

PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY
HISTORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT
POINT LOMA NAZARENE UNIVERSITY
SUBMITTED TO PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE JANUARY 2015

INTRODUCTION

A: INTRODUCTION

The History and Political Science Department has a deep tradition in PLNU's institutional history going back to the founding of the college in Pasadena. The goal of the Department has always been the formation of good, wise, well-informed citizens of both church and state. The Early Church first developed Christian education in Ancient Alexandria as a liberal arts project for the training up of young people to the highest ideal of individual good character and social virtue and the History and Political Science Department still affirms this goal.

Christian Liberal Arts is always evolving as both the methods of knowing, the extent of knowledge, and the applications of knowledge keep expanding. Today Christian citizenship has been globalized by the missionary endeavors of the church and the new technologies of travel and communication. Graduates of PLNU need to think of themselves as world citizens with responsibilities to understand and serve the whole world. The History and Political Science Department is deeply committed to the full expansiveness of this human and Christian pursuit.

Humanity is the center of our interest. Our curriculum is organized to study the whole population of the globe—both living and dead. We recognize that people are not just living in the now, but live by long traditions deep into history. Aristotle famously declared that humans are political animals, and the Department is designed to enable students to explore their political nature, their natural need and Christian calling to work with people for the betterment of people both locally and globally. The Department emphasizes not only the classroom but student opportunities to speak publically, do internships, go to conferences, and travel widely. The department is committed to gendered and racial awareness and the redress of issues associated with them. The Department faculty is gender-balanced and has members that have extensive expertise from diverse regions of the globe.

The History and Political Science Department also has a dual role in the curriculum. Not only does it teach majors and help students find fulfilling jobs in their chosen vocation, it also serves the core general education curriculum for all majors on campus. That work requires extensive time commitment from the History faculty in particular—fully half of their teaching duties are in service

of general education. The Department has long been devoted to serving the whole student body by introducing them directly to the history of world civilizations and assisting each student to integrate these essential perspectives into their majors and the rest of their liberal-arts education.

B: DEPARTMENT DESCRIPTION

The Department of History and Political Science (HPS) offers four undergraduate majors: Political Science, History, International Studies, and Social Science. It also offers one minor in History. While the minor in Women’s Studies is not technically within the Department, it is coordinated by a professor within the Department and supported in other ways by the Department. The Department also contributes four courses to the General Education curriculum.

HPS is the home of the Pre-Law Program. The Pre-Law Program is not curricular (there are no courses tied to it), but it serves in advisory and resource roles for students across the University who wish to pursue a career in Law. The Department is also the home to the Institute of Politics and Public Service (IPPS). IPPS serves in advisory and resource roles for students who wish to pursue careers in public service. Finally, while not technically within the Department, the Department also provides support for the Women’s Studies Center.

The HPS Department currently has eight full-time faculty positions, five within History and three within Political Science. All of the faculty members in the Department have their Ph.D. The faculty members of the Department have an unusually high record in teaching and learning excellence, scholarship, and University service. The extent of the Department’s faculty contribution to the University and their fields is, we believe, one of the greatest strengths of this Department.

There are just over 100 students in the Department in the various majors (see table below). While there was an overall decline in the number of students in the Department in the early 2000s, the numbers roughly stabilized since about 2007. The decline in the number of Social Science majors is part of the story here, though some of these students opted for the History major. The nationwide decrease in student demand for the Humanities in general, and History in particular, also explains some of the decline. Some of the decline in the Political Science major is also explained by the emergence and increasing numbers in the International Studies major. There is considerable overlap in the curricula of the two majors. If the Political Science and International Studies majors are considered together, those numbers have remained fairly steady since the early 2000s.

	Undergraduate Enrollments (measured in Fall semesters)										
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
History	39	38	32	27	24	28	22	35	27	29	28
Soc. Sci.	25	24	15	14	13	10	6	5	1	5	5
Poli. Sci.	70	64	58	48	50	44	48	63	47	46	47
Intl. Stud.	N/A	2	21	36	31	24	32	33	28	28	29
HPS Dept.	133	128	122	121	117	104	105	133	102	108	109

The six-year graduation rates for the majors were also on par with the PLNU average, occasionally performing lower than the institutional average and, in some instances, above. The majors performed significantly better than the institutional average on the one-year retention rate, with a couple anomalous underperforming years and two years where the numbers were too small to accurately measure (sm). The Department is committed to ensuring that the students succeed academically and this is reflected in these measures.

	Six-Year Graduation Rate (year specifies the cohort)					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
His/SS	66.7%	85.7%	70.0%	54.5%	100.0%	69.2%
PS/IS	62.5%	63.6%	78.9%	63.6%	63.6%	82.6%
PLNU	73.2%	75.5%	76.1%	75.5%	78.1%	74.5%

	One-Year Retention Rate (year specifies the cohort)					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
HIS/SS	71.4%	sm	sm	91.7%	60.0%	100%
PS/IS	87.5%	88.9%	86.4%	68.4%	94.4%	93.3%
PLNU	84.8%	86.1%	86.3%	84.9%	85.8%	90.8%

C. DEPARTMENT MISSION AND ALIGNMENT WITH PLNU MISSION

Department Mission: “The Department of History and Political Science seeks to emphasize rigorous analysis of political structures, historical changes and continuities, and human relationships; to train students in the craft of communicating their ideas orally and in writing with precision and formal organization; and to equip studies for immediate entry into either graduate or law school or a chosen career.”

PLNU Mission: “Point Loma Nazarene University exists to provide higher education in a vital Christian community where minds are engaged and challenged, character is modeled and formed, and service becomes an expression of faith. Being of Wesleyan heritage, we aspire to be a learning community where grace is foundational, truth is pursued, and holiness is a way of life.”

The History and Political Science Mission resides within the overarching umbrella of the PLNU Mission. In this Department, we recognize that intelligent Christians can be a force for good in the world. Here, the pursuit of learning and understanding is coupled with the Wesleyan emphasis on human responsibility and creativity.

One further note: the Department faculty have consciously decided to have a departmental Mission rather than separate program mission statements. The curricula and learning outcomes of our various programs may diverge, but we seek (as far as possible) to create a unified learning community where majors in various programs and disciplines can interact and participate in growth together.

D: THE HISTORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT AS AN ACADEMIC UNIT

PLNU has offered a History major as far back as when the campus was located in Pasadena. In 1990, in keeping with national trends in the CCCU and nationwide and tapping into expressed student demand, the Faculty of PLNU voted to create a separate Political Science major and develop the History and Political Science Department as a partnership of the two disciplines.

The International Studies program was formed in 2004 as an interdisciplinary major between Political Science and History, a natural outgrowth of the interdisciplinary nature of the Department as a whole. This major also involves courses from other departments and schools at PLNU. International Studies is a relatively new discipline nationally (roughly 50 years old), but is one of the fastest growing disciplines in academia and represents a growing need and demand among college students.

The Social Science major was created in the 1990s as a “fast-track” for students to earn a credential for teaching history in secondary schools. Up until about five years ago when the California Department of Education changed its policy, it met specific course requirements of the state to allow students to bypass the CSET test. Since the state of California has revised its policies, the Social Science major has ceased to offer a direct pathway to a secondary school teaching credential, and as a result that major now has very few students, and sometimes none in a given year. Because of this changing context, the Department is recommending that the Social Science major be eliminated.

E: PREVIOUS PROGRAM REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIONS TAKEN

As a result of the 2003 History and Political Science Department Program Review, five key recommendations emerged. Below are these recommendations, along with the actions that were taken to further study or implement them.

1. Increase the total number of majors in the department to 200 by 2009: the department underwent rapid growth in the number of graduates per year between 1996 and 2003 (from 14 to 27). The 2003 Program Review projected this growth would continue. However, this was about the same time when the University’s enrollment cap was becoming a reality. If the cap had been taken into account, the Department’s growth goal would have been much more conservative, possibly even setting a goal to maintain the 2003 number of majors. In 2003, the number of majors in the department was 120. The average number of majors in the department in the past few years is slightly lower than this, at 113.
2. Increase staffing to cover current shortfalls in the curriculum: it should be highlighted here that the staffing increases that were recommended in 2003 were *in response to growth that had occurred since 1996 rather than in anticipation of future growth*.
 - a. Hire History faculty to meet General Education needs and to generate a better distribution of student enrollment in upper division courses: an additional full-time faculty position

for a Historian was added by the University in 2006. There are currently five full-time Historians.

- b. Increase Political Science FTE to fill the curricular gap in American politics: an additional ½ FTE was added to Political Science faculty in 2006 (a half-time Political Scientist position was converted to full-time). There are currently three full-time Political Scientists. However, rather than fill the curricular gap in American politics, the department opted to fill a gap in Comparative Politics. Fortuitously, the person who filled this position also possessed some expertise in American politics.
3. Develop a clear overview of Colt Endowment funds and formulate decisions about their use that focuses on student programs: As a result of this recommendation, the Colt Endowment funds were primarily earmarked for additional student scholarships, bringing speakers to campus, and funding an annual student research conference. There has been some disagreement with the administration about the allocation of some of the donated funds that were given with the intent of Colt Hall maintenance and upkeep. Much of this was made moot when the economy crashed in 2008 and the annual funds were greatly reduced, at least temporarily. With the recovering economy, this discussion may need to be reengaged.
4. Increase administrative support (department assistant) to assist with departmental service with respect to the Pre-Law program and the Women's Studies Center: the job description of the HPS Department Assistant was expanded to include administrative support to the Pre-Law program, the Women's Studies Center, and the Institute for Politics and Public Service.
5. Develop an International Studies major: the International Studies major was approved by the Faculty and added to the Catalog in 2004. It is an interdisciplinary degree that takes advantage of space and curricular offerings in the History program and the Political Science program (as well as a few other courses from other disciplines).

F. DEPARTMENTAL SWOT ANALYSIS

There will be separate SWOT analyses for the programs below. The list here represents strengths and weaknesses common to all of the programs within the History and Political Science Department. For opportunities and threats and additional program-specific strengths and weaknesses, please refer to the individual program reviews below.

Strengths:

- One of greatest strengths of the Department is its faculty. The faculty are extremely active in teaching, research, publication, and faculty governance. The HPS faculty bring a great deal of value-added to the University as a whole.
- Facilities and space (Colt Hall) are excellent for both students and faculty.
- The presence of two active student honor's societies that help build community and enhance the academic experience.
- The University's Pre-Law program is closely tied to the Department.
- Location and reputation of the University.

Weaknesses:

- Low faculty morale due to rising number of department-, program-, and course-level administrative tasks and a perceived institutional preference for programs in natural sciences, professional studies, and at the graduate level.
- Insufficient professional resources (money and time) for faculty scholarly work. This has become even more glaring as the University has moved to a more rigorous tenure and post-tenure structure that requires higher-level evidence of scholarly work.
- Inability to directly access some of the funds donated expressly for the development and maintenance of facilities and programs connected with Colt Hall by the estate of Clara Colt.

G. SOME GUIDANCE ON THE PROGRAM REVIEWS

There are a few important elements of the Department and its programs that readers of this document should be aware of before proceeding forward. First, some of the reviewed data below is common to all of the programs in the Department. Thus, there may be instances where the reader is asked to refer to a section in another program's narrative. This seemed a better method than rewriting identical information in each of the program reviews.

Second, while there are currently four programs in the Department, Social Science will not have a separate program review included here. There are two reasons for this. First, in practice, the Department has treated the Social Science major as a program similar enough to the History major to allow the faculty to combine programmatic learning outcomes and tasks (e.g. assessment) and treat the programs as one. Second, this program review will recommend eliminating the Social Science major, so a separate program review seemed moot. Thus, review of the Social Science program will be subsumed under the review of the History program.

Third, the International Studies major is an interdisciplinary major combining Political Science and History courses. The major/program does not have its own faculty or its own course number designation. This creates some difficulties in undertaking its own program review that will be addressed in the section on International Studies below.

The key curricular and extra-curricular recommendations the Department is making as a result of this Program Review may be found in section IV.B of each review below. The key future inquiries – or, more clearly, issues and questions with which the Department must continue to wrestle – may be found in section VI of each review below. These two sections effectively summarize the Department's preliminary findings from its self-study and suggested courses of action.

THE HISTORY PROGRAM

PART I: HISTORY PROGRAM PURPOSE

I.A: HISTORY LEARNING OUTCOMES

Students who complete the program in History will be able to:

1. Complete a substantial historical project autonomously.
2. Demonstrate the relationship between primary and secondary materials by assessing a historian's work and recognizing the evidence used to construct that historical argument.
3. Present and analyze, in written or oral presentation, different perspectives on an event from the past.
4. Have an academic transcript that shows courses with content that ranges over time, space, culture, and qualitative and quantitative historical methods.
5. Find appropriate materials online, in a library, or in the community and know how to cite them.

These learning outcomes were modified to their current form in spring 2014 in response to an institutional request for academic programs to integrate the core competencies more directly into each program's set of learning outcomes.

I.B: ALIGNMENT WITH PLNU MISSION AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

The PLNU Mission can be found above [Introduction, section C].

PLNU Institutional Learning Outcomes:

1. Students will acquire knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world while developing skills and habits that foster life-long learning.
2. Students will develop a deeper and more informed understanding of self and others as they negotiate complex environments.
3. Students will serve locally and/or globally in vocational and social settings.

The History program is designed to equip students to meet PLNU's ILOs through the use of the tools, methods, and insights of the History discipline. The PLO's are especially concerned with capturing several aspects of the ILOs: (1) knowledge of human cultures both currently and in the past; (2) a deeper and more informed understanding of self and others through the medium of historical method and reasoning; and (3) obtaining the skills and tools that will allow graduates to serve as historians or in any career that requires critical thinking and reasoning. All three ILOs are addressed in the PLOs.

I.C: GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

The History program is responsible for two three-unit courses within the general education program: World Civilizations I and II (HIS110 and HIS111). Every student is required to take this two-course, six-unit sequence. These courses are a central feature of PLNU's GE requirements and provide a global, historical, and multi-cultural basis for other elements of the GE curricula and majors. Such a sequence is also the standard practice of university GE programs around the country.

PART II: INTEGRITY, SUSTAINABILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

II.A: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DEMAND FOR THE HISTORY PROGRAM

The internal demand for the History major has been on the decline for the past few years. This is part of a larger trend among the Humanities majors at PLNU and American universities in general. As a percentage of the total university population, PLNU's History program falls in the middle-to-low end of comparator and aspirant universities. These range from .5% at Abilene Christen to 4.4% at Gordon. PLNU's History program consists of 1.2% of the total undergraduate population (slightly higher if Social Science is included in these numbers).

The external demand for the History program is "high" (according to 2014 Noel-Levitz data). This particular data consists in part of high school students self-reporting what areas of study they are interested in. "History" is a familiar discipline to high school students, so it is expected that they would self-report interest in History at a higher rate than what their actual decision will be upon beginning their undergraduate program.

With this in mind, however, it is still possible to say that the History program is underperforming in terms of attracting quality students to the History major. Noel-Levitz identified the History program as a "high" demand, "low" cost, "medium-high" capacity program, which makes it ostensibly ripe for increasing numbers. The program is particularly weak at converting "admitted" students into "enrolled" students. Anecdotal evidence and conversations with History programs at comparator and aspirant universities suggests that many of these admitted students choose similarly-situated Christian liberal-arts universities that have functioning and respected Honor's programs.

As part of the GE, every student is required to take six-units of World Civilizations (HIS110 and HIS111). These courses make up the bulk of the History units offered each semester. Each section is usually full at 40-plus students each (25 students each for sections using alternative media). We do not expect there to be significant change in the demand of these courses unless there are significant changes in the GE program.

II.B: SIZE, SCOPE, AND PRODUCTIVITY OF THE HISTORY PROGRAM

The main costs of operating the History program are faculty salaries and benefits. Each of the five full-time History faculty members has a “normal” full-time faculty contract (24 units teaching, 4 units research, and 4 units service). One faculty member has three units of course release as Pre-Law Advisor. Four of the five faculty also have regular Summer School courses. All faculty members are involved in ongoing assessment tasks (see III.A below for the details) and student advising responsibilities.

In terms of institutional service, the History faculty are disproportionately represented on Faculty governance committees and other task forces. While the faculty are happy to serve in these roles, this also places some additional pressure on time, energy, and faculty-student interaction, especially alongside the increasing amount of administrative tasks that are being mandated on programs and departments (e.g. assessment). Each of the History faculty is also actively engaged in Departmental and program governance.

The History faculty are also actively involved in research and publication. The faculty participate formally and informally as experts for local community programs. Several faculty serve in leadership positions in guild organizations.

Conversation involving History program improvement is a continuous and ongoing process that primarily revolves around the program’s assessment plan (see III.A below). The program also relies on feedback from student evaluations in individual courses. In addition, graduating seniors are asked for their overall impressions of the major, department, and specific courses. All of this feedback is processed and acted upon formally and informally by the History faculty.

II.C: FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND ACADEMIC UNIT COSTS

The main costs of operating the program are faculty salaries and benefits. The History program has five full-time faculty. The only ongoing course release is for the Pre-Law Director (3 units annually), though History faculty are regular recipients of grants that pay for course release and the Department Chair rotates through History and Political Science faculty. The Department has one department assistant (30-hours a week). The annual budget for the Department is modest with no large expenditures other than the everyday operation of an academic unit.

When examining income and expenditures at the program level, the History program is enormously efficient. The History faculty teach roughly 3,000 student credit units annually and have Student Credit Units per FTE far in excess of the PLNU average. The History faculty are responsible for roughly 4-5% of the total undergraduate units taught at PLNU. While the History program’s Student/Faculty Ratio is much better than the PLNU average, this is almost wholly due to the World Civilizations sections. Taking this into account, it is also clear that there have been some inefficiencies in the upper-division History courses. These were addressed, in part, through the

Prioritization process (see II.G below) and can be further managed through curricular changes and improved recruitment.

The History program’s Cost per Student Credit Unit is almost identical with the Delaware benchmark for History. This is especially significant given that the years of this Delaware data were atypical in terms of staffing: in Fall 2010 History faculty had 14 non-repeated units in course release (new faculty seminar, Wesleyan grant, etc.); in Fall 2011 a History faculty member was on sabbatical. In short, PLNU’s History costs would likely have been well below the Delaware benchmark in “normal” years.

	2010-11		2011-12	
	History	PLNU	History	PLNU
Student credit units per FTE	262.4	197.0	336.9	198.8
Student/Faculty Ratio	16.40	12.32	21.06	12.42
Unfilled Course Capacity			16.7	14.1
	History	DE Bench	History	DE Bench
Cost per Student Credit Unit	\$170	\$172	\$177	\$175

Unlike some other academic programs, the History major does not require labs or special equipment. In terms of Cost per Student Credit Unit, the History program is much more cost effective than the majority of programs at PLNU. On the other hand, much of this efficiency is generated by the World Civilizations demands.

Three key conclusions may be drawn from this data. First, even with the abnormal course release in the data years, the History program is comparable to similarly-situated History programs in terms of Cost per Student Credit Unit, and is perhaps even more cost effective in “normal” years. The University “gets its’ money’s worth” from the History faculty and program. Second, a student who majors in History is more cost effective to the University than many other majors. The high Unfilled Capacity in the upper-division History courses means that the program has lots of room for growth and the University would benefit by actively recruiting students to the History major. Third, the History program can be made more efficient and steps can be and have already been taken in that direction (see II.G below).

II.D: QUALITY OF HISTORY PROGRAM INPUTS AND PROCESSES

II.D.1: Faculty

The History program has five full-time faculty members, all with terminal degrees. The program (and Department) has a strong commitment to using full-time faculty as opposed to adjunct faculty where possible. This is reflected in the statistics below. We have used adjunct faculty and expect that we will be asked by the University to increase our use of adjunct faculty in course delivery in the future. However, we will also continue to advocate for PLNU to depend on full-time faculty and long-term adjuncts, especially in its’ General Education offerings.

	2010-11		2011-12	
% units taught by full-time	History	PLNU	History	PLNU
	92.0%	75.5%	84.7%	75.7%

II.D.2: Professional Development

History faculty have made the most of the opportunities for professional development the University provides. History faculty are regular recipients of Wesley, RASP, and other grants. Two History faculty have also participated in the HOLD program and two have participated in TILE. The Department also makes additional funds available to supplement University development funds and assists faculty and students in attending conferences in the discipline.

II.D.3: Information and Technology Resources

The History program has been fairly innovative and experimental in terms of course delivery media in the past few years. One faculty member has developed a fully online version of HIS111 and another has developed a hybrid version of HIS111. In both cases, training and resources were provided by Instructional Technology Services. The hybrid version has not been very successful in terms of student success and student satisfaction and will likely be phased out.

As disciplines that depend so heavily upon textual sources, the Department’s programs are deeply reliant upon the Ryan Library faculty and staff to ensure access to up-to-date research and sources. History, Political Science, and International Studies majors are connected with Ryan Library faculty and staff early in their curriculum. The Department faculty and Ryan Library faculty and staff have a good working relationship, but more intentionality in that relationship can only be beneficial to everyone. The Department faculty are vocal advocates for robust institutional resourcing of Ryan Library personnel and materials.

II.E: INFRASTRUCTURE

The History and Political Science Department is housed entirely within Colt Hall. The Department also has nominal responsibility for this facility (although it is also often used for University meetings and events). The building was opened in 1997 and this Department has been housed there from the first day. The building is one of the most optimal on campus for encouraging the development of a learning community. Faculty offices, for the most part, are accessible to students and one another. There are several common areas for students to gather in the evenings to do work together or study alone.

The upkeep of Colt Hall has been deferred in many ways since 1997, although similar maintenance deferrals have been standard practice across the campus. Understanding this, the original donation from Clara Colt for the building intentionally included annual funds for the upkeep of the building,

but this money has been routinely reassigned by the University (much to the chagrin of the Department). This was an ongoing conversation between the Department and the University administration until the financial decline in 2008. With the recovery of the economy, this conversation should be reengaged.

II.F: STUDENT PROFILE

Unfortunately, the University data on student demographics is too small to provide much confidence in the numbers. Thus, the narrative here is partially based on this incomplete data and is partly anecdotal. Because of the incompleteness of the data, we have opted to leave the actual tables out of this report. In this area, the tables themselves are frustratingly unhelpful.

Combined, students majoring in History or Social Science make up roughly 1.4% of the total majors at PLNU. SAT numbers and GPA appear to be slightly below the PLNU average (though the data is sketchy at best). This seems accurate, however, since high school students interested in History and who have higher GPA and SAT scores tend to be attracted to universities that offer an emphasis on the humanities through a well-developed Honor's program. This means that, as a whole, students in the History major may require more help in terms of study skills and academic success. The faculty will likely need to be extra-intentional about identifying at-risk students early on and connecting them with University resources.

Retention rates and six-year graduation rates appear to be similar to the PLNU average, with the program doing much better in some years and much worse in other years. In departments and programs with small numbers, a single student staying or leaving can create wide swings in the statistics, making comparisons less than reliable.

The History program attracts significantly more male than female students, which is very different from the institutional gender imbalance in favor of female students. The students in the History major have been significantly and consistently less ethnically diverse than PLNU averages. This can be partially explained by parental resistance to a major like History, especially among first-generation college students. This is definitely a problem that needs to be addressed. One way this has been addressed is by relying on the greater diversity of the Department as a whole. However, the program also needs to do a better job in recruiting and in communicating the career opportunities in the History major to potential students and their families.

II.G: 2014 PRIORITIZATION RESULTS

The data relevant to this section has been meticulously and repeatedly examined by many institutional actors in the past two years as the University has undergone its 2014 Prioritization process. This means that some steps are already being taken to address several of the inefficiencies mentioned above. As a result of this Prioritization process, the Provost asked the History program to take three actions. It should be noted that the History faculty volunteered to do the first two

actions before the prioritization process began and have already taken action toward their fulfillment. The three actions are:

1. Eliminate 12 units of HIS taught annually: to this end, the History program is reducing the number of upper-division courses it teaches and the faculty members are replacing these units with additional, much-needed World Civilizations sections (see III.H.1 below). This will increase the number of students in the remaining upper-division courses and improve the efficiency of the program.
2. Attend to long-term enrollment challenges: to this end, the History faculty (and Department) are moving to a more active, intentional, and coordinated campaign with Admissions to recruit quality high school and transfer students. History faculty are also actively involved in the conversations and task forces working on developing a Humanities Honor's program for the University.
3. Attend to long-term staffing imbalance: the History program is currently working to meet this by developing online and hybrid (Liberty Station) World Civilizations sections. These courses meet some of the University's financial goals. Because of the media, these new section sizes are smaller, thus creating the need for more sections (some of which will be adjunct-taught) and righting some of the perceived "staffing imbalance." While the program is working and will continue to work to comply with this Prioritization mandate, the History faculty are also philosophically in disagreement with what the institution implies is a desirable adjunct/full-time ratio and therefore disagree that there is a real "imbalance."

PART III: STUDENT LEARNING AND SUCCESS

III.A: ASSESSMENT PLAN

III.A.1: Overall Assessment Plan

As mentioned above, the History faculty have conducted its' assessment of the History and Social Science programs jointly. This is in part because of the large overlap in the courses required for each program and in part because of the low number of students in the Social Science program (usually no more than one or two students per year, and sometimes none).

The History program's assessment plan (Appendix C: History Assessment Activities) calls for assessing every Program Learning Outcome (PLO) every year so that sufficient data can be gathered despite the fairly small sample size. Every History faculty member participates in the assessment activities. The faculty assess key pieces of evidence from every senior in a variety of upper-division courses, including research papers, historiographical essays, and oral presentations. Beginning with the fall of 2014, this assessment process is being streamlined by relying on evidence produced by the seniors enrolled in the capstone course HIS 470: Senior Seminar in History.

Every third year, the History faculty will compile all of the assessment data to produce more reliable statistics upon which to base decisions about changes that should be made to the program. This assessment cycle began in 2011-2012, so the first year for compiling the data should be 2013-2014. However, as is discussed below, the History faculty revised the PLOs in 2013, so the faculty are now assessing different PLOs than those being assessed in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. Therefore, the new three-year cycle begins in 2013-2014. Much of the earlier data will still be relevant and useful, though not directly applicable to the PLOs.

III.A.2: Assessment Activities since Last Program Review (2003)

Before 2011-2012, the History program's assessment centered on a group exit interview conducted with all of the graduating History and Social Science seniors every May (see III.A.4 below). Since 2011, the History program has developed a well-defined assessment plan that strives to meet the current standards for best practices in assessment. New Program Learning Outcomes were written in 2011, and then rewritten in 2013 due to new institutional instructions about the necessity of having PLOs that include the five core competencies: written communication, oral communication, information literacy, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning. In 2011-2012 an assessment plan was constructed that was used until the PLOs were rewritten in 2013, which also necessitated a rewrite of the assessment plan and rubrics (Appendix D: History Assessment Rubrics).

Also since 2011, the History faculty have developed Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) for all of the offered History courses that align with the PLOs and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). This included developing a standard set of CLOs for all of the sections of the general education courses World Civilizations I and II, which are taught by a variety of professors. The History faculty relied on Bloom's taxonomy to help represent a range of higher level thinking skills in both our PLOs and CLOs. (See Appendix E: HPS Department PLOs, ILOs, CLOs.)

Since instituting the new History PLOs in 2011-2012, the program has followed the updated assessment plan by assessing evidence from all senior History and Social Science majors for each PLO every year. The program therefore has assessment data for these new PLOs from 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. The History faculty have been gathering evidence for the 2013-2014 assessment that will happen in the spring of 2014.

III.A.3: Means of Assessment

From 2011-2013 the History faculty conducted the program's assessment by having all of the History faculty gather the necessary pieces of evidence from every senior History or Social Science major following the assessment plan. All of the History faculty then gathered together at the end of each school year to assess this evidence using the analytic rubrics and discuss the results.

In the fall of 2013, the History faculty began the process of moving the program's assessment activities online to an electronic portfolio system (LiveText) to make this process more efficient and

to be able to generate more data. The program is on track to begin having both students and faculty use this system to submit and assess pieces of evidence by April 2014. In the fall of 2014 this will be further streamlined by combining the collection of evidence with the senior seminar capstone course (which will be offered for the first time that fall).

III.A.4: Measures of History Program Learning Outcomes

Direct Measures: The History program measures its learning outcomes annually, using a different rubric for each PLO (Appendix D: History Assessment Rubrics). The History faculty use the rubrics to assess the following types of evidence from each senior History or Social Science major: research papers, historiographical essays, book reviews, exam essays, and oral presentations. Beginning with 2013-14, those rubrics reference the AACU VALUE rubrics for assessing the Core Competencies. The program's benchmark is that students will achieve a minimum group average of 2.75 out of 4 for each of the criteria on the rubric.

Indirect Measures: The History program also conducts group exit interviews with the graduating History and Social Science seniors every May. All of the History faculty attend this event. The faculty members ask the seniors about what they learned in the program, what books were most meaningful to them, what they would do differently, how to increase camaraderie among the students, etc. Every student participates in these discussions and the feedback is used by the faculty to improve the program in large and small ways.

III.A.5: Results of Assessment

The History program's assessment results demonstrate that the students are consistently meeting and exceeding the minimum standards for most criteria in every PLO. The results were slightly higher in 2012-2013 than in 2011-2012, but this may be primarily the effect of a larger sample size in 2012-2013 (seven students, as opposed to four the previous year). The results of this assessment have significantly impacted the decisions the History faculty have made about the program's curriculum.

III.B: THE HISTORY CURRICULUM

The History curriculum is designed to provide a great deal of latitude to students to explore the areas of historical inquiry that most appeals to them and are areas in which they would like to build a career. This means that it offers a wide selection of electives that the student (in ongoing conversation with his or her advisor) can choose from to learn and practice the skills and tools of the History discipline.

The major is 44 units, which is at the low end of major requirements at PLNU. This is a conscious decision to limit the number of required units within the major: a liberal-arts university is designed to allow a student to explore a wide-range of subjects and courses. The program believes that PLNU's current trend toward increasing the number of required units in majors prevents students from taking advantage of a liberal-arts education and restricts the fullness of the student's overall education.

There are two required courses in the major: HIS270 Research Methods, taken as Sophomores and in some cases as Freshmen, and HIS470 Senior Seminar, taken as Seniors. The first introduces students to some of the key tasks, tools, and methods of historical research (see the PLOs in I.A), while the latter gives students an opportunity to demonstrate mastery of these techniques. The rest of the requirements of the major are upper-division electives that allow students to develop these techniques in the exploration of topics, eras, and places that are of most interest to them.

In order to ensure each student engages in a breadth of topics, the curriculum requires each major to take two courses (eight units) in American electives, two courses in European electives, and two courses in Non-Western electives. The remaining twelve units are pure electives (upper-division HIS courses).

The History faculty have debated this curricular structure extensively over the years and in a more focused manner for Program Review. These discussions have been deeply informed by the ongoing assessment process and results. Students and alumni have been asked informally for their perspectives on the structure and content of the curriculum as well. The overwhelming response is that what the structure intends to model and convey is essential and worth preserving. Such a structure, however, does require greater intentionality in the advisor-student relationship in order to help the student better map out what courses would best match his or her interests. Reducing the number of upper-division courses slightly should help to create a more stable course rotation and make it easier for student and advisor alike to map out a future path of study.

III.C: HISTORY PROGRAM FACULTY

Faculty members in the History program routinely attend events and workshops sponsored by the Center for Teaching and Learning. In some cases, History faculty has sought and received individual assistance from the CTL in addressing specific weaknesses. Several History faculty have also participated in the HOLD and TILE programs. Faculty that teach alternative media courses are in constant communication with ITS and CTL to refine and improve their pedagogy in these relatively unfamiliar media. In addition, History faculty are all continuously engaged in the ongoing tasks of assessment, reflection, and informed improvement of the program.

III.D: COMPLIANCE

Credit-hour policy and monitoring is done under the oversight of the Provost and the Dean.

With respect to core competency assessment, the program (and Department) followed the instructions of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and ensured that the program learning outcomes contained the core competencies and the assessment of core competencies with structured into the ongoing assessment plan for the program. See III.A above for an explanation and the plan itself.

III.E: HISTORY ALUMNI SATISFACTION AND PLACEMENT

Any data the program has on alumni satisfaction and placement is anecdotal. The Department is not currently resourced to be able to adequately track and assess alumni data. To the degree that the University expects academic units to gather this data, the University needs to provide training for the department assistant in how to best gather this data and needs to improve its institutional alumni tracking systems and make these accessible to academic units (again with training). The program's alumni tracking is currently done via Facebook and other social media, but this is in no way formalized.

III.F: STUDENT EVALUATION FEEDBACK

Student feedback is an essential part of the formation of the structure and content of the program. Along with regular student feedback in courses and faculty-hosted dinners and activities, graduating students and faculty meet each spring to discuss how the program can be improved. A key non-curricular piece of feedback gleaned from these times is the need for more intentional means of building camaraderie among the students of the program. This has improved substantially in the past few years.

PART IV: QUALITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

IV.A: COMPARATOR AND ASPIRANT HISTORY PROGRAMS

Using the list of Comparator and Aspirant Colleges and Universities used by the administration of PLNU, data was gathered from department leaders in many of these programs and from their websites.

General Note on Web Presence: The PLNU HPS department and its history program share with most comparators and aspirants an appealing and informative website. Some websites were better focused to recruit students than the PLNU site. These better websites included embedded videos and specific information about career possibilities. The History program at PLNU should take action to make its website a better recruiting tool.

Programs and Distinctives: The range of offerings in the history program compares favorably with most of the comparators and aspirants. Most offer, along with a standard History program, a teacher track and a History minor. Four schools (Cal Lutheran, Gordon, Messiah, and Whitworth) offer a museum studies-public history track. Increasing the PLNU focus on public history should improve the program's ability to recruit students and set it apart from most comparators and aspirants. The PLNU History program's integration with Women's Studies, pre-law, and its emphasis on educational travel is comparable to several other comparators and aspirants, but these aspects should be more prominently highlighted on the website. Several types of other concentrations appear at other institutions—classical studies, regional/racial/gender studies, and archeology. The PLNU History program does not have formal concentrations because, given the small faculty, such concentrations would be very limiting in terms of recruitment. Azusa Pacific noted prominently on its web site its regular department social hour called "Tea, Bread, and 3 Things." PLNU has much that it does socially—for example its' Tuesdays with a faculty member discussing international news— and should think about creating a regular and intentional event that it can promote. This would help strengthen the program and also help with recruitment.

Scope: Recent articles from the History discipline reaffirm the need for History programs to have a global scope. The consensus is that History programs should aim to provide systematic global perspectives in History so that major societies and major international trends will be treated over several major time periods. The curricula at comparator and aspirant universities reaffirm this in their majors (through a breadth of course offerings) and their general education requirements (usually *World Civilizations* offerings, rather than *Western Civilizations*). The PLNU History program and GE requirements have historically seen, and continue to see, the global breadth and scope of the History curricula as crucial.

Percentage of majors in school population: Those comparators and aspirants that responded to the email request gave a present-day picture of the total population compared to number of history majors. Institutions that prominently emphasize liberal arts, such as Gordon, Westmont, Seattle Pacific, Whitworth, and Wheaton, constitute a group with significantly higher percentages of History majors than PLNU. PLNU falls on the middle-to-lower end of this continuum, demonstrating that there is room for improvement.

Number of Faculty: The comparators and aspirants tend to have a similar number of FTE faculty in relation to undergraduate population as the PLNU program. PLNU has 5 History faculty for 2400 students. Schools with a lower ratio include Calvin with 10 for 4000, Wheaton with 6 for 2400, Messiah with 7 for 2800, and Westmont/Gordon with 5 for a mere 1275/1580. These are the true aspirants of the History program and efforts should be made to maintain or improve the ratio of PLNU History faculty to the overall student population that is served. At present PLNU is similar to Whitworth with 5 for 2270, Pepperdine with 6 for 3400, Seattle Pacific with 6 for 3360, and Cal Lutheran with 5 for 2888.

It has been implied that the University will consider downsizing the History program to 4 FTE in the near future. The Department believes such a move would be detrimental to the University. Going down to 4 Historians would jeopardize the University's ability to maintain the kind of quality in teaching and scholarship that puts it in the company of the institutions mentioned above.

The most compelling argument for keeping the program size at 5 FTE is the program's commitment to General Education. Although the loss of a full-time faculty member will adversely affect the ability of the program to sustain a major that strives to cover the essential chronology and geography of world, the students who will suffer the most are the large numbers of freshman and sophomore students in World Civilizations who would be guided by an adjunct professor rather than one fully engaged with the life of PLNU. The General Education curriculum is the center and most influential aspect of PLNU's aspiration to promote both Wesleyanism and the Liberal Arts. The faculty of the World Civilizations courses have a disproportionate professorial influence in what becomes "the brand" of a graduate of PLNU. It is short-sighted, we believe, to turn such important teaching responsibilities over to less-integrally-engaged part-time help.

IV.B: ACTION PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT

IV.B.1: Proposed Curricular Changes

The History and Political Science Department will recommend to the Academic Policies Committee and Faculty the elimination of the Social Sciences major. This major was created in the 1990s as a means for students interested in teaching the social sciences at the high school level. However, since then numerous state and local policies on teacher education have changed making the Social Science degree less advantageous to students. The internal and external demand for this major has all but evaporated as students interested in high school social studies teaching have opted for either a History major, a Liberal Studies major, or both. There are no courses or faculty positions that only service the Social Studies major, so the elimination of the program will have no impact on personnel or finances.

Based on the data above and the conversations that have occurred within the History program's ongoing assessment process, the Department will recommend to the Academic Policies Committee and Faculty the following changes to the current History curriculum.

1. Add a four-unit capstone course. The need for this course was clear early in the pre-Program Review process, so the course was already added two years ago (HIS470 Senior Seminar). It is being taught for the first time in Fall 2014. In brief, the highly-elective nature of the major requires a course in the senior year that can help tie all of the methods and ideas together more uniformly. The course also serves as a useful means of generating assessment data for the program.
2. Eliminate several upper-division HIS courses from the Catalog. This step will allow the program to reduce some of its inefficiencies and to meet the mandate from the Prioritization process. The courses tagged for elimination have not been offered for the past two years as the program has come into compliance with Prioritization. The courses that will be removed from the Catalog are:
 - HIS311 European Intellectual History (4 units)
 - HIS360 Modern South Asia (4 units)
 - HIS365 Modern Japan and Korea (4 units)

HIS369 China in Revolution (4 units)

HIS372 Two Years Before the Mast and the History of Coastal California (2 units)

HIS413 Nineteenth Century Europe (4 units)

HIS436 America in East Asia: 1800s to the Present (4 units)

HIS486 Modern Christianity (3 units)

3. Make HIS484 Ancient and Medieval Christianity a 4-unit course. This course was originally conceived of as a 3 unit course to help fit the curricula of other programs. It is not being used by these other programs currently, but is being used by the History program which is based on a 4-unit course model.
4. Add a new course HIS450 Topics in Public History.

IV.B.2: Proposed Extra-Curricular Changes

The History faculty will enhance the usefulness of the History curriculum to students by taking several steps that do not require Academic Policies Committee or Faculty approval. As a side note, the History program had considered building “concentrations” in “History Education” and “Public History” into the existing curriculum (as many other programs at PLNU have done), but opted against this move since it had the potential of making the major more inefficient. Instead, the program will seek to fulfill these needs by committing to improvements in the following areas:

1. Collaborate more closely with the School of Education to enhance the History major for students who may desire to teach high school and advise these students accordingly.
2. Place a greater emphasis on public history in certain HIS courses and advise students who may desire a career in public history into these courses.
3. Build a wider and deeper local internship network that focuses on internships History majors would find particularly useful in career development (e.g. museums, parks, education, government, etc.).

The History faculty (and the Department as a whole) will more actively recruit new majors from those who have expressed an interest in the major to Admissions. In addition to maintaining intentional and continuous communication with the Admissions staff, the Department will enhance its own recruitment efforts. Actions that will be taken include greater direct faculty communication with interested recruits, improved social media and website content, and use of current students to assist in recruiting potential students.

PART V: INTERNAL STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND EXTERNAL OPPORTUNITIES (SWOT)

Please see the Departmental SWOT Analysis above [Introduction.F].

Strengths:

- The expertise of the History faculty makes it possible to cover a wide range of topics, both in terms of region and era. One of the largest challenges for History programs at smaller schools is providing a curriculum that has global and cross-cultural scope. Despite having only five faculty members, the PLNU History program has been able to cover a wide breadth of places, cultures, and eras.
- A flexible curriculum that provides for both a breadth of regions and eras, but also allows students to build their own curriculum to focus on areas of their interest and career goals.
- Strong working relationships with local public history resources (e.g. parks, museums, etc.), including geographic proximity to Point Loma Lighthouse National Park.
- Low cost per student credit unit (see Delaware data) relative to History programs in the Delaware study and to other PLNU academic programs.
- Extremely efficient use of faculty in terms of faculty-student ratio relative to the PLNU average.
- Because of the high profile of History courses in the GE curriculum, the program has relatively high access to PLNU students making decisions about their major

Weaknesses:

- The currently-small number of majors and the gradual decline in these numbers over the past ten years. While much of this decline can be linked to the national decline in demand for History programs, it is probable that there are some internal weaknesses that have contributed to this.
- Relative lack of diversity, in terms of gender and ethnicity, among majors.
- Lack of curricular coverage for Latin America and Africa.

Opportunities:

- Active participation in the institution-wide effort to build and develop a Humanities Honors program. This new program has the potential to energize History faculty and students, create synergistic innovations by the closer interactions between humanities faculty in currently siloed programs, and grow the size of the major.

Threats:

- The major of History, and the Humanities more generally, is in decline in terms of student demand across the country. It is unclear nationally if this is a temporary fluctuation in student demand or if this is an ongoing trend. This obvious threat to the sustainability of the program must be balanced with two other realities: (1) the demand for the discipline of History remains essential to a liberal-arts educational structure and a student's well-rounded education and (2) students express a great deal of interest in the History discipline, but often are unable to see how such a major will translate into a career after graduation.
- Increased federal interest in higher education regulation and reform creates a great deal of uncertainty in what is needed from the program in the near future. As an example, federal

subsidization of community college tuition could impact the need for World Civilizations course offerings.

- Increased availability of online options for World Civilizations from other schools may cut into the internal demand for World Civilizations sections. Arguably, PLNU could tap into this market by providing its own World Civilizations sections. However, there is likely a strict limit to how much of this market that could be captured because PLNU would be unable to compete in terms of credit unit cost.
- An institutional trend toward increasing the adjunct-to-full-time faculty ratio.

PART VI: THEMES FOR FUTURE INQUIRY FOR THE HISTORY PROGRAM

1. Inquire into the pros and cons to the University, program, and students of having a History program with 5 FTE versus one with 4 FTE supplemented with adjunct faculty.
2. Inquire into the best means to actively support and participate in the creation and development of a Honor's program in conjunction with the other PLNU Humanities programs.
3. Inquire into the best means to recruit History majors in conjunction with the Office of Admissions.
4. Inquire into developing a high-quality online version of HIS110 (World Civilizations I).
5. Inquire into the pros and cons of increasing Summer School History options, especially HIS110 and HIS111.
6. Inquire into the best means to develop and maintain a local internship network specifically designed for students pursuing History-related careers.
7. Inquire into developing a more formal relationship and a recommended curriculum with the School of Education that will enable History majors who are interested in a career in Education to be best prepared.
8. Inquire into the best means of improving high-school recruitment to the major.

THE POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

PART I: POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM PURPOSE

I.A: POLITICAL SCIENCE LEARNING OUTCOMES

Students who complete the program in Political Science will be able to:

1. Develop an appreciation of the field of politics.
2. Evaluate, design, and apply social science research with respect to political phenomena.
3. Understand and critically assess the processes, theories, and outcomes of political institutions and political behavior.
4. Demonstrate social scientific information literacy.
5. Develop and express ideas in written communication in an effective and scholarly manner.
6. Demonstrate oral communication abilities, particularly to convey complex ideas, recognize diverse viewpoints, and offer empirical evidence of an argument.
7. Construct and evaluate analytical, comprehensive arguments.

These learning outcomes were modified to their current form in spring 2014 in response to an institutional request for academic programs to integrate the core competencies more directly into each program's set of learning outcomes.

WASC's Standard 1.1 (July 2013) calls for all universities to clearly define the ways in which the university contributes to the public good. The Political Science program, including the Institute for Politics and Public Service (IPPS), help PLNU to achieve this goal. In addition to the academic goals and outcomes listed above, the Political Science program encourages students across the University to engage in real-world public affairs, both local and global. Schomberg and Farmer (1993:17) argue that "public service is a set of activities utilizing faculty expertise to solve societal problems or to help others to do so, intended to benefit the public and contribute to the welfare of society." Democratic societies hinge on talented and compassionate political leaders, strong civic engagement, and a healthy political system, and universities have a long history of contributing to these elements. The Political Science program and IPPS are instrumental in helping PLNU meet these needs locally and globally.

I.B: ALIGNMENT WITH PLNU MISSION AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

The PLNU Mission can be found above [Introduction, section C].

PLNU Institutional Learning Outcomes:

1. Students will acquire knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world while developing skills and habits that foster life-long learning.
2. Students will develop a deeper and more informed understanding of self and others as they negotiate complex environments.
3. Students will serve locally and/or globally in vocational and social settings.

The Political Science program is designed to equip students to meet PLNU's ILOs through the use of the tools, methods, and insights of the Political Science discipline. The PLO's are especially concerned with capturing several aspects of the ILOs: (1) fostering life-long learning by mastering the tools that will enable students to view new information through familiar frameworks; (2) developing a deeper and more informed understanding of self and others through the medium of social scientific method and reasoning; and (3) obtaining the skills and tools that will allow graduates to serve as political scientists or in any career that requires critical thinking and reasoning. All three ILOs are addressed in the PLOs.

I.C: GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

The Political Science program is responsible for two courses within the general education program: POL101 Introduction to International Relations (3 units, 2 sections offered annually) and POL190 Politics of Race, Class, and Gender (4 units, 1-2 sections offered annually). Both courses are within "The Social World" category, of which each student must choose one of eight options. Having either required courses or offerings from Political Science is a standard piece of most Universities' general education programs.

PART II: INTEGRITY, SUSTAINABILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

II.A: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DEMAND FOR THE POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

The internal demand for the Political Science major has been largely steady in recent years. Since 2005, the annual number of students in the major has been in the high 40s, with a couple years where that number has been higher. The roughly 20-student drop in the major that occurred around 2005 is most likely the result of the establishment of the new International Studies major which grew rapidly during these early years. Students in the Political Science major make up just over 2% of the total PLNU population.

	Undergraduate Enrollments (measured in Fall semesters)										
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Political Sci.	70	64	58	48	50	44	48	63	47	46	47
Intl. Stud.	N/A	2	21	36	31	24	32	33	28	28	29

The external demand for the Political Science program is “high” (according to recent Noel-Levitz data). Given this, it is likely that the Political Science program is slightly underperforming in terms of attracting quality students to the major. Noel-Levitz identified the Political Science program as a “high” demand, “medium low” cost, “medium low” capacity program, meaning there is some space for additional students and these would be financially beneficial to the University. The program could improve at converting “admitted” students into “enrolled” students by more intentionally assisting Admissions in recruiting prospective students.

As part of the GE, every student is required to take one course from a menu of seven courses under the heading of “The Social World.” Two of these seven courses are from the Political Science program [POL101 Introduction to Political Science (3 units); POL190 Politics of Race, Class, and Gender (4 units)]. Currently, one section of POL101 is offered each semester and one section of POL190 is offered annually [10 units total per year]. We do not expect there to be significant change in the demand of these courses unless there are significant changes in the GE program.

II.B: SIZE, SCOPE, AND PRODUCTIVITY OF THE POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

The Noel-Levitz data describes the Political Science program as one of “medium low” cost. The main costs of operating the Political Science program are faculty salaries and benefits. Each of the three full-time History faculty members has a “normal” full-time faculty contract (24 units teaching, 4 units research, and 4 units service). However, each of the three also have some annual course release currently [8 units for Department Chair; 6 units for Women’s Studies Center Director; and 4 units for Institute for Politics and Public Service Director]. Please note that the course release for Director of the Women’s Studies Center is institutional rather than departmental (the Women’s Studies Center is not formally housed within the Department). All faculty members are involved in ongoing assessment tasks (see III.A below for the details) and student advising responsibilities.

In terms of institutional service, the Political Science faculty are disproportionately represented on Faculty governance committees and other task forces. While the faculty are happy to serve in these roles, this also places some additional pressure on time, energy, and faculty-student interaction, especially alongside the increasing amount of administrative tasks that are being mandated on programs and departments (e.g. assessment). Each of the Political Science faculty is also actively engaged in Departmental and program governance.

The Political Science faculty are also actively involved in research and publication. The faculty participate formally and informally as experts for local community programs.

Conversations involving Political Science program improvement is a continuous and ongoing process that primarily revolves around the program’s assessment plan (see III.A below). The program also relies on feedback from student evaluations in individual courses. In addition, graduating seniors are asked for their overall impressions of the major, department, and specific courses. All of this feedback is processed and acted upon formally and informally by the Political Science faculty.

I.I.C: FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND ACADEMIC UNIT COSTS

The main costs of operating the program are faculty salaries and benefits. The Political Science program has three full-time faculty. The only ongoing course release is for two Center/Institute Directorships, though Political Science faculty are regular recipients of grants that pay for course release and the Department Chair rotates through History and Political Science faculty (the Chair is currently held by a Political Scientist). The Department has one department assistant (30-hours a week). The annual budget for the Department is modest with no large expenditures other than the everyday operation of an academic unit.

When examining income and expenditures at the program level, the Political Science program is efficient. The Political Science faculty teach roughly 1200 student credit units annually (slightly below 2% of total undergraduate units taught at PLNU) and have Student Credit Units per FTE slightly below the PLNU average. It should be pointed out here that, unlike many programs, Political Science has very few GE sections (only 10 units of the roughly total 54 units of POL taught annually). This means that Political Science’s “Unfilled Course Capacity” of 11.0 is much better than the PLNU average of 14.1.

The Political Science program’s Cost per Student Credit Unit is admittedly higher than the Delaware History benchmark. However, it should be noted that one of the faculty members was on Family Leave during Fall 2010. In addition, due to efforts to correct some inefficiencies in the program, the program’s Delaware number in Fall 2012 was brought down to \$217, which roughly matches the Delaware benchmark.

	2010-11		2011-12	
	Poli. Sci.	PLNU	Poli. Sci.	PLNU
Student credit units per FTE	154,4	197.0	182.1	198.8
Student/Faculty Ratio	9.65	12.32	11.38	12.42
Unfilled Course Capacity			11.0	14.1
	Poli. Sci.	DE Bench	Poli. Sci.	DE Bench
Cost per Student Credit Unit	\$243	\$209	\$233	\$213

Unlike some other academic programs, the Political Science major does not require labs or special equipment. In terms of Cost per Student Credit Unit, the Political Science program is one of the more cost effective majors at PLNU.

Two key conclusions may be drawn from this data. First, the Political Science program has brought program costs into better alignment with similarly-situated Political Science programs in terms of Cost per Student Credit Unit. This is even more impressive given that many of these universities require more and offer more GE units in Political Science than PLNU does. Second, a student who majors in Political Science is more cost effective to the University than many other majors. Thus, the University benefits financially by maintaining and/or slightly increasing the percentage of its undergraduates in the major.

II.D: QUALITY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM INPUTS AND PROCESSES

II.D.1: Faculty

The Political Science program has three full-time faculty members, all with terminal degrees. The program (and Department) has a strong commitment to using full-time faculty as opposed to adjunct faculty where possible. This is reflected in the statistics below. We have used adjunct faculty and expect that we will be asked by the University to increase our use of adjunct faculty in course delivery in the future. However, we will also continue to advocate for PLNU to depend on full-time faculty and long-term adjuncts.

	2010-11		2011-12	
	Poli. Sci.	PLNU	Poli. Sci.	PLNU
% units taught by full-time	75.6%	75.5%	94.3%	75.7%

II.D.2: Professional Development

Political Science faculty have made the most of the opportunities for professional development the University provides. Political Science faculty have received Wesley, Alumni, and other grants. One Political Science faculty has also participated in the TILE program. The Department also makes additional funds available to supplement University development funds and assists faculty and students in attending conferences in the discipline.

II.D.3: Information and Technology Resources

See History II.D.3.

II.E: INFRASTRUCTURE

See History II.E.

II.F: STUDENT PROFILE

Unfortunately, the University data on student demographics is too small to provide much confidence in the numbers. Thus, the narrative here is partially based on this incomplete data and is partly anecdotal. Because of the incompleteness of the data, we have opted to leave some of the actual tables out of this report. In this area, the tables themselves are often frustratingly unhelpful.

Students majoring in Political Science make up roughly 2.0% of the total majors at PLNU. SAT numbers and GPA are not significantly different from those of PLNU. Of course, averages can be

deceiving and each year there are stellar students who sail through the courses and others who need extra academic assistance. There is no question that the faculty need to be extra intentional about identifying at-risk students early on and connecting them with University resources.

	Incoming Student Data				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
PS (SAT)	1119	1142	1106	1158	1159
PLNU (SAT)	1137	1150	1115	1164	1136
PS (GPA)	3.72	3.44	3.57	3.81	3.75
PLNU (GPA)	3.70	3.74	3.77	3.81	3.82

One-year retention and six-year graduation rates for the Political Science program are slightly lower than the PLNU average taken as a whole [see Introduction.B above]. However, these numbers improved in the last three years of data to reach near parity with the PLNU average. The most likely source for the low numbers is that the program was undergoing two faculty transitions during the early years of data (in a department of three, a change of two faculty members can be very disruptive). The improvements in the numbers thus likely reflect the newfound program stability and energy following the hiring of new faculty members.

The Political Science program attracts roughly equal numbers of male than female students, which is very different from the institutional gender imbalance in favor of female students. The students in the Political Science major have been significantly and consistently more ethnically diverse than PLNU averages. The program needs to continue both of these trends.

II.G: 2014 PRIORITIZATION RESULTS

The data relevant to this section has been meticulously and repeatedly examined by many institutional actors in the past two years as the University has undergone its 2014 Prioritization process. As a result of this Prioritization process, the Provost did not ask the Political Science program to take any specific actions.

PART III: STUDENT LEARNING AND SUCCESS

III.A: ASSESSMENT PLAN

III.A.1: Overall Assessment Plan

The Political Science program assessment plan (Appendix D: Political Science Assessment Activities) calls for assessing every PLO within a two-year rotation and for assessing every PLO that is embedded with a core competency every year. The faculty assess key pieces of evidence from

every senior in a variety of upper-division courses. While the feedback from the assessment is often reflected on and discussed immediately, every second year the faculty will meet formally to discuss the overall results.

III.A.2: Assessment Activities since Last Program Review (2003)

The PLOs have undergone several iterations because the directives from the University concerning PLOs have changed several times. In the most recent iteration, efforts were made to embed some of the core competencies within the PLOs (see I.A).

Having established the program PLOs, an assessment plan was then constructed, including a curriculum map, a determination of which courses would be used to assess which PLOs and core competencies, a determination of what assignments in each course would best measure the outcome or competency in question, and a general calendar of when assessment activities would take place. This may be found in Appendix D.

Since 2011, the Political Science and History faculty members have been in the process of building Course Learning Outcomes into each course that line up with the respective PLOs.

III.A.3: Results of Assessment

While the faculty are still learning how to adequately and most effectively interpret the assessment data in such a way that it can improve the quality of the program, some conclusions have been reached following reflection on the results. For example, we found that there was some confusion among students on proper citation methodology and so all Political Science assignments in all courses will be done using the Chicago style and this will be driven home in each syllabus.

One of the more surprising conclusions we have found is that the students are missing the mark in a few areas of developing and expressing ideas in writing. We had to admit that we had been relying on GE Writing courses to train our students in this critical core competency, but it is has become apparent that students are not getting even some of the basics in these courses or from high school. We have decided that we will need to pay closer attention to grammar and syntax in our feedback of student assignments. For some writing assignments it may be necessary to build peer review and proofreading requirements into the assignments overall grade. It is also necessary for the faculty to direct some students more pointedly to take advantage of student academic services to improve their writing.

As of now, we are grateful that our assessment results have highlighted places where instruction and assignments should be tweaked. In general, the structure and content of the curriculum has been overall confirmed as effective in achieving the PLOs and student satisfaction.

III.B: THE POLITICAL SCIENCE CURRICULUM

The Political Science program underwent a structural review and revision in 2007 and 2008 after the hiring of two new faculty members to ensure that the program met the academic rigor of the University and the guild, and also matched the expertise and interests of the faculty members and students. In this process the structure of the curriculum was maintained, but some courses were eliminated, modified, or added.

The Political Science major is 52 units, 4 of which meet a GE requirement. The philosophy of its structure is to (a) ensure all majors are introduced to the fundamental principles of Political Science (largely via the lower-division courses), (b) ensure all majors are exposed to the four primary subdivisions of the discipline (American, Comparative, Global, and Theory) (largely via upper-division courses), (c) ensure all majors experience some academic instruction in Political Science at another location from other faculty, and (d) ensure all majors receive some internship experience.

The fundamental principles and practices of the discipline of Political Science are introduced in the four lower-division courses that every major is required to take. The lower-division offerings, including a methods course (POL270), largely reflect the standard lower-division courses offered at other institutions.

The upper-division requirements consist of (1) four units (one course) from each of the four disciplinary subdivisions, (2) four units of internship, (3) nine units of the Capitals Program, and (4) eight units (roughly two courses) of electives within the major.

For the Capitals Program, each major is required to take nine units in Political Science courses at an institution of their choice in a capital city. The capital can be either a state capital or a national capital (including Washington DC). There is a little flexibility on the “capital” requirement, provided the destination plays a significant political role nationally or globally. The Department, in partnership with Study Abroad, has developed several relationships with academic institutions that meet the Capitals requirement, allowing advisors to better direct students to the program that best meets their interests and career goals. It is also often encouraged that the student do his or her internship during this semester, as San Diego has limited internship options for students interested in politics and public service.

The Political Science faculty have debated this structure extensively over the years and in a more focused manner for Program Review. These discussions have been deeply informed by the ongoing assessment process and results. Students and alumni have been asked informally for their perspectives on the structure and content of the curriculum as well. It is clear that this model has worked well for student success, both in the University and after graduation.

Several issues have arisen in recent years however. First, it has become increasingly apparent that assessment tasks are difficult to coordinate because of a lack of a capstone course. The faculty believe the addition of a Senior Seminar to the Political Science curriculum would be beneficial to the students and would assist the faculty in assessment. Second, there has been some difficulty in recent years regarding the offering of POL380 Congress and the Presidency, one of two possible courses that can fulfill a student’s American Government upper-division requirement. This course

is not an area of expertise of any of the current Political Science faculty and finding an appropriate adjunct to teach it has been problematic. Thus, the faculty believe it would be appropriate to replace POL380 as an American Government requirement with POL441 Issues in Public Policy. This course will convey the skills, practices, and topics of the disciplinary subdivision of American Government quite well.

III.C: POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM FACULTY

Faculty members in the Political Science program routinely attend events and workshops sponsored by the Center for Teaching and Learning. The student evaluations of the Political Science faculty are excellent in general. One Political Science faculty member participated in the TILE program. Currently, Political Science faculty do not teach any courses that would be considered alternative media (online, hybrid, etc.). In addition, Political Science faculty are all continuously engaged in the ongoing tasks of assessment, reflection, and informed improvement of the program.

III.D: COMPLIANCE

Credit-hour policy and monitoring is done under the oversight of the Provost and the Dean.

With respect to core competency assessment, the program (and Department) followed the instructions of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and ensured that the program learning outcomes contained the core competencies and the assessment of core competencies with structured into the ongoing assessment plan for the program. See III.A above for an explanation and the plan itself.

III.E: POLITICAL SCIENCE ALUMNI SATISFACTION AND PLACEMENT

Any data the program has on alumni satisfaction and placement is anecdotal. The Department is not currently resourced to be able to adequately track and assess alumni data. To the degree that the University expects academic units to gather this data, the University needs to provide training for the department assistant in how to best gather this data and needs to improve its institutional alumni tracking systems and make these accessible to academic units (again with training). The program's alumni tracking is currently done via Facebook and other social media, but this is in no way formalized.

III.F: STUDENT EVALUATION FEEDBACK

Student feedback is an essential part of the formation of the structure and content of the program. When the major was unofficially reviewed in 2008 following the hiring of two new faculty

members, a student committee was assembled that, in general, did not suggest major structural changes to the program itself. Student feedback is a crucial part of each course, the program as a whole, and extracurricular activities attached to the program.

PART IV: QUALITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

IV.A: COMPARATOR AND ASPIRANT POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAMS

Using the list of Comparator and Aspirant Colleges and Universities used by the administration of PLNU, data was gathered from department leaders in many of these programs and from their websites. To be precise, the Political Science programs at fifteen comparator and aspirant schools were researched and analyzed.

The curriculum of PLNU's Political Science program is very similar to these schools and the guild recommendations. In particular, there is ample coverage of the four main subdivisions of the discipline (American, Comparative, Global, and Theory). For the most part, PLNU does not offer a wide variety of specialized courses in these subdivisions, but this is to be expected at a smaller liberal-arts university. In fact, this is one of the primary reasons why Political Science majors are required to do the Capitals program: the student can seek out programs that have the capacity to offer a wider breadth and depth of courses in the areas of his or her interest and career goals.

While most of the Political Science curricular offerings are standard fare at the comparator and aspirant schools, PLNU also offers some more specialized courses that have the effect of attracting students to the program. Notable among these (based on feedback from students) are International Law, Development of Feminist Thought, and Protests and Social Movements. Almost all of the comparator and aspirant schools also take advantage of their respective faculty's expertise and offer similar, more-specialized courses.

In terms of the size of the major, PLNU's 52-unit curriculum is on the higher side compared to the average unit size of the comparators, though it is on par with the aspirant schools. One of the main reasons why the size of the major is relatively high is because of the nine-unit Capitals requirement that is unique among the schools examined. Although this requirement is unique, PLNU students claim it is one of the most valuable, energizing, and innovative components of the major. Students report that the Capitals requirement is enormously helpful in focusing their scholarly and career aspirations, as well as exponentially improving their understanding of political systems and global issues.

A growing number of comparator and aspirant Political Science programs are adding a capstone course to their curricula. Such a course is not necessarily a guild recommendation, but it is becoming more and more necessary given regional and national assessment requirements.

While there is variation in the size of schools and programs among the comparator and aspirant list, most are similar in size and scope to PLNU. The average number of faculty in these programs is 6; taking into account outliers on this list, the median number of faculty in Political Science programs is 4.5. Many of these schools require more Political Science in their GE programs, which may explain some of the difference between the median and PLNU's current number of 3 faculty. Still, the three PLNU Political Science faculty are pleased that we can offer the breadth and quality of program that we do and do so at a reasonable cost per student credit hour. The PLNU Political Science program compares favorably in numerous areas against these comparator and aspirant schools, nearly all of whom have more Political Science faculty than PLNU.

IV.B: ACTION PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT

IV.B.1: Proposed Curricular Changes

Based on the data above and the conversations that have occurred within the Political Science program's ongoing assessment process, the Department will recommend to the Academic Policies Committee and Faculty the following changes to the current Political Science curriculum.

1. The creation of a capstone course: POL470 Senior Seminar in Political Science (4 units).
2. The addition of POL470 to the upper-division requirements. Every Political Science major will be required to take this course, ideally in his or her senior year, as part of the curriculum.
3. The reduction in the required Electives from 8 units to 4 units (to accommodate the addition of POL470 to the curriculum).
4. Under the choice of courses students may take to fulfill the American Government upper-division requirement, replace POL380 Congress and the Presidency with POL441 Issues in Public Policy.
5. Eliminate the following POL courses from the Catalog which are no longer in the regular rotation of courses offered:

POL301 Transitions to Democracy (4 units)
POL325 American Political Thought (4 units)
POL444 Contemporary Political Ideologies (4 units)

IV.B.2: Proposed Extra-Curricular Changes

The Political Science faculty (and the Department as a whole) will more actively recruit new majors from those who have expressed an interest in the major to Admissions. In addition to maintaining intentional and continuous communication with the Admissions staff, the Department will enhance its own recruitment efforts. Actions that will be taken include greater direct faculty communication with interested recruits, improved social media and website content, and use of current students to assist in recruiting potential students

PART V: INTERNAL STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND EXTERNAL OPPORTUNITIES (SWOT)

Please see the Departmental SWOT Analysis above [Introduction.F].

Strengths:

- The expertise of the Political Science faculty is well-balanced, allowing the program to efficiently cover the major subdivisions of the discipline with very few faculty positions.
- The activity and growing local reputation of the Institute for Politics and Public Service. This allows for a stronger footprint for the program and University in the San Diego community and enables the development and maintenance of a strong internship network.
- Low cost per student credit unit (see Delaware data) relative to other PLNU academic programs and one that is on par with other similarly-situated Political Science programs in the Delaware study.
- Efficient use of course capacity.
- Study abroad component built into the curriculum (the Capitals program).
- Relatively strong diversity in the students taking the major in terms of both gender and ethnicity.
- The program has a very high success rate in student acceptance to top-tier graduate schools and law schools.

Weaknesses:

- The lack of a capstone course makes it relatively inefficient to assess PLOs and core competencies.
- The curriculum is structured primarily for the “traditional” undergraduate student. If the demographic of the Political Science student changes in the near future, the curriculum will need to be adjusted accordingly, while still retaining its essential goals.
- Because of the low profile of Political Science courses in the GE curriculum, the program has relatively low access to PLNU students making decisions about their major.

Opportunities:

- The high demand for Political Science degrees in the region creates the potential for a growth in the numbers of majors through enhanced and intentional recruitment in partnership with Admissions.
- National employment of Political Scientists is projected to grow 21% from 2012 to 2022 (US Department of Labor estimates).
- IPPS partnerships with other San Diego academic institutions in the San Diego Deliberation Network.

Threats:

- Though not as pronounced as in the Humanities, the Social Sciences have also seen a slight downturn in demand nationally in the past several years. This downturn will likely correct as the global economy improves. However, in the meantime extra efforts in recruitment are called for.
- There has been a decline in law school enrollment and a glut in the market for lawyers. As a result, law school is less of an option for some students than in the past. Many Political Science majors are interested in law.

PART VI: THEMES FOR FUTURE INQUIRY FOR THE POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

1. Inquire into the best means for non-traditional students to achieve the learning outcomes and goals associated with the Capitals program. Questions should include what types of non-traditional students are likely in future years (e.g. students with families and/or careers based in San Diego); and whether similar outcomes can be achieved without the student leaving San Diego.
2. Inquire into the necessity of creating a capstone course and adding it to the curriculum. Questions should include whether such a course is preferable to other means of creating a cumulative experience and accomplishing assessment tasks; and, if created, of what would such a course consist.
3. Inquire into the best means of improving high-school recruitment to the major.

THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAM

PART I: INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAM PURPOSE

I.A: INTERNATIONAL STUDIES LEARNING OUTCOMES

Students who complete the program in International Studies will be able to:

1. Recognize and appreciate the historical, political, social, cultural, and economic dimensions of international processes and issues.
2. Critically analyze issues of global significance using knowledge and techniques from more than one academic discipline (e.g. political science, history, geography, economics, sociology, literature, etc.).
3. Make informed, reasoned, and ethical judgments in matters relating to issues of international public action.
4. Demonstrate a sense of global awareness, by critically evaluating his or her own culture and society in a global and comparative context.

These learning outcomes were modified to their current form in spring 2014 in response to an institutional request for academic programs to integrate the core competencies more directly into each program's set of learning outcomes. The outcomes were heavily informed by the guild standards suggested by the International Studies Association.

I.B: ALIGNMENT WITH PLNU MISSION AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

The PLNU Mission can be found above [Introduction, section C].

PLNU Institutional Learning Outcomes:

1. Students will acquire knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world while developing skills and habits that foster life-long learning.
2. Students will develop a deeper and more informed understanding of self and others as they negotiate complex environments.
3. Students will serve locally and/or globally in vocational and social settings.

The International Studies program is designed to equip students to meet PLNU's ILOs through the use of the tools, methods, and insights of the International Studies discipline, informed by the tools and insights of other academic disciplines as well. The PLO's are especially concerned with capturing several aspects of the ILOs: (1) knowledge of human cultures both currently and in the past; (2) a deeper and more informed understanding of self and others through the analysis of global issues and cross-cultural contexts; and (3) obtaining the skills and tools that will allow

graduates to pursue careers in a variety of areas, particularly those that involve cross-cultural and global issues. All three ILOs are addressed in the PLOs.

I.C: INTERDISCIPLINARY NATURE OF THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAM

The International Studies program differs from the History and the Political Science programs in that it has an intentionally interdisciplinary structure. There is only one required course in the International Studies curriculum that is not required in any other major (POL290 World Regional Geography, which functions as an introductory course for the major). Other than this course, all of the other courses in the curriculum piggyback on courses available in other programs. There are no faculty positions assigned in whole or in part to the International Studies programs. This means, in short, that some of the program review categories do not apply to this program. Because most of the courses in the International Studies curriculum are available through the History program and the Political Science program, information for these omitted categories may be found in the corresponding categories in the other two reviews.

PART II: INTEGRITY, SUSTAINABILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

II.A: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL DEMAND FOR THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAM

The internal demand for the International Studies major has been on the rise since the major’s creation in 2004. As a percentage of the total university population and annual graduates as a percentage of total graduates, PLNU’s International Studies program is comparable to the comparator and aspirant universities.

	Undergraduate Enrollments (measured in Fall semesters)										
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Intl. Stud.	N/A	2	21	36	31	24	32	33	28	28	29

The external demand measures provided by Noel-Levitz did not consider International Studies as a separate program, but combined it with the Political Science program (see Political Science II.A). Anecdotally, it is clear that International Studies is not a “high” demand among high school students as the discipline is relatively unknown to them. However, there are demographic groups in which the major does have a higher appeal, especially racial and ethnic minorities, and these groups could be more intentionally addressed during the recruitment phase.

Taken together, the internal and external demand trends point to the fact that the International Studies major has historically been a “destination major”: many students choose the major after

they have already started attending the University. These trends are consistent with other International Studies programs around the country and in comparator and aspirant schools.

With this in mind, however, it is still possible to say that the International Studies program is underperforming in terms of attracting quality students to the International Studies major. Because the curriculum piggybacks on courses in other programs, there is room for growth in capacity. The program is particularly weak at converting “admitted” students into “enrolled” students. More intentional recruitment methods are needed to improve the conversion at this phase of the process. Because of the relative unfamiliarity of the discipline to high school students, many students and families will need additional information and personal contact that faculty members can assist Admissions in providing. Improved website and social media content can also better educate prospective students about the program and its career possibilities.

II.B: SIZE, SCOPE, AND PRODUCTIVITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAM

There are no faculty positions that are assigned to the International Studies program. Program advising and management is handled by faculty in the Political Science program and History program. For more information, see Political Science II.C and History II.C.

II.C: FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND ACADEMIC UNIT COSTS

Aside from the single course that is unique to the International Studies major [POL290 World Regional Geography, 3 units annually], there are no costs that may be assigned specifically to this program. The institution considers POL290 as a part of the Political Science program. For more information, see Political Science II.C.

Courses from other programs that are in the International Studies curriculum are not dependent on the International Studies students to make enrollments. Thus, given the current numbers, the addition of International Studies students in these already-existing courses actually reduces academic unit costs for these other programs by filling capacity. An increase in International Studies majors of five or more students, all things being equal, would likely necessitate the addition of another section of the methods course [POL270]. Other than this one exception, current capacity in existing courses could absorb an increase of up to about ten additional International Studies majors with no additional FTE.

II.D: QUALITY OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAM INPUTS AND PROCESSES

See Political Science II.D.

II.E: INFRASTRUCTURE

See History II.E.

II.F: STUDENT PROFILE

Unfortunately, the University data on student demographics is too small to provide much confidence in the numbers. Thus, the narrative here is partially based on this incomplete data and is partly anecdotal. Because of the incompleteness of the data, we have opted to leave the actual tables out of this report. In this area, the tables themselves are frustratingly unhelpful.

International Studies majors make up roughly 1.1-1.4% of the total majors at PLNU. SAT scores appear to be roughly in line with PLNU totals, though there is enough missing data (sm) that very little can be taken from this. The incoming GPA of International Studies majors seems to be significantly above the PLNU average. Anecdotally, this is unsurprising as PLNU has been ahead-of-the-curve among Christian liberal-arts institutions in offering a truly interdisciplinary International Studies major (as opposed to an IS major that is merely a subset of a Political Science department) and this has been attractive to students serious about pursuing International Studies.

It should also be added that the International Studies major has historically been a “destination major:” roughly half to two-thirds of current majors switched into it once they were already attending PLNU. This makes the SAT and GPA numbers slightly biased as they only reflect the measures for first-time Freshmen. It is likely that, if the statistics for the students who switched into the major later in their academic career were combined with those of the first-time Freshmen, the overall SAT and GPA averages would be slightly lower. Knowing this reality about the demographics of the major allows the faculty to advise students better and steer them towards academic help when needed.

Retention rates and six-year graduation rates are significantly higher than the PLNU average (with a couple anomalous years). Though no faculty member “owns” International Studies, all of the faculty in the Department take extra care of the International Studies majors through advising, participation in events sponsored by History and/or Political Science, and intentionally integrating the students with the students in the other majors in the Department. The size of the major currently allows one faculty member (a Political Science faculty) to do most of the advising, which prevents students from falling through the gaps for the most part.

The International Studies program attracts significantly more female than male students. The students in the International Studies major have been significantly and consistently more ethnically diverse than PLNU averages and this trend has been increasing in the past few years. International Studies programs nationwide tend to attract a higher percentage of students from a variety of ethnic backgrounds. Arguably, an intentional global and cross-cultural focus within the curriculum is a useful means to attract a more diverse student body (both in the major and in the institution as a whole).

	Ethnic/Racial Diversity (measured in Fall semesters)					
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
INT STUD	12.5%	21.9%	33.3%	35.7%	50.0%	55.2%
PLNU	20.1%	21.8%	24.0%	29.0%	32.3%	34.2%

II.G: 2014 PRIORITIZATION RESULTS

The data relevant to this section has been meticulously and repeatedly examined by many institutional actors in the past two years as the University has undergone its 2014 Prioritization process. As a result of this Prioritization process, the Provost did not ask the International Studies program to take any specific actions, except as it related indirectly to the actions required of and taken by the History program. Some of the HIS upper-division courses eliminated were considered elective offerings for International Studies majors, but none were required.

PART III: STUDENT LEARNING AND SUCCESS

III.A: ASSESSMENT PLAN

III.A.1: Overall Assessment Plan

This section is perhaps best begun with two caveats. First, roughly five years ago the Department faced a great deal of confusion concerning whether the major of International Studies was considered an “academic program.” It is only recently (in the past 2-3 years) that the Department and the University have determined that International Studies is a “program” and, thus, should have distinct PLOs, a separate assessment plan, and an accompanying program review. All of this is to say that the International Studies program is a little behind other programs in the development and implementation of an assessment plan.

Second, because the International Studies program does not have any faculty positions specifically designated for it, the development and implementation of an assessment plan has been somewhat haphazard. The assessment of the International Studies program has often unintentionally become an afterthought to the assessment of the History and the Political Science programs. The assessment processes we have followed thus far have helped the Department recognize the need to develop a more formal administrative structure for the International Studies program.

The International Studies program assessment plan (Appendix E: International Studies Assessment Activities) calls for assessing every PLO within a two-year rotation and for assessing every PLO that is embedded with a core competency every year. The faculty assess key pieces of evidence from every senior in a variety of upper-division courses. While the feedback from the assessment is often reflected on and discussed immediately, every second year the faculty will meet formally to discuss the overall results. Currently, this faculty consists of all those within the Department who

are responsible for one or more courses that International Studies majors may take in their curriculum. This body of faculty needs to be clarified in the future.

III.A.2: Assessment Activities since Last Program Review (2003)

Since the International Studies program did not exist as of the last Program Review, all of the assessment activities, including the establishment of an assessment plan, are new. The PLOs have undergone several iterations because the directives from the University concerning PLOs have changed several times. In the most recent iteration, efforts were made to embed some of the core competencies within the PLOs (see I.A).

Having established the program PLOs, an assessment plan was then constructed, including a curriculum map, a determination of which courses would be used to assess which PLOs and core competencies, a determination of what assignments in each course would best measure the outcome or competency in question, and a general calendar of when assessment activities would take place. This may be found in Appendix E.

Since 2011, the Political Science and History faculty members have been in the process of building Course Learning Outcomes into each course that line up with the respective PLOs of those programs. The next task is to ensure that the CLOs also reflect the PLOs of the International Studies program where appropriate. This is not especially difficult as the PLOs of the programs overlap in many ways. Courses that are required parts of the International Studies curriculum have already been analyzed and aligned.

III.A.3: Results of Assessment

In large part because of the caveats mentioned above, the International Studies program has only haphazard assessment data. In fact, much of what the Department has learned from the process of assessment is that an “orphaned” program like International Studies has unique challenges that must be addressed in order to better assess the overall program. In other words, the greatest effect of the evidence of assessment is that the *structure* of the assessment process must be fixed before a useful assessment of the *content* of the program can be approached.

III.B: THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

The International Studies curriculum is designed to provide a great deal of latitude to students to explore the areas of the discipline that most appeals to them and/or is an area in which they would like to build a career. This means that it offers a wide selection of electives that the student (in ongoing conversation with his or her advisor) can choose from to learn and practice the skills and

tools of the discipline. These electives are not confined to a single program, but may be found in numerous PLNU programs.

The major is 51 units. There are four lower-division requirements designed to introduce majors to the broad structures and tools of the discipline. Among these four courses is one that acts as an introduction to the major (POL290 World Regional Geography) and one that is a methods course (POL270 Scope and Methods of Political Science).

There are five required upper-division courses in the major and a three-unit internship. Students must also select a concentration and take eight units within it. The concentrations are mostly regionally based and there is a Peace Studies concentration, which is popular. Every International Studies major is required to participate in one off-campus cooperative program (also known as Study Abroad). Most students fulfill their concentration requirements during their Study Abroad experience (under the advice and consent of their advisor, who works with each student to find courses that will meet the requirements of the concentration).

Finally, each student must take an additional eight units (two courses) of electives within the major. The Catalog lists most of these on-campus options, both those within the Department and those in other programs. Because different programs create and develop offerings each semester that may be considered electives within the discipline, the International Studies advisor makes a list available to students of the possible available courses that would meet the major's elective requirements. Courses that have been used as electives have come from HIS, POL, ECO, LIT, SPA, SOC, ART, CHU, and PHL.

The faculty affiliated with the International Studies program have debated this structure extensively over the years and in a more focused manner for Program Review. These discussions have been deeply informed by the ongoing assessment process and results. Students and alumni have been asked informally for their perspectives on the structure and content of the curriculum as well.

As a result of these discussions, the program underwent a major curriculum revision in 2009 (between program reviews) to its current structure. The major was made more academically rigorous, with more required courses and the addition of the methods course. The feedback from students after these changes has been overwhelmingly positive. Though the new curriculum is more difficult and structured than the earlier format, student success has increased both while at PLNU and in graduate programs. Hence, the faculty affiliated with the International Studies program will not be recommending significant structural changes to the program's curriculum.

III.C: INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAM FACULTY

See History III.C and Political Science III.C.

III.D: COMPLIANCE

Credit-hour policy and monitoring is done under the oversight of the Provost and the Dean.

With respect to core competency assessment, the program (and Department) followed the instructions of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and ensured that the program learning outcomes contained the core competencies and the assessment of core competencies with structured into the ongoing assessment plan for the program. See III.A above for an explanation and the plan itself.

III.E: INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ALUMNI SATISFACTION AND PLACEMENT

Any data the program has on alumni satisfaction and placement is anecdotal. The Department is not currently resourced to be able to adequately track and assess alumni data. To the degree that the University expects academic units to gather this data, the University needs to provide training for the department assistant in how to best gather this data and needs to improve its institutional alumni tracking systems and make these accessible to academic units (again with training). The program's alumni tracking is currently done via Facebook and other social media, but this is in no way formalized.

III.F: STUDENT EVALUATION FEEDBACK

Student feedback is an essential part of the formation of the structure and content of the program. When the major was restructured in 2008, a student committee was assembled that provided a great deal of the impetus for the changes made, including asking for a more rigorous methods course for the program (POL270 was subsequently made a requirement for the major).

PART IV: QUALITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

IV.A: COMPARATOR AND ASPIRANT INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAMS

International Studies programs at comparator and aspirant schools fit into two general categories: (1) programs that are more like "International Relations" programs housed exclusively within Political Science departments and (2) interdisciplinary "International Studies" programs. Programs in this latter set, which includes PLNU's program, may be housed within an already-existing department (often Political Science, Social Sciences, History, or some combination thereof) or may exist as an independent and interdisciplinary stand alone.

Among comparator institutions, PLNU stands out with its requirement for Study Abroad. Many of these institutions have international academic opportunities through the program. PLNU's model is to have each student choose the location and program that best suits his or her interests and career goals rather than a one-size-fits-all international experience that all students participate in. We continue to believe that the benefits of the PLNU model outweigh the one-size-fits-all model. Making sure that students participate in the daily life of *their* regional specialty (as opposed to the University's specialty) continues to be a good policy.

One area in which PLNU's International Studies program lags behind comparator and aspirants is in the area of foreign language acquisition. International Studies programs at Abilene Christian College and Anderson both require slightly more language acquisition than the GE requirements. Pepperdine requires exposure to two languages. PLNU's program relies on the one-year of foreign language required by the GE. Most PLNU International Studies majors receive this while studying abroad.

In this area, PLNU's International Studies program is limited due to the lack of variety of foreign language instruction at the University. Students who return seeking to build their language skills or who want to learn the basics of the language before going abroad are out of luck unless the language is Spanish, French, or German. This particular selection of languages is not out of the ordinary for PLNU's *comparator* schools, but is decidedly limited compared to its *aspirant* schools. PLNU could easily find a middle ground through the use of adjuncts to teach year-long courses in languages that have increasing global relevance (e.g. Mandarin, Arabic, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, etc.).

Most International Studies programs at comparators and aspirants also use a "concentration" or "track" curriculum, as does PLNU. Some divide these concentrations regionally. Calvin College recently restructured its concentration system from one that is regionally based to one that is thematically based (e.g. Peace Studies). PLNU's program largely relies on a regional concentration system. It also has a concentration in "Peace Studies." On very rare occasions and in deep consultation between the student and advisor, ad hoc thematic concentrations can be constructed that best meet the student's goals and the academic rigor of the program.

Finally, it is not uncommon or redundant for a university to have both an "International Studies" program *and* an "International Development Studies" program, as PLNU has. Calvin College, to name just one school, also has both majors. The PLOs, emphases, and disciplinary focuses of each is very different, despite the similarities in the program names.

IV.B: ACTION PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT

IV.B.1: Proposed Curricular Changes

As the program was restructured in the past five years and those changes have been for the better of the program, the Department is not recommending any major structural changes to the International Studies program as a result of this Program Review. There are several potential

trends that will need to be further investigated (see VI below), such as foreign language requirements, the need for a capstone course, and a review of the current concentrations. However, at this time no curricular changes are being recommended.

IV.B.2: Proposed Extra-Curricular Changes

The most important extra-curricular change that is needed is a change of the current administrative structure of this “orphan” program. The increase in the desired quantity and quality of program-level tasks being sought by the University has made the current informal administrative structure untenable. Unfortunately, inquiries into comparator and aspirant International Studies programs have not provided a model that sufficiently fits the challenges and structures PLNU’s International Studies program faces. In each case, either the program is wholly a subset of another program (e.g. Political Science) or that school has formally designated faculty tasked with the responsibility of administrating the program. Neither option seems likely for PLNU (if, with respect to the second option, the additional administrative tasks mean the reduction of tasks for that person or persons in other areas). In short, it is unclear what is needed to move forward. Change is definitely needed here, but it is currently unclear what that looks like. It is very apparent that improvements that may be gained in the future through assessment are contingent on finding a more effective administrative structure for the program.

The International Studies program (and its Department) will also begin to more intentionally work with the Department of Literature, Journalism, and Modern Languages and the Administration to investigate ways for PLNU to increase the variety of languages offered through the University. Even every-other-year offerings of Mandarin and/or Arabic would be a great boon to current International Studies students and could improve the program’s recruitment efforts (not to mention the University’s recruitment efforts).

PART V: INTERNAL STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND EXTERNAL OPPORTUNITIES (SWOT)

Please see the Departmental SWOT Analysis above [Introduction.F].

Strengths:

- The truly interdisciplinary nature of the program. It involves courses and faculty from various disciplines. In its current configuration, there are no faculty positions and no course numbers that are assigned to “International Studies.”
 - This is highly advantageous to the University in terms of finances: the program piggybacks on already-existing faculty positions and courses (with the single exception of POL290, a three-unit course which exists almost solely for the

International Studies major). In short, the program improves the efficiency of courses in other programs without adding costs.

- The program is able to take advantage of faculty expertise from a wide range of disciplines and topics.
- Majors in the program can design a curriculum (with the assistance of a faculty advisor) that best fits their interests and career goals. Because the program is interdisciplinary, the options for majors are even broader. This is especially beneficial at a small to medium-sized liberal arts institution.
- PLNU's Study Abroad Office is extraordinarily good and has contributed greatly to the success of the program and student experience in off-campus programs.
- The program meets a definite perceived need among the PLNU student body. This is shown, in part, by its popularity as a destination major.
- High ethnic diversity among majors.

Weaknesses:

- The truly interdisciplinary nature of the program.
 - No faculty member "owns" the program, which means that some administrative tasks get short shrift (e.g. assessment). As more and more University tasks devolve to the "program level," it becomes more imperative that a more formal administrative apparatus be erected for the International Studies program.
 - The lack of strong institutional models at PLNU for interdisciplinary programs and courses. This dearth adds to the confusion of maintaining the program at the level of other discipline-specific academic programs.
- PLNU course content is limited in terms of Latin America and Africa. Students seeking International Studies courses concerning these regions must look to Study Abroad options.
- PLNU's current offerings of foreign language is narrowly limited to three (Spanish, French, and German), whereas many International Studies majors demand other languages of growing global importance (e.g. Arabic, Mandarin, Hindi, etc.).

Opportunities:

- Demand for graduates with global knowledge and skills has grown exponentially and continues to grow.
- The new institutional emphasis on PLNU International will create even more opportunities for the program and its majors (depending on the eventual configuration of PLNU International).

Threats:

- As a relatively new and unfamiliar discipline, International Studies is often overlooked by prospective high school students.
- A potential decrease in the number of History faculty positions will likely reduce the breadth of international content for the program.

PART VI: THEMES FOR FUTURE INQUIRY FOR THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAM

1. Inquire into the best formal administrative structure and processes for International Studies program development and assessment. Questions should include whether a faculty member should be formally designated as responsible for the program; whether this task is best managed by “committee” (and the make-up of the committee); and what these tasks should involve.
2. Inquire into the usefulness of adding a capstone course. Questions should include whether the program would be enhanced by a capstone course; what such a course might consist of; what other adjustments would need to be made to the current curriculum to accommodate the additional units; and whether the program could piggyback on capstone courses in History or Political Science or should have its own capstone.
3. Inquire into the program’s emphasis on foreign language acquisition. Questions should include whether foreign language (beyond GE standards) should be required; what languages best fit the needs of International Studies majors; and how to best meet these needs.
4. Inquire into the ways to enhance extra-curricular opportunities for International Studies majors. Questions should include whether to investigate organizational memberships or continue to piggyback on existing honors clubs in Political Science and History; and what additional activities might be geared for International Studies majors.
5. Inquire into the possibility and usefulness of adding more thematic concentrations (as was done recently at Calvin College) or reducing the number of concentrations.
6. Inquire into the best means of improving high-school recruitment to the major.

Program Review Committee Feedback to HPS Self-study

9-30-15

To: Rosco Williamson, Chair of the Department of History and Political Science

From: Program Review Committee

Subject: Program Review Committee Feedback on History and Political Science Self Study

The Department of History and Political Science (HPS) submitted to the Program Review Committee in January 2014, its program review self-study of the faculty's assessing and analyzing the current state of the department's academic programs and the students' educational experience. The HPS faculty are to be commended for their commitment to work together to address their common concerns, and they are to be commended for the extensive work they have undertaken over the past several years in the areas of assessment. The self-study is ready for external review and the following is the Program Review Committee's feedback based on its review and analysis of the department's self-study.

The Program Review Committee prepared for the review of the HPS self-study document according to the approved Program Review Guidelines protocol. The Committee has taken into consideration that while the department has been working on the program review, that the Program Review Guidelines have been continually updated and improved. As much as possible the Program Review Committee has taken this into consideration and been guided in its assessment by the Guidelines under which the department began the program review process. The Program Review Committee provided the department a liaison, Program Review Committee member Dr. Phil Bowles, to support the department's review work through the process. In addition, the College Dean and the Director of Institutional Research also met with the department on an as-needed basis.

However, since the review of the self-study by the Program Review Committee in spring 2015, the process of Program Review has been simplified and a new template with guided questions has been adopted. Given there are significant changes in the new process and HPS completed their self-study under the old system, it seemed prudent to re-evaluate the committee's feedback to the department in light of the new expectations to ensure that the feedback does not emphasize areas that will not be a part of program reviews moving forward (while also not introducing new expectations). Previous feedback from the Program Review committee to other departments has been directly tied to the PR template for the self-study. Rather than provide the feedback in this manner for HPS, we will summarize the general areas that the committee had concerns that would still be relevant under the new and simplified system. The PR committee apologizes for the delays caused by this transition to a simplified system but believes the feedback will be more beneficial to the department as a result.

1. All programs did well introducing and describing their programs and the quality and scholarly productivity of their faculty. However, all programs tended to view productivity solely in terms of scholarship and therefore did not reflect on other areas of faculty productivity such as SCH generation, advising loads, % of FT faculty, and involvement in high impact practices, etc...
2. While it is strongly believed that the faculty implicitly support and live out the Christian mission of the university, the committee had difficulty finding explicit evidence of this in the written documents of the department that would distinguish them from any other university without a Christian mission. The Program Review committee recommends the department find ways to explicitly communicate what we know is implicitly occurring in this area.
3. On the whole, the self-study was seen as very good though there seemed to be unevenness between the programs with clear ownership (History and Political Science) and the program without clear ownership (International Studies). There were a few general gaps identified in the self-study that applied to all of the programs. These are summarized in the bullets below.
 - a. It was recognized that the development of an assessment plan and infrastructure is emerging for the department's programs. It was not always clear how some assertions, conclusions or recommendations were connected to assessment data vs. some other rationale. The committee recommends that department continue to development its assessment infrastructure and more clearly link its analysis and recommendations to its assessment data in future program reviews.
 - b. It seemed that not all (any?) of the programs were tracking the success of their students post-graduation. It seemed like the programs are collecting and using information from current students as part of their assessment plan as allusions to student input were made in the report but perhaps not from alumni. It was unclear if these were formal or anecdotal references since the actual data was not clearly included or referenced. There were comments to the effect that the department did not have the resources for this and it was unreasonable to assume this would be done. This expectation has been a part of past program reviews and most departments have been doing this for several years. If the programs is not collecting and tracking these kinds of information, it is recommended that they put a plan in place to ensure that they do this moving forward as it is a significant part of the program review process.
 - c. It appears that a curricular analysis was done for each program and at least in some cases included comparison so to similar programs at other institutions but the committee could not find the actual data. If this assumption is correct, the evidence should be included in the self-study. If this was not done, what is the rationale and evidence for the recommended curricular changes that are being suggested since it is an expectation that all programs be compared to either guild standards or comparison programs.
 - d. It was unclear how certain recommendations in the self-study connected to an analysis or evidence. It is recommended that the department consult with the Dean and

external reviewers to ensure that recommendations that move forward in the action plan and MOU are connected to strong rationale and supporting evidence.

4. History Feedback: The committee felt that the History section of the self-study was generally good but did contain a few gaps in the analysis and depth of reflection on the programs data. For example, the committee wondered why the data showing lower yield rates for History majors at PLNU was not countered with any strategic recommendations for how that might be addressed moving forward. Are there things the program can do during preview days, rethinking their web communication strategy or collaborating with admissions in the recruitment of students? The committee also felt there could have been deeper reflection on what is driving any changes in demand for their major and what possible strategies could be used to address this in how their program is configured or perceived.
5. Political Science Feedback: The committee felt that the Political Science section of the self-study was generally very good with no real unique gaps other than what was identified above for the department.
6. The International Studies Feedback: The committee felt that the International Studies portion of the self-study was adequate but it was noted that there seemed to be a clear “lack of ownership” referenced in the report. The committee was uncertain as to why this was the case given the strong enrollment numbers that indicate a clear student interest in the program. The committee recommends the department work in collaboration with the Dean and external reviewers to identify a clear plan for the leadership of this program and strategies to develop departmental ownership of it moving forward.



PLNU Program Review External Reviewer Report Template

Rev 12-4-15

Instructions:

Thank you for agreeing to be an external reviewer for the PLNU Program Review process. We are grateful for your engagement with us and look forward to your feedback and insights. We are including the department's/school's entire self-study document in order to give you context. While we appreciate your feedback on the entire self-study, we especially look forward to your feedback on the specific program that you have agreed to review. The Dean and Chair of the academic unit will be your main points of contact and will arrange opportunity for you to interact with them and/or other departmental personnel as appropriate. This will allow you a chance to ask questions or seek clarification prior to the completion of your report. We have created the following external reviewer template for your report in an attempt to give you some guidance in terms of what type of feedback we are hoping to get. The text boxes are there for your convenience, but if they get in the way or create formatting issues, feel free to delete them and put your text in their place. This is a new process for us so we have created a space at the end to provide any feedback on the process that can help us create a better instrument in the future.

Thank you again for your help with our program review at PLNU,

Kerry Fulcher, Provost

Point Loma Nazarene University

Department Level Analysis

A) Introduction

B) Alignment with Mission

Please review and evaluate the academic unit's response to the questions regarding mission alignment of their unit with the university mission from both an academic and Christian faith perspective. Are there any suggestions for how they might better articulate and demonstrate their alignment to the university mission and purpose?

According to the introduction of the program review, the department centers itself in the Christian Liberal Arts tradition and states up front that a key goal is "the formation of good, wise, well-informed citizens of both church and state." Such a goal is admirable in a climate where the liberal arts are increasingly marginalized in favor of occupationally-oriented programs. To move their students toward responsible global citizenship the department emphasizes not only strong classroom experiences but "student opportunities to speak publically, do internships, go to conferences, and travel widely." These types of applied learning are high impact practices and should be continued and strengthened. In section C, however, the department mission statement seems to move away from citizen-character ideals and more toward practical skills. Although in the explanatory narrative in this section the department highlights themes like human responsibility, creativity, and a community of engaged learners, the formal mission statement emphasizes rigorous analysis, written and oral communication, and equipping their students for graduate schools or careers. The department might consider revising their department mission statement to align more closely to the ideals of the PLNU mission, or at least to link the practical/vocational skills they mention to those ideals like character, holiness, lifelong learning, service, and truth that are listed in the university mission statement.

C) Quality, Qualifications and Productivity of Department Faculty

Based on all the evidence and responses provided in the program review report, provide a summary analysis of the qualifications of faculty associated with the program. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's) at this type of institution. Are there any strengths or distinctives that should be noted? Are there any gaps or weaknesses that should be noted?

The Department Review states in several places that their faculty members have an unusually high record for teaching, service, and scholarship. While that is commendable, it would be good to list some specific examples and to know how their record compares with that of other departments. A 3-3 teaching load with annual release time for service and scholarship does allow for some, but not extensive scholarly productivity. I am curious about the increased rigor for scholarly work around the issue of tenure—if the university has increased scholarly expectations without increasing time and money for that scholarship, that is a recipe for low faculty morale, as stated in the department's SWOT analysis. The commitment that the department has to maintaining a high percentage of full-time faculty in teaching their courses is remarkable. If they have to resort to a higher percentage of adjuncts in years to come, the department should still be proud of a much higher FT average than the university and most comparable institutions.

Review and comment on the scholarship of the faculty. Identify the degree to which scholarly production aligns with the expectations of the degree level of the program offered (undergraduate, master's) at this type of institution. Where appropriate, suggest

improvements that may be necessary to increase the quality and/or quantity of scholarship produced by the faculty in this program.

I had very little specific data provided, but a review of the faculty member profiles and, in some cases, CV's on the faculty website gave a snapshot of scholarly production. The range of articles, books, and presentations is what I would expect to see at a teaching-oriented institution with a high course load. Some faculty members are well-published and others have published little or not for some time. This most likely relates to larger institutional questions that must be asked—what are the scholarly goals of the institution and if they are expecting much higher scholarly productivity it is simply not practical to ask for that productivity without providing some release and funding options for the faculty.

D) Progress on Recommendations from Previous Program Review

Review the narrative supplied for this section. Discuss whether it provided a good accounting and rationale for what changes have or have not been made based on the previous program review and/or any circumstances that have arisen since? Where appropriate, identify any insights or questions that you might have stemming from this narrative.

The department has done a good job of acting on its goals from 2003, and should not be faulted for missing some of its marks. In terms of undergraduate growth, for example, they had grown steadily and could not have foreseen the university's enrollment caps that took effect in the mid-2000s. They made logical faculty and staffing choices based both on goals and changing economic realities. Likewise, the department has used of the Colt Endowment funds wisely, and could not have anticipated the economic crash and the subsequent administrative struggles over how to continue to use that money. The department's goal of adding an International Studies major and the growth of that major in a short time is especially commendable. Hopefully the department has learned some lessons on setting goals based primarily on student population growth. Speaking from the experience of a partner institution that did not look beyond increased tuition dollars as the way to fund goals, anticipating slowdown and being more realistic about possible trends has to be factored more prominently in goal-setting. Develop a series of scenarios, or at least a "plan B" when making department-wide goals.

E) General Education and Service Classes

Identify any program response to GE or service classes that may be associated with this program. Review and discuss the quality of the program's responses to the questions in this section of the self-study. Identify any insights or suggestions that program might consider based on your knowledge of courses like these at other institutions.

It seems curious that one of the department's major contributions to the General Education program is a two-course sequence in world history. The program review states "Such a sequence is . . . the standard practice of university GE programs around the country." That statement is much too bold—the variety of history GE requirements is much wider than the world history survey sequence. And while students will undoubtedly gain knowledge of diverse cultures and learn solid historical skills through that sequence, limiting the GE options to world history seems to make problematic the larger goals of U.S. civic responsibility and citizenship that are part of the goals of PLNU. At the very least, giving the students the option of taking one of the U.S. history surveys seems a more balanced approach.

F) Program Level Analysis

1. Trend and Financial Analysis

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the effectiveness of the program's recruitment and matriculation efforts as it relates to enrollment. Are there any suggestions or insights that you might have that can help to increase the demand for the program and/or improve the enrollment yield?

The department mentions in several places that better strategies for student recruitment need to be investigated. I would encourage the department to be more concrete, explicit, and intentional in those strategies—to create an action plan for recruitment that includes the relevant faculty, administrative staff, and offices that should be involved.

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the program's role in GE and Service functions and identify any opportunities or challenges from this that could have positive or negative impacts on the program itself.

Reviewer did not see evidence to provide a response.

Based on data and responses provided by the program, summarize and evaluate the efficiency of the program based on its overall and course enrollment trends along with the external benchmarking use of the cost per student credit hour data (Delaware). Are there any suggestions or insights that you might have that can help to increase the efficiency of the program without having a negative impact on quality?

The number of students in the department has remained relatively stable over the last decade, the exception being the Social Science degree, which the department recently eliminated. Their retention and graduation rates are at or above the university average. The various majors are doing an admirable job considering the relative size of their student population and are performing very efficiently.

2. Findings from Assessment

After reviewing the program's responses to their assessment findings, do you think the program is effectively using their assessment activities and data? Are there suggestions that you might make to improve their assessment plan or insights from their data that you might offer in addition to their analysis? Discuss the quality of their analysis and identify elements of their analysis that you think could be strengthened.

Part of the department's assessment process involves asking graduating seniors their overall impressions of the major, department, and specific courses. This is a wonderful idea, but it is unclear whether that is a formal or informal process. If it is not formal, the department should consider some standard questions done in a standard format so that the data could be made more reliable and accessible. Likewise, the information that could be culled from department alumni might provide valuable insights and taking concrete steps to find ways to track that data seems important. Each of the programs has a formal assessment plan that calls for every PLO to be assessed every year. The History program has helped streamline this annual assessment by relying on evidence, if I am interpreting this correctly, only from the HIS 470: Senior Seminar course. The every year approach might be a bit much; WASC, for example, only requires periodic assessment—perhaps every 3 to 5 years. The danger of collecting every year may be assessment burnout on the part of the faculty. And, though relying on one course does provide some consistency in the type of data collected and analyzed and may indicate broad aspects of their students' achievements, the program is also a product of its parts, and how those smaller parts contribute to the whole seems important. The emphasis on Bloom's taxonomy, the use of AAC&U VALUE rubrics, and the automation of assessment data through an e-Portfolio system are excellent moves and indicate a thoughtful process.

The assessment plan for Political Science seems especially thoughtful and there are several instances of adjusting curriculum based on the results. The remarks concerning poor writing is not surprising—those are national trends. The peer review and proofreading requirements are good. Two general comments, however, on the corresponding plan of the department to address these writing issues. First, the idea of relying on GE to do writing instruction is probably not wise; instead, your campus should partner with GE to embed writing principles throughout the curriculum and create a culture of writing that pervades your campus. Second, the goal of paying attention to grammar and syntax will not necessarily make your students better writers. The latest best practices for writing are much more holistic and require a much different strategy.

I also want to highlight the ways in which the department planned and responded to the assessment for the International Studies major. They created a thoughtful plan, gathered a variety of assessment data, and then changed the structure of the major based on those results. This "closing the loop" is a model of how assessment should be done.

That the assessment results demonstrate student success in meeting the PLO's speaks highly of the quality of instruction and of the faculty giving that instruction.

3. Curriculum Analysis

After reviewing the program's curricular analysis, student learning outcomes (SLOs), and curricular map, characterize the quality and appropriateness of the program's curriculum for meeting the learning outcomes expected of students within this discipline. Identify any possible changes to the curriculum or to the SLOs that would result in an improved program.

The program review recommends the elimination of the Social Science major, quite understandable considering the trends of the State of California in not renewing the CSET waiver for departments. With that shift, are the History and Political Science students pursuing single-subject credentials being given adequate information and options for how to reach their goals. The department could consider giving alternative scenarios to those students so they are best prepared to succeed as future high school teachers. Their plan to collaborate more closely with the School of Education to advise such students better is good, but it would be good to develop a more specific action plan.

The conscious decision to limit the History major to 44 units so that students have the freedom to pursue other courses, majors, and minors is commendable and is a practical demonstration of their commitment to a liberal arts education. The additional of a capstone course was also a wise move—capstone courses, when done well, are identified as one of the AAC&U’s high-impact practices. For the Political Science major, SLO’s 1, 2, and 3, could use some improved language i.e. “develop an appreciation of” and “understand” are not the types of SLOs that can easily be measured. I do, however, appreciate the goals of the department in relation to the larger nationwide goals of building a better democratic society. In that regard, it is unfortunate that POL 380 needs to be eliminated from the curriculum because of lack of faculty expertise—seems like a fundamental course for a political science program. For International Studies, SLOs 1 and 4 could be improved for the same reasons listed above. The emphasis on study abroad within the International Studies major is wonderful and I commend that you have found your niche and are comfortable with the program’s aims.

After reviewing the program’s curricular analysis through a guild or comparator lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and comparison and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding their curriculum content and structure.

The level of comparator and aspirant work is extremely strong and should give the department confidence that they are doing a remarkable job. The Political Science program, for example, analyzed fifteen different schools—a very thorough study—and their conclusions seem solid. Their analysis, for example, that a smaller faculty and inability to teach a wide variety of courses that would be possible in a larger department, led them to conclude that their Capital program could and does meet the need for student specialization. And, considering their size, they still offer some fascinating specializations, including International Law, Development of Feminist Thought, and Protests and Social Movements. It does seem that the department needs to make some decisions about the leadership/management of the International Studies major. Even providing one of your faculty with a one-course release for some administration of this major could be crucial.

After reviewing the program’s curricular analysis through an employability lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and narrative and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding their curriculum content and structure as a preparation for future employment.

The purposeful design for history majors to take courses in American, European, and non-Western history is wise and will better prepare students for future teaching, knowledge, and/or grad school. A caution mentioned in the report is that this approach requires greater intentionality in advising. Does the department have any type of advising checklist or form that faculty members complete after advising their students? Such a form might be a way of making sure all students are advised consistently. Likewise, the plan to “place a greater emphasis on” public history in certain courses sounds good, but without specific strategies to make this happen goals like this tend to fall by the wayside. It would also be good to task a particular person or persons with the plan to “build a wider and deeper local internship network that focuses on internships.”

About the concern of students not seeing the career opportunities in a liberal-arts major like history, it might be good to provide some information from and create some publicity based on the latest [AAC&U employer survey](#).

The Capitals Program within the Political Science major is an outstanding way to expose students to real-world situations and encourage them about future employment possibilities.

After reviewing the program’s curricular analysis through a pedagogy lens, summarize and discuss the quality of their analysis and narrative and offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider regarding the delivery of their curriculum in ways to enhance the student learning experience.

The review states that the history program “has been fairly innovative and experimental in terms of course delivery media in the past few years,” and a hybrid and online version of HIS111 is cited as evidence. I’m not sure that evidence supports the claim of innovative and experimental. The department should consider a wider approach to innovation, including observing each other in the classroom and creating dialogues for pedagogical approaches. The department could consider reading and discussing books that provide teaching ideas. If it is not already a practice, the faculty could consider giving short, five-minute mid-term evaluations to their students that ask what is going well, what is not, and what they would suggest changing.

I also commend the department for thinking about ways to build camaraderie among the students and between the students and faculty. The department might consider a more concrete action plan to move toward even better implementation of these camaraderie ideals.

The goal of creating a capstone for Political Science should be pursued—such courses are a high impact practice. Might it be possible to create a capstone based on the Capitals program?

I highly applaud the department’s interdisciplinary approach in its International Studies Program. Teaching students how to integrate their learning is a sometimes difficult process in today’s higher education, and this is a strong model for doing just that.

4. Potential Impact of National Trends

After reviewing the program’s discussion of possible impacts from national trends, discuss the quality of their response and identify if there are trends in the discipline that the self-study has missed or not adequately addressed based on your expertise and opinion.

The program's limitations include its geographical location—beautiful but not conducive to massive expansion. That also means that drawing a more diverse student body will continue to be a challenge. The department is to be commended for the diversity it has created with those limitations, especially for its International Studies major, and should continue to explore ways to expand on those trends.

5. Quality Markers

After reviewing the program's discussion of its quality markers and the questions posed in this section of the self-study, discuss the quality of their response to these questions and identify any particular strengths and/or weaknesses that you might see in this section of the self-study. Please offer any suggestions or insights that might be helpful for the program to consider relating to these quality markers.

The department has done a thorough job of comparison with both comparative and aspirant schools. Although PLNU would like to model certain aspects of other schools, its geographical location and the subsequent enrollment limitations may make some of those goals impractical. The program is very thoughtful about what it does well, what its limitations are, and what it would like to do. The history program's intentional relationship with Women's Studies, for example, creates a strong interdisciplinary connection that most programs across the country will not have. The desire to add a stronger public history emphasis is likewise a strong move that will make PLNU a more desirable destination. The department should be rightly concerned with the implication that the administration will downsize the department. From a great deal of available evidence the department faculty is working extremely hard and the students appreciate those efforts at quality. Losing even one faculty member would seriously jeopardize the goals of the program.

6. Infrastructure and Staffing

After reviewing the program's discussion of its infrastructure and staffing, discuss the quality of their analysis and reflection in this important area and offer any suggestions or insights that you might suggest they consider.

In section II.G.3 the review notes that the department is attempting to meet some long-term staffing imbalances by developing online and hybrid courses. This will require additional staffing and may lead to the hiring of additional adjunct faculty to meet that need—a move that the university will deem as more financially responsible. I find this a bit confusing, because in II.D.3 the report states that the hybrid attempt was largely unsuccessful and will be phased out. On the other hand, I, once again, applaud the stance of the department not to hire adjuncts for the sake of finances. If the department believes in the online delivery of courses and can do it without compromising the integrity of the instruction, they should by all means pursue that goal. There are ways of doing online courses with quality. To pursue that format so that additional adjuncts can teach, seems philosophically opposed to the higher goals of the university to produce an excellent curriculum that will help develop excellent graduates.

7. Challenges and Opportunities

Do you feel the report adequately identified the challenges and opportunities that they face based on your understanding of the discipline? Why or why not. Are there other challenges or opportunities that you see based on your review of the self-study and your understanding of the discipline in today's higher education context?

A very complete, thorough report.

8. Recommendations for Program Improvement

Do you feel the recommendations being made for this program are supported by the analysis and evidence provided in the self-study document and narrative? Discuss why or why not. Are there other recommendations or suggestions that you would make that the academic unit should consider? If so, please give a brief rationale for why?

There are several mentions of identifying at-risk students early on and connecting them with University resources. This is a wise idea, but, again, my encouragement is to develop an actual plan with concrete steps and a timeline so this idea does not fall through the cracks.

G) External Reviewer Feedback on PLNU Program Review Process:

We recognize that there are many ways to approach a program review. We would value your feedback on our process so that that we can continue to make it better and more helpful to the programs undergoing review. Are there areas that were confusing or sections that you felt were unhelpful? Are there areas that you were not asked about where you feel you could have provided useful information? Is there anything about the process that you would recommend we change or consider changing that could make it better?

While I understand the trend toward having an external reviewer focus only on a written analysis of the program review itself (our university is now doing the same), I believe it will leave departments with only a narrow view of their effectiveness. A site review that includes time with faculty, time with students, time with key administrative personnel, and the chance to view students and teachers in the classroom, as well as making additional documents available i.e. cv's, student ratings, etc. adds a much fuller picture of a department's operations.

HPS Response to Program Review Committee and External Reviewer

April 19, 2016

To: Program Review Committee

Thank you for the opportunity to present a brief response to the external reviewer's report. Quite frankly, we believe he did an admirable job of understanding our department's goals, context, strengths and weaknesses.

We are unsurprised that the program review process showed that our programs are of high quality and largely successful. We are also pleased that the external reviewer recognized the advances we have made in assessment planning, program efficiency, and several program-specific value-added elements that make our programs even more successful.

The Program Review process has also been helpful in crystallizing a few areas needing improvement. Four areas of improvement in particular, with a few action steps each, stand out:

- A. Solidify our mission and PLOs. Our department mission and program outcomes were negatively affected by the confusion surrounding these over the past few years. Now, with the benefit of deeper institutional and departmental understanding, we need to reexamine these to ensure we have a mission and PLOs that both say who we are *and* are measurable.
 1. Mission: consider revising to align more closely to the ideals of the PLNU mission
 2. PLO improvement in Political Science: make 1, 2, and 3 more measurable
 3. PLO improvement in International Studies: make 1 and 4 more measurable
- B. Clarify our program leadership structures. As the University moved from a department focus to a program focus, our department lagged behind. International Studies is the most obvious example, but clarity in *program* administration is needed in each of our programs.
 1. International Studies major management: identify a clear plan for the leadership of this program and strategies to develop departmental ownership of it moving forward
 2. Improve intra-departmental organization: formalize program-level administrative roles and responsibilities. This is especially important since it is at these levels that many of these action steps will be planned and implemented.
- C. Develop a cohesive plan for the History major. This program has some staffing changes approaching in the next couple years and lots of ideas about best next steps. The program review process revealed that we have lots of ideas, but we still need an overall plan that coherently interconnects and prioritizes these ideas and retains our current high quality.
 1. Social Science phase out: eliminate the Social Science major and develop a plan, in consultation with School of Education, to advise students interested in teaching
 2. Public history focus: develop specific strategies to place a greater emphasis on public history in certain courses
 3. GE options: consider broadening GE options in History to include other offerings, such as American History
- D. Intentionally prepare for the next program review cycle. Many of the difficulties we faced in this program review cycle involved our lack of information in several key areas. There are many steps we can and should take to ensure our next program review focuses more on our program content and less on the review and assessment processes.

1. Political Science/International Studies capstone course: adjust curricula in these majors to provide space for a capstone course, either jointly in one course or divided between programs
2. Alumni feedback and success: put a plan in place to track the success of students post-graduation and receive feedback from this constituency
3. Formalize exit surveys: develop a standardized mechanism that will make this data more reliable and measurable

While these are certainly important and challenging issues to tackle, we are pleased that they are “tweaks” of our existing programs rather than full-scale renovation. It is also gratifying that many of the areas where improvement is needed are administrative rather than content-based. The curricular changes posed by this program review are crucial, but also relatively undistruptive to the current curricula. We do not believe at this point that there are financial implications to any of these actions.

In short, we believe that this program review process has helped highlight our program strengths, pinpoint essential areas of improvement, and outlined a path forward. Thank you for the work you do to enable these positive outcomes!

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the History and Political Science Department,

Dr. Rosco Williamson
Chair, History and Political Science Department, Point Loma Nazarene University

**Program Assessment & Review Committee
FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT
HPS Program Review (Self-Study & External Review)**

DATE: October 31, 2016

TO: Dr. Lindsey Lupo and Dr. Rosco Williamson,
Co-Chairs of the Department of History and Political Science

FROM: Program Assessment & Review Committee

SUBJECT: Program Assessment & Review Committee Feedback on HPS Program Review

INTRODUCTION

In October 2016, the Program Assessment & Review Committee (PARC) evaluated a complete set of documents for the Department of History & Political Science (HPS) Program Review. The HPS Department faculty are to be commended for a comprehensive review of their programs, describing a productive, engaged department whose missional ethos and student-centered care are reflected by a rich curriculum design, a wide range of university service, quality faculty scholarship, and conscientious stewardship of facilities and financial resources. The self-studies were originally submitted in January 2015. The department's response to the external review generated useful extrapolations and follow-up analysis where requested. Overall, the rigorous process led to thoughtful conclusions and recommendations for each program. To this end, HPS is ready to proceed in crafting a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

CONTEXT & PROCESS

The HPS Department conducted its program review during a transition in self-study and external review formats to the current format. PARC has taken these changes into consideration, offering flexibility in its criteria to allow for differences between the former evaluative rubric and extant new one. For example, challenges in linking the analysis of data templates to questions in the prior format are mitigated by the provision of data charts loaded directly into streamlined program review templates. The prior self-study format required a Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) analysis, which can be applied to the criteria for GF7, "Challenges and Opportunities" in the new format, but the criteria for "Quality Markers" did not align as seamlessly.

Due to the transition in formats and criteria, new rubrics used for this final report on the HPS program review will not be submitted in the form of a consensus rubric. The former Program Review Committee provided written feedback for each programmatic self-study, culminating in a summation report to HPS after the full set of external reviews. The summation report re-evaluated the feedback provided to HPS under the old program review model. This final report aims to offer a final summation with an eye towards providing useful recommendations for submitting Academic Policy Committee (APC) proposals and crafting the MOU.

FINDINGS

The self-study and external review highlighted a quality faculty whose scholarly productivity, albeit understated, was still evident in their academic accomplishments, teaching, and university service. The HPS programs offer a richly varied curriculum to their majors, including internships in History and Political Science, and required study abroad for International Studies. PARC found the curriculum analysis particularly strong. The data exhibits and formal data analysis of national trends and financial

analysis were less developed, perhaps due to the difference in data preparation and presentation for the prior self-study format. Longitudinal enrollment data and graduation & retention rates were analyzed. The external reviewer's report was thorough and constructive in pointing out useful recommendations as well as reinforcing the HPS program review's strong areas and departmental needs in a supportive manner.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Align Departmental Goals and University Mission: The department is encouraged to contemplate the nuances of this alignment, especially in terms of how its goals reflect and articulate our university's Christian values and beliefs. Additionally, the missional context of faith, intellectual engagement, and service can be highlighted through student learning outcomes as well as faculty productivity: activity on conference circuits, scholarly publications, participation on panels, media references, and other types of academic involvement related to our missional ethos. As mentioned in the HPS response to the Program Review Committee and External Reviewer (April 19, 2016), PLO adjustments to Political Science PLOs 1, 2, 3, for International Studies PLOs 1 and 4 are under exploration for missionality as well as measurability.

Clarify Administrative & Leadership Structure: Following the submission of the April 19, 2016 HPS response to the Program Review Committee and External Reviewer, HPS has identified a clear plan for the leadership of the International Studies program, now led by Rosco Williamson, who serves as co-chair of HPS. HPS will continue to formalize program-level administrative roles and duties, as program leadership will be responsible for implementing a substantial portion of action steps generated by this program review.

Adjust Curriculum: The HPS Response dated April 19, 2016 mentions a plan to phase out Social Science, i.e. eliminate the Social Science major and develop a plan, in consultation with the School of Education, to advise students interested in teaching a single subject (i.e. history and/or social studies) in elementary school, middle school, or high school. HPS also plans to develop strategies to place a greater emphasis on public history in specific courses. PARC recommends that the strategic plans in these areas be further parsed with respect to specifics, so these plans can begin implementation over the next five years. In line with recent prioritization recommendations, History has reduced its upper-division electives taught annually and explored replacing those classes with in-demand sections of World Civilization, both on-line and hybrid (Liberty Station).

Provide & Strengthen Culminating Experiences: Political Science and International Studies might consider designating a senior-level research seminar as a culminating experience, wherein students can pull together their learning from multiple facets of their program, further extending, synthesizing, and applying their formative educational experiences for a cumulative evaluation of outcomes. The HPS Response dated April 19, 2016 suggested adjusting curricular offerings in Political Science and International Studies to include a joint capstone course or one for each program.

Continue to Develop Assessment Culture: HPS and International Studies should persist in their implementation of assessment practices and annual documentation on the wheels, providing both evidence and use of evidence as well as current multi-year assessment rotations and assessment maps. Over time, longitudinal data should be available for analysis of trends. Data collection, especially for International Studies, needs strengthening in this regard.

As noted in the September 30, 2015 Program Review Committee feedback to the HPS self-study, formalized alumni tracking and exit surveys or exit interviews will provide further evidence of program outcomes and job placement, alongside monitoring national trends, external demand, applicant conversion rates, and internal major migration. Adequate data collection will help to prepare HPS for its next program review cycle, to focus improvement upon content rather than the processes implemented to assess quality. The IR Director, Brent Goodman, is designing customized, discipline-specific alumni surveys that will be available for distribution, which should assist with departmental collection of alumni data.

Revise & Update General Education: Improved consistency of GE assessment data collection and analysis will be useful for strengthening the assessment culture in this program, too. In particular, HPS provides a significant portion of GE service, due to GELO 2c: "Students will demonstrate an understanding of the complex issues faced by diverse groups in global and/or cross-cultural contexts." The HPS Response dated April 19, 2016 considers broadening History GE options to include American History and possibly other offerings.

Revisit Colt Endowment Funds: As noted in the HPS response to the prior program review's recommendations, re-engagement of the Colt Endowment Funds was tabled in light of the 2008 financial recession and subsequent priority with regard to physical maintenance vs. student scholarships, campus speakers, and an annual research conference. Revisiting the allocation status of the funds would likely serve as a constructive exploration in the spirit of financial stewardship.

Promote Visibility of Program Distinctives: Women's Studies (affiliated with HPS), pre-law preparation, Institute of Politics and Public Service (IPPS), and the department's emphasis on educational travel are notable yet comparable to comparators and aspirants. That said, these program traits could be more prominently highlighted on the website alongside internship opportunities available to HPS majors through the Office of Strengths and Vocation.

CONCLUSION

With a set of clear recommendations in hand, HPS is positioned to consider departmental, co-chairs, and decanal feedback in response to this report prior to PARC finalization of "Findings & Recommendations." After the report is finalized and the department is provided with an opportunity to share feedback, HPS may submit proposals for curricular adjustments and craft an MOU in conferral with the department, co-chairs, dean, and provost.