

# I. Department Review: Introduction and Formulation

---

Our program review for the History/Social Science Department has developed into a different sort of program aid than the review from 2003. Rooted in the discussion of educational effectiveness and occurring along the same timeframe as the WASC visit, we have been much more focused on the dynamic change that could occur if we restructured the methodology of current best practices for outcomes education as the central element of our program. While the first program review from five years ago generated useful insights and promoted significant dialog, this review has promoted functional means of evidence collection that will allow the faculty to determine success as measured in more objective measurements.

Having produced the 2003 department review and having professional goals in mind that could be advanced in this study, Jon DePriest (Chair of the History/Social Science Department), took the lead in conducting this departmental review. Kathy King, the other full-time faculty of the department, supported the whole process and carried out significant tasks to help generate as much information as possible into and out of this report. Adjunct faculty, though contributors in various ways to the curriculum study, were not expected to contribute work to this study or attend department meetings. At a May 2008 culminating meeting, SDCC faculty and our designated outside reviewer, Judith Rood, Ph.D., from Biola, met together to grade the capstone project as well as earlier work from this year's graduates to assess progress.

The decision to use the opportunity of the WASC educational effectiveness visit as the heart of this review became rewarding early on. Knowing that an overhaul of methods would be an important goal to attain for both departmental teaching and for evidence for the March 2008 visit, the bulk of our time centered on these focused tasks. The end product and plans that were made by that time demonstrated that choosing that focus was worth the hours of effort that are delineated here. Unfortunately, trying to pull together the other aspects of quantitative analysis and surveys of alumni tended to drag along at a pace that did not promote as much learning from them as components of this study as they could. Consequently, this review does not reflect as much value from these reflective elements as it could.

The following report does cover the elements of the SDCC Comprehensive Program Review guidelines, but some sections are given general study while curriculum assessment work here advances the institutional possibilities to completely new structures of evidence. It is our hope that the work we have done on curriculum mapping and rubric development will become a model for other departments to use as potentially new methods to bring cohesion to their program and build an evidence base that demonstrates learning. It is exactly in those areas that this report is strong and we submit it as having been a worthwhile use of our time to better understand our profession and the success of our students.

## II. Departmental Quantitative Analysis

---

### A. Quantitative Data

In the last department review, the History/Social Science Department used the quantitative data sections to look at broad categories of students who at some time self-selected history as a major. In the following section, the interest will be more focused in order to gain a better understanding of a profile that may assist the department in the advising process. To that end, and with the understanding that we usually do not know why someone changes major or colleges, we will focus on the profile of the six years of graduates since the last study. We seek to understand the reasons why these students finished the program and graduated.

#### Profile of Incoming Graduates to Department

The total **number** of graduates in History/Social Science since 2003 is 28. The largest graduating class occurred in 2006 when eight graduates crossed the stage; the smallest class was in 2004 when there were only two graduates from the department. The oldest graduate in **age** was 33 and the youngest was 22 (6 times). The average age at graduation was 24.5 years of age. There were 17 male graduates and 11 female graduates. This represents a fairly large disparity between the college **gender** average of over 60% female to the History/Social Science Department's 39% female. The department does have over 21% of its graduates from **ethnicities** other than Caucasian. Four of the graduates have been Hispanic and two were African American. They came from nine different **church affiliations**. A full 25% of our graduates were married at the time of graduation. In three of those seven occasions, their **marital status** changed while in college—one having met his wife while in the college. Only one had a child.

Of these 28 graduates, we know the **high school grade point average** of all but two. The range of the gpa for these students goes from 2.47 to 4.0. The average was 3.31. It is interesting to note that in four of the six cases where these graduates entered into the program with high school gpa's under 2.9, the student was an older student who returned to college after time in the workplace. They were all males, and the other two with low gpa's and finished school with the incoming class were females. Fifty-seven percent (16) of these graduates entered the program with the intention of entering the teaching profession as their **career goal**. Three of them (11%) were interested in law or politics, one targeted missionary work and another set a goal of working in a library when they entered the program. There were four students in these years of graduates who were undecided about their career goal when they entered the program. Three of these did have a direction for their career at the time of their graduation.

#### Profile of Graduating Senior Students in Department

While in college, most of these students did set a consistent course towards graduation once enrolled at SDCC. In two cases, one for a yearlong mission trip and the other who sought to

transfer, students missed more than a semester and returned to complete their degree in the History/Social Science Department. While in the program, therefore, a consistency tends to dictate success. This consistency has not been a hallmark of students who enter the program. Only 7 of these 28 entered into the program as a freshman out of high school. The other 21 came into the program through a variety of means: one as a returning adult freshman, one who added a second major while at SDCC, a full 11 (39%) entered after taking coursework at another institution of higher education, 6 changed their major within SDCC, and two declared with the History/Social Science Department in their sophomore year after being undeclared through their freshman year. These graduates finished the program with a **college grade point average** of 3.25. The range of their college gpa went from a low of 2.37 to a valedictorian gpa of 3.96. At the time of their graduation, their **career goals** had shifted some from their entering expectations. Most of them (82%) believed that they were going to continue in academic studies after graduation. For several, a shifted interest in teaching targeted college level instruction instead of high school or middle school. At least two added that they wanted to write as a profession, a career goal that was not expressed in any earlier survey. Only one graduate related an interest outside of the program of study that he graduated in—he wanted to enter the police force. This was a student who was undecided about career goals as a freshman or sophomore. All other goals listed by the 28 graduates fall within the normal materials that designate career options for student with a History/Social Science degree.

In the last semester of their senior year, graduates of the History/Social Science Department fill out a survey that includes a place to **self-identify strengths and weaknesses of their academic program**. While only 15 of the 28 filled out this survey, their remarks are reflective of the general tenor of the department—both in strengths and weaknesses. The biggest concern mentioned by graduating seniors is that there are so few courses offered so that the student often has time conflicts with courses available. This was especially troubling when a course was offered that the student wanted to take, but was unable to enroll in it because of outside conflicts. One mentioned that night classes may allow some flexibility. The other concern was related to the first one—there are only two full-time faculty in the department. There was not a concern listed on deficiencies within the faculty, just that there are not enough of them.

The list of commendations from graduating seniors targets several key elements. First, many noted that they had been strengthened in their knowledge of history. One wrote that “all of my classes were unbelievable and I learned so much.” Almost half made a point to recognize that the teachers made the courses enjoyable. One said, “The teachers were amazing. They kept me motivated and wanting to come back.” Some other notable comments included that there were good resources and books provided, that skills learned in the History/Social Science Department transferred to other courses, and that the department aided the student’s ability to conduct “great research, writing, and thought development.” In all the positive comments outweighed the negative ones in a five to one ratio.

## **B. Cost Analysis**

### **1. Resources**

The History/Social Science Department has been supported by SDCC in that we have been able to deliver curriculum in a variety of media. Most of our courses are enhanced by the utilization of visuals and technology. In the classrooms, the access to the internet and compatible programs like PowerPoint allow the visual component that was lacking just fifteen years ago. The courses are supported by a significantly improved library. Our students comment frequently about the assistance they receive from the qualified personnel. There has been a notable increase to the quality of research material for research papers, both in hard copy and electronic resources. The college's increase support of library holdings has generated a higher quality collection.

There are no frills in the resource allocation of the SDCC budget to academic departments. While we do not have some of the desires for the educational interests of our faculty, the basic necessities are met. We have never been told to reduce our Xerox copies for teaching, cut down on phone contacts with students or faculty colleagues at other institutions, or other essential processes for teaching excellence.

### **2. Faculty**

The History/Social Science Department employs two full-time faculty and various adjuncts. It has been maintained at that level for the past fifteen years. One has focused on World history and the other on the American history curriculum. Additionally, the use of an adjunct at the upper division level creates a third scholarly voice in the department. Of these three main members, two have terminal degrees and the institution has taken some steps to undergird the efforts of our third member to complete a Ph.D. in the near future.

### **3. Cost Comparison to Other Departments**

During this past year, the Academic Vice President distributed a program cost analysis in a meeting of academic department chairs. The key measurement that was targeted in the cost analysis study was program costs in relation to student seat income. Of the ten departments in the study, the History/Social Science Department placed as the sixth highest income generating department teaching 474 units totaling \$606,195. The department's program cost percentage of 28% was lower than all other departments except Bible, Business and Psychology. There were three departments whose program costs were over 50% of the generated income. The History/Social Science Department realizes that the good numbers here are benefitted by the higher numbers of students in our general education courses. The department would generate better numbers in cost analysis with an increase of majors so that upper division courses had larger populations. This could be done with better promotion and further work with the Admissions and Advancement offices.

# III. Enhancing the SDCC Mission

---

## **Question 1: How does the department intentionally relate the curriculum content to the College Mission Statement?**

### Rationale:

The College Mission Statement, in setting forth the aims of the College, establishes the parameters of the curriculum.

### Factors to Consider:

How does the content of the curriculum relate to the Mission Statement?

How do the learning objectives of the department relate to the Mission Statement?

### **A. Departmental Mission and Objectives**

*“The mission of San Diego Christian College is to engage Christians in an academic community that offers a liberal arts education, promotes and environment of scholarship, and fosters the examination of truth, preparing them to influence the world through godly character within a framework of the authority and inerrancy of Scripture.”*

This mission statement for the college informs all that we undertake in the History/Social Science Department. In the past year, the academic division has attempted to identify a mission statement that reflects the ambitions for learning within the learning environment. A draft was disseminated and individual departments were requested to use it as a guideline for a departmental mission statement. The wording used was: “The mission of the academic division is to lead and nurture an active learning community at SDCC that promotes scholarship, personal development, and service.”

As a department, we immediately thought that the statement was similar to the objectives we had identified ten years ago. Therefore we began to formulate a mission statement for the department that fit between the academic division statement and pointed to the learning objectives we already identified. On November 2, 2007, a draft was advanced and then edited for a meeting later that month. The mission statement for the History/Social Science Department is: ***“The mission of the History/Social Science Department is to mentor students, including a willingness to represent Christ within a culturally diverse society, while acquiring general knowledge, scholarly reasoning, and research skills.”***

Below that mission statement, the department retains its five learning objectives, with the second one reflecting a recent wording change to include the concept of information literacy:

1. To synthesize knowledge of the structure, history and management of human societies.
2. To develop information literacy, generating research from well-developed reasoning and critical interpretation of material evidence, communicated in both oral and written form.
3. To differentiate between culturally generated beliefs and divinely revealed truth, while developing a biblical perspective that reflects an appreciation for the richness and diversity of cultures.
4. To cultivate a lifelong commitment to growth in the Christian faith, professional integrity, and passion for service.
5. To demonstrate an eclectic approach to historical investigation in order to apply information from a variety of sources.

These objectives have been the focus of the department in an intentional effort to maximize the learning potential of the majors and other interested learners who take courses in the department. It is notable that parallels between the new History/Social Science Department mission statement and the SDCC mission statement exist on many levels. The idea of scholarship and truth relate to the department's first, second, and third objectives. The concepts of godly character and biblical integration are clearly advanced in objectives three and four. Correlation between the institutional, division, and departmental mission statements are exceptionally high.

It should be noted that Dr. Judith Rood, outside reviewer from BIOLA University, noted that the "wording of the mission statement seems awkward to me when thinking about student-centered learning: perhaps rephrasing it along these lines: 'The mission of the History/Social Science Department is to enable students to represent Christ through their knowledge of history and the social sciences within a culturally diverse society' would be clearer tying it directly to the department's learning objectives." This suggestion will be looked at more thoroughly in the fall semester as we sharpen our departmental mission statement.

# IV. Curriculum Construction

---

## **Question #2: What is the scope-and-sequence and structure of the department's curriculum?**

### Rationale:

Departmental curriculum should be logically constructed, based upon what students should know and be able to do at the end of the program. Content should be selected and sequenced according to a model or paradigm.

### Factors to Consider:

Are the courses sequenced from easy to difficult? Or Are the courses of equal difficulty?

Are some courses foundational to the learning of other courses?

How do the courses fit together?

How does the structure of the curriculum foster student learning?

How consistently does the department's curriculum follow a structure in presentation of concepts and learning activities?

### **A. Curriculum Introduction**

The curriculum of a liberal arts college has for years been a nebulous concept. Recently, however, more concrete patterns of reason are required for a program to meet needs of students. As a smaller school, the faculty focuses on the teaching of the catalog as a public design of curriculum. From the college's inception until the mid-1990s, the catalog was organized in a strict chronological format. In the past fifteen years, changes have been made to restructure the American history offerings in a more topical format in order to address the requirements of the social history focus in the discipline. In the world history curriculum, few changes have been made from the earliest creation—it remains chronological in arrangement. The upper division courses also remain tied to a European focus because of size restrictions, but the faculty has been intentional in connecting these courses to world developments.

### **B. Scope and Sequence**

The curriculum in the History/Social Science Department has consistently been a four level structure since the addition of a history seminar in 1982. The students in the department take general education in their freshman and sophomore years, with the seminar as part of the sophomore curriculum. This seminar is an introduction to the requisite skills needed to successfully engage in upper division courses. It serves as the second level of student learning. The upper division offerings have been scheduled over the years as a combination of student interest and faculty proficiency within restricted ability to offer a wide variety in any given semester. Usually having 15-30 majors at one time makes it economically challenging to give a wider selection of courses, therefore the student interest component has been a significant

indicator of course choice. At the end of that third level of courses, the senior major in the History/Social Science Department must complete a capstone course—either HI 495 Senior Thesis or HI 499 Internship. This is the fourth and final level of learning in the scope and sequence of the curriculum.

As part of the dissemination of the major's scope and sequence, the registrar's office has created a master schedule and sample course outline for the students of the department. Little has changed as the GE, seminar, upper division, and capstone levels have been consistent over the past 25 years. The key changes have been in areas of communication (e.g. identifying courses that aid in the requirements for teaching in California) and allowing more choice in the GE portion of the college requirements (e.g. historically based literature elective instead of World Literature). The master schedule of the History/Social Science Department can be found as Appendix A in Section Nine.

### **C. Departmental Communication on Curriculum Changes**

For the past few years, in a greater regard for educational effectiveness, the departments of SDCC have been discussing a more intentional plan to collect proof of learning objectives through student evidence. In spring of 2004, the Chair of the department (Jon DePriest) attended a WASC seminar on student learning outcomes with the Vice President of Assessment and Planning, Lundie Carstensen. At that seminar, the progression of objectives, evidence, learning criteria and rubrics was introduced as a model program for outcome assessment. In the fall faculty orientation, Jon and Lundie conducted several sessions for the faculty on this concept and advanced the need for a more intentional effort on the part of departments for evidence collection and grading. At that time, the example used was the biblical integration feature that informs every department of the college.

By the spring of 2006, departmental capstone reviews were conducted through the Assessment Office and half-day meetings with each department. These sessions have been held after the spring semester each of the past two years and have become an expected part of the assessment on campus for departmental faculty. Likewise, each department has been given prescribed time during the orientation week before the fall semester to advance their assessment plan. Because of these scheduled meetings, most of the departments have been moving forward in collecting evidence of student learning. While the History/Social Science Department did not meet for the first spring meeting, the rest of the sessions have produced important dialog that has resulted in intentional changes in methods, theory, and practice. The following summarizes the key developments in those meetings. (Communication in the department are included as Appendix B in Section Nine)

In the 2006 orientation meeting, the History/Social Science Department identified the HI 300 research paper and the capstone paper as samples to be collected for assessment. In addition, a review of the department objectives by each student would continue to be collected for a more reflective overview of learning. We also started a History/Social Science Department organizational site on Blackboard so students in the department can be engaged in learning

that is happening in courses that they may not be attending. At that meeting, the department faculty also realized that objective four (new) was not very well supported by curriculum, but needed co-curricular support for attainment.

In the spring 2007 capstone session and the 2007 orientation session, the department faculty realized that the current state of evidence collection did not satisfy our interests for student mastery. In grading the capstone work for the 2006-2007 academic year, it was obvious that an internship was insufficient as a capstone experience. The department could not make clear identification of learning objective mastery through time given in support of a community organization which enhanced a student's resume. After a time of trying to "beef up" the requirements of the internship, the department decided that the HI 495 Senior Thesis course must be the only capstone for majors. Additionally, there was concern about how the department could demonstrate critical thinking as collected evidence. The department had a matrix, but did not have a location for an assignment to be collected or a rubric for learning criteria. It was determined that those pieces would be resolved and HI 428 Foreign Policy was chosen as course to make a trial run at grading and collection. Another issue that emerged was that the student thesis papers retained bias at an unacceptable level. Greater work on research papers in a developmental way and a stronger scrutiny of source use would be employed to correct this concern. Finally, there was concern over the cultural diversity component of the History/Social Science Department objectives. It was decided that some changes needed to be made to the master schedule of the department to meet this requirement (also reflected in some restrictions for course choice). Additional checklist items in the master schedule to be completed by the student would include a paper on cultural diversity (collected by faculty) as identified in select courses, along with a service learning requirement to be included in the institutional requirements for student ministry. As a History/Social Science Department major, the student would need to conduct a service learning piece as a part of the SDCC requirements. Finally, it was decided that an additional checklist item or a 12-15 page research paper should also be included and collected by faculty. This would give a third (developmental) component for the research paper between HI 300 and HI 495.

This past year has included both the WASC educational effectiveness reports and a departmental review. With these challenging and important projects, the department decided it was time to make a concrete program with evidentiary material to support the objectives we had taught for years. Several departmental meetings have been used to advance targets for success. The November 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting identified changes mentioned from the previous paragraph and laid out tasks to be completed in the subsequent 2-3 months. Besides approving the department mission statement, the November 30<sup>th</sup> meeting discussed the usefulness of the SDCC critical thinking rubric and SDCC writing standards as starting points for departmental rubrics. Each faculty member was given the task (AVP directive) to conduct a SWOT analysis of the department, which was done for the December 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. The results of the analysis presented a familiar list (included in appendix B). The main focus of the meeting turned to department rubrics, which were at various stages of completion. Five emerged as needed components for a more constructive analysis of learning criteria (critical thinking, oral presentation, book review, position paper, and research paper). In an addendum report to the

AVP, information regarding the completion of the rubrics and the implementation of the critical thinking rubric in the Foreign Policy course was reported. A sixth (class discussion) appears to be needed. The use of the book review rubric produced a ½ lower grade on an average in one class and a similar result for the critical thinking assignment in the other. It was clear that student learning must include a clear understanding of the rubric before implementation as a product measurement. The first departmental meeting of the spring semester, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, focused on the new objectives curriculum map that was developed after Jon DePriest attended another WASC sponsored seminar on student learning outcomes in Irvine. It was also noted that the whole task of collecting evidence should not be done every year for every objective, but that pieces of the department's objectives could be collected and evaluated in a planned schedule. Later in the semester, Kathy King evaluated all syllabi in the department to solidify the alignment of designations of introduction, development, and mastery of various components of the department's objectives.

#### **D. Departmental Objectives—State of Evidence and Proposed Embedding**

Objective One: *To synthesize knowledge of the history, structure, management, and significance of human societies*, comprises the basic understanding of the framework of the study of history—societies. Without this standard knowledge, the deeper study in the history and social sciences would not be meaningful. This objective was one of the original goals established by the department in the mid-1990s and remains a crucial component of understanding that we desire our students to grasp. More than any other objective, this human society understanding objective contributes strongly to the department's breadth in the general education core of SDCC.

- **Current State of Evidence**

In 1998, the department developed a matrix for this objective that included 15 reference points for student learning criteria (Appendix C). As noted earlier, this has been so monumental that department faculty has not collected student samples related to this objective.

- **Proposed Embedding and Collection**

The new curriculum map changes the collection of student product from five levels to the main idea of having clarity of knowledge related to an understanding of human societies (Included as Appendix E in Section Nine, along with a survey of department syllabi conducted by Kathy King). It further identifies the introduction of this objective in the survey courses of general education and developed in several social science courses. A further identification and collection of understanding will be made in the seminar course in the sophomore year. As a foundational element in any social science, this objective will continue to be developed in all upper division courses and a demonstration of mastery will be collected and evaluated in the senior thesis.

Objective Two: *To develop information literacy, generating research from well-developed*

***reasoning and critical interpretation of material evidence, communicated in both oral and written form***, establishes collegiate skill standards for majors in the History/Social Science Department. In the mid-1990s, the objective aimed at “replacing personal biases with informed opinions.” Recent discussion in the department has led us to edit this objective to focus on the lifelong habit of information literacy. The department believes that this skill encompasses the previous notion of replacing bias and aligning department objectives within more contemporary academic dialog. With information literacy supporting the other parts of this objective, these skills remain the most transferrable elements of a quality college education for any student in any major.

- **Current State of Evidence**

In 1998, the department developed a matrix for this objective that included 15 reference points for student learning criteria (Appendix C). As noted earlier, this has been so monumental that department faculty has not collected student samples related to this objective. The objective has, however, pushed faculty to introduce more oral presentation components in the curriculum and additional discussion on quality sources.

- **Proposed Embedding and Collection**

The information literacy objective has been divided into four measurable student learning outcomes on the new curriculum map (Appendix E). Below are the four areas as embedded in the curriculum and the associative courses for introduction, development and mastery.

1. **Information Literacy**: This component will be introduced at the survey level and developed in several social science and upper division courses. Most of this component will be identified with quality and breadth of sources chosen for information delivery. Nevertheless, the library has identified information literacy for all SDCC students in four levels of learning—introduction in the becoming a master student course, additional development in the college composition course, and two courses for each department where information literacy could be departmentally formed. For the History/Social Science Department, the seminar course and the capstone experience will be used to develop information literacy to mastery. By the time of the senior thesis, the student should demonstrate the competent skills of a researcher.
2. **Critical Thinking**: This component will also be introduced in the survey courses through an understanding of various interpretive perspectives and discussion of the validity of those perspectives. Most social science and history courses will continue the development of critical thinking, but may not have collectable evidence of such activity. Likewise, it is not necessary that a senior thesis contain a critical thinking portion in the paper. Therefore, the department has chosen four courses that must have a collectable assignment that specifically targets mastery of critical thinking.

These courses are Renaissance/Reformation and Enlightenment in world history and American Revolution and American Foreign Policy in the American history curriculum. Students will need to select one of these courses in their final two semesters in order to meet the requirements of this objective. There is a departmental rubric for critical thinking (Appendix D). This rubric has been through several revisions. It started as a piece of the Critical Thinking Task Force in the late 1990s, where the History/Social Science Department served as the initial program to attempt to define this concept in academic coursework. Using information from the Foundation for Critical Thinking, the task force defined critical thinking and integrated the History/Social Science Department objectives into the definition to create a matrix. This matrix had 19 points of evidence collection that like the other matrices became too cumbersome for the faculty. It did serve as a point of reference in the most recent Critical Thinking rubric, which took the recently promoted SDCC rubric with the earlier work from the task force to make this new departmental rubric.

3. Argumentative Essay: The proper standards for an argumentative essay in this discipline will be introduced in the survey courses and also in a more specific way in the history seminar course. At the sophomore seminar, the rubric will be introduced and explained for student understanding. While there are several rubrics available in the department related to this (book review, position paper, research paper), it should be noted that all of them require that the student present a thesis with an argumentative position (Appendix D). Mastery of this component should be demonstrated in the collected senior thesis (research paper rubric).
4. Oral Presentation: The first look at oral presentation within social sciences will be introduced as a debate component at the survey level. Again, the rubric for presentations in the department will be introduced and the skill developed and graded in the presentations required in the department (Appendix D). While other upper division courses may require a form of oral presentation, the mastery of this skill will be collected and displayed in a campus event as a senior thesis presentation at the end of their capstone experience.

Objective Three: ***To differentiate between culturally generated beliefs and divinely revealed truth, while developing a biblical perspective that reflects an appreciation for the richness and diversity of cultures***, contains the two key elements of cultural diversity and biblical integration. One of the original mid-1990s objectives, its wording has never changed through several faculty revisions. These two components are not unique to other departments, as all education should have intentional understanding of cultural diversity and SDCC mandates a biblically integrated curriculum.

- **Current State of Evidence**

In 1998, the department developed a matrix for this objective that included 18 reference points for student learning criteria (Appendix C). As noted earlier, this has been so monumental that department faculty has not collected student samples related to this objective.

- **Proposed Embedding and Collection**

For the cultural diversity component, the new curriculum map designates an introduction of this idea in either the cultural anthropology or geography course. Since majors can complete their requirements without taking either course, it will need to become part of the checklist for students to take at least one of them. This concept will be developed in a variety of courses, but may not be relevant to the work undertaken by a student in their capstone. Therefore, the department has identified the Enlightenment or European Nationalism courses in the world history curriculum and American Ethnicities or the American Sixties courses in American history curriculum to assess mastery of a student's understanding of cultural diversity.

The biblical integration component will be introduced as a part of the history seminar course at the sophomore level. Like the cultural diversity element, there may or may not be a biblical integration component in the senior thesis. In order to measure mastery in the student, the History/Social Science Department has identified the Ancient Near East and Renaissance/Reformation courses in world history and American Revolution and American Religious History in American history as courses where mastery of biblical integration could be collected. Faculty teaching these courses will have an assignment that allows collection and measurement of this skill. Again, the checklist for majors will need to have a place to ensure that all majors take at least one of these courses near the end of the program—preferably in their senior year.

Objective Four: *To cultivate a lifelong commitment to growth in the Christian faith, professional integrity, and passion for service*, was added to the department's objectives in 2003. Concerns about plagiarism and engagement coupled to drive this statement. As a departmental objective, this statement calls for the student to demonstrate Christian living while matriculating through the curriculum. As a measurable idea, growth and evidence of Christian living has been a challenging concept to grasp in an evidentiary sense. The other component of this objective, professional integrity, has been included in the curriculum all along. It has not, however, been intentionally developed or measured.

- **Current State of Evidence**

As the newest objective, there is not a matrix from 1998 as to a method of assessment on these goals. There has been significant faculty dialog on how to measure Christian living that has prompted intentional change in the curriculum and co-curricular learning.

- **Proposed Embedding and Collection**

The department has identified a place for introduction, development and mastery for the goal

of Christian living. As part of the department's seminar course, a definition and discussion will be included as the introduction of the obligations of the Christ follower in society and in academics. The development of the student will be assigned to the Christian ministry and community service requirements in the co-curricular program of SDCC. It will be advanced by the department that two of the six semesters that are required of for ministry be allowed for service learning in the community for students in the History/Social Science Department. Mastery of Christian living will be added as a component of Age of Dictators in the world history curriculum and the American Sixties and American Religious History in the American history curriculum. In those courses, an assignment that documents the understanding of the Christian life within the difficulties of the course subject matter can be used to collect and measure student mastery. The department believes that the HI 499 Internship course may also demonstrate mastery in Christian living depending on the selection of the internship.

Professional integrity in the academic setting is discussed in virtually every course. For the purpose of student assessment, the History/Social Science Department will introduce this concept in each survey course with additional reinforcement in the seminar course for majors. It will be developed throughout the curriculum and collected for mastery analysis as part of the senior thesis capstone.

**Objective Five: *To demonstrate an eclectic approach to historical investigation in order to apply information from a variety of sources***, has been the History/Social Science Department's goal for capstone achievement since the mid-1990s. It includes the important skills of research design and implementation that are required of successful historians. The research paper in the discipline demands the full attention of students to apply all the other skills from objectives one through four.

- **Current State of Evidence**

As the capstone objective, the department has been mindful of collection for this objective since the matrices were created in 1998. To date, the department has collected most capstone projects for those ten years. Since the 2003 department review, the department has collected the HI 300 seminar paper as an earlier piece of evidence in the student's career. We have also collected the student's review of the departmental objectives for almost ten years. These items have been used in the 2003 departmental review, but have not been consistently analyzed for mastery because of a lack of learning criteria for level determination.

- **Proposed Embedding and Collection**

In the new curriculum map, the student will be introduced to disciplinary benchmarks for a proper research paper in the seminar course. This will include a clear introduction to the research paper rubric. Both the design of the research and the paper will be measured through the rubric. The seminar paper will be collected as a sophomore writing sample. While every upper division history course will require some writing component, there will be several papers that are more akin to the research model that conforms to this objective. Somewhere in their

junior year, the history/social science student will need to submit another 10-15 page research paper from a course for collection and developmental measurement. The department will make sure that a standard research paper is available in at least two courses in each academic year for this measurement. Finally, mastery will be collected and measured in the senior thesis research paper of 25-30 pages in the capstone experience. In all of these papers, the student will be required to demonstrate skill in an increasing amount of primary and secondary sources. It should be noted that research design has been recognized as a key part of an internship project, but there is no way for the internship project to include the level of material engagement that the department desires for a research paper. This became the crucial reason for eliminating the internship as a capstone learning experience for the department.

### **Question #3: How comprehensive is the scope of academic disciplines covered in the department's curriculum?**

#### Rationale:

Departmental curriculum should be based upon or drawn from the body of knowledge which underlies the academic discipline being learned.

#### Factors to Consider:

How do you know that you are covering all of the appropriate areas in providing a broad-based undergraduate program?

To what models have you compared your program in determining the adequacy of the program's scope?

#### **A. Comparison to Other Liberal Arts Colleges**

The 2003 study of curriculum for SDCC's History/Social Science Department revealed that we needed to add a California history course. This was completed in the subsequent year and has been offered each fall to both history majors and students in liberal studies. Since that thorough comparison was produced just five years ago, with little change in the discipline, no additional work was conducted for this program review.

#### **B. Intentional Use of Adjuncts**

The one troubling issue concerning the History/Social Science Department curriculum in its comprehensive elements remains our size. With only two specialists hired as full-time faculty, the breadth of curriculum remains less than what we would like, and sometimes what our students desire. In response to this issue, the department has made three changes, all of which were true five years ago but warrant mentioning. First, we have consistently had a third voice in our upper division courses. For the past few years, Dr. Matthew Herbst has been willing to teach one of the ancient history courses around his specialty in Byzantine history and culture.

He is employed full-time at the University of California at San Diego, but enjoys our students and the ability to more thoroughly engage in biblical integration within our philosophy. Second, we continue to survey our students as to their areas of interest. When they have requests for a course, we are able to teach it under a “themes” course in the catalog. This is a course that was approved in the late 1990s and has since been added to many smaller institutions of higher education. Third, if we are unable to meet the need with a course or there are not enough students interested in a course, we will supervise an Independent Study or Directed Research course in a student’s interest area.

# V. Academic Rigor

---

## **Question #4: What evidence is there that the department's program is rigorous enough to adequately prepare graduates for graduate programs and for the workplace?**

### Rationale:

Departmental curriculum should provide an excellent, well-rounded, balanced, in-depth learning experience for students so that they are able to easily fit into graduate programs as well as achieve success in the workplace.

### Factors to Consider:

Have you compared your program to reputable graduate expectations in your discipline? How was this done?

Have you compared your program to workplace expectations? How were these workplace expectations identified? How was the comparison made?

### **A. Departmental Matrices**

About ten years ago, the History/Social Science Department created its first four learning objectives. Shortly thereafter, an attempt was made to identify three assignments that would demonstrate successful completion of these objectives within the curriculum. The matrices created for each objective included levels of learning desired (an integration of Bloom's taxonomy to the matrix), along with courses and associative assignments for each objective (included as appendix C in Section Nine). While the matrices produced a usable picture of the department's curricular goals and intentions, the usefulness of the product was unsatisfactory. For each objective, the faculty would have needed to collect some 15 pieces of student work to measure the completion of the objective. Because of the cumbersome nature of the matrices, there was little collection other than the capstone project and several of the papers from HI 300. Still, without a rubric or quantifiable component to the collection, the information for feedback and adjustments failed to serve the needs of the department.

### **B. Departmental Rubrics**

In addition to the Curriculum Map, the History/Social Science Department has developed several rubrics for embedding learning objectives into the curriculum (included as appendix D in Section Nine). Unlike the matrices, these tools appear to have the promise of making evidence "speak" to the faculty concerning measurements of success and need for adjustment. The key to the use of these rubrics will include a period of departmental "buy in" related to the consistent use of them course to course and with adjuncts. Once employed, and required for use, the majors of the History/Social Science Department should gain consistency in feedback and attain benchmarks of success that the faculty can collect. These rubrics were gathered and

constructed through rubric sharing ideas from other institutions of higher education and through the attendance of faculty at relevant sessions at the American Historical Association meetings. As grading standards, the rubrics should begin the process of setting and meeting expectations for college level work, as well as initiate the steps for successful graduate studies.

### **C. Comparison of SDCC to BIOLA and Williams College**

Since the summer of 2007, the department has been surveying various methods of embedding objectives into curriculum in higher education. One of the most intriguing programs we encountered was from Williams College in Massachusetts. In their program, they identify levels of learning as first-year, survey, junior seminars, and advanced seminars. At each level, the curriculum focuses on one objective for that given year. Therefore, the faculty introduces the learning goal, develop it, and measure mastery as an annual process for the students at the assigned level. Each course includes all three components for the associative objective. When the student completes their freshman year, they move to survey courses at the sophomore level where they process through the next objective. Faculty with specialties in every number of historical fields all form courses that conform to departmental expectations for curriculum-embedded objectives. Unfortunately, while their institutional practices seem like a usable model, the smaller size of SDCC's History/Social Science Department renders the idea impossible.

In schools within our educational niche, using the Coalition for Christian Colleges and Universities as a body, our department at SDCC seeks to instill similar research and learning goals. The one difference that seems notable is that most of the schools use the skills trained in a Seminar as the capstone experience with a final paper. Since the 1982 inclusion of the History Seminar at SDCC in this department, the intention has been to increase the research rigor in the sophomore year with the understanding that application of those skills should be developed and mastered over the junior and senior coursework. We believe that this model serves our students well and gives them more training in definable objectives for learning.

### **D. Comments from Dr. Judith Rood—Outside Reviewer**

On March 27, 2008, the History/Social Science Department conducted a focus group using our outside reviewer with majors in the department. While much of this session will be covered later in this review, Dr. Rood noted in a subsequent email that “the small size of your department is a real asset, especially your high faculty to student ratio. Your bright and energetic students affirm your department as the most academically rigorous on campus, and feel that they are being well prepared for careers in education, which most of them said was their goal.” After reading through student work samples on May 16, 2008, Dr. Rood wrote in her report about the grading session with History/Social Science Department faculty:

When I met with them to grade the student papers using the new rubric for seminar papers I found that we tended to grade the papers similarly, identifying aspects of the rubric that needed to be expanded or made more precise to be most helpful. The

students' abilities seemed to be similar to students I've taught at Oakland University, Wayne State University, William Tyndale College, and Biola University. In my judgement, the rubric will serve all students—whether they are department majors or not—by providing detailed feedback on their work to explain the reasons for the grade that they received. I suggest that students submit drafts that would be graded according to the rubrics, given an opportunity to revise and resubmit their work for a final grade, so long as the original rubric and draft are returned with the revision. I applaud the department for holding the line on grading by upholding the high standards of the discipline, expecting the students to follow directions and to turn in quality work. The best students always appreciate this, and the weaker ones will learn to be teachable and improve with the proper mentoring. The clear, careful, and informative structure of the rubrics developed as part of the self-study will aid the department greatly in improving student-centered learning. (See Appendix H)

Upon that session with a colleague from a quality CCCU sister institution, the History/Social Science Department faculty made changes to the rubrics used in the assessment process of student work. There were several other relevant topics that came out of that session which will become points of discussion in the 2008-2009 academic year (See minutes of meeting in Appendix G). Dr. Rood concludes that "it is clear from the department's curriculum mapping and rubric development that it is rigorous enough to adequately prepare graduates for graduate programs and for the workplace, and that this aim is taken seriously by the faculty and students alike."

# VI. Student Achievement

---

## **Question #5: How intentionally and effectively does the department's objectives content relate to students' career goals?**

### Rationale:

Department objectives should help students identify realistic career goals and learn concepts which lead to the fulfillment of these goals. The College Mission Statement implies career preparation.

### Factors to Consider:

How does course content lead students to career goals? How does curriculum inform students of aptitude for and expectations of intended career workplace?

### **A. Student Evaluation of History/Social Science Department Objectives**

As part of the capstone experience in the History/Social Science Department, students are required to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum in relation to departmental objectives. This reflective assignment allows the student to identify portions of the coursework that better enhanced their learning goals. Because the department clearly identifies its objectives in department chapels and on all syllabi, it is assumed that the students of the department understand that the learning goals of the department are the intended outcomes of the program.

The student review of the History/Social Science Department objectives generally followed a general structure of numerical order. The first objective on knowledge and management was affirmed, but there were few notable comments on this most basic goal. In my opinion, this objective was reminiscent of work done before college as preparatory in nature. The other four objectives generated more thoughtful, enlightened comments from the graduates. The critical thinking objective on bias and interpretation seemed to resonate most with students who arrived with one idea of how the discipline carried on in dialog and learned to identify complexity in perspectives. One considered the assignment of a distinct perspective (isolationism) during a foreign policy course as a stretching learning assignment. Another noted that her biases were challenged through the lives of others in primary sources whose lives "drew me deeper into the study of history." In several cases, text choices were noted as being important on addressing bias. One student noted that the bias of the text balanced with the very different bias of the instruction, while another appreciated that the texts were "written from different perspectives and each perspective is treated critically and with sensitivity." In a course on the holocaust, a student noted that she had to process both the stripping of the preconceived ideas out of her thinking, and then reconstruct a "conclusion from an informed opinion."

The third objective of the History/Social Science Department focuses on discernment between culturally generated ideas and those which are really from Scripture. In order to achieve this goal, the department seeks to be open to ideas from other cultures, which one student noted how surprised he was at the care exhibited with other cultures in the department. While the department did not “teach everything from a purely Christian perspective,” the relevance of biblical teachings were injected as warranted. The general tenor of those evaluating the department was that the emphasis was first placed on getting into the mindset of those in history without judgment, then to overlay the biblical elements.

Most acknowledged that objective four began in HI 300, where professional integrity stressed the choice of quality sources in research. In Dr. Herbst courses, noted one student, success in research meant that the student was “required to give explanations for why our sources were credible.” Another said that they were challenged in “every class to produce the best writing and research a student can produce.” One identified that the variety of belief systems introduced in the curriculum made him “confront issues and bring clarity to my faith.” He believed that this made him a more effective witness for his faith. One other student noted that the department chapels and fellowships/parties helped to build a stronger connection to faculty as mentors and spiritual advisors. This allowed the advising process to be more productive in her estimation. Overall, the students noted that they were “able to see men and women that I respected for their knowledge and hard work pursuing a closer relationship with the Lord and standing strong in their beliefs.”

The fifth objective, generally the highest in commendation, is the focus of research from a variety of sources. As one student said, “Each class employed varying techniques in order to achieve this aim.” One called it a “buffet of primary sources” that became standard work with the selected secondary materials. The most succinct review stated that “source variety enables a more complete knowledge of history, and therefore a more rewarding one.”

All of the students who have completed their capstone stated that the History/Social Science Department fulfilled its objectives in their academic development. In several cases, it was noted in a broader context than just the department’s objectives. One student stated that “through my various classes I not only learned names and dates, but I learned how to study and how to think—skills that will be helpful for the rest of my life.” Another wrote that the History/Social Science Department created a “stimulating atmosphere where debate and discussion was encouraged and differing opinions were explored.” These comments verify to the faculty that outcomes we seek are being instilled into the learners in the program. Life skills of learning and wrestling through perspectives are the hallmark of success in this discipline. One of our transfer students noted that the “close, and sometimes intense, discussion of books helped me to see issues in history from more perspectives in a better way than the State schools could have.”

For most of our students, the turning point in their learning process remains the Seminar course in their sophomore year. One senior said, “Once they [history majors] finish taking History Seminar, they know that they are not to have their own opinion until they have thoroughly researched the topic from scholarly and credible sources.” The placement of the

historian skills course at the sophomore level encourages students to advance towards graduate level work in a safe and nurturing environment. After five or six semesters of utilizing a variety of skills and engaging with colleagues and scholars, our graduates note that they are “leaving the department with the confidence that I have improved as a student, a Christian, and a historian.”

#### **B. Focus Group (March 26, 2008)**

In March, Dr. Rood visited the campus and spent 90 minutes meeting with students of the department without SDCC faculty present (Student minutes of the group session and Dr. Rood’s follow-up email are included as Appendix F in Section Nine). She conducted a guided discussion with some questions that we agreed with her that were essential prompts to cultivate valuable discussion. She also interjected other questions as she determined were useful in her evaluation of the department as an outside reviewer or to flesh out more specific information. Some of that information related to the student’s understanding of professional preparation through their degree program. While the students were quite affirming of the program, they noted that some connection to other institutional societies, job placement, or study abroad programs would enhance the learning. The only shortcoming that targeted the degree program was limited course offerings and the lack of a focus or emphasis. There was also a suggestion to add a research methods course to the curriculum in the upper division.

### **Question #6: At what level of performance are the graduating seniors able to meet each of the department’s learning objectives?**

#### Rationale:

It should be possible to assess the quality of student learning when compared to the outcomes expected by the department’s learning objectives.

#### Factors to Consider:

What has been articulated by the faculty to represent excellence for each of the department’s learning objectives? What assessment activities are utilized with students to determine their learning competencies, in both knowledge and skills? What collections of concrete evidence does the department have to demonstrate the students’ level of competency? What discussion has taken place focused on the level of student learning demonstrated in capstone papers? What recommendations have resulted from those conversations? What improvement has occurred in student learning outcomes as a result of the above recommendations?

#### Possible Assessment Activities:

For each of departmental objectives, at least two categories of information need to be collected. These categories may include:

- analysis of departmental capstone papers
- analysis of outcomes for specific tasks required of all students by time of graduation

## **A. Objective Development and Mastery**

Seminars by Amy Driscoll, Barbara Wright, and others at WASC promoted events have lent usable ideas to our department. These educators have demonstrated that simpler more usable structures of collection and measurement are available for smaller institutions like ours where there are only two full-time faculty members. Using an alignment matrix example from the *Assessment in Learning-Centered Institutions* seminar by Mary Allen, the History/Social Science Department has produced a draft copy of the department's Objectives Curriculum Map (Appendix E). This one-page picture of the department's curriculum lends clarity to the purpose of each course offered in the catalog. As a guideline, the curriculum map intentionally assigns portions of the student's learning program into a specific course which will introduce, develop, or assess mastery of a component in the department's objectives. Therefore, the instructor of a specific course will collect student work in association to prescribed piece of assessment. A course may have several components assigned to it or as little as one, but each course must have a purpose for reaching departmental goals.

## **B. Department Handbook**

As a result of the curriculum map and embedded assessments in courses, the department will need to have a handbook to inform faculty of the requirements in the department on a course by course basis. This handbook is projected for completion as part of the History/Social Science Department Review due by the beginning of the 2008-2009 academic year. More details of this project will be given in Section VIII. (Note: completed as we waited for Dr. Rood's report— included as Appendix I)

## **C. Analysis of Student Work**

In the spring 2007 capstone session and the 2007 orientation session, the department faculty realized that the current state of evidence collection did not satisfy our interests for student mastery. In grading the capstone work for the 2006-2007 academic year, it was obvious that an internship was insufficient as a capstone experience. The department could not make clear identification of learning objective mastery through time given in support of a community organization which enhanced a student's resume. After a time of trying to "beef up" the requirements of the internship, the department decided that the HI 495 Senior Thesis course must be the only capstone for majors. Additionally, there was concern about how the department could demonstrate critical thinking as collected evidence. The department had a matrix, but did not have a location for an assignment to be collected or a rubric for learning criteria. It was determined that those pieces would be resolved and HI 428 Foreign Policy was chosen as course to make a trial run at grading and collection. Another issue that emerged was that the student thesis papers retained bias at an unacceptable level. Greater work on research papers in a developmental way and a stronger scrutiny of source use would be employed to correct this concern. Finally, there was concern over the cultural diversity component of the History/Social Science Department objectives. It was decided that some changes needed to be made to the master schedule of the department to meet this requirement (also reflected in

some restrictions for course choice). Additional checklist items in the master schedule to be completed by the student would include a paper on cultural diversity (collected by faculty) as identified in select courses, along with a service learning requirement to be included in the institutional requirements for student ministry. As a History/Social Science Department major, the student would need to conduct a service learning piece as a part of the SDCC requirements. Finally, it was decided that an additional checklist item or a 12-15 page research paper should also be included and collected by faculty. This would give a third (developmental) component for the research paper between HI 300 and HI 495.

The spring 2008 capstone review included department faculty and the outside reviewer for this report (Dr. Judith Rood, BIOLA). (Notes from the Capstone meeting are included as Appendix G in Section Nine) As noted in her report, "The students' abilities seemed to be similar to students I've taught at Oakland University, Wayne State University, William Tyndale College, and Biola University." This was reinforced to SDCC faculty because Dr. Rood brought along capstone word being completed at BIOLA by their seniors. The project was quite different, but the level of competence was similar. Both SDCC History/Social Science Department majors and similar majors at BIOLA will be adequately prepared to be successful in graduate programs supported by the major.

One of the key goals for the spring meeting was to assess the growth of student success from their sophomore year to their senior year. As this was the first group of graduates whose HI 300 seminar paper was retained for review, we were able to analyze the growth of these majors over the past three years. It was clear that "there is evidence of student growth." (See Appendix G) While this was a first run at this measurement, there will need to be some sort of measuring device created that can demonstrate this growth in a more concrete manner. As is, it is simply an understanding of professional faculty that growth was evident. The key difficulty was that even while using the same rubric, the expectations for student work in the sophomore year is clearly not as rigid as they are in the senior thesis.

One other point came out of the spring meeting. Dr. Rood noted that after looking at the work done for this report, meeting with students in March, and grading papers with faculty that "success in the major depends on the student's adherence to the major from their freshman year, and that students who enter the major later, either as transfers or after changing their major, have more difficulty doing well in the program." The methods used to bring along a freshman student to graduation are clearly in place. More challenging is the ability of the transfer student to make up ground and engage in the learning expectations of the department.

## **Question #7: How well-prepared are the department's graduates**

## **for the skills required in their first position following college?**

### Rationale:

The College Mission Statement implies adequate preparation for employment after graduation.

### Factor to Consider:

What assessment activities can be used to ascertain success in initial employment?

### Possible Assessment Activities:

- Survey graduates of department

The survey given to seniors about to graduate includes a place to identify employment plans or ideas of graduate training, but there is not a specific area to express whether they believed that the program adequately trained them for the first position out of college. The strengths/weaknesses comment section and the additional comments section did not produce a comment that addressed this question. There will be a change to the instrument for next year.

# VII. Alumni Reflection

---

## Question #8

Category: Graduate Follow-up

### How does the department maintain follow-up with graduates?

#### Rationale:

To adequately determine success, the department must maintain short-term and long-term follow-up of its graduates.

#### Factors to Consider:

What immediate follow-up processes are carried out?

What long-term processes are carried out?

How effective are these processes?

#### Possible Assessment Activities:

- Compile an alumni data base in a central place, with a process for consistently and regularly updating information
- Structure a process that consistently follows graduates from SDCC commencement to a point of time post-graduation
- Analyze data available on past graduates

The History/Social Science Department has surveyed its graduates at the time of department reviews. This means that the surveys went out to the 28 people who have made up the student base of this review. Of those 28, the email addresses retained by the institution or the email files of the Chair of the department only reached half of the graduates. Of those, nine completed the survey that was posted utilizing surveymonkey.com. Eight of the nine were male graduates, while every year of the six included graduate lists had at least one response. The survey included sections on general information and satisfaction of the department. The survey was short both to encourage full participation and to refrain from paying the costs needed to post a longer survey. It was deemed satisfactory to have the questions allowed in the “free” version. The survey follows with responses and comments (in boxes), then a response and analysis from a departmental review perspective.

**Page: General Information**

**1. What was your career goal at the time of graduation? What have you done for employment since graduation?**

1. To become a teacher, high school. I finished my credential and have been teaching elementary school.
2. Goal: To continue my education in pursuit of a Doctorate in History. Employment: I am a research analyst for a commercial real estate information service.
3. Graduate school and then teaching in college--since graduation I worked in sales for two years, then graduate school for three and I have been teaching junior high history in Pasadena Unified for 1 year
4. Career goal at the time of graduation was high school social sciences teacher. Since graduation, employment has been high school World History teacher.
5. To pursue a job in teaching, either public High School or Junior High, with a long term goal of attaining a Masters degree in History, teaching in a college or university, and possibly writing books or spending copious amounts of time in historical research. A dream is to be a "resident historian" at some prestigious university, museum, or national park. Since graduating, after applying to every high school district in San Diego county, in addition to private/ Christian school districts, I have not met with any success in the arena of teaching. I have obtained employment at Mission Linen as a driver, and am about to become a father. Teaching seems to be on hold at the moment.
6. I wished to get a doctorate to teach history at the college level.
7. My career goal at graduation was to become a history teacher in middle school. Since graduation, I have worked as a substitute teacher in Cajon Valley Union and Santee School Districts as well as Grossmont Union High School District. I am currently a middle school teacher at Cornerstone Christian School in Poway. I teach 6th, 7th and 8th grade history but I also teach 6th grade English, Art History, cooking, and PE. Our school is closing in June so I will be forced to job search once again.
8. Professor of History. Joined Student Development. Now want to be a college administrator.
9. I wanted to pursue a career in politics and possibly be involved in some area of the law. I worked for a television and radio ministry for a year after graduation. I then attended law school for three years until graduation in '07. I now work as Litigation Counsel for Liberty Counsel- a non-profit legal organization specializing in protecting religious freedoms.

*Department Comments/Analysis:* Career development seems to be a concern for majors who are not focused at the time of graduation. Certainly, the department and SDCC as a whole should make changes to assist graduates with job opportunities. About half of the respondents embarked on a direct track toward life success.

**2. Have you attended graduate school? If so, what kind of program did you enroll into (include desired degree)? If you took standardized tests (GRE, LSAT, etc.), what were your scores?**

1. I have started my masters in Principalship. I did not take the tests.
2. N/A - plan to enter a graduate school program in the Fall. I will likely take the LSAT.
3. Master of Arts in Theology from Fuller Seminary
4. Have not attended graduate school. Going back in the fall for an additional undergraduate degree, to the University of Idaho for a Bachelor's in Accounting.
5. Not yet.
6. Yes. I am enrolled in the Masters of Education (MA Ed) program at Biola University. I took the GRE my junior year of college and remember my scores being around 600. My math score was about 50 points higher than my verbal/writing.
7. I have not begun graduate school yet but I would like to in maybe a year or two.
8. Applying soon. No GRE yet. Wife gets to go first.
9. Yes, I attended law school at Liberty Univ. School of Law in Lynchburg, VA. My LSAT score was 157.

Department Comments/Analysis: The four graduates who entered grad school right out of their degree program graduated in a timely manner, or in the case of an '07 grad, are currently in the program. While several of the other five note some interest in grad school, it seems that a gap in time produces floundering. There seems to be a few here that completed graduate work in a teaching credential program, but do not see that post-degree work as graduate school.

**Page: Satisfaction with Department Training**

**1. How well did the department help you synthesize knowledge of the structure, history and management of human societies?**

89% responded with very well, 11% with quite well, 0% for somewhat well, 0% for not well

1. The profs were the only reason I stayed at the school. I did not care to much for the structure of a lot of aspects of the rest of the school.
2. I was given the opportunity to learn about the differences and similarities of many societies.
3. This is a very strong component the training done by our history department. I find that I am ahead of many of my graduate peers in this aspect.
4. Best class was History 300. Learned to cogently organize work and convey ideas onto paper. Far better English Composition class than Eng 201 was.

Department Comments/Analysis: The comment on being ahead of peers in understanding human societies is valuable.

**2. How well did the department help you possess information literacy, being able to research a variety of viewpoints and sources on a topic and form a compelling argument?**

78% responded with very well, 22% with quite well, 0% for somewhat well or not well

1. It is my practice now - as a student of history - to consider problems from multiple points of view to ensure an informed opinion.
2. The professors of the department continually sought to expose the student to all viewpoints of each specific subject, and taught the value of research in every class. In addition, debating both sides of historical issues was paramount.
3. Research was well integrated, but I have developed much stronger internet research skills in grad school. I am uncertain, however, if this is a personal or departmental problem.
4. Exercises were targeted and organized to have a multi-media approach.
5. In our research assignments we had to conduct much research to submit a quality paper. We were not to merely state our position and back it up, but were also encouraged to find the weaknesses in our position and evaluate those as well.

Department Comments/Analysis: This objective's wording is just changed, so these students had not seen the focus on information literacy. Nevertheless, they responded with overwhelming support of the department in its efforts to reach this objective.

**3. How well did the department help you to appreciate value in viewpoints from a different cultural perspective?**

67% responded with very well, 11% with quite well, 22% with somewhat well, and 0% for not well

1. In my senior thesis - this instruction informed my point of view considerably. In my examination of the International Criminal Court, I was to take into account the ramifications of a patriarchal approach of western society toward world cultures.
2. Cultural history was dealt with in a fair and balanced way, multiple sources were used in research of various cultural topics, and historians from differing cultures were studied.
3. The department was very strong on this though much of what I learned was also due to Fred Blackburn's philosophy classes.
4. The college/department needs a class in Comparative Religion. My own background in this class assisted me far beyond what my contemporaries were capable of. Moreover, religion is one of the four basic points of view. It is a travesty that we do not understand other religions/belief systems as we should.

*Department Comments/Analysis:* The area of cultural perspective for these graduates, though not rated weak, emerges as an area of concern for department faculty. It may be that the support of the practice of covering various cultures needs to be more clearly communicated as a function of the class.

**4. How well did the department help you to develop a biblical perspective to a variety of topics within a diverse society?**

56% responded with very well, 44% with quite well, and 0% for somewhat well or not well

1. My studies helped me to understand the difference between a cultural and a biblical view of truth. The one shortfall was the Women in American History course, the focus of which was feminism rather than the contribution of women in American History. This did not serve to arm me with a more biblical perspective of women's value to our nation.
2. All classes were taught with the end goal being to find the Biblical perspective on history in that context.
3. Well integrated. I feel that I am able to talk intellectually about the Bible and its impact and significance in society.
4. Being a life-long Christian, it was easier for me to develop my biblical perspective. However, those without this background would have been hard-pressed to achieve this.
5. Every lesson, assignment, or conference with a professor, we were always encouraged to find Biblical support for our positions. Also, the professors did a great job of incorporating Biblical truths and principles into the lectures.

*Department Comments/Analysis:* Also a weaker area of support from these graduates, so the department faculty need to be more focused on meeting expectations of objective three. There is one comment here that falls on the choice to use an outside the department faculty member to teach the Women in America course. She did not bring a departmental focus to the topic and several students complained during the semester and still have bad memories about the style of teaching conducted in that course. She is no longer with the institution and Dr. DePriest was able to teach that course the last time it was offered since being out of the administration team

at SDCC.

**5. How well did the department assist your ability to think critically (understanding underlying assumptions in various argumentative perspectives)?**

100% responded with very well, 0% for quite well, somewhat well or not well

1. Though the school's perspective was always overtly stated, they never used the expressed Christian viewpoint as an excuse to exclude the discussion of other ideas. This resulted in a practice of considering other points of view while maintaining a firm foundation.
2. My own assumptions were challenged frequently, in a loving and respectful way, but challenged nonetheless. Subsequently I have a different view than before attending CHC.
3. Another VERY strong component of the SDCC History Department.
4. Being constantly challenged will do this.
5. Dr. De Priest, in particular, made us engage in assignments that would help us think critically. This was a great help in law school.

Department Comments/Analysis: Even the one student who marked every other area with something less than very well marked this as a strength of the department.

**6. How well did the department develop your ability to communicate in an argumentative essay?**

78% responded with very well, 22% with quite well and 0% with somewhat well or not well

1. The class size and face to face discussion inspired me to be better prepared to defend my point of view than I probably would have been in a class of 400, where you're expected to simply absorb what you've been told.
2. I was taught the "although clause" method of developing an argumentative essay, and nothing less than a strong argumentative thesis was accepted.
3. Isn't that all I did? :)
4. I found that the verbal interchanges within class had more effect on my ability to communicate clearly in essays.
5. Again, our assignments could not just be our views or what we thought. We were exhorted to back up all opinions and arguments with objective, dispassionate arguments. This style of writing greatly enhances the credibility of the one writing an essay.

Department Comments/Analysis: Another area where the department focus has been strong.

**7. How well did the department aid your ability to develop your skills in oral communication?**

33% responded with very well, 44% with quite well, 22% with somewhat well, and 0% with not well

1. Though discussion groups were excellent at promoting an ability to present an argument in conversation. The next level of official presentation of an oral argument was not emphasized to the same degree.
2. Every student was required, at some point, to be able to communicate his or her arguments orally. Frequent debates were also encouraged and required.

3. This was a weakness in our department when I graduated. I remember doing well on the written portion of my senior thesis, but my oral presentation of it was abysmal.
4. Again, the discussions were what I remember as my fondest memory. Perhaps this is due to learning style, but the differing points of view were quite instructive.
5. I appreciated all the opportunities we had to develop our oral skills. Whether we were giving our oral history presentations in Mrs. King's class, or leading a class discussion in Dr. DePriest's Constitutional History of America class, we were forced to speak in front of others and cultivate the ability to think on our feet.

*Department Comments/Analysis:* Clearly this was a lower rated component of the survey. The instruction in oral presentation, however, has been a focus over the past two years in the department. We have formulated the Oral Presentation rubric and will be including formal presentation in several more courses. The students also seem to miss the point that oral communication includes the more informal practices of class discussion and leading those discussions.

Overall, the alumni survey for 2008 confirmed most of what the 2003 survey did. There was some new ideas in this survey that resonate with the same concerns that our Focus Group identified, which makes placement and community connection that much more important in the coming years. In some ways, the success of these students correlated to the career focus of the student when at SDCC. Those who were more pensive or laid-back had responses that reflected a personality lacking the motivation needed to create success in life. I do not know if there is a course to instruct those people who could use this instruction.

Finally, the department needs to be more intentional in its updates of where majors go after graduation. Several ideas will be suggested in the next section as improvements in departmental connection with alumni.

# VIII. Departmental Commendations and Improvement Plan

---

## Question #9-10

Category: Departmental Improvements

**What changes or improvements have been made in the departmental program(s) in the past two to five years? What commendations?**

Rationale:

Departments must constantly be self-reflective and sensitive to quality indicators as well as areas needing improvement (based upon data from the previous categories).

Factors to Consider:

What evidence caused the department to make the changes?

How do you know that the changes have improved the program?

Possible Assessment Activities:

- Collect and analyze data relating to changes made in the curriculum, giving evidence of the actual results of the changes
- Survey department students regarding processes and/or procedures
- Monitor changes articulated by professional(s) in the field

**A. Commendations from 2008 Department Review**

1. High Level of Student Satisfaction
2. Strong Student Cohort Group
3. Quality of Student Work
4. Increased Viability of Assessment of Student Achievement
5. Balanced Rigor with Student Connection
6. Alignment with SDCC Mission and Purpose
7. Quality at Notable Cost Efficiency

## B. Recent Changes

- **Development and Implementation of Rubrics from Matrices**

The 2007-2008 changes to rubrics has already demonstrated that consistency in expectations and grading can be more aligned with departmental objectives. In late 2007, the department created five rubrics (Appendix D). The **position paper rubric** was not used in the 2007-2008 academic year, as it was made too late in the fall semester for inclusion with the course materials in American Foreign Policy to test as a grading mechanism. The **book review rubric** was used in that class as a test case. It was only utilized after grading of the book reviews were already completed because of its late development in the semester. Nevertheless, the results were quite enlightening. The grade for the book review using the rubric came out about one half of a grade lower with the standardized guidelines. The faculty noted three pertinent reflections: subjectivity was removed, the rubric promised higher achievement if utilized properly, and teaching of the rubric would be essential for student success. The third rubric, **critical thinking**, was also used in the Foreign Policy class in the final exam. As a suggestion from the Assessment Office of SDCC, the rubric was introduced, trained, and implemented for a take home essay question in this senior level course. The result was more affirming than anything else. As an assignment that emphasized selecting one position over another within a strong argumentative thesis, the students performed quite well on the assignment and within the guidelines of the rubric. This also demonstrated that departmental objectives were being accomplished.

The final two rubrics were implemented as part of the five capstone projects in 2007-2008. For the fall semester, the **research paper rubric** and the **presentation rubric** were used after grading was completed. In both cases, grades were deemed nearly a half a grade lower if the rubric was used. Again, the requirement of teaching the rubric was evident. Therefore, in the spring semester, students who were in the Senior Thesis course were given both of the rubrics and instructed as to the level of expectation for high level achievement. They were told that the rubric would be the basis of the grade given for the thirty page paper and twenty minute presentation of their findings. In the case of the spring semester students, the understanding of the rubric increased aptitude in research and overall presentation of finding, both written and oral. For the oral presentation, two history faculty and one member of the English department graded the students. Other than the need for a comments section and time limit requirements, the rubric was easy to use, not distracting, and even the faculty member who had never seen it before found it simple to use.

The research paper rubric formed the basis of grading for the spring 2008 Senior Theses (3 students). As faculty members met on May 16<sup>th</sup>, several changes were suggested and made to the rubric. Several of these changes correlated to similar issues in other rubrics as well. The included rubrics in Appendix D reflect updated versions based on the noted from the 2008 spring capstone grading session included in Appendix G.

The research paper rubric was also used in the spring American Ethnicities course. Students were introduced to the rubric on the first day of class and instructed on the requirements of a good research paper a few weeks before the paper was due. While the average grade for the assignment was lower than usual for upper division history students, it was not because the students did not understand the rubric. In my assessment, the rubric did increase the focus of the work on thesis and organization. Therefore, it did its task. The problem, in this case, was that the students as a whole neglected to utilize their primary sources in the significant way that they were directed.

Overall, the five new rubrics allow for some focused uniformity in departmental assignments. These five represent only the beginning for the department, and they can be used as the basis of other assignments that faculty give. For example, we all use class discussion as a graded component of most courses. Hence, a rubric for class discussion should be created for better communication and consistent expectations. The other advantage of these rubrics is that they can be attached to assignments and retained as evidence of student outcomes. In this way, the History/Social Science Department maintains its compliance with current trends in higher education and provides evidence for its own program achievements as well as that of SDCC.

- **Addition of Curriculum Map**

Throughout this year, the History/Social Science Department has been seeking a device to organize curriculum in a simple form for departmental communication. At the January WASC Student Outcomes conference in Irvine, the idea of a curriculum map was given as a means to see course and objective development. With some reconfiguring and an analysis of the most recent syllabi for each course, the department has completed a curriculum map that establishes the place of introduction of an objective component, the courses that develop that component, and where the department will measure mastery of it. This curriculum map will become the basis of a Department Handbook that will be available for Orientation in August 2008. (Appendix E)

Several changes occurred in the process of making the curriculum map. First, the department had to identify skills associated with the objectives listed in for student outcomes. This finished off any remnant use of the old matrices and led the department to identify eleven skills that should be measured as benchmarks for success. These are placed at the top of the map, which then correlate to the courses which advance training in that area. Where the rubrics are utilized in areas, there is a notation of their use. In each of the eleven subject areas, the letters I (Introduction), D (Development), and M (Mastery) are used to denote department curriculum design for student outcomes. While the capstone project measures mastery in seven of the eleven areas, the department had to identify courses where mastery could be measured in the senior year for four categories: cultural diversity, critical thinking, biblical integration, and Christian living. These categories will require a more purposeful plan for the courses

offered each year in order to collect student work that demonstrates mastery level of achievement in these areas. Some of this will change how assessment is conducted in the department. The new curriculum map will also lead to a more specific checklist for student completion of their degree program. The Chair of the department will work with the Registrar to see if the current "master schedule" for History/Social Science Department majors can be adjusted to contain all the information that will be needed to measure the completion of a more specific checklist for graduation.

- **Professional Development and Learning**

During the past year, Kathy King went to two conferences, conducted an interview panel and began her first steps toward the completion of a Ph.D. Jon DePriest finished the publication of his first book, wrote book reviews for journals for the first time, and had a lead article published in the *Evangelical Review of Society and Politics*. The article has been picked up as a chapter in a 2008 release of an edited book on religion and foreign policy. The high level of activity over the past year has led to a heightened level of scholarly engagement between faculty and department majors. It is clear that such activity needs to be promoted and supported as a department and an institution. It should also lead to more student research production worthy of outside consideration. Finally, it could become the basis of faculty/student contributions in the discipline with some intentional structuring and an early identification of quality majors who would come along side the work of individual faculty.

**C. New Implementations for 2008-2009**

- **Promotion of CCCU Study Abroad Programs**

The use of an outside reviewer and the March Focus Group has led to some specific steps to improve the History/Social Science Department. One of the first areas that can be promoted for a broader learning experience is that the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities has approved programs for students interested in studying abroad. These programs make it easier for students who have an interest in a semester or a summer learning experience in another country to make that a reality. Some of the increased interest on the topic has developed as the Business Department at SDCC has now conducted about four years of self-directed trips to foreign countries. While they should be commended for their commitment to the value of this learning experience, the CCCU allows all departments (even those of us who do not want to deal with all the details of the trip) to make learning abroad a reality for our students. As part of the departmental chapel in the fall semester, the faculty will bring materials to students so that they can plan for this opportunity.

- **Enhancing a Richer Learning Community**

While Dr. Rood was impressed with the quality of student at SDCC, she noted some areas that could enhance the learning community. One idea was to initiate a chapter of Phi Alpha Theta at San Diego Christian College. This would connect our students to history majors from across the country and around the world. It would also be a way to develop departmental leadership and even leadership outside the institution. Another step she noted was that the SDCC History/Social Science Department could connect students to presentation conferences like the Conference on Faith and History, which has a regional conference in Southern California on an annual basis. The first day of this conference is usually reserved for undergraduate and graduate student paper presentations. Another connection point would be to be more intentional to promote academic events from other local colleges and universities. This would build both interest in student research and relationships with fellow institutions. Finally, Dr. Rood suggested that incentives should be established for quality presentations of papers. This could take the form of prizes within the department and/or promotion on the website.

- **Building Connections on Campus**

Several challenges on campus were noted as areas that could be improved. For most students, two seemed to be lacking that would assist their development into and out of the program. To aid the initial connection to the department, students suggested that a mentor program be established. In this program, an upper division student would be assigned to help an incoming freshman or transfer student as they began their time at SDCC. On the other end, the students stated that their next steps after graduation were not well supported by the institution. Two options have been suggested: one is to make the career center more usable for placement, and if that does not happen, then the department should make a resource for students that can serve as a guide for local libraries, universities, businesses and graduate schools where they can take their next steps. Much of this could be posted on the department web pages so that all alumni could access the information in any time of transition.

- **Develop and Distribute Department Handbook**

Because of the findings of this program review, the History/Social Science Department will need to have a more accessible means to distribute findings and action plans. Most of the attention will be found in a five-year plan to fulfill the curriculum map. In order to have all faculty in the department (full-time and adjunct) contribute fully to the plan, a handbook needs to be established and distributed by the fall orientation of 2008. This handbook should have a short section that gives an overview of the findings of this report, then a larger and more detailed section on the functions of the curriculum map. Each course in the curriculum should have a one-page layout of its place in the curriculum and the requirements of that course for instruction and student work collection for program review.

**D. Recommendations and Action Plans for 2013 Department Review**

- **Annual Assessment of Individual Department Objective**

While the SDCC Assessment Office has established an annual capstone review and a revolving five-year program review plan, the History/Social Science Department believes that an additional step is needed to level out the burden of the program review year. In order to be more intentional and focus attention on student achievement by area, it is suggested that one of the four objective skill areas be included for collection and measurement each year. Along with the focus on the capstone's seven objective areas, this will become a foundational element of measurement for the program review of 2013. To accomplish this, the department should offer such courses as they correspond to the objective skill being scrutinized that year. Here is a suggested course offering pattern:

First Year after Review	2008-2009	Christian Living	HI 317, 424
Second Year after Review	2009-2010	Biblical Integration	HI 309, 314, 412, 422
Third Year after Review	2010-2011	Critical Thinking	HI 315, 410, 428
Fourth Year after Review	2011-2012	Cultural Diversity	HI 316, 317, 418, 424
Program Review Year	2012-2013		

- **Increased Connection to Alumni**

While this review focused on curriculum and assessment, the most disappointing portion of the work was the lack of alumni connection. Even in the last five years, the Empower database's addresses and emails for alumni was sorely insufficient. There seems to have been a better listing of graduates since 2006, but even those had less than 50% accuracy. The best idea that the department has is to have a better presence on the website with alumni. A "spotlight" section and other alumni news should be updated monthly. This would take more time than is usually possible in the middle of a semester, but something that would be attractive to graduates looking for news on their friends. Another possibility would be to have quarterly email news that goes out to alumni and students in the department and is posted on the web. The email listing could help in keeping up with changes.

- **Department Review Report from Judith Rood, Ph.D. (Biola University)**

(Full Report of Department Review included as Appendix H in Section Nine)

- **Assignments and Timeline for Next Steps**

Item	Timeline	Who?	Budget
------	----------	------	--------

1.	Support Kathy King to get Ph.D.	4-5 years	Chair and AVP	\$4-9,000/yr
2.	Increase majors through promotion	Immediately	Chair	Time
3.	Complete Department Handbook	Summer '08	Chair	Time
4.	Inform Students on Study Abroad	Fall '08	Chair	Time
5.	Begin Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta	2008-2009	Dept. faculty	Unknown
6.	Connect with Conf. on Faith/History	2008-2009	Dept. faculty	Unknown
7.	Promote local academic events	2008-2009	Dept. faculty	Time
8.	Begin mentor program	2008-2009	Dept. faculty	Time
9.	Increase placement function at SDCC	Unknown	Chair/others	Unknown
10.	Make career resource guide	2009-2010	Chair	Time
11.	Plan/assess annual objective skill	2008-2009	Chair	Time
12.	Create Alumni Spotlight Section	Summer '08	Chair	Time
13.	Make Department Quarterly	Fall '08	Chair	Time

While it should be noted that each of these thirteen items are worthwhile for department growth and development, resource limitations tend to be targeted in the area of time. With only two full-time faculty members, the above list seems more excessive than can be covered in a regular load. The department chair expectation has increased greatly with the student outcomes piece in the past few years and this review suggests a more active collection process than has even been used at SDCC. Unfortunately, the stipend for department chairs has not changed in the fifteen years that I have been a chair. While it is certain that some chairs may only be worth the current pay, maybe there should be a sliding scale developed that looks at load and pay for a department that looks to be a trendsetter in advancing institutional purposes like assessing student work. Of greater concern is the reduced time available for this department to continue to contribute in scholarship or advance in degree programs. This review suggests that a thorough discussion with SDCC administration should be made to identify items of greater importance and those worth load reduction or an increase in pay.