, problem-solving skills needed to develop programs, use of operating systems and compilers, and written and oral communication; and
- The most highly valued aspects of the program are: quality of instruction, laboratory activities, faculty accessibility, faculty advising, and computing resources.

**3. Faculty Research:** High level of faculty research and publication with five of six faculty receiving NSF and HIH grants.

B. The **external reviewers** identified the following CSIS B.S. program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

**1. Curriculum.**

**2. Teaching.**

**3. Faculty/student research:** Especially impressed by externally funded research activities carried out with students.

**4. Assessment procedures.**

**5. Links to local industry.**

C. The **Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics** noted the following additional CSIS B.S. program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Curriculum:** Curriculum development that is responsive to ACM/IEEE guidelines.
2. **SLOs and assessment:** Well articulated SLOs and yearly assessments.
3. **External funding:** Faculty and student involvement in external funding activities.

*CSIS B.S. Program Challenges to Achieving Educational Outcomes*

A. The CSIS B.S. program **Self Study** identified the following challenges to achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Student Readiness:** Assessment of B4 GE courses shows that students' mathematical background is weak.
2. **Curriculum Development:** The curriculum for the B.S. program has not been revised in the last 10 years, although a new design for lower division courses that reflects 2001 ACM Curriculum Guidelines is in progress, particularly with regard to students' mathematical preparedness. Other modifications are pending in light of SB 1040 and the new CS Curricula 2013.

B. The **external reviewers** noted the following CSIS B.S. program challenges to achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Lack of Resources:** Attributed areas in need of improvement to constraints on resources.
2. **Classroom scheduling.**
3. **Advising.**
4. **Relations with other departments.**
5. **Alumni tracking.**

**I.B. Achieving Educational Outcomes: Computer and Information Systems M.S. Program**

**Annual Assessment Activities: CSIS M.S. Program**

Since 2007, CSIS faculty have conducted assessments for the following M.S. program SLO:

- Design, implement, and present individual and team projects (2007-2008; 2008-2009; 2009-2010).
- Students to learn to work individually and/or in teams on a project as well as to learn how to prepare and give presentations.

The 2007-2008 annual assessment activity conducted in selected CSIS courses focused on how to design, implement, present, and document and present a project. The 2008-2009 annual assessment, conducted in CS 671: Artificial Intelligence, was designed to determine whether there was a difference in achieving learning outcomes when students worked individually or in teams. The 2009-2010 annual assessment, also conducted in CS 671, examined the benefits of writing a proposal before students engaged in their culminating project.

### **Findings and Uses of Assessment Data to Create M.S. Program Change:**

- **2007-2008:** Data from the 2007-2008 annual assessment revealed that students benefitted from involvement in individual and team projects through: exposure to different research topics, methodologies, and approaches to developing a project; preparation to select and work on a research topic for their final project or thesis; and learning the roles and responsibilities entailed in implementing a successful project. The Self Study provides no indication of program changes based on these assessment data;
- **2008-2009:** Assessment data show that some students benefitted from continuous training as well as individual and team projects, but there was no indication of the factors associated with these outcomes. Program-level changes based on these results were not discussed; and
- **2009-2010:** Assessment revealed that writing a proposal for their culminating project assisted students in choosing a project related to the course, completing the project on time, determining resources, and communication with teammates in accomplishing their goals. No program changes were discussed based on these assessment data.

### ***M.S. Program Additional Strengths and Accomplishments in Support of Achieving Educational Outcomes***

A. The CSIS Program **Self Study** noted the following additional CSIS M.S. program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

- 1. Curriculum:** CSIS faculty seek to prepare students for careers in business and industry, the public sector, and for advanced graduate study which leads to careers in community college teaching. To achieve these goals, the curriculum emphasizes a course of study focused on the development of theoretical foundations, critical thinking, and independent research, project development, presentation and documentation, and quantitative reasoning skills. **The M.S. program is distinguished by:**

- Breadth as well as depth of study in areas such as networking communications, databases, and artificial intelligence;
- Opportunities for applied experience aimed at enhancing professional development and contributions to the community;
- Low SFR;
- Faculty mentoring;
- Evening courses; and
- Incorporation of students into Departmental life.

### ***CISIS M.S. Program Challenges to Achieving Educational Outcomes***

A. The CSIS M.S. program **Self Study** noted the following challenges to educational outcomes:

1. **Curriculum Development:** While a change in one of the core courses and a program elective is under discussion, revisions are necessary to make the curriculum more current with emerging trends in technology and industry.

## **II. Developing and Applying Resources (Capacity Review)**

### ***CISIS B.S. and M.S. Program Challenges Related to Developing and Applying Resources***

A. The program **Self Study** identified several challenges related to developing and applying resources that the B.S. and M.S. programs face:

1. **Declining Enrollments:** Enrollments in the B.S. program have dropped significantly in recent years, a trend that faculty attribute to a reduction in the program's GE offerings.
2. **Number of Faculty:** The CSIS Department has lost four faculty since 2005 which limits the program's ability to offer a variety of courses.
3. **Library resources:** The library has ended its subscription to the Digital Library of the ACM which provides access to conference proceedings because of budget constraints, and only a few students are aware of the interlibrary loan option.
4. **Insufficient computer lab and software resources:** Limited access to computer labs and essential software (note: the Dean of IITS states that: the standard configuration in all computer labs includes software identified by the CSIS Department, Linux access is possible, and IITS provides for individual software needs through the refresh program and advises the use of "Cougar Apps" for access to sophisticated software products).

**5. Frequency with which courses are offered:** The feature rated lowest on the graduation survey which results from the loss of faculty and decrease in enrollment.

B. The **external reviewers** assessed the CSIS B.S. and M.S. programs to be “severely limited” in the following areas related to developing and applying resources:

- 1. Insufficient Number of Faculty:** Faculty shortage severely limits program effectiveness in several areas, including:
  - Too few professors to cover even the core classes; undergraduate exit survey data also show that the aspect of the program that was rated lowest was the frequency with which courses are offered;
  - Loss of expertise in areas in which graduate students may want to focus but do not have the opportunity to acquire these skills; and
  - Continuity of the program suffers because courses cannot be offered on a regular basis.
- 2. Library resources:** Current library subscriptions and book holdings are inadequate to maintain currency in the discipline and support the programs, especially the graduate program.
- 3. Computer lab resources:** Computer lab resources have been reduced, and properly equipped labs that are available outside of normal teaching hours are important for student learning.

### III. Additional Themes/Special Issues

#### *B.S. and M.S. Program Strengths and Accomplishments*

A. The CSIS **Self Study** identified the following additional B.S. and M.S. program strengths:

- 1. Student Research Opportunities:** Students have opportunities to work on projects for local companies and with faculty on research projects. Examples include:
  - Students in CIS490: Project Management work in teams to develop software for local companies;
  - CS majors work with CSIS faculty who collaborate with schools to develop new learning tools; and
  - In the M.S. program, CSIS faculty collaborate with the Biology department in developing and applying computational methods. Students are involved in the development of new methods and applications.
- 2. Advising:** CSIS faculty are active in the following advising activities:

- Students are advised on an individual basis;
- Graduating majors take a survey that provides the department with information about employment opportunities and the quality of the program. Results show that most graduates are employed and that they were adequately prepared in a number of areas;
- Communication with students via current student and alumni listservs that are used to distribute information about job opportunities, course requests, internships, scholarships, and seminars and talks;
- The Department website provides information about the B.S. and M.S. programs, faculty research, exit survey, and alumni success stories for prospective students, as well as companies and industries that may be interested in sending their employees to take courses in CS programs; and
- An alumni web page has been developed as a graduate student project.

#### **IV. B.S. and M.S. Program Future Plans and Recommendations**

A. Based on the results of its **Self Study**, future plans for the CSIS B.S. and M.S. programs include:

1. Hire two tenure-track faculty in the areas of Net-Centric computing and Systems Hardware order to preserve program integrity.
2. Secure additional space and priority usage of computer lab space.
3. Review and revise program curricula to align with SB1040 and the new Curricula 2013 from the ACM and IEEE. One aspect of the plan is to replace the elective CS 513: Analysis of Algorithms with the current core course, CS 551:Advanced Programming Languages.
4. Increase enrollment by recruiting students from high schools and community colleges.
5. Increase enrollment by developing GE offerings in addition to its current six GE courses and continue collaboration with the Biology Department on two interdisciplinary courses in biomedical sciences.
6. Use existing library resources to acquire literature from ACM through interlibrary loan (ILL) and make students more aware of this possibility.
7. Continue to pursue opportunities to establish links with companies in the region through internships.



8. Continue efforts to establish relationships with international universities to provide study abroad experiences for students and to recruit graduate students.
9. Update the Department website to provide accurate information for current students and companies interested in their employees taking CSIS courses.

B. The **Dean of IITS** recommends the following future plans:

1. Use campus servers for Linux and other sophisticated software through "Cougar Apps."
2. Meet regularly with the IITS Dean and his Academic Technology Director to insure that CSIS software needs are met.
3. Use IITS support for online and multimedia classes.
4. Insure that new courses are in compliance with the CSU Accessible Technology Initiative guidelines for instructional materials.
5. Become aware that resources for course development are available in MERLOT (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching).
6. Identify online courses in the CSU and consider course sharing with other campuses in response to the labor intensive character of developing online courses.
7. Identify funds that will enable access to multimedia resources and facilities outside of regular business hours.

C. The **external reviewers** recommend the following future plans:

1. Hire additional faculty to reach a total of eight to nine full-time faculty in the Department.
2. Update the CSIS curriculum in cooperation with other Departments.
3. Expand GE offerings, including the development of GE courses in collaboration with other Departments such as Bioinformatics and Computer Forensics.
4. Continue collaboration with community colleges regarding preparation of transfer students (especially in the context of SB 1440), teaching Discrete Mathematics as a lower division course, and the difficulties of students transitioning from Java to C++. To address the problem that community college transfer courses may not be as rigorous as CSUSM equivalents, make Catalog descriptions more explicit about the language, mathematics, and other skills expected of transfer students.

5. Improve scheduling to avoid time conflicts for pre-requisite courses, and collaborate with other departments in scheduling.
6. Examine the necessity of pre-requisite courses.
7. Improve coordination between CSIS faculty, the library, and students, including classroom visits from librarians that focus on accessing research related materials.
8. Introduce lab fees to support greater access to computer labs.
9. Improve computer lab facilities: access to Linux for graduate students and lab facilities behind a firewall where students can safely experiment with new technologies.
10. Implement mechanisms to insure that students seek advising.
11. Provide support for maintaining the Department website and use social networking to maintain contact with alumni.
12. Provide college-level support for meeting with an "Industrial Advisory Board" each semester to maintain contact, provide support, and receive curricular advice.
13. Provide compensation for faculty who mentor graduate students and serve on thesis committees.
14. To attract students, develop a Professional Science Master's option with an industry advisory board that could lead to paid internships, graduate assistantships, and hardware donations.

D. The **Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics** recommends the following future plans for the CSIS B.S. and M.S. programs:

1. Operationalize the external reviewers' recommendations.
2. To encourage growth in FTES, develop GE offerings in emerging areas of: digital forensics, privacy and technology, discoveries in computer science, or infographics.
3. To accrue resources for curriculum infrastructure, develop coordinated courses with thematic foci in Extended Learning that respond to unmet needs in the region.
4. To accrue resources, develop self-support offerings and thematic options for the M.S. program.
5. To accrue resources, seek funding through grants from external agencies.

6. Address instructional capacity needs by submitting hiring proposals that include approaches to creating the financial resources and infrastructure to support new hires.
7. Work with librarians to improve use of library resources, for example, by communicating regularly with librarians about resources that are accessible electronically through library databases.
8. To offset the expense required for maintenance and upgrades to computer laboratories and the acquisition of specialized technologies, propose a student fee schedule sufficient to support computer laboratories.
9. To support a computer laboratory that meets the needs of computer science students to engage in computer activities without compromising the campus network and to acquire specialized technologies, seek external funding for curriculum development and construction of a dedicated computer laboratory.
10. Establish a Professional Science Masters self-support program that would enable students to conduct projects as interns in industry.
11. In considering of curricular revisions, consult and collaborate with other Departments.
12. Communicate regularly with the Dean and Advancement regarding external funding opportunities.

## **PAC Summary and Conclusions**

The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) thanks the faculty of the Computer Science and Information Systems Department for the successful completion of their Program Reviews for the B.S. and M.S. programs. The reviews demonstrate a commitment to program assessment, successful faculty research, and a flourishing relationship with local companies. The PAC acknowledges that the CSIS Department, like many other departments, realizes these accomplishments despite a severe shortage of faculty and other resources.

Contributors to this program review have offered thoughtful observations on the current state of the program as well as a rich array of suggestions for future planning for the CSIS B.S. and M.S. programs. One challenge will be for the CSIS faculty to prioritize their short and long-term goals for growth and development. In what follows, PAC offers its recommendations, highlighting several that resulted from this Program Review, for consideration by the CSIS Department and those who will formulate the B.S. and M.S. program MOUs:

- **PAC recognizes the need for additional faculty** to preserve the integrity of both the B.S. and M.S. programs.

- To preserve program integrity, PAC strongly encourages the CSIS Department to prioritize **updating its curriculum** by: adopting the Computing Curricula 2013 to ensure that new developments in the field are incorporated into its programs and by developing additional GE courses. An updated curriculum and increased FTES are also necessary to support the Department's request for additional faculty, to guide the Department in its hiring criteria and decisions, and to attract quality faculty to the Department.
- As it updates its curriculum and attempts to increase enrollments, PAC proposes that the CSIS faculty **collaborate with faculty from other disciplines to development new GE courses**—for example, Bioinformatics and possibly Physics courses. Updating the curriculum to reflect the current state of the field will make the CSIS curriculum more relevant to student interests and needs, a necessary step for increasing enrollments. Such increases will also be important to justifying requests for new faculty hires.

Finally, PAC's overall assessment is that the Computer and System Information Systems B.S. and M.S. programs are both Programs of Quality and Promise with a recommendation for a five-year review cycle. In the absence of a previous MOU, PAC bases this recommendation on the following three criteria contained in the Program Review Guidelines:

- the degree to which the annual assessments have generated useful data and whether assessment results have been used to make appropriate changes;
- the degree to which the five-year plan explicitly and appropriately addresses program challenges and enhances or preserves program strengths; and
- the strengths and challenges identified by the review of educational effectiveness and capacity.

Based on its review of all material received, the PAC thinks that the CSIS B.S. and M.S. programs will benefit from a review in five years when faculty will reflect on its efforts to address B.S. and M.S. program challenges, particularly in the following areas:

- The urgent need to update curriculum according to ACM and IEEE standards and SB 1040; and
- Refinements to its assessment process, particularly: the use of annual assessments with a more specific and distinctive focus on the B.S. and M.S. programs; further development of assessment tools for determinations of SLO mastery; more in depth discussions of the assessment results and the basis for conclusions about SLO mastery; and the use of assessment data to create appropriate program-level change, especially in an area that is evolving as rapidly as CSIS.

The PAC congratulates the Computer Science and Information Systems Department on its completion of this Program Review. In particular, the PAC thanks the faculty for their ongoing commitment to student achievement while responding to significant challenges.

PAC wishes the CSIS Department faculty success in their continuing efforts to meet these challenges and in realizing its plans for the future development of the CSIS B.S. and M.S. programs.

cc: Wayne Aitken, Chair, Academic Senate  
Marcia Woolf, Coordinator, Academic Senate  
Emily F. Cutrer, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Katherine Kantardjieff, Dean, College of Science and Mathematics  
Program Assessment Committee



**DATE:** April 18, 2012

**TO:** Peter Arnade, Ph.D.  
Chair, History Department

Jeff Charles, Ph.D.  
Program Review Lead, History Department

**FROM:** Linda Shaw, Ph.D. *Linda Shaw*  
Chair, Program Assessment Committee

For the Program Assessment Committee: Donna Goyer, Olaf Hansen, Moses Ochanji, Toni Olivas, David Barsky, Gerardo Gonzalez, Jennifer Jeffries, and Karen Irwin

**SUBJECT:** History B.A. and M.A. Program Review

The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) has reviewed the Program Review documents for the History B.A. and M.A. programs. In what follows, PAC summarizes findings from the History Department Self-study Report, the review of the Self Study by the Library, the Dean of IITS, the Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences (CHABSS), and the external reviewers' report. Based on its review, PAC also offers recommendations for consideration by the History faculty and those who will participate in the MOU process.

## **IA. Achieving Educational Outcomes: History B.A. Program**

The History B.A. program provides a liberal education focused on developing students' critical thinking skills, improving their writing and speaking abilities, and deepening their understanding of the human experience. Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) support the University Mission Statement, and its digital multi-media focus supports the University's emphasis on new technologies. The History B.A. program seeks to achieve SLO mastery through courses that focus on different world regions and two required seminar classes—an introductory methods course and a capstone course.

### **B.A. Program SLOs and Annual Assessment Activities**

The History program has conducted three annual assessments of student mastery of SLOs for its B.A. program. Employing a pre- and post-test design, these assessments consist of

---

surveys administered first in HIST 301, the introductory historical methods course, and again in the 400-level capstone seminar. Assessment reports have discussed one component of these surveys each year.

**1<sup>st</sup> Year Assessment:** The **goal** of the first assessment was to establish a baseline for the program's future multi-media SLO, especially regarding student awareness of the impact of the Internet on historical practice and how multi-media resources could be used as historical evidence. **Findings** of the assessment included: 1) students were skeptical of Internet sources; 2) students at neither the introductory nor capstone levels could specify how they might use multi-media sources available on the Internet; and 3) students did not have an adequate sense of how the Internet and multi-media sources could transform the presentation and practice of history.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Year Assessment:** The **goal** of the second assessment was to assess student mastery of critical inquiry in using the Internet. A questionnaire administered in both HIST 301 and HIST 400 asked students use the Internet to find reliable primary and secondary sources, to identify several reliable sources, to respond to a hypothetical website containing spurious sources, and to identify strengths and weaknesses of Wikipedia as an historical resource. **Findings** of this assessment indicate that: 1) students acquire web literacy as they progress through the program; and 2) the program needs to further address how students present history on the web and other forms of media as well as how multi-media presentations might affect historical content.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Year Assessment:** The **goal** of the third assessment was to measure student mastery of the SLO: "Students will be able to develop and defend historical arguments, understanding the philosophical assumptions of historical interpretation." A questionnaire asked HIST 301 and HIST 400 students to identify the historical forces used by historians to explain historical causation, understandings of philosophies of history, and the influence of current events on historical study. **Findings** of this assessment show student improvement from HIST 301 to HIST 400 in all categories, yet there was relatively little improvement with regard to historical interpretation.

#### **Changes to the History B.A. Program Since the Last Program Review:**

1. **SLO Development:** Added a new SLO that consists of "incorporating new digital and multimedia formats into the practice and presentation of history" in order to provide students additional understanding of how technology shapes historical knowledge and analysis.
2. **Curricular Development:**
  - Shifted major requirements to a thematic, flexible structure in which students take courses in three world areas, a course focused on gender history, and a course in history prior to 1800 as well as an introductory methods course and a 400-level capstone seminar;

- Added courses to support the new SLO focused on digital practice and multi-media that examine the presentation of history in film and integrate historical arguments with videos, multi-media slide shows, or digital maps;
- Established guidelines and standardized required and recommended content for HIST 301; plans to discuss whether topics related to the theory and philosophy of history, particularly with regard to history and the media, should be incorporated through the upper-division curriculum; and
- State authorization for teacher education subject matter in history approved in the spring of 2011 with courses now under University review.

**3. Faculty:** Hired a faculty member with expertise in history and media who is involved in shaping the multi-media curriculum and exploring a variety of multi-media assignments in a range of classes.

***History B.A. Program Strengths and Accomplishments in Support of Achieving Educational Outcomes***

**A.** The History B.A. Program **Self Study** noted the following additional strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

**1. General Education:** Central role in GE offerings, applying LEAP standards in its 25 GE offerings, the most of any department.

**2. Student Research Opportunities:**

- Undergraduate student won the student research competition in 2008 for “Outstanding presentation in the Humanities” in the CSU Undergraduate Research competition; and
- Students established a chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, the national history honor society, that encourages student research through regional research competitions and has resulted in seven awards over the past four years.

**3. Student Access and Retention:**

- Ethnic diversity of majors has increased;
- Retention rate that is above the 45% level for CSUSM and is 71% for transfer students with most graduating in a little over four semesters; and
- Curricular changes that have resulted in fewer advising problems and bottlenecks.

**4. Faculty Research:**

- Published six books and over 20 major articles in last five years, a number of which include emphases on digital history; and



- Increased racial and ethnic diversity has brought a broader array of research interests.

**5. Campus and Community Leadership:**

- Faculty have served the campus as Academic Senate Chairs, Chair of College Faculty, Director of Faculty Center, and memberships on College and University committees; and
- Faculty have received the Teaching American History Grant which partners with local public schools and have been museum board members, film festival advisories, and taught at the local Marine base.

**6. Advising:** As a result of curricular changes, advising problems have decreased.

**B. The external reviewers** noted the following History B.A. program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Program excellence:** Program is well respected across the campus for excellence in teaching, research, and service and is a model of how to fulfill the campus Mission, Vision, and Values Statements; program does well in balancing competing demands: graduate study vs. undergraduate study, majors vs. non-majors, and service courses vs. small classes.

2. **Faculty:**

- Faculty committed to student learning, historical scholarship, shared governance, and campus leadership; faculty are productive scholars despite lack of institutional support; and
- Even distribution between lecturers and tenure-track faculty in lower and upper division courses.

3. **Curriculum:** Significant presence in GE in addition to a rigorous major, single-subject teaching credential, and graduate program.

4. **Assessment:**

- Admirable attempt to quantitatively measure mastery of SLOs in a field that does not lend itself to standardized testing or sequential curricula; and
- Improvement of undergraduates in achieving mastery of SLOs in assessments was significant over time.

**C. The College Dean** noted the following History B.A. program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Assessment:**

- Commitment to enhancing the curriculum, aligning it with SLOs, and assessing the results of these efforts; and
- Course matrix and survey approach to assessment with its pre-and post-test design to measure learning as students progress through the major.

### ***History B.A. Program Challenges to Achieving Educational Outcomes***

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following History B.A. program challenges to achieving educational outcomes:

#### **1. Curriculum:**

- Budget cutbacks have made it difficult to maintain the balance between a traditional curricular objectives and a media-related focus;
- Schedule cuts that constrained the ability to require 301 as a prerequisite;
- Lack of “intermediate” disciplinary courses to prepare students for upper division courses;
- Difficulties achieving curricular balance between: lower division, GE courses, and upper division seminars that are key to the major; undergraduate and masters classes; and traditional and innovative curriculum focused on digital history;
- Need to determine whether or not to teach more online courses with a media focus; and
- Need to determine if current curriculum provides a comprehensive, in depth understanding of history.

B. The **External Reviewers** identified the following History B.A. program challenges related to achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Faculty:** The Department needs to fill two more positions (in addition to the two recent replacement hires)--one in colonial Latin American history and one in the history of science.

C. The **College Dean** identified the following B.A. program challenges related to achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Curriculum:** Some questions about the efficacy of G.E. courses in preparing students for upper level major courses.

## **IB. Achieving Educational Outcomes: History M.A. Program**

The History M.A. program is distinctive for its new media emphasis, and program SLOs focus on the historical understanding, practical mastery, and application of new media

technology. The emphasis on the understanding and practice of multi-media aligns with the University Mission Statement's emphasis on new technologies.

### **History M.A. Program SLOs and Annual Assessment Activities**

The History program has conducted three annual assessments of student mastery of SLOs for its M.A. program. Employing a pre- and post-test design, surveys to assess mastery of graduate-level SLOs were administered to students in the program, and assessment reports have discussed one component of these surveys each year.

**1<sup>st</sup> Year Assessment:** The **goal** of the first assessment was to provide a baseline for future multi-media SLO assessment. **Findings** include: 1) The more technologically sophisticated students initially over-estimated their technical skills, but almost all felt they had acquired greater facility in web building and video editing; and 2) While students found the program's digital emphasis challenging, they wanted to learn more history, as well as research and writing skills, that would enable them to better apply new digital skills.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Year Assessment:** The **goal** of the assessment was to determine students' abilities to use the Internet to find reliable primary and secondary sources, to identify several reliable sources, to respond to a hypothetical website containing spurious sources, and to identify strengths and weaknesses of Wikipedia as an historical resource. **Findings** of this assessment indicate that M.A. students are the most Internet literate of all of those included in the assessment (B.A. and M.A. students).

**3<sup>rd</sup> Year Assessment:** The **goal** of this assessment was to determine student mastery of the SLO focused on "advanced understanding of historical theory and historiography." **Findings** indicated a significant difference in student understanding of history and historiography from their first semester to their second year.

### **Changes to the History M.A. Program Since the Last Review**

1. **SLOs:** Developed and revised program SLOs.
- 2 **Curriculum:**
  - Added historiography, topical seminars, and media-themed courses;
  - As a culminating experience, added a media project option consistent with the program's emphasis on media understanding and practice; and
  - Restructured the HIST 620-621 thesis courses to provide a structured thesis experience in order to improve time to graduation.

***M.A. Program Strengths and Accomplishments Specific to the History M.A. Program in Support of Achieving Educational Outcomes***

A. The **Self Study** noted the following additional History M.A. program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Student Accomplishment:** History 502:History and Applied New Media Technology generated two showcases of graduate history presentations that were well attended by those outside the History Department.

B. The **external reviewers** noted additional History M.A. program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Program Goals:** M.A. program is on track regarding its mission, average time to degree, and graduate student satisfaction; the digital program has the potential to make CSUSM distinctive within the discipline with regard to creating, theorizing, and problematizing digital history; and the program does well to balance competing strains of graduate vs. undergraduate study.
2. **TAs:** The design of the HIST 513: History Teaching Practicum that allows graduate teaching assistants to teach “breakout sections” of larger lecture classes enables graduate students to gain valuable experience and undergraduates to benefit from increased attention; graduate students feel camaraderie and mutual support between themselves and program faculty.
3. **Student satisfaction:** The graduate students were unanimous in their enthusiasm and appreciation for courses and the digital history emphasis which attracted most of them to the program.
4. **SLOs:** The measurement of graduate student understanding of historiographical questions indicated a more improved understanding, though not much can be concluded from the small overall sample (14 students).
5. **Curriculum:** The Department has opportunity to build a truly innovative program at the forefront of the field, geared toward educating students in how best to create, theorize, and problematize digital history.

C. The College Dean noted additional History M.A. program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Curriculum:** Use of HIST 513 to meet the needs of both B.A. and M.A. programs.

***Challenges to Achieving Educational Outcomes Specific to the History M.A. Program.***

A. The **Program Self Study** noted the following challenges to achieving educational outcomes specific to the History M.A. program:

### 1. Curriculum:

- Limited course offerings resulting in the need among students who have exhausted seminar options to take independent study courses; and
- Uncertainty about whether the program adequately provides digital history skills.

2. **Student readiness:** Only four students have completed the degree in its four-year history due to difficulties in completing their thesis project which suggests student challenges related to reading, writing, and thinking readiness for graduate-level work.

B. The **external reviewers** noted the following challenges to achieving educational outcomes specific to the History M.A. program:

1. **Curriculum:** The need for balance between the focus on practical skills and epistemological and theoretical issues related to the multi-media emphasis.

## II. Developing and Applying Resources

### *History Program B.A. and M.A. Program Strengths and Accomplishments Regarding Developing and Applying Resources:*

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:

1. **Faculty:** Talented experienced and skilled lecturers, virtually all with Ph.D.s, who teach both lower-and upper-division courses, the methods course, and graduate seminars.

2. **Library:** Excellent supporting librarian.

3. **External Funding:** Faculty received three-year, \$500,000 grant for redesigning teacher preparation track.

B. The **program Librarian** noted the following strengths related to developing and applying resources:

#### 1. **Library holdings:**

- The library print and media collection as well as online collections have grown and experienced increased usage;
- Appropriate and well-designed digitized primary sources included in the library catalog and course guide pages;

- The only Federal Depository Collection available in online format within 30 miles; and
  - Expanded media library.
- C. The **external reviewers** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:
1. **Lab Space:** Impressive lab space that reflects successful administrative and financial support of department needs.
  2. **Library Support:** Quality library support.
  3. **Faculty and Staff:**
    - The Department's two new very accomplished replacement hires spoke highly of the Department's welcoming and collaborative environment; and
    - Release time for new faculty.
- D. The College **Dean** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:
1. **Faculty Hires:** Two tenured faculty positions vacated in recent years have been filled for 2011-2012.
  2. **Lab Space:** College providing technical equipment, space, and staff support for the digital history enterprise in SBSB.

***History B.A. and M.A. Program Weaknesses and Challenges Regarding Developing and Applying Resources***

- A. The History B.A. and M.A. **Self Studies** noted the following weaknesses and challenges regarding developing and applying resources:
1. **Technology:** Need for computer equipment, software, and technical support for classes employing multi-media assignments and for graduate multi-media theses [External reviewers note that the staff support position in the Digital History Lab has been filled].
  2. **Faculty:**
    - Lost two key tenure-line faculty in Middle Eastern History and Native American Studies [note: the Department has made two new replacement hires subsequent to submitting its Self Study];
    - Need for more faculty in the area of European and Latin American history to expand the range of course offerings;

- Need support for faculty development, including travel as well as library resources (book acquisitions and primary source data bases);
- Need for release time or expert assistance to assist faculty to provide classes employing multi-media presentations and assignments;
- High TA turnover due to inability to pay for services; and
- Need for adequate numbers of faculty to teach the smaller seminars.

### 3. Library:

- Need for library support for on-line primary source databases and e-books;
- Need for the library to maintain both hard-copy book collection and subscriptions to on-line databases; and
- Constant budget cuts to the library seriously impede student learning.

B. The program **Librarian** noted the following challenges in the B.A. and M.A. programs related to developing and applying resources:

- The purchasing power of allocations for library purchases has declined as the campus has grown;
- Aggregation of expensive online resources and the need to eliminate duplication of formats leaves the program vulnerable to decisions of aggregation suppliers and limits faculty instructional design;
- Any addition of new journals must be accompanied by cancellation of another journal subscription; and
- The library collection has not kept up with student needs, especially primary resources for M.A. students and materials required for digital projects (e.g., newspapers on microfilm need to be replaced with digital versions that are better indexed).

C. The **external reviewers** noted the following weaknesses and challenges in the B.A. and M.A. programs regarding developing and applying resources:

1. **Library Resources:** The new M.A. has increased demands on the existing collection, especially in the primary sources category, for materials available for digital projects.

D. The College **Dean** noted the following challenges and weaknesses in the B.A. and M.A. programs related to developing and applying resources:

1. **Faculty:** M.A. program has challenged the Department's instructional resources.
2. **Library:** History research has a heavy demand for primary source materials covering a wide range of time, geographic, and topic foci.

3. **Curriculum:** The ability to continue to offer small sections of HIST 301 and HIST 400 as the Department grows.

### III. Additional Themes/Special Issues

- A. The History B.A. and M.A. program **Self Studies** identified the following additional themes and special issues:

1. **Online Teaching:** Successful use of limited on-line course offerings, but many faculty are skeptical, believing that critical inquiry and oral argument are best learned in a face-to-face-format and that retention may suffer without the community building that face-to-face instruction provides.
2. **Relationship of Graduate Program to the Undergraduate Curriculum:** The graduate program, inaugurated four years ago, shows signs of success: enrollments have met expectations; the work of students and faculty in graduate seminars—especially ones in historiography, digital media, and public history—has been strong and brought laudatory public attention to the Department; the program has successfully deployed graduate T.A.s who have earned excellent reviews, and graduate students have been enthusiastic about their T.A. experiences; working with graduate students has enabled faculty to acquire additional historical and technical expertise; and the undergraduate program has benefited from these additional skills and perspectives.

Yet, graduate students are resource intensive with graduate seminars offered at the cost of offering fewer undergraduate seminars. Independent studies courses that must be taken when graduate students have exhausted seminar offerings require significant uncompensated faculty time, and graduate students who must take 400 level courses in lieu of graduate courses find them inadequate. Problems also arise with the use of graduate students as TAs—because they cannot be paid, there have been problems insuring a consistent supply of TAs, and courses for which T.A.s have been scheduled have had to be cut. Some of the resource problems associated with the graduate program could be solved by opening some graduate seminars to undergraduates.

### IV. History B.A. and M.A. Program Future Plans and Recommendations

- A. The B.A. and M.A. Program **Self Studies** proposed the following future plans and recommendations:

1. **Curriculum:**



- Develop department guidelines for online teaching; perhaps increase the number of online and on-line/in person hybrid courses available to students;
- Develop a framework for balancing graduate and undergraduate curriculum, employing courses that can be taught simultaneously to undergraduate and graduate students where feasible;
- Incorporate new media technologies more completely throughout the curriculum—from media-based courses to individual assignments;
- To strengthen research skills and raise rates of freshman retention, place more emphasis on the essentials of research in survey courses or open HIST 301 to lower division students who have completed the sequence of survey courses; and
- Consider incorporating the theory and philosophy of history into undergraduate courses.

**2. Staff:** Hire a dedicated technical support person with special relevance to history courses.

**3. Faculty:** Hire the two replacement faculty that have been granted to restore department staffing.

**4. T.A.s:** Consider paying graduate student TAs to make these assignments more attractive.

B. The **external reviewers** proposed the following future plans and recommendations for the History B.A. and M.A. programs:

**1. Curriculum and Class size:**

- Reconsider the extent of the commitment to GE classes and instead use resources to grow the major;
- Add option to the graduate digital history program that would provide specific training relevant to the growth field of public history;
- Make the technical processes of online research and media creation the starting point for a greater focus in the M.A. program on epistemologies of new media and how the new media is changing the way we understand the past;
- Offer online classes as a means to increase student access, not to increase class size; and
- Reduce the size of upper division and seminar classes.

**2. T.A. Support:** Provide graduate T.A.s with a small honorarium, rather than just course credit, for their work in teaching.

**3. Faculty and student development:**

- The University needs to provide more than the \$500 stipend currently available for faculty travel and research; and
- Sustain release time for new hires, providing for a 2-2 teaching load per year.

C. The College **Dean** recommends the following future plans for the History B.A. and M.A. programs:

**1. Curriculum:**

- Re-examine Department's role in GE in order to better meet the needs of majors;
- See development of online classes as a pedagogical tool to increase access rather than increasing class sizes, although offering selected large online lower division classes in pedagogically appropriate ways may be a way to respond to the resource challenges of the graduate program;
- Utilize campus resources—technological and pedagogical--for developing online courses;
- Continue to use HIST 513 to enrich both undergraduates and graduate students while freeing faculty to teach seminar and major courses;
- Develop ways to continue to teach HIST 301 and HIST 400 with small enrollments;
- Further develop and refine the digital history focus with the potential to work with the library and other humanities disciplines to develop a core digital humanities curriculum in the College;
- Develop a track in public history to give more employment opportunities to graduates and focus on employment opportunities for graduates more generally; this could be done by exploring partnerships with local organizations for internship placements and experiential learning; and
- Use self-support mechanisms to enhance curricular objectives.

D. The **Dean of IITS proposed** the following future plans and recommendations for the History B.A. and M.A. programs:

- 1. Online Teaching:** Consider decoupling references to offering online courses with University budget pressure but consider instead a possible connection to increased access or more flexible access for students.
- 2. Utilize external and internal resources to plan new courses:** Attend EDUCAUSE Learning Institute conference, and utilize MERLOT and online offerings in the CSU as well as no cost campus instructional support as resources for planning new and online courses.
- 3. Consult with IITS regarding technology needs:** Meet with IITS representatives to make sure that the History program's needs are met and that they are included in IITS's three-year rolling plan.

4. **Consult with IITS Staff to Insure ATI Compliance:** Meet with IITS instructional developer to discuss assistance in creating new courses to comply with the CSU Adaptive Technology Initiative guidelines.
5. **Multi-media support:** Identify funds for multimedia support needs outside of the M-F 8-5 schedule.

## PAC Summary and Conclusions

The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) thanks the faculty of the History Department for the successful completion of their Program Review and for their thoughtful reflections on their B.A. and M.A. programs. We also applaud the many accomplishments cited in the Program Review that the History Department, like many others on the campus, achieves despite a shortage of faculty and other resources. In what follows, PAC highlights recommendations from the Program Review and, based on its own review, offers recommendations for consideration by the History Department faculty and those who will participate in the MOU process:

1. **Annual Assessment of SLOs:** PAC commends the Department's use of measurable approaches to assessing SLOs using a pre- and post-test survey design in HIST 301 and HIST 400. PAC makes the following recommendations for the use of annual assessment data:
  - **Consider and implement long-term program-level change based on assessment findings:** For example, there were assessments conducted during the review period that revealed areas where the program could improve in SLO mastery in HIST 301 and HIST 400. And while there is discussion about curricular change in HIST 301 in response to these findings, it is not clear if changes were made that would address these areas of needed improvement. If such changes have been made, it would be beneficial to further describe these efforts and how they make use of assessment findings.
  - **Reassess the SLO course matrix:** The SLO course matrix indicates that nearly all SLOs are addressed in almost every course. The PAC wonders about the extent to which a course can effectively address so many SLOs and suggests that the Department consider: 1) selecting particular courses that are best suited for helping students to achieve mastery of particular SLOs and/or specifying how SLOs can be addressed developmentally in different courses. Finally, if mastery of skills related to digital history is a program SLO, the program might consider **offering a single course taken by all majors that focuses on digital history;** and
  - **Explicit Assessment of M.A. program SLOs:** The History M.A. program would benefit from annual assessments that are specific to the M.A. program and different from the B.A. program SLOs and assessment process. This

would enable gathering data about graduate students' mastery of the M.A. program's SLOs and program-level changes that result from these data.

2. **Curriculum:** The Department faces a number of curricular issues that while difficult also offer possibilities for innovation that will further strengthen the B.A. and M.A. programs. In grappling with these issues, PAC recommends that the History faculty consider the following recommendations from this Program Review:

- **Need to balance G.E. and major offerings:** While noting the significant contribution of the History Department to G.E. offerings, reviewers recommended reevaluation and a possible reduction of the program's participation in G.E. A reduction in the number of G.E. courses may: strengthen the B.A. program by providing a more in depth experience for majors when they do not have to be taught at a level that is appropriate for non-major, G.E. students; help to address the related question of whether G.E. courses can adequately enable mastery of B.A. program SLOs; and allow deployment of resources for further development of the B.A. and M.A. programs;
- **Balance the resource needs of the B.A. and M.A. programs:** As noted by several contributors to this Program Review, the Department's use of graduate students T.A.s provides a valuable learning experience for both undergraduate and graduate students and also frees resources for graduate program course offerings. Reviewers note, however, that the program needs ways to support additional offerings in the graduate program (to reduce, for example, reliance on Independent Study courses when graduate courses are not available) that will not result in reductions in the numbers of courses offered in the B.A. program. One possibility lies in the selective use of larger enrollment, face-to-face and online (including hybrid) courses, perhaps employing T.A.s for break-out sections in the in- class component of these courses;
- **Consideration of a balance between the practical and epistemological foci in the M.A. program's digital media emphasis:** PAC suggests that the program consider exploring the external reviewers' recommendation to find greater balance between its emphasis on the practical and technical processes and the epistemological and theoretical questions related to its digital media component;
- **Address student readiness in the M.A Program:** The M.A. program Self Study attributes the program's relatively low graduation rate to issues related to student readiness for graduate-level study. This is a difficult problem that is no doubt faced by other graduate programs that must strike a balance between admitting a sufficient number of students to ensure program viability and the preparation and skills needed for graduate study possessed by its applicants. This problem may partially be solved as the program matures and acquires a sufficiently large applicant pool to permit greater selectivity among the students it admits. In the meantime, PAC

suggests focusing the program's annual assessments on the following issues: identifying skills that may delay students' progress through the program; developing means for strengthening students' abilities in existing courses; and developing additional courses and/or using existing campus resources to address these issues (e.g., if graduate level writing is a skill that needs to be strengthened, is it possible to develop a writing course for graduate students or to use resources available from the Writing Center); and

- **Consider a track in Public History:** This was suggested as a direction for expansion of the History program curriculum that is consistent with the Department's digital multi-media emphasis and that may meet the employment needs of its graduates.

3. **Faculty Development Support:** To sustain its excellent level of scholarly and pedagogical achievement, PAC agrees with the external reviewers that more faculty development funds should be provided for History Department faculty.
4. **Graduate Student Support:** Provide compensation as a way to attract and retain T.A.s and to decrease time to graduation for graduate students who must work.

Finally, PAC's overall assessment is that the History B.A. and M.A. programs are both Programs of Quality and Promise with a recommendation for a five-year review cycle. In the absence of a previous MOU, PAC bases this recommendation on the following three criteria contained in the Program Review Guidelines:

- the degree to which the annual assessments have generated useful data and whether assessment results have been used to make appropriate changes;
- the degree to which the five-year plan explicitly and appropriately addresses program challenges and enhances or preserves program strengths; and
- the strengths and challenges identified by the review of educational effectiveness and capacity.

Based on its review of all material received, PAC thinks that the History B.A. and M.A. programs would benefit from a review in the next five years in which faculty have the opportunity to show a linkage between program challenges identified in assessments and the use of findings for program improvement.

- For example, in the B.A. program, the link between assessment results and specific changes to strengthen HIST 301 (or any course that will be assessed) could be clarified;
- Similarly, PAC applauds the M.A. program for its innovative curriculum while at the same time thinks that the program would benefit from a discussion of how it has

addressed challenges such as the link between low graduation rates and the lack of student readiness to pursue graduate study; and

- The B.A. and M.A. programs will also benefit from future plans that specify the steps they will take to address program challenges or to enhance strengths identified in the Program Review.

PAC congratulates the History Department on its completion of this Program Review. In particular, PAC thanks the faculty for their ongoing commitment to student achievement while responding to significant challenges. PAC wishes the History Department faculty success in their continuing efforts to meet these challenges and in realizing its plans for the future development of the History B.A. and M.A. programs.

cc: Wayne Aiken, Chair, Academic Senate  
Marcia Woolf, Coordinator, Academic Senate  
Emily F. Cutrer, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Adam Shapiro, Dean, College of Humanities, Arts, Behavior and Social Sciences  
Program Assessment Committee



**Date:** April 18, 2012

**To:** Vivienne Bennett, Ph.D.  
Chair, Liberal Studies Department

Jocelyn Ahlers, Ph.D.  
Program Review Lead, Liberal Studies Department

**From:** Linda Shaw, Chair *Linda Shaw*  
Program Assessment Committee

For the Program Assessment Committee: Donna Goyer, Olaf Hansen, Moses Ochanji, Toni Olivas, David Barsky, Gerardo Gonzalez, Jennifer Jeffries, and Karen Irwin

**Subject:** Liberal Studies B.A. Program Review

The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) has reviewed the Program Review documents for the Liberal Studies (LBST) B.A. program. In what follows, PAC summarizes findings from the LBST program Self-study Report, the Library report, the letter from the Dean of IITS, the external reviewers' report, and the College of Humanities, Behavioral and Social Sciences (CHABSS) Dean's response to the program review. Based on its review, PAC also offers recommendations for consideration by the LBST faculty and those who will participate in the MOU process.

## I. Achieving Educational Outcomes

### Program SLOs and Annual Assessment Activities

The LBST program consists of an interdisciplinary major with three options that lead to a Bachelor of Arts degree in Elementary Subject Matter Preparation (ESM), the Integrated Credential Program (ICP), or in Border and Regional Studies (BRS), a new option offered in the 2009-2010 academic year. The program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) encompass goals for students that are aligned with the Mission Statements of the program, University, CHABSS, and the School of Education. The SLOs for the Border and Regional Studies option, in particular, ensure that students have obtained required knowledge, skills, and abilities before earning their degrees.

The LBST program has also developed matrices that list courses for each option and the SLOs addressed in each course taught by LBST faculty. However, such matrices have not been developed for courses offered in other departments that are part of the ESM's Depth of Study Modules.

The last LBST Program Review was conducted in 1998, and the program has conducted one annual assessment of student mastery of program SLOs in 2008. Despite this relative lack of program reviews and annual assessments over the last decade, faculty nonetheless note that extensive curriculum review occurred in 2001-2004 in response to new state standards for elementary subject matter preparation. Because of this history, the faculty have focused this Program Review on establishing a baseline for future program reviews by describing the program and identifying data needed for future assessments as well as areas in which resources are needed.

### **Uses of Assessment Data to Support Program Change**

The 2008 program assessment suggested questions for consideration in curricular planning, but the Self Study reported no program changes based on this assessment activity. However, the Self Study notes that one indicator of student success in achieving program goals for ESM and ICP students can be seen in LBST student performance on the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET), which consistently shows LBST students scoring higher than other CSUSM students who take the test.

Moreover, as noted above, LBST faculty engaged in extensive curricular review in response to passage of SB 2042 and publication of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness that resulted in thirteen standards and seven content specifications for the curriculum required for multiple subject preparation programs across the state. While conducted in response to externally imposed state standards, rather than CSUSM yearly assessments, this three-year review nonetheless led to changes in several courses in fourteen departments and in the (then) College of Education (now School of Education) to bring the ICP into compliance with the new standards. These changes were implemented in the 2004-2005 academic year.

### ***Program Strengths and Accomplishments in Support of Achieving Educational Outcomes***

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments in support of efforts to achieve educational outcomes:

- 1. Diverse and innovative curriculum:** The LBST program offers an interdisciplinary degree with multiple options for teacher education and a new option in Border and Regional Studies offered since 2009. Students in the ICP program (which consistently enrolls 30% of the LBST majors) take courses in cohorts and in themed semesters, which correspond to the four core subject matter areas for teachers. The ICP program is also the only teacher preparation program in the CSU that fully



blends undergraduate and post-baccalaureate coursework with teaching practice at the undergraduate level.

2. **Delivery of courses both within the LBST department and in partnership with other programs across the campus:** Course work in the program's seven content areas are offered by 11 departments, and the ICP option is offered jointly with the School of Education. Moreover, the LBST Department has its own faculty who offer the program's three required areas (Linguistics, World Regional Geography, and Diversity), and while not unique in this respect, tenure-track faculty housed within LBST programs/departments is the less common staffing configuration within the CSU.
3. **Faculty and student commitment to the broader University and community:** The program supports the mission of the University through its several GE courses and courses that support interdisciplinary programs (Literature and Writing Studies, Cognitive Science, Global Studies, Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, Environmental Studies, and the School of Education). LBST faculty are strongly committed to activist scholarship, and its students are committed to local communities through their future work in K-8 classrooms.

B. The **External Reviewers** noted the following program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Excellent curriculum:** All three programs reflect careful planning, imagination, curricular innovation, and academic excellence. Curricula for the teaching options reflect current standards in the discipline that are aligned with the California state K-8 ESM Standards. ICP is one of the most innovative programs in the state, and the thematic semesters are a great service to students.
2. **Well prepared students:** Degrees are highly valued, and students are well prepared to make important contributions to their disciplines and communities.
3. **Committed faculty:** Faculty are committed to students, passionate about research, and devoted to excellent teaching.
4. **Outstanding pedagogy:** Students praise faculty for outstanding pedagogy.
5. **Collegial faculty relationships:** Strong working relationships among faculty who are professional, productive, and collegial; strong support for junior colleagues in the tenure process; and lecturer faculty who feel strong support from tenure-track faculty.
6. **Strong demand for ESM and ICP:** While demand for the ESM and ICP programs has declined in recent years, demand for the ESM program is nonetheless still strong and expected to remain steady with potential for growth.

7. **Engaged students:** Students have opportunities to participate in curricular activities, including fieldwork experiences, and students are active participants in the learning process.

C. The **CHABSS Dean** noted the following program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Curriculum:** A complex and unique interdisciplinary curriculum that adapts to changing state standards.
2. **Faculty:** A dedicated faculty who have developed a well-regarded ICP program.
3. **Student success:** Success in educating students with high CSET pass rates.

#### *LBST Program Challenges to Achieving Educational Outcomes*

A. The program **Self Study** notes the following challenges related to achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Measuring Mastery of SLOs:** Difficulty tracking mastery of SLOs in courses offered in other departments.
2. **Identification of SLOs:** SLOs for ICP/ESM are too vague.
3. **Resources for Assessment:** Insufficient resources to monitor course offerings in other departments and the School of Education.

B. The **External Reviewers** identified the following challenges related to achieving educational outcomes:

1. **Revise SLOs:** SLOs for the ESM and ICP options need revision to make them simpler, more direct, and easily measurable.

## **II. Developing and Applying Resources**

#### *LBST Program Strengths and Accomplishments Related to Developing and Applying Resources*

A. The program **Self Study Report** identified the following strengths and accomplishments related to developing and applying resources:

1. **External Collaboration:** Collaboration with community colleges to secure external funding to support technology and curriculum development--collaboration with Palomar College resulted in a National Science Foundation grant to expand the Liberal Studies Geographic Information Systems (GIS) curricula.

B. The **Librarian's Report** identified the following strengths related to developing and applying resources:

1. **Library holdings:** The Library has over 42,200 print and electronic holdings, and about 10% of government publications and six primary data bases support the LBST program and provide students with thousands of articles both on and off campus. Materials not owned by CSUSM library can be accessed by students using The Circuit or Interlibrary Loan.
2. **Library staff support:** Three librarian specialists assigned to the LBST program teach information literacy classes, do collection development, and provide LBST students with one-on-one research assistance.

*LBST Program Challenges Related to Developing and Applying Resources*

A. The program **Self Study** identified the following challenges related to developing and applying resources:

**1. Program Support:**

- **Lecturer budget:** Decreased lecturer budgets result in the inability to offer the needed number and range of classes, especially those needed to leverage smaller capstone courses and to grow the BRS program; and
- **Faculty and staff support:** Insufficient faculty and staff support to realize University and College vision for GIS development.

**2. Faculty Support:**

- **Faculty development:** Insufficient faculty development funds, especially for senior faculty; and
- **Department Chair support:** Insufficient support for Department Chair, especially in years when the state mandates curriculum revision.

C. The **External Reviewers' Report** identified the following challenges related to developing and applying resources:

**1. Program Support:**

- **Program delivery:** Insufficient resources for program delivery including lack of phonology lab; and
- **Staff support:** Inadequate support for staff with expanded responsibilities.

**2. Faculty Support:**

- **Travel:** Insufficient travel funds to support disciplinary pursuits;
- **Assessment:** Insufficient professional development funds for assessment;
- **Curricular development:** Inadequate faculty compensation for curricular development and other service to the Department; and
- **Department Chair:** Inadequate compensation for Department Chair that is below statewide average for similar departments, possibly making the position difficult to fill.

### III. Additional Themes/Special Issues

#### *LBST Strengths and Accomplishments*

A. The **Self-study Report** described the following LBST program strengths and accomplishments regarding the following additional themes/special issues:

1. **Advising:** Students are very satisfied with academic advising in regards to advisor knowledge, appointment atmosphere, and exploration strategies for the degree.

#### *LBST Program Challenges*

A. The **Self-study report** described the following LBST program challenges related to additional themes/special issues:

##### 1. **Advising:**

- **Program Complexity:** The number of options in the major using different advising protocols; large number of courses that can be used to fulfill the major requirements in the teacher preparation track; courses that are offered across the College; large number of students in the major; and changing state regulation of teacher preparation tracks resulting in student requirements being governed by four Catalogs; students must decide early about the major to avoid taking additional courses and to achieve on time graduation; and
- **Insufficient number of advisors:** Reductions in the number of advisors in the School of Education and Advising Services results in the inability to meet current and anticipated growth; and student dissatisfaction with the availability and process for scheduling advising appointments.

##### 2. **Coordination with Other Departments:**

- **Scheduling and access to courses:** Difficulties scheduling and access to non-core courses for ICP students whose core courses are taken at specific times since these courses are offered in 12 different departments.

##### 3. **Student Preparedness:** Decline in SAT scores suggests students are less

prepared for university-level work, resulting in a need for remediation and increased faculty workload.

B. The **External Reviewers' Report** notes the following LBST program challenges related to additional themes/special issues:

### 1. Advising:

- **Systematic advising:** Lack of systematic advising through the student career in light of changing state requirements;
- **Lack of articulation with feeder colleges:** Advising that is not articulated with feeder colleges;
- **Insufficient advising staff:** Insufficient resources for advising needs; and
- **Insufficient lower division advising:** Insufficient advising available to lower division students in a user-friendly manner.

### 2. Program Vision and Mission:

- **Lack of clarity about program mission/vision:** Interdisciplinary expertise of faculty is a strength; however, it also presents a tension in terms of the program's vision and mission with lack of clarity about the connections between the ICP, ESM, and Border Studies Options;
- **Lack of clarity about BRS identity and direction:** The BRS option lacks a clear identity and direction which results in a lack of student familiarity and understanding of what the option encompasses or how it might advance their educational and career objectives. There are questions as to whether LBST is the proper place to house Border Studies because it drains resources from the general mission of preparing teachers, and there are only 10 students enrolled in the Border Studies program; and
- **Limited collaboration with School of Education:** There is too little collaboration between LBST and the School of Education.

## IV. LBST Program Future Plans and Recommendations

A. The LBST **Self Study** included the following future plans:

### 1. Program Development:

- **Achieve curricular consistency:** Work to achieve curricular consistency across multiple sections of required courses;
- **Explore BRS curriculum development:** Examine the feasibility of offering additional courses required for the BRS option;
- **Secure support for curriculum development:** Provide course releases to faculty to revise the major in light of new statewide requirements (SB 1440); and

- **Secure more faculty and staff support:** Provide full-time staff support for GIS program as well as two more faculty.

## 2. Achieving Educational Outcomes:

- **Refine SLOs:** Create measurable SLOs for the ESM and ICP options;
- **Collaborate with other departments in scheduling:** Work with other departments to schedule sufficient courses for their students and examine SLOs in these courses to determine alignment with program SLOs;
- **Address consequences of lack of student preparedness:** Use assessments to address consequences of lack of preparedness and develop strategies to address the problem of students who are unprepared for college-level work;
- **Assess student preparation in K-8:** Assess preparation of students to work in K-8 classrooms, especially with regard to courses offered in other departments; and
- **Access to data needed for assessment:** Obtain data needed to determine: graduate preparedness in subject matter after students have worked in the classroom; majors' time to graduation; credential program applications/acceptances by LBST majors and success in graduate school; and LBST majors' job placement.

## 3. Advising:

- **Secure More Staff Advisors.**

## 4. Faculty Support:

- **Restore faculty development funds;**
- **Restore lecturer budget:** Enhance lecturer budget beyond replacement sections for faculty release time; and
- **Provide adequate support for Department Chair:** Additional support for the Department Chair will be necessary to fill the position in the future.

## B. The Dean of IITS recommends the following future plans:

1. **Utilize external resources:** LBST faculty are encouraged to attend EDUCAUSE Learning Institute conference.
2. **Consult with IITS to plan for LBST needs:** Meet with IITS representatives to discuss how online services such as the Degree Progress Report can be used to serve LBST; and meet with the Dean of IITS to make sure the IITS three-year rolling plan includes provisions to help LBST.
3. **Insure ATI Compliance:** Meet with IITS instructional developer to discuss assistance in creating new courses to better comply with the CSU Adaptive Technology Initiative guidelines.

4. **Utilize media resources and online course sharing:** Faculty should make themselves aware that resources for course development can be found in MERLOT (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching), identify similar online offerings in the CSU system, and consider course sharing with other campuses.
5. **Identify funds for additional multimedia support:** Identify support for additional support for programs with multimedia support needs outside of the M-F 8-5 schedule.

C. The **External Reviewers' Report** makes the following recommendations for the LBST future plans:

#### 1. Program Development:

- **Strengthen partnerships with School of Education;**
- **Plan for increases in ICP enrollment:** Consider how to maintain the cohort model in ICP if student numbers increase to double or triple their current enrollment; and
- **Re-envision BRS:** Create an integration and disciplinary fit between BRS and the teaching options (e.g., integrate it into the K-8 educational programs or maintain it as a separate program) or determine how BRS can be developed into a stand-alone major. That is, decide what the program is trying to achieve and a strategy for strengthening the program.

#### 2. Achieving Educational Outcomes:

- **Refine SLOs:** Develop simpler, more direct, and easily measurable SLOs for the LBST major in general and particularly for the ESM and ICP Options;
- **Align ICP/ESM with School of Education:** ICP SLOs should include SLOs from the Multiple Subject Credential component of the program, enabling collaboration with the School of Education;
- **Develop methods of systematically assessing SLOs:** Develop assessment within programs with analytical rubrics for assessing SLOs in courses taken by all students in an option; and
- **Provide institutional support for CSET assessment:** Link CSET data to individual students, and identify areas of strength in the subtests of the CSET.

#### 3. Developing and Applying Resources:

- **Secure facilities support:** Institutional support should be provided for phonology lab

#### 4. Advising:

- **Increase staff advising:** Increase advising staff dedicated to LBST;

- **Develop system for comprehensive advising:** Work with Advising Services to develop a system that addresses the needs of students prior to and throughout the program;
- **Develop alternative means of advising:** Develop workshops to introduce the major to freshman and sophomore students and to alleviate pressure on advisors and/or develop a freshman level one-unit course with a strong advising component for prospective teacher candidates;
- **Develop outreach to community colleges:** Establish relationships with local community college advising offices to increase outreach and recruitment as well as a seamless transition to the University;
- **Recruiting students from under represented groups:** Place greater emphasis on recruiting students from under-represented minority populations;
- **Improve website access:** Improve web access to information about LBST program and develop handouts about careers for graduates;
- **Emphasize recruitment for BRS students:** Emphasize outreach to attract students to the BRS program using social media, speakers, programs, clubs;
- **Enhance student engagement:** Establish student groups to encourage program involvement such as future-teacher student groups in order to create student networks, bring speakers to campus, and hold social events; establish student advisory group to the Department Chair in order to make suggestions and serve as an avenue of feedback on all aspects of the programs; establish student ambassadors who serve to recruit freshmen and sophomores into the programs and who visit local community colleges to recruit future transfer students; establish Border Studies Student Groups in order to make connections with other programs, institutes, and agencies in the surrounding areas; and
- **Establish Border Studies internships:** Establish BRS internships similar to the Student Teaching experience for teacher candidates.

#### 5. Faculty Support:

- **Enhance travel funds:** Provide travel funds to support disciplinary pursuits;
- **Enhance professional development funds for assessment:** Provide professional development funds for assessment;
- **Provide adequate faculty compensation for curricular development and other service to the department;** and
- **Provide adequate compensation for Department Chair.**

#### 6. Staff Support:

- **Provide additional staff support:** Provide additional staff support and/or reallocation of expanded staff responsibilities

### D. The Dean of CHABSS recommends the following future plans:

#### I. Advising:



- **Advising methods:** Clarify whether the current system of advising is detrimental to students' timely progression through the major;
- **Advising capacity and service to students:** Examine advising capacity and explore better methods to ensure that appointments are available to students; and
- **Coordinate advising:** Explore coordinating advising with the School of Education.

## 2. Program Development:

- **Rethink BRS:** Clarify the identity of the program, particularly with regard to rethinking the BRS option;
- **BRS student recruitment:** Consider ways to attract students to BRS;
- **Program development:** Consider resource challenges of program expansion on curricular offerings and staff and administrative support;
- **Clarify role of GIS:** Clarify how GIS furthers BST objectives and curriculum and how additional resources would be used; and
- **Meet student demand through self support:** Enhance curricular offerings through self-support offerings to meet student demand and provide needed support to the department.

## 3. Assessment:

- **Conduct and Use Assessment:** Engage in annual assessment of SLOs, and present plans for continuous improvement; absence of assessment data makes allocation of additional resources difficult.

## 4. Collaboration with Partner Institutions:

- **Cross-college collaboration:** Expand collaboration with School of Education.

## PAC Summary and Conclusions

The PAC thanks the faculty of the LBST Department for the successful completion of their Program Review. As the external reviewers and Dean of CHABBS acknowledge, a major strength of the LBST program lies in its faculty who offer a diverse and innovative interdisciplinary program with outstanding pedagogy that graduates students who are well prepared to make significant contributions to their professions and communities. PAC acknowledges that the LBST Department realizes these accomplishments despite a severe shortage of faculty and other resources.

The faculty, external reviewers, and deans have thoughtfully assessed the program and offered numerous suggestions about plans for the future and directions for programmatic change. Going forward, the program's challenge is to prioritize and decide which of these suggestions are most central to its short and longer-term growth and development. In what follows, PAC highlights the most salient and recurring issues resulting from this Program

Review that may warrant particular consideration by the LBST Department and those who will formulate the program MOU:

1. PAC strongly encourages LBST faculty to prioritize program development, particularly with regard to suggestions made by the external reviewers and the CHABSS Dean for clarifying the program's identity and direction and how BRS and GIS fit into the program's overall goals with regard to curricular coherence and development, attracting students, and deploying resources.
2. PAC recommends that the LBST take advantage of campus-wide assessment funding to take the following actions related to its program SLOs:
  - It will be extremely important to refine and clarify ICP/ESM SLOs to make them more specific in identifying measurable program goals;
  - PAC sees developing ways to assess how courses delivered in other departments are contributing to achieving program SLOs to be a priority issue. If direct assessment is too difficult, PAC suggests indirect assessment that might be accomplished through conducting assessments in its own courses covering skills and knowledge that students are expected to acquire in departmental courses;
  - PAC encourages greater collaboration with the School of Education related to the ESM program and that the program faculty take advantage of the CHABSS Dean's offer to facilitate these efforts;
  - PAC encourages faculty to explore advising issues to clarify the problems resulting from current approaches to advising and their solutions; and
  - PAC strongly supports the LBST faculty in their call for additional faculty support through enhanced professional development funds and adequate compensation for the Department Chair.

Finally, PAC's overall assessment is that the Liberal Studies B.A. program is a Program of Quality and Promise with a recommendation for a five-year review cycle. In the absence of a previous MOU, PAC bases this recommendation on the following three criteria contained in the Program Review Guidelines:

- the degree to which the annual assessments have generated useful data and whether assessment results have been used to make appropriate changes;
- the degree to which the five-year plan explicitly and appropriately addresses program challenges and enhances or preserves program strengths; and
- the strengths and challenges identified by the review of educational effectiveness and capacity.

PAC recognizes and applauds the LBST faculty's prior efforts to review and extensively revise its curriculum in response to external state mandates. We also strongly believe that the program would benefit from:

- conducting annual assessments over the next five years that monitor student mastery of program SLOs and the use of findings to create appropriate program-level change; and
- future plans that specify the steps for addressing program challenges identified by this review—for example, clarifying the identity and direction of the program (such as the future of the BRS option), responding to advising issues, and prioritizing future plans.

Because of the significant challenges identified in the program review, PAC recommends a process that would be embedded in the MOU--such as an interim report--that will guide and provide early feedback to the program regarding its progress in achieving program goals agreed upon in the MOU process. Should there be an interim report, we recommend that the specifics for review of this report be determined during the MOU conversation.

PAC congratulates the LBST Department on its completion of the program review. In particular, PAC thanks the faculty for their ongoing commitment to student achievement while responding to significant challenges. PAC wishes the Department faculty success in their continuing efforts to meet these challenges and in realizing its plans for the future development of the Liberal Studies program.

cc: Wayne Aiken, Chair, Academic Senate  
Marcia Woolf, Coordinator, Academic Senate  
Emily F. Cutrer, Provost and vice President for Academic Affairs  
Adam Shapiro, Dean, College of Humanities, Arts, Behavior and Social Sciences  
Program Assessment Committee



California State University  
SAN MARCOS

Academic Senate California State University San Marcos 333 S. Twin Oaks Valley Road San Marcos, CA 92096-0001  
Tel: 760.750.XXXX Fax: 760.750.XXXX XXXX@csusm.edu www.csusm.edu/XXXX

---

Date: April 4, 2012

To: Marie Thomas, Ph.D.  
Professor of Psychology

Dawn Formo, Ph.D.  
Associate Dean for Instruction and Academic Programs  
College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences (CHABSS)

From: Linda Shaw, Chair Program Assessment Committee (PAC) *Linda Shaw*

For the Program Assessment Committee: David Barsky, Gerardo Gonzalez, Donna Goyer, Olaf Hansen, Karin Irwin, Jennifer Jeffries, Moses Ochanji, and Toni Olivas

**Subject: Social Sciences B.A. Degree Program Review**

The Program Assessment Committee thanks Dawn Formo and Marie Thomas as well as the Social Sciences faculty, advisors, and College Dean for their review and reflections on the Social Sciences major degree program. We recognize that following the usual program review process was not possible given the unique nature of the Social Sciences program which has no faculty lines or dedicated social science courses. This means, for example, that a focus on the program's efforts to achieve its goals in the area of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) was not possible in this review. Given these challenges, the PAC appreciates the thoughtful and thorough program review that details the strengths, challenges, and future plans of the Social Sciences program.

In the report that follows, PAC summarizes findings from the Social Sciences program Self-study and commentary on the Self Study by the Interim Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Based on its review, PAC also offers recommendations for consideration by the program.

**Notable Attributes and Strengths of the Social Sciences Program**

Social Sciences is a multidisciplinary degree comprised of courses from across the social sciences disciplines with concentrations in one major and two minor fields. As initially envisioned, this enables the College to offer a major that serves the needs of transfer students with a large number of units as well as those with interests in several social science fields. Based on the Social Sciences program and Dean's review, the program's distinctive attributes and achievements include:

- student and alumni satisfaction with the major and a perception that its flexible and broadly-based social science curriculum meets their personal and professional needs;

---

The California State University

Bakersfield | Channel Islands | Chico | Dominguez Hills | East Bay | Fresno | Fullerton | Humboldt | Long Beach | Los Angeles | Maritime Academy  
Monterey Bay | Northridge | Pomona | Sacramento | San Bernardino | San Diego | San Francisco | San Jose | San Luis Obispo | San Marcos | Sonoma | Stanislaus

- the number of majors—101 at the time the Self Study was conducted—is larger than the number of majors found in several other programs in the College (e.g., Anthropology, Applied Physics, Biochemistry, Economics, Spanish, and Women’s Studies); and
- graduation and retention rates that are higher than for comparable majors.

### **Social Sciences Program Challenges**

The Social Sciences Program Self Study and the College Dean identified several challenges that the program faces. These include:

- lack of courses which are unique to the Social Sciences major and housed in a department;
- lack of faculty lines with support for the program dispersed throughout multiple departments;
- inability to develop a consistent experience for students comprised of a coordinated curriculum with depth in the theory, methods, and substantive issues addressed within a discipline;
- difficulty formulating and assessing SLOs because courses in the major are distributed across multiple social science disciplines;
- student difficulties in getting necessary or desired classes, the absence of the waiver program, and the lack of knowledge about the major on campus;
- trend toward a declining number of majors since 2004;
- lack of institutional support for a program coordinator and other resources;
- while the major can provide a solution for students who enjoy multiple social science fields or who have difficulty completing another major, it seems more like a “solution major” rather than a structured major; the lack of a rigorous, coherent curriculum lead some faculty to think that the program should be phased out; and
- the need for greater institutional support if the campus chooses to keep the major.

### **Future Plans**

Based on the results of the Self-study, the future plans for the Social Sciences program include:

- Developing criteria for deciding the ongoing viability and need for the program; if the program continues, it will require:
  - greater institutional support that includes compensation for a faculty member to advise Social Sciences majors and coordinate and develop the program;
  - revised curriculum to strengthen program integrity, including the possibility of an introductory theory/methods and/or capstone course; and
  - greater visibility and community among faculty, students, and alumni.

The College Dean also recommends that the program incorporate the following recommendations into its future plan:

- develop a plan for strengthening the current curriculum;

- create program-specific tools for assessing SLOs and analyzing the major's curricular strengths and weaknesses; these might include an essay or portfolio at the end of the program; and
- develop an alumni survey assessing SLOs and their usefulness in future careers.

### **PAC Summary and Conclusions**

PAC commends Dawn Formo and Marie Thomas for their in depth and thoughtful review of the Social Sciences program and recognizes that due to the unique nature of the program, this review was difficult to complete. A major finding of both the program Self Study and the review by the Dean suggests that the Social Sciences program is valued by and serves the needs of a significant number of students. But, there have been a number of significant changes in regard to campus/student needs for the major and student composition since the major was originally designed. Based on these changes, and in light of concerns expressed in the program Self Study and the Dean's review, PAC recommends that the Social Sciences program consider the following future plans:

- expansion of the choice of fields included in the major (e.g., Women's Studies, Ethnic Studies);
- revisit core area options since new social science programs have been added to the College since the major was designed, but these are not reflected as options in the program's core areas;
- establish a capstone and/or introductory course;
- create community partnerships through internships in community organizations to link the major more closely to future career possibilities;
- continue to monitor trends related to the number of majors and the reasons that students choose this major;
- establish a more effective way to measure student SLOs; and
- identify a program coordinator with adequate compensation who can help: create additional courses, strengthen the integrity of the major, serve as a faculty advisor, ensure SLOs are being met, and help establish a sense of community for both students and faculty advisors serving in each of the core areas.

Based on this program review, PAC strongly endorses adoption of changes recommended in the Self Study, by the College Dean, and those listed above based on its own review. A theme underlying all of these recommendations is that to maintain viability, the program clearly requires additional institutional support.

The Social Sciences program is truly at a crossroads. The PAC therefore recommends that an MOU Committee be established to consider whether or not the Social Sciences program warrants ongoing campus support. If there is support for the Social Sciences program, PAC strongly recommends that the MOU Committee consider implementing the recommendations contained in the Program Review Self Study, the College Dean's recommendations, in PAC's response. But, if support for the program is not forthcoming (including resources required to achieve

program viability), PAC recommends that the MOU Committee initiate processes specified in the University Academic Program Discontinuance Policy leading to suspension or discontinuation of the program.

Cc: Wayne Aiken, Chair, Academic Senate  
Emily F. Cutrer, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Adam Shapiro, Dean, College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences  
Marcia Woolf for Academic Senate  
Program Assessment Committee