Academic Program
Review **BA Social Science**

Table of Contents

APROC Recommendation to Faculty Senate
BA Social Science
12/15/2021

The Academic Program Review Oversight Committee (APROC) affirms that the Social Science has completed program review as per policy, including self-study, external review, internal review, and action plan submission for the BA Social Science. APROC recommends that the next program review be scheduled for six years from Faculty Senate approval; or should the College of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Studies decide to schedule a college-wide program review, the next program review will occur at that time.

APROC Chair: Jeffrey Brodd, Professor of Humanities and Religious Studies

Social Science Program Review
Spring 2020
Timothy P. Fong
Director, Social Science Program

Reviewed by:
Jeffery Wilson, Department of History
Chloe Burke, Department of History
James Cox, Department of Political Science
Tom Krabacher, Department of Geography
Brittany Bass, Department of Economics
Amy Liu, Academic Program Assessment

Program History:

Social Science was one of the original majors when Sacramento State College opened its doors in 1947. The major consisted of 36 units broadly distributed in various departments such as anthropology, economics, history, government, psychology, and sociology. Since its inception, the Social Science was the major for students interested in securing what was then the General Secondary Credential. Although the Social Science program provides the undergraduate content prior to earning a teacher credential, the program has always provided an opportunity for students to build on the foundation of their general education and become familiar with several areas in the Social Sciences.

 By 1958, the Social Science major increased to 40 units. The major also offered four lower-division courses, all fulfilling General Education requirements, three upper-division courses, and five graduate-level courses. In 1960 the Social Science program included a major, three minors (Secondary School, Elementary School, and General/Non-Teaching), as well as a new Master of Art degree with a Specialization in Social Sciences. In 1965, the Social Science program began offering its 21-9-9 major requirement pattern where a student would take 21 units in one discipline and 9 units in two other disciplines.

Around this time was greater attention to the preparation of prospective teachers. This began with the Licensing and Certificated Personnel Law of 1961, the Fisher Act, is the foundation for the preparation for prospective primary school teacher (K-12). Requirements from this legislation called for all teacher candidates, both elementary and secondary, to complete a year of post-baccalaureate study, a "fifth year," for full certification. In addition, all candidates, both elementary and secondary, were to complete an "academic" undergraduate major in their teaching field consisting of a subject matter major appropriate for teaching. (Inglis, p. 54)

The most important legislation came with the Ryan Act (1970), which was a response to complaints about the inconsistencies in college-level education courses. The Ryan Act created an independent agency, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). The

CCTC became responsible for setting the standards for public school educator preparation, accrediting the programs that offer it, licensing educators, and, when necessary, disciplining license holders. The legislation also created the terms "multiple subjects" for teachers who teach many subjects to a single group of students in a self-contained classroom, and "single subject" for teachers to teach a single content to changing groups of students throughout the school day. (Inglis,143-145)

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing began establishing rigorous and highly prescriptive standards for the content in an approved subject matter program. As a result, the 21-9-9 plan came to an end of the 1988 and replaced by a CCTC approved curriculum that is the core of what is in place today. The Social Science program also discontinued its Master of Art degree. The last CCTC review and approval of the Social Science curriculum came in 2004.

The Social Science Program Requirements:

The current Social Science undergraduate curriculum is 60 units. For all students there are Core Requirements (45 units) and Electives (15 units). In addition to the core curriculum for the major, students who want to become Social Science teachers take an additional 14 units that are pre-requisites before entering the Teacher Credential program.

Program Requirements

Code	Title	Units
CORE REQUIREMENTS (45 UNITS)		
ECON 1A	Introduction to Macroeconomic Analysis [1]	3
ECON 1B	Introduction to Microeconomic Analysis [1]	3
ECON 113	Economic History of the United States	3
GEOG 100	Themes In World Geography	3
GEOG 121	United States and Canada	3
HIST 17A	United States History, 1607-1877 [1]	3
HIST 17B	United States History, 1877-Present [1]	3
HIST 50	World Civilizations, Beginnings-1600 [1]	3
HIST 51	World History from 1500 to the Present. [1]	3
HIST 100	Introduction to Historical Skills	3
HIST 133	Twentieth-Century World History	3
HIST 183B	California History, 1860-1970	3
POLS 1	Essentials Of Government [1]	3
or POLS 150	American Governments [1]	

Code	Title	Units
POLS 35	World Politics	3
POLS 180	California State and Local Government [1]	3
ELECTIVES (15 UNITS)		
Select one of the following (National Perspective, History):		3
HIST 150	Colonial America	
HIST 151	The Age of the American Revolution	
HIST 152	Young Republic, 1790-1840	
HIST 153	Civil War and Reconstruction, 1840-1890	
HIST 154	20th Century United States, 1890-1940	
HIST 155	20th Century United States, 1941-Present	
HIST 156	The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage	
HIST 157	History of International Relations in the 20th Century	
HIST 159	History of US Foreign Relations	
HIST 160	The United States in Vietnam, 1940-1975	
HIST 162	Social History of the United States	
HIST 163	The City in US History	
HIST 167	History of American Women	
HIST/HRS 168	Images Of America	
HIST 173	The History of the Civil Rights Movement: From Reconstruction to Deconstruction, 1865-Present	
HIST 177	The African-American Experience, 1603-Present	
HIST 178	Mexican-American History	
Select one of the following (National Perspective, other Social Sciences):		3
ANTH 101	Cultural Diversity	
ANTH 135	Indians of North America	
ECON 152	Economics of Education	
ECON 181	Economics of Racism	
ECON 184	Women and the Economy	
ECON 189	Economics at the Movies	

Code	Title	Units
ETHN 100	Ethnic America	
ETHN 131	La Raza Studies	
ETHN 140	Native American Experience	
ETHN 170	Pan African Studies	
POLS 112	Current Political Thought	
POLS 153	The American Presidency	
POLS 155	The Legislative Process	
POLS 165	Politics of the Underrepresented	
SOC 120	Ethnic and Race Relations	
SOC 125	Social Inequalities	
SOC 135	Sociology of Popular Culture	
Select one of the following (World Perspectives, History):		3
HIST 109	History of Modern Greece	
HIST 103	Mediterranean Europe: From the Renaissance to the European Union	
HIST 117	Europe, 1815-1914	
HIST 118A	World War I: Causes, Conduct, Consequences	
HIST 118B	World War II: Causes, Conduct, Consequences	
HIST 119	Europe Since 1945	
HIST 122B	History of Women in Western Civilization, Renaissance-Present	
HIST 125	Modern Germany, 1806-Present	
HIST 128C	British History, 1714-Present	
HIST 129C	Twentieth Century Russia	
HIST 130	The Fall Of Communism	
HIST 135A	History Of Mexico To 1910	
HIST 135B	Revolutionary and Modern Mexico	
HIST 138A	Colonial Latin America	
HIST 138B	Modern and Contemporary Latin America	

Code	Title	Units
HIST 141	History of Africa Since 1800	
HIST 142	History of Women in Africa	
HIST 143B	The Modern Middle East	
HIST 146B	Modern Japan, 1800-present	
HIST 148B	China, 1600 to Present	
Select one of the following (World Perspectives, other Social Sciences):		3
ANTH 102	The Nature of Culture	
ANTH 121	Archaeology of Mexico	
ANTH 143	Culture and Society in Mexico	
ANTH 145	Peoples and Cultures of Latin America	
ANTH 149	Cultures of South Asia	
ECON 112	European Economic History	
ECON 190	International Trade	
ECON 192	International Finance	
ECON 193	Development Economics	
GEOG 127	Geography Of Africa	
GEOG 128	Geography Of Europe	
GEOG 145	Population Geography	
POLS 130	International Politics	
POLS 142	Government and Politics in Africa	
POLS 144	European Politics	
POLS 147	Latin American Government and Politics	
POLS 148	Governments and Politics in the Middle East	
SOC 160	Asian Societies	
SOC 162	Middle Eastern Societies and Culture	
SOC 164	Sociology of Globalization	
Select one of the following (State Perspective):		3
ANTH 128	Indians of California	

Code	Title	Units
ECON 114	The California Economy	
ETHN 110	The Asian American Experience	
ETHN 130	Chicano/Mexican-American Experience	
GEOG 131	California	
HIST 185	California Indian History	
SOC 118	Chicano Community	
TOTAL UNITS		**60**

[1] Course also satisfies General Education (GE)/Graduation Requirement.

ADDITIONAL PRE-CREDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS (14 UNITS)		
EDUC 100A	Educating Students with Disabilities in Inclusive Settings	2
EDUC 100B	Educating Students with Disabilities in Inclusive Settings Lab	1
EDUC 170	Bilingual Education: Introduction to Educating English Learners	3
HLSC 136	School Health Education	2
SSCI 193	Integrating History and Social Science	3
Select one of the following (ethical perspective):		3
HRS 4	Exploring World Religions	
PHIL 2	Ethics	
PHIL 100	Ethics and Personal Values	
PHIL 101	Ethics and Social Issues	

Special Features

- The program provides an opportunity for students to build on the foundation of general education and become familiar with several areas in the Social Sciences. A Social Science major is excellent background for advanced graduate studies and in professional careers. Non-credential students need not complete the pre-credential professional education coursework, and elective courses are available to complete the 120-unit Bachelor of Arts degree.

- The Social Science program works closely with the Career Center and the California Interns Network to support internship opportunities that will enhance future professional development and employment for those not planning a teaching career.

- Through the Social Science major, graduates will also earn a 24 unit minor in History. Formal submission of a Minor Degree Application is required.

- Social Science majors can also earn a minor in other disciplines including Economics, Ethnic Studies, Geography, Political Science and more. Additional specialized advising is required in these cases.

- Graduates of the Social Science program have distinguished leadership careers in government service, public policy, politics, business, K-12, education, higher education administration, law, law enforcement, counseling, community service, and military service. Several Social Science majors (including two former mayors of Sacramento) are inductees into the College of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Studies Academy of Distinction and Honor.

- The Social Science program works closely with the Career Center on campus to provide proactive and comprehensive career services to students through: career development, experiential learning, on-campus recruitment, and employer relations.

- A Roadmap for majors wanting to pursue a career in teaching are on the Social Science website: https://www.csus.edu/college/social-sciences-interdisciplinary-studies/social-science/_internal/_documents/4yrssci_precred_jan2019.pdf

- A Roadmap is also available for majors who do not want to enter the teaching profession: https://www.csus.edu/college/social-sciences-interdisciplinary-studies/social-science/_internal/_documents/4yrssci_baonly_jan2019.pdf

List of Learning Outcomes:

The Social Science program has Learning Outcomes that aligned with both Sacramento State's Baccalaureate Learning Goals and the California Department of Education's History-Social Framework Goals and Curriculum Strands. This information is readily accessible on the Social Science website.

Social Science Assessment Plan
Aligned Social Science and Sacramento State Learning Outcomes

Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals	History-Social Science Framework Goals and Curriculum Strands*	Social Science Learning Outcomes	Where SSCI SLOs are Measured
1. Competence in the Discipline	1. Knowledge and Cultural Understanding: 1.1 Historical Literacy 1.2 Geographic Literacy 1.3. Economic Literacy 1.4 Socio-Political Literacy	1. Synthesize fundamentals of interdisciplinary approaches as the basis for competence for high school-middle school teaching and learning.	Measured throughout the interdisciplinary program in the disciplines of History, Government, Geography, and Economics. Measuring competency in the disciplines is through specific assignments required in the Capstone Course SSCI 193 (Integrating History-Social Science) e-portfolio. In addition, measuring competency in the disciplines is through the passage of the Single Subject California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET). The CSET is require of all prospective teachers who do not major in a social science waiver program or who fail SSCI 193.
2. Intellectual and Practical Skills:	2. Skills Attainment/ Social Participation:	2. Demonstrate intellectual and practical skills:	Measuring all core competencies (2.1-2.5) is through specific assignments required

8

2.1 Critical Thinking 2.2 Information Literacy 2.3 Written Communication 2.4 Oral Communication 2.5 Inquiry and Analysis	2.1 Basic Study Skills 2.2 Critical Thinking Skills 2.3 Participation Skills	2.1 Critical Thinking 2.2 Information Literacy 2.3 Written Communication 2.4 Oral Communication 2.5 Inquiry and Analysis	in the Capstone Course SSCI 193 e-portfolio.
3. Personal and Social Responsibility 3.1 Civic knowledge and engagement 3.2 Intercultural knowledge and competence	3. Democratic Understanding and Civic Values	3. Apply personal and social responsibility 3.1 Civic knowledge and engagement 3.2 Intercultural knowledge and competence	Measured through specific assignments required in the Capstone Course.
4. Integrated Studies	4. Integration	4. Synthesize integration of studies	All students in SSCI 193 are required to submit materials on an e-portfolio and provide evidence of his/her competency in the social sciences (history, government, geography and economics) as mandated by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards and the *History-Social Science Framework.* Students were also required to develop detailed

| | | | lesson plans integrating interdisciplinary approaches to teaching and learning.

All students in SSCI 193 want to be high school/ middle school teachers. Some students already have provisional acceptance to the teacher credential program at Sacramento State before completing SSCI 193. Students that successful completion of SSCI 193 are formally eligible to continue in the teacher credential program.

Students who received a 1 score were not considered subject matter competent. These students will not be eligible to enter a teacher credential program. If the student is already has provisional acceptance into a teacher credential program, he or she would not be allowed to complete the teacher credential program unless they either repeat SSCI 193 or pass the single subject California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET). |
|---|---|---|---|

*See http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/histsocsciframe.pdf

Summary of the types of assessment for Learning Outcomes

The annual Social Science assessment reports and review comments have shown dramatic improvement in the last several years.

2018-2019 Writing
Submitted July 1, 2019

2017-2018 Oral Communication
Commendations:
The program has continued its effort to improve the assessment and student learning and is commended for addressing the following areas well:
Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:
- Specified PLOs.
- Demonstrated alignment of PLOs with University BLGs and accrediting standards.
Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:
- Used direct measure of student learning.
- Provided the prompt for the measure.
- Modified nationally recognized VALUE rubrics to measure student learning.
Standards of Performance at Graduation:
- Specified a standard of performance defined as the percentage of students performing at a specific level.
Data Collection and Presentation:
- Sampled full student population.
- Presented data in clear, easy-to-read data table.
- Provided analysis of standard of performance.
Use of Assessment Data:
- Used assessment data from last year to meet accreditation standards.
- Used feedback from OAPA to shape assessment process.

Recommendations:
As the program continues its annual assessment efforts we encourage it to pay attention to the following areas:
Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:
- We strongly recommend that the program assess a different PLO next year after 2 years of assessing this PLO. All of the PLOs should be assessed by the time program review is due. Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:
- It is not clear if the students receive the VALUE rubric before working on the portfolio. It would probably be useful if the students knew the criteria that their work is being judged by.
Use of Assessment Data:
- Because one criterion has been the lowest two years running, we recommend that the program questions whether this skill is being explicitly taught in the program, or if students need more practice and feedback in applying this skill.

2016-2017 Integrated and Applied Learning

Commendations:

The program has continued its effort to improve the assessment and student learning and is commended for addressing the following areas well:

Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:
- Specified PLOs.
- Demonstrated alignment of PLOs with University BLGs and accrediting standards.

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:
- Used direct measure of student learning.
- Provided the prompt for the measure.
- Modified nationally recognized VALUE rubrics to measure student learning. Standards of Performance at Graduation:
- Specified a standard of performance defined as the percentage of students performing at a specific level.

Data Collection and Presentation:
- Sampled full student population.
- Presented data in clear, easy-to-read data table.
- Provided analysis of standard of performance.

Use of Assessment Data:
- Used assessment data from last year to meet accreditation standards.
- Used feedback from OAPA to shape assessment process.

Recommendations:

As the program continues its annual assessment efforts we encourage it to pay attention to the following areas:

Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:
- We strongly recommend that the program assess a different PLO next year after 2 years of assessing this PLO. All of the PLOs should be assessed by the time program review is due.

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:
- It is not clear if the students receive the VALUE rubric before working on the portfolio. It would probably be useful if the students knew the criteria that their work is being judged by.

Use of Assessment Data:
- Because one criterion has been the lowest two years running, we recommend that the program questions whether this skill is being explicitly taught in the program, or if students need more practice and feedback in applying this skill

2015-2016 Integrated and Applied Learning

Commendations:

The program has used feedback from the Office of Academic Program Assessment to make an excellent start on designing a new assessment plan and beginning to measure student learning. The progress over a single year is quite impressive, and the program is commended for addressing the following areas well:

Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:
- Specified PLOs and aligned them to both BLGs and relevant education standards.

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:
- Adapted VALUE rubric.

Standards of Performance at Graduation:
- Set program standard of performance (80% of students will score 2 or above; 60% will score 3 or above.)

Data Collection and Presentation:
- Presented data in clear, easy-to-read table organized by percentage of students scoring at each level of the rubric. – Provided useful data analysis.

Use of Assessment Data:
- Used assessment results as evidence of subject matter competence for students.

Recommendations:
As the program continues its annual assessment efforts we encourage it to pay attention to the following areas:

Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:
- Specify the details of the PLOs as they apply to these students in this program. For example, what should Written Communication mean for students in this program?

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:
- Provide the prompt for the direct measure (the e-portfolio and lesson plan assignment).

Use of Assessment Data:
- Plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making.

Summary:
- Use your curriculum map to help students develop their roadmaps (academic plan) for the degree, so that their roadmap to the degree is explicitly linked to student learning (annual program assessment and 6-year program review), PLOs (program learning outcomes), advising, and the mission of the program and the university.

2014-2015 Integrated and Applied Learning
Commendations:
None

Recommendations:
As the program continues its annual assessment efforts we encourage it to:

Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:
- Specify how these PLOs are able to demonstrate the meaning, quality, integrity and uniqueness of the degree program.
- Define what integrative learning means in the context of this program. While students in Social Science learn about several disciplines, this does not automatically mean that the students are in fact integrating the knowledge from those different disciplines. What do students in Social Science do that uses concepts, skills and information from across at least two disciplines?

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:
- The report was confusing as to what the program considers to be the direct measures, and what an indirect measure is. The data provided is all about graduation rates. This is an indirect measure, in that it is not directly assessing what students are learning. We did not see any data from direct measures reported.

- The program needs to find a way to use direct measures of student learning. We realize that this is challenging for a program like Social Science that depends upon other departments for its coursework. Consider identifying a few key classes and collaborate with those instructors to collect direct evidence of student learning.
- The indirect measure of graduation rates does not explicitly align with the PLO chosen, Integrative Learning. The graduation rate only shows that students have been successful in passing courses in many disciplines. Graduation rate, while important, is not a very useful measure for instructional improvement in that it does not point to the areas for improvement in the program.

Standards of Performance at Graduation:
- Develop explicit standards of performance for all assessment tools and PLOs, and report the percentages of students who meet these standards at graduation.
- Include PLOs, rubrics, and standards of performance by graduation: in all course syllabi and catalogs for the program that claims to introduce/develop/master the PLOs.

Data Collection and Presentation:
- Ultimately the program should be aiming to collect evidence of student learning through direct measures, setting a standard of performance for that measure (e.g., 70% of students will perform at level 3 or above in the Critical Thinking VALUE rubric), and reporting the data as percentages of students performing at each level of the rubric (or other evaluative tool).

Use of Assessment Data:
- Use assessment data and feedback from the Office of Academic Program Assessment to update the assessment plan and improve student learning.
- Think about who is going to use the assessment data, and conduct follow-up assessments to see if any changes have significantly improved student learning.

2013-2014 Written Communication
Commendations:
The program has made improvement in its program assessment, has spotted areas of self-improvement, and used the feedback from the 2012-2013 assessment report. The program is commended for addressing the following areas well:
Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:
- Aligned PLOs with the mission and vision of the university and the academic unit.

 Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:
- Adopted nationally developed VALUE rubrics to explicitly assess student complex skills and values.
- Used a portfolio and reflection essays as direct measures to assess student learning outcomes.
- Used capstone project to directly assess student learning outcomes at graduation.

Recommendations:
As the program continues its annual assessment efforts we encourage it to:
Program Learning Outcomes and their Alignment:

- Specify how these PLOs are able to demonstrate the meaning, quality, integrity and uniqueness of the degree program.

Measures, Rubrics and their Alignment:
- Please provide the rubric next time.
- Make sure the rubrics used to evaluate/assess student work align directly and explicitly with PLOs and key assignments.
- Use curriculum maps to make sure key assignments/projects directly and explicitly assess all dimensions of PLOs.

Standards of Performance at Graduation:
- Develop explicit standards of performance for all assessment tools and PLOs, and report the percentages of students who meet these standards at graduation.
- Include PLOs, rubrics, and standards of performance by graduation: in all course syllabi and catalogs for the program that claims to introduce/develop/master the PLOs.

Data Collection and Presentation:
- Make sure the data collected is reliable and valid, and the data presented is simple and clear for the faculty and the general public to interpret.

Use of Assessment Data:
- Use assessment data and feedback from the Office of Academic Program Assessment to update the assessment plan and improve student learning.
- Think about who is going to use the assessment data, and conduct follow-up assessments to see if any changes have significantly improved student learning.

<u>2012-2013 No assessment report submitted</u>

General Recommendations:

As we move forward with our assessment, we would strongly encourage all academic units to:

1. Clearly articulate the program learning outcomes (PLOs): What students should know, value, and be able to do at or near graduation.
2. Align these outcomes with the missions and visions of the university and the academic unit.
3. Specify how these PLOs (together with the standards of performance at graduation) are able to demonstrate the meaning, quality, integrity and uniqueness of the degree program.
4. Use backward design, curriculum maps, and PLOs/VALUE rubrics to demonstrate explicitly where learning (introduced, developed, and applied/mastered) and assessment (such as activities and assignments) occur in the curriculum and co-curriculum for each learning outcome.
5. Include professional accreditation standards and the University Baccalaureate Learning Goals, such as critical thinking, information competency, oral communication, written communication, and quantitative reasoning (the 5 WASC core competencies) in the PLOs.

6. Develop/adopt program learning outcomes directly from The Degree Qualifications Profile (http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf) so there are clear distinctions and connections among associate, graduate, and undergraduate expectations. (Measures, Rubrics and Their Alignment)

7. Adopt nationally developed rubrics such as the 16 VALUE rubrics (http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index_p.cfm?CFID=41012296&CFTOKEN=24714954) to explicitly assess student complex skills and values.

8. Make sure that the rubric(s) used in any course(s) to evaluate/assess student work (projects, papers, and key assignments) align directly and explicitly with program learning outcome(s) and the key assignment(s).

9. Use curriculum maps to make sure key assignments/projects or survey questions directly and explicitly assess all dimensions of the program learning outcome(s).

10. Use direct measures to assess student learning outcomes. (Standards of Performance at Graduation)

11. Develop explicit standards of performance for all assessment tools and program learning outcomes and report the percentages of students who meet these standards at graduation.

12. Include program learning outcomes, rubrics, and standards of performance at graduation in all course syllabi and catalogs so everyone, including students, faculty, and the general public, would know them. (Data Collection and Presentation)

13. Make sure the data collected is reliable and valid.

14. Make sure the data presented is simple and clear for the faculty and the general public to understand.

15. Use capstone course(s)/projects to directly assess student learning outcomes at graduation.

16. Use external benchmarking data, including national/statewide/professional exams, for assessment.

17. Use student self-reflection to assess student learning outcomes.

18. Collect basic information so the program would know the major classes students have taken and how many students from a particular class, such as the capstone class, are in the major.

19. Collect the number of units students have taken so far so the program would know this information.

20. Collect any other key social and demographic data about the students, so the program would have a better understanding of students' background and their learning. (Use of Assessment Data)

21. Use assessment data and feedback from the Office of Academic Program Assessment to update the assessment plan and improve student learning, assessment, curriculum, planning, and budgeting.

22. Use curriculum maps to show how the whole curriculum (not just the course where the data is collected) plans to improve the specific learning outcome(s) assessed the previous year.
23. Think about who is going to use the assessment data.
24. Conduct follow-up assessments to see if any changes have significantly improved student learning.

Summary Data/Retention and Graduation:

Number of Majors

Social Science Majors					
2014 Fa/Sp	2015 Fa/Sp	2016 Fa/Sp	2017 Fa/Sp	2018 Fa/Sp	2019 Fa/Sp
113/116	120/117	129/114	154/141	117/141	94/117

Source: CSU Student Success Dashboard

https://csusuccess.dashboards.calstate.edu/public/faculty-dashboard

Retention

One-Year Retention Rates for First-Time Freshman						
	2011 N=8	2012 N=6	2013 N=8	2014 N=12	2015 N=16	2016* N<10
SOCSCI	88%	50%	88%	83%	88%	NA
College	82%	83%	84%	84%	79%	83%
University	81%	82%	82%	80%	81%	84%

One-Year Retention Rates for Transfers							
	2011 N=25	2012 N=23	2013 N=32	2014 N=18	2015 N=13	2016* N=10	2017* N=12
SOCSCI	76%	78%	78%	83%	85%	80%	95%
College	85%	85%	88%	89%	86%	87%	90%
University	86%	85%	87%	88%	89%	89%	89%

Source: *Department Factbook*, Fall 2017

https://www.csus.edu/president/institutional-research-effectiveness-planning/factbooks/socialsciences17.pdf

*CSU Student Success Dashboard

https://csusuccess.dashboards.calstate.edu/public/faculty-dashboard

Graduation

4-Year Graduation Rates for First-Time Freshman					
	2010 N=11	2011 N=8	2012 N=6	2013* N=8	2014* N=12	2015* N=16
SOCSCI	27%	25%	17%	50%	17%	19%
College	13%	14%	14%	17%	23%	28%
University	9%	8%	9%	12.7%	15%	20%

6-Year Graduation Rates for First-Time Freshman					
	2008	2009	2010	2011*	2012*	2013*
SOCSCI	63%	40%	64%	NA	NA	NA
College	49%	54%	54%	53	50	58%
University	43%	46%	48%	48	36	55%

2-Year Graduation Rate for Transfers					
	2012 N=23	2013 N=32	2014 N=18	2015* N=12	2016* N=25	2017* N=21
SOCSCI	26%	22%	28%	25%	28%	33%
College	26%	32%	32%	37%	42%	45%
University	24%	26%	27%	35%	37%	42%

4-Year Graduation Rates for Transfers					
	2010	2011	2012	2013*	2014*	2015*
SOCSCI	94%	72%	70%	75%	59%	67%
College	75%	75%	72%	74%	74%	78%
University	71%	71%	70%	71%	72%	77%

Source: *Department Factbook*, Fall 2017
https://www.csus.edu/president/institutional-research-effectiveness-planning/factbooks/socialsciences17.pdf

*CSU Student Success Dashboard
https://csusuccess.dashboards.calstate.edu/public/faculty-dashboard

A summary of suggestions to maintain success and changes needed to improve admission, retention, and time to degree:

Subject Matter Reauthorization

The California State Board of Education adopted the History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools on July 14, 2016. The new framework also reflects recent legislation:

- Coverage of the Armenian Genocide (*Education Code* [*EC*] sections 51220 and 51226.3) in grade ten, and references to several other genocides of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.
- The FAIR Education Act, signed into law in 2012, requires that instructional materials adopted at the state or local level include coverage of the contributions of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender persons and people with disabilities to the history of California and the United States. References to support this legislation are in grades nine, eleven, and twelve.
- Information on financial literacy is part of the Principles of Economics course in grade twelve and elsewhere in the *Framework*, including a recommended Financial Literacy elective course in grade nine.
- Coverage of the contributions of Filipinos and Filipino-Americans to the Pacific Campaign in World War II and to the farm labor movement in California is now in grade eleven.
- Voter education information, including information about how students can register to vote, is in the grade twelve Principles of American Democracy course.

The California Commission on Teacher Credential will eventually begin its reauthorization process for History-Social Science subject matter programs to ensure they are meeting the standards and domains found in the Alignment Matrix.

This will provide an opportunity for the Social Science program to consider curriculum changes and look at possible strategies for streamlining and/or integrating course content and pedagogy.

Non-Teacher Preparation Track

The Social Science curriculum focuses heavily on the California Department of Education subject matter standards for several decades. At the same time, recent data from the CSU Student Success Dashboard shows 38 percent of Social Science majors enter postgraduate programs, which is higher than the Sacramento State average of 25 percent. Developing a non-teaching track focusing on many other professional options, career/graduate school readiness, and study abroad opportunities is worth examination.

A summary of suggestions to partner on and off campus to improve learning or success…library, writing, tutoring, success centers, advising, advisory groups, international etc.:

The 4-year and 6-year graduation rates for Social Science majors has been flat for native freshman students over the past several cohorts. The 2-year graduation rates for Social Science transfer students has remained steady in the years reported above, but has fallen behind the college and the university rates. The 4-year graduation rates for Social Science students declined for the 2014 and 2015 cohorts. These data points are cause for concern.

Some of these graduation rates are a factor of relatively few students being in a high unit major. The small "N" in each cohort can change data results from year to year. In addition, a number of students choose to take an extra semester to graduate in order to complete the 14 units of pre-

credential coursework. This is true for students who clearly desire to enter a credential program as well as other students who want to give themselves an additional career option in the future. Nonetheless, there is a need for research, partnerships, and action.

Review High DWF Rates

One suggestion is to work closely with the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning to look at courses with a high DWF (D, Withdrawal and F grade) rates. A review of the <u>required</u> courses in the Social Science major has identified recent trend of courses with a high percentage of DWFs. These figures are <u>only</u> for Social Science majors in each course. The recent spike in DWF rates in these two courses will start discussion with individual department chairs to confront this trend and possibly create specialized tutoring in partnership with the Peer Academic Resource Center (PARC).

Upper-Division	F16	S17	F17	S18	F18	S19	F19
Course 1	12.5%	10.5%	0.0%	11.5%	13.6%	37.5%	26.9%
Course 2	11.8%	4.3%	64.7%	15.4%	15.5%	15.8%	25%
Total (Potential for getting a DWF each semester)	33.3%	14.8%	64.7%	26.9%	29.1%	43.3%	51.9%

Source: Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning

EAB Analytics

Another suggestion is to utilize EAB Analytics to better identify and advise Social Science majors beyond the once every semester appointment requirement. A review of EAB analytics from fall 2019 found 41 percent of Social Science majors had a lower GPA compared to spring 2019. This is higher than the 33 percent of all Sacramento State students who had lower GPAs from on semester to the next. Similarly, spring 2019 data shows 47 percent of Social Science majors had a lower GPA compared to fall 2018. This is higher than the 41 percent of all Sacramento State students who had lower GPAs from on semester to the next. Social Science majors tend to take less units per semester relative to the general Sacramento State student population and tend to have a higher percentage of students with over 120 units. A review of Platinum Analytics does not indicate any course scheduling problems that create unnecessary bottlenecks that slow student progress.

Getting student data for Social Science majors needs to rely on EAB since the Office of Research, Innovation, and Planning no longer produces the annual Department *Factbook* and the CSU Dashboard does not provide data for programs that have entering cohorts of less than 10 students.

Fall 2019	Last Enrolled GPA < Cumulative GPA	Taking 12-15 units	Above 120 units
Social Science	41%	43%	26%
Sac State	33%	50%	17%
Spring 2019			
Social Science	47%	45%	44%
Sac State	41%	55%	32%

Source: EAB Analytics

Enhanced Advising

Social Science majors are required to come in for advising once a semester. Students are not able to registration the following semester if they do not come in for advising. Both Cognos and EAB provide data on students, but EAB is especially useful for advising campaigns to call in students for earlier and multiple advising. Campaigns can also keep track of students to see if their academic performance improves over time and provides evidence of a successful campaign.

What do you want to see 5-10 years from now, and what might you need to do to get there? New degrees, minors, courses, culture, operations, etc.:

The next several years are important to the Social Science program and could see many changes.

Reinvigorate the Social Science Advisory Committee

The Social Science program had an advisory committee for many years. The ad hoc advisory committee, made up of representatives from various disciplines and the College of Education, was most active during reauthorization processes in 1988 and 2004. There has not been a California Commission for Teacher Credentialing reauthorization since that time and advisory committee eventually stopped meeting around the time of the economic decline (recession) during the late 2000s and early 2010s. There were many cost cutting measures during this period including the merging of the Director of the Liberal Studies program and the Director of the Social Science program into one position. Prior to this merger, the Liberal Studies director received 9-units of reassigned time and the Director of the Social Science program received 6-units of reassigned time. The new position came with 9-units of reassigned time. In 2019, the position separated again, but now the Director of the Liberal Studies receives 6-units of reassigned time and the Director of the Social Science program receives 3-units of reassigned time.

This history provides the context for how and why the Social Science Advisory Committee is no longer functioning. However, now is a good time to reinvigorate the Social Science Advisory Committee, and with a formal governance structure. As mentioned above, the California Department of Education adopted the History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools on July 14, 2016. The Social Science program should move proactively in preparation for the inevitable process of California Commission on Teacher Credential reauthorization of Subject Matter Programs.

<u>Consider Creating a Distinct Non-Teaching Social Science Track</u>

The high percentage of Social Science majors seeking non-teaching careers, or deciding in midstream not to be teachers, are important shifts that the Social Science director and advisory committee must address. This could mean major restructuring of the curriculum and provide more opportunities for students to explore disciplines beyond history, political science, geography and economics. This may also mean creating introductory (freshman) or cornerstone (transfer) courses to provide an intellectual context and career opportunities/advantages in a multidisciplinary major. In addition, a separate capstone for non-teaching majors with a culminating research project is something to consider.

<u>Developing a Community for Students</u>

A common concern among Social Science majors is the desire for a greater sense of cohesiveness and community. This is somewhat mitigated by the fact that majors often take required classes together, and they sometimes form study groups. There is no Social Science student club, lounge area, regular survey of student opinion, or social media presence. A reinvigorated Social Science Advisory Committee should include a student representative.

<u>Review Annual Assessment Process and Practices</u>

The eventual reauthorization of the Social Science curriculum and possible creation of a distinct non-teaching curriculum track will also necessitate working closely with the Office of Academic Assessment. This will mean developing measurable and content-specific learning outcomes measured in various courses to improve student learning <u>and</u> success. The current process and practice focuses on assessment of knowledge and skills in the capstone course taken the last semester before students graduate. There is great value in encouraging formative assessment strategies for student learning to provide ongoing feedback that can be used by instructors to improve their teaching and by students to improve their learning. Formative assessment will also help to identify and address the high DWF rates in specific courses required by Social Science majors.

Operational opportunities and challenges as a cross departmental/divisional program:

The reinvigoration of the Social Science Advisory Committee is fundamental to the future opportunities for the Social Science program. As stated above, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) will soon begin the process of approving History-Social Science subject matter programs throughout the state. Along with ensuring that the Social Science program receives state-approved reauthorization to continue its waiver program, the director and advisory committee will also lead the program in other areas.

<u>Opportunity: Possible 4-year BA-Credential Pathway</u>

The advisory committee could look into the possibilities of creating a 4-year BA-Credential pathway. This will require a great deal of collaboration with the College of Education to (1) completely rethinking of the current 60-unit curriculum, (2) integrate credential coursework

during the undergraduate experience, and (3) still meet all of the subject matter as well as teacher credential standards established by the CCTC.

Challenge: Addressing Courses with High DWF Rates

The recent spike in DWF rates in the two courses mentioned above necessitate discussion with individual department chairs to confront this trend and possibly create specialized tutoring in partnership with the Peer Academic Resource Center (PARC). Students in advising sessions most commonly identify these two courses as the most problematic for them.

Potential partnerships on and off campus:

The Social Science program routinely refers majors to the Career Center and their many campus-wide events. Of particular interest to Social Science majors is the "Pathways to Community Service Career Fair" that focuses on city, county, and state employment opportunities. Other popular events are the "Here to Career Workshop: How to Build a Perfect Modern Resume" and "The JC Penny Suit-Up" where students and alumni can shop for professional clothing-wear wear for up to 60 percent discounts. The Social Science program also refers majors to the California Intern Network for paid internships in government offices.

One potential partnership with the Career Center is to develop a course for non-teaching Social Science majors, and any other student from the College of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Studies, focusing on career and professional readiness. The College of Arts & Letters already has its own career and professional course.

The Social Science program can also look to CSU Chico and CSU Stanislaus about their non-teaching Social Science programs for possible advice and guidance.

https://www.csuchico.edu/sosc/

https://www.csustan.edu/social-sciences

References:

Inglis, Sydney. "A Political Firestorm Surrounds the Fisher Credential Reform (1950–1961)" in *A History of Policies and Forces Shaping California Teacher Credentialing* (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2011). Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/files/ctc-history.pdf?sfvrsn=0

Inglis, Sidney. "Development of the Ryan Credential Reforms (1966–1970)" in *A History of Policies and Forces Shaping California Teacher Credentialing* (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2011). Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/files/ctc-history.pdf?sfvrsn=0

Sacramento State University
Social Science Program External Review
Conducted by: Rosa RiVera Furumoto, CSUN & Marcos Pizarro, SJSU
Submitted: November 20, 2021

Introduction

On September 24 and 25, and October 2 and 3 we met with multiple stakeholders of the Social Science Program at Sacramento State University. These meetings included the Program Director, Program Coordinator, and capstone faculty member; the chairs of all the departments that contribute to the program's curriculum; the Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies; the College of Education's Credential Program Chair, Social Science Methods instructor and Education Equity Coordinator; a representative of the Academic Program Review Committee; the Director of the Office of Academic Program Assessment; the Associate Vice President for Academic Excellence; 6 current students in the program, and 4 alumni of the program. We also reviewed the program's self-study document, assessment reports and data, and sample portfolios from the capstone course.

This careful analysis of the program allowed us to identify themes related to the impact of the program and the challenges it has faced, as well as make recommendations to support the program as it plans the work for the coming years.

Program Strengths
Our conversation with stakeholders made it clear that the SSCI program has had a positive impact on students' retention and success that is particularly significant given the program's limited resources. The students and alumni offered clear and specific feedback on the powerful impact the program has had on their education and preparation for their careers. They highlighted several facets of the SSCI program that are worthy of acknowledgement:

Advising and Student Support: Comments from current students and alumni suggest that advising is one of the highlights of the Social Science Program. Students clearly expressed that Dr. Fong's advising helped them to thrive and successfully complete the program. His focus on advising students based on their specific and evolving interests helped them choose the track, courses, and best overall plan to prepare them for their post-graduation careers.

Flexibility and Large Array of Course Offerings: Students were enthusiastic about the array of course offerings. They were excited about the breadth of the curriculum and their ability to

1

develop knowledge and skills in areas that were meaningful to them. Faculty also noted this as a strength of the program in terms of meeting students' needs and interests.

Capstone Course SSCI 193: Integrating History and Social Science: The capstone course is a highlight of the program as explained by both students and faculty. Professor Vang is doing an excellent job engaging students as they analyze how their previous SSCI courses relate to the California History/Social Science Framework and Standards. The e-portfolios indicated that the students used previous SSCI course artifacts to reflect on how course content connected to specific California History/Social Science Framework Standards and on how they might teach the content to their future students. Evidence of deep reflection, critical thinking, and lesson design were evident. The students also explained that this course brought the curriculum together for them as they gained clarity on how the different courses fit together and had the opportunity to really understand the strength of an interdisciplinary degree.

Student Engagement: The students and alumni that we met were thoughtful and clearly demonstrated an appreciation for the SSCI program, faculty, and staff. It was obvious that the program was meaningful to them both personally and professionally. They were enthusiastic about their careers and the way in which their training in the program had set them up to be critical and creative thinkers and problem-solvers.

Challenges
Our review of the SSCI program self-study, assessment reports and data, and the conversations with stakeholders demonstrated that there are several specific challenges that the program faces:

Program Curricular Alignment: It is difficult to ascertain if the program's curriculum is aligned without a clear vision and stated Program Learning Objectives (PLOs). Courses in the Core Requirements (45 units) appear to address the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards and the History-Social Science Framework. As noted by Professor Vang, SSCI capstone instructor, the updated State History/Social Science Framework incorporates a greater focus on the history and social issues facing diverse populations. As the program reviews its course offerings and syllabi, it may want to consider a stronger alignment with the 2016 History/Social Science Framework including greater attention to the history and social issues facing diverse populations (which will be required when the program is next reauthorized).

Other Alignment Issues: General alignment needs to be revisited in the core. For example, GEOG 131 is not part of the core requirements and instead is offered as an elective within the "State Perspective" section of the curriculum (3 units). It would seem that this course is necessary to meet CTC standards. GEOG 121 could be replaced with a Geography course focused on the United States. An examination of the CTC standards could provide the opportunity to streamline the core requirements and better prepare future teacher candidates. For another example, it may be that ECON 113 could be eliminated as a core requirement and instead offered as an elective.

Curricula to Better Meet Student Needs: There is a need to provide SSCI courses earlier in the program to orient students and to help them better understand how all of the courses fit together instead of waiting until the capstone course (SSCI 193). Stakeholders suggested that it would be helpful if one of these courses included an internship, service learning, and/or other early classroom-based field experience. The internship, service learning, or field experience could be tailored to match the student's particular pathway or interest. Early field experience could help students decide if the major and/or pathway within the major is appropriate for them and to support their knowledge and understanding of the field and its application. Research and experience in similar programs suggests that early field experiences for future teacher candidates are beneficial and even necessary to ensure students are in the appropriate pathway.

Student Concerns Regarding Curriculum: Students were generally very positive about the courses that they took and the course offerings. They did express concerns about the lack of availability of courses that they felt would benefit them in their training. They also noted that there were problems with two of the courses in particular, Geography 121 and ECON 113. These courses also have high DFU rates and were raised as a concern in the program's self-study. It appears that students, faculty, and administrators know that the approaches currently being taken in these courses are not beneficial to students and given that shared knowledge, it seems critical that this be addressed.

Assessment: The SSCI program provided assessment reports addressing general categories that lacked clearly stated Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). It was not clear to what extent SSCI SLOs were being met because the SLOs/PLOs were not delineated. Our analysis of the campus assessment report form suggested that programs are encouraged to select target areas to assess each year from a list of 20 "PLOs" provided by the university. These PLOs actually reflect core competencies (Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, Written Communication, Oral Communication, etc.) that should be fulfilled through GE rather than PLOs or SLOs specific to given programs. The Program Assessment Office should

take a lead role in clarifying the kinds of PLOs that will support programs in reaching their objectives. With that support, the SSCI program should establish SLOs/PLOs that are both measurable and actionable and specific to the program itself. Collaboration from the University's or College's Office of Assessment and/or Assessment Coordinator on the program assessment can lead to assessment results that can be used to understand and improve student learning, the teaching/learning cycle, and overall program efficacy.

Lack of Interdisciplinary Focus: The chairs of the departments with courses in the SSCI program explained that there is a lack of interdisciplinary conversations and collaboration in the college specific to the SSCI program. Chairs noted that their focus was on their departments and programs (as expected) and that there had not been dedicated time and opportunities to consider how to support and develop the Social Science program. They also expressed that the program could become a marquee program (rather than an afterthought) with more leadership and support from the Dean's office to develop and center the interdisciplinary aspects of the college. We heard more than one reference to stakeholders forgetting about the Social Science Program. At the same time, the chairs of the other departments expressed interest in supporting efforts to design a degree that tapped into their courses in ways that best benefited students.

Lack of Collaboration across Programs: In addition to the issues raised by the chairs in the college, the College of Education faculty and staff noted the need for greater and more structured collaboration and communication with the SSCI Program. One faculty member explained that "Sac State is a siloed bunch." They emphasized the need to inform future teacher candidates earlier about certain education requirements and to provide greater collaboration to facilitate student preparation for and engagement with the credential programs they would later apply to and enroll in. Providing clear pathways for students through intentional cross-program supports is crucial to achieving their career objectives.

Recommendations

Our conversations with students, staff, faculty, chairs and administrators made it clear that the Social Science program is at the perfect juncture to engage in a thoughtful vision-building to direct the program over the next several years. The program has achieved great success pursuing its goals with the limited resources available to it, but it is apparent that to best meet these goals, the program will require the support and opportunity to create a more comprehensive vision of how to prepare the next generation of social science teachers and practitioners. From our conversations and overall analysis it appears that there are several key components to this work:

Advisory Council and Program Planning: To begin with, because the program relies almost entirely on faculty and courses from other departments, the director has been unable to establish a clear, distinct vision for the program that centers the needs of its students. There is a critical need for support from the Dean's office to invigorate the Advisory Council and provide it with the opportunity and resources to develop a vision for what the program can be, where the focus is on the program itself and its mission for interdisciplinary training for future teachers and practitioners. It would be helpful if the program had a 5 year plan (or longer) that included short- and long-term goals.

Collaboration: Various stakeholders across campus could play a vital role in the planning and development of the Social Science program. Collaborative processes should be fostered and supported with resources where possible to ensure that they are substantive. This could be led by the Dean's office as part of the vision-building work and extend beyond the Advisory Council to include other administrative units in the university as well as departments and faculty in the college and partners in the College of Education (to establish clear pathways for students that help them understand requirements for credential programs and prepare them for success in those programs; collaborative advising would also be beneficial).

Interdisciplinary Social Science Focus: As part of this process of developing a vision for the program for the next 5 years, it will be beneficial to consider the central role of interdisciplinary degrees and approaches to the future of academia and the preparation of students. Social science teaching, the governmental sector, and even the tech industry, require professionals with training that is as complex as the realities they will face in their careers. This training is most powerful when it helps students develop inter- and trans-disciplinary approaches to teaching and problem-solving. This approach will meet the evolving workforce needs that are rapidly shifting in our current context.

It was apparent in our conversations with students and alumni, as well as with the program director and capstone instructor, that the SSCI degree needs to include more SSCI offerings to provide students the opportunity to fully contextualize their coursework, particularly since the remainder of their courses are in other disciplines/departments. Students would benefit from having a core of SSCI courses. One model that could help students meet the program objectives is to have 3 SSCI courses: an entry level-course that allows students to understand the program and provides tools for students to apply an interdisciplinary framework to the coursework they will take in other departments (a frosh/transfer seminar could achieve this); a second course that students could take mid-way through the program to weave together the content, approaches, and tools being acquired in their courses in those departments; and the

final capstone course, which students and program faculty find invaluable. Each of these courses could also include specific content for the two tracks in the program (or, when enrollments in each track allow, there could be distinct sections for the two tracks). Integrating teaching methods and practicum/fieldwork components into the curriculum through these SSCI courses would support the program objectives and better prepare students.

Social Science teacher preparation in California is currently in the midst of a shift toward centering Ethnic Studies as a model of innovative approaches to interdisciplinary work that address community needs and align with students' interests. One possible way for the program to clarify its vision would be to center Ethnic Studies as a model of interdisciplinary analysis. As the CSU commits to the new Ethnic Studies requirements, with high schools expected to have their own requirement, and with the demand in government, teaching and industry for CSU graduates to have formal Ethnic Studies training, the SSCI program could play a critical role in addressing these needs. Similar programs at other CSU campuses are already taking this kind of approach, centering Ethnic Studies in Social Science teacher preparation, and could provide models. The SSCI program could be housed in Ethnic Studies or aligned with it (perhaps building on the existing Ethnic Studies "Teachers in Bilingual Education" concentration) and it could be the home department for the core SSCI courses. At the very least, the program should have an appropriate Ethnic Studies required course. A related issue that needs to be addressed is the alignment of the curricula with the 2016 History/Social Science Framework and the emerging Ethnic Studies framework. Partnerships with the College of Education and Ethnic Studies could help in planning for appropriate ethnic studies pedagogy to be centered in the program. Completing this shift in focus before the next CTC reauthorization of the program would be beneficial.

Pathways/Tracks: The program includes students with two distinct career paths: teaching and other governmental and industry-based professions. The program may need to decide to focus on beginning in one of these two areas as the vision-building for the program commences and short- and long-term plans are established. Without the dedication of significant resources, it may be difficult to develop a program that effectively addresses the needs of students in each of these tracks. It is clear, however, that students and alumni in each track find the program invaluable to their professional preparation, as it addresses their interests and commitments in ways that other degrees could not. We envision a program with a track that has internships into state and local government for students with those interests, alongside a track that prepares other students for dynamic approaches to teaching the diverse students served in the schools of California and, in particular, the Sacramento region, through the proposed Ethnic Studies teaching pathway. There is also great interest in and support for accelerated BA +

Credential programs and 4 + 1 programs that could attract students and meet regional needs for more teachers.

Assessment and Program Development: The assessment plan and approach will need to be reimagined as the program vision and focus for the coming years is established. The program should have clear measurable Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) aligned with the program vision and purpose and an assessment plan that will help identify where the SLOs are introduced, reinforced, mastered and assessed and how the overall PLOs are determined to be met. Program assessment reports need to contain actionable results.

Resources: One of the most apparent challenges facing the SSCI program is the limited resources available to the program, particularly with regard to faculty. The program has the potential to increase enrollment and to address student interests in ways that other departments and degrees cannot, but doing so will require dedicated faculty. Furthermore, the revisioning that the program clearly needs and wants will require significant assigned time for the program coordinator (more than the current assigned time provided). With these resources and through coordination with other units on campus, the program could be much better known to students, increase the number of majors, and help fulfill the mission of the college.

We offer these recommendations as a broad vision of the possibilities for the SSCI program. Of course, the program must undergo a carefully designed process of planning for the coming years that is strategic and builds on the current strengths of the program, college and university. The SSCI program is dynamic and essential to the mission of the college and can be a cornerstone program that supports students across the university.

Internal Review Report

Degree: **BA Social Science**
College: **Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies**
Internal Reviewer: **Dr. Jeffrey Brodd, Department of Humanities & Religious Studies**
Date: **December 31, 2020**

I. Self-Study

The Social Science Program Self-study was submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs on February 3, 2020. It consists of 23 pages, including 5 concluding pages dedicated to self-reflective suggestions and planning for the future. The BA in Social Science requires 60 units: 45 of core requirements and 15 of electives; students planning to become teachers take an additional 14 units to prepare for entering the Teacher Credential program. The 24-unit minor in History is earned through fulfilling the Social Science BA requirements. There are no dedicated faculty in the Program. All courses are provided by seven departments (Anthropology, Economics, Ethnic Studies, Geography, History [one of these courses, HIST 168, is cross-listed with HRS 168], Political Science); the additional pre-credential requirements are provided by courses in Education, Health Science, Humanities & Religious Studies, Philosophy, and Social Science (the capstone SSCI 193, "Integrating History and Social Science"). The Program Coordinator (currently Dr. Tim Fong) receives 3 units of assigned time (previously it had been 6 units). The Self-Study includes a 6-page summary of the Program's Assessment Plan listing the four programmatic Learning Outcomes (the Assessment Plan is also readily accessible via the Program's website) and feedback from the Office of Academic Program Assessment for the past six years. The Self-Study sets forth a brief but informative history of the Program, noting that the BA in Social Science dates from the establishment in 1947 of Sacramento State College. The institution in 1970 of the Ryan Act and the creation of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) has been the most consequential development. The most recent CCTC review and approval occurred in 2004. The Self-Study summarizes data pertaining to enrollment and student success. The number of majors over the course of the previous six years ranged from 94 (Fall 2019) to 154 (Fall 2017). Retention rates have tended to range from 76% to 95% and have been similar to College and University rates. Graduate rates for first-time freshmen also have been similar, but rates for transfer students have been relatively low in some years, especially recently. The Self-Study notes specifically as a "cause for concern" (p. 19) the 4-year rates for 2014 and 2015.

The Self-Study admirably focuses on self-reflection aimed at enhancement in five concluding sections (with sub-sections):
- A summary of suggestions to maintain success and changes needed to improve admission, retention, and time to degree
  - Subject Matter Reauthorization
  - Non-Teacher Preparation Track
- A summary of suggestions to partner on and off campus to improve learning or success…library, writing, tutoring, success centers, advising, advisory groups, international etc.
  - Review High DWF Rates
  - EAB Analytics
  - Enhanced Advising

- What do you want to see 5-10 years from now, and what might you need to do to get there? New degrees, minors, courses, culture, operations, etc.
  - Reinvigorate the Social Science Advisory Committee
  - Consider Creating a Distinct Non-Teaching Social Science Track
  - Developing a Community for Students
  - Review Annual Assessment Process and Practices
- Operational opportunities and challenges as a cross departmental/divisional program
  - Opportunity: Possible 4-year BA-Credential Pathway
  - Challenge: Addressing Courses with High DWF Rates
- Potential partnerships on and off campus

The Self-Study's careful attention to these issues is commendable, and especially so for those that are not easily discernible from simple analysis of data. For example, it identifies high DWF (D grade, Withdrawal, F grade) rates for Social Science majors in the required courses (p. 20), and explains how EAB Analytics has facilitated discernment of relatively high percentages of Social Science students who achieve lower GPAs from one semester to the next.

II. External Review

Rosa RiVera Furumoto, CSU Northridge, and Marcos Pizarro, San José State University, met (via Zoom) on September 24 and 25 and October 2 and 3 with a wide variety of stakeholders in the Social Science Program, including six current students and four alumni. They submitted their report on November 20, 2020 (the report itself errantly states the submission date as November 20, 2021).

The report is generally positive, commending the Social Science Program for having "achieved great success pursuing its goals with the limited resources available to it" (p. 4). The report identifies four specific strengths:
- Advising and Student Support
- Flexibility and Large Array of Course Offerings
- Capstone Course SSCI 193: Integrating History and Social Science
- Student Engagement

The report identifies six specific challenges:
- Program Curricular Alignment
- Other Alignment Issues
- Curricula to Better Meet Student Needs
- Student Concerns Regarding Curriculum
- Assessment
- Lack of Interdisciplinary Focus
- Lack of Collaboration across Programs

The report sets forth six specific recommendations, the first three of which emphasize need for greater collaboration and interdisciplinary focus.
- Advisory Council and Program Planning
- Collaboration
- Interdisciplinary Social Science Focus
- Pathways/Tracks
- Assessment and Program Development
- Resources

III. Internal Review

The Internal Review takes into account the Self-Study and the External Review report. It endorses all of the suggestions and recommendations that they set forth, but with some qualifications and augmentations based mainly on specific circumstances of our University. The following five recommendations align almost exactly with five of the External Reviewers' recommendations and for sake of clarity the same titles are maintained; their sixth recommendation, on resources, is addressed here in Recommendation #1.

Recommendation #1: Collaboration
The Social Science Program is already strong and is in position to become stronger, in part because of the talent and commitment of those in leadership positions: the Program Coordinator, the College Dean and Associate Deans, the chairs of contributing departments, and faculty and administrators in the College of Education who are involved in the Teachers Credential program. Enhanced collaboration is naturally a positive means of more effectively planning and implementing for a better future. A cautionary note is warranted, however, regarding the issue of resources. In at least three instances, the External Review report urges increased allocation of resources, perhaps most tellingly with its specific "Resources" recommendation: "The program has the potential to increase enrollment and to address student interests in ways that other departments and degrees cannot, but doing so will require dedicated faculty. Furthermore, the revisioning that the program clearly needs and wants will require significant assigned time for the program coordinator (more than the current assigned time provided)" (p. 7). Program review documents through the years have been littered with calls for increased allocation of resources without paying proper heed to the practical challenges, such as the zero-sum game that typifies competition between academic programs. But on balance, there is good reason in this situation to be optimistic, as collaboration by the various departments and the College of Education should be a win-win for them and for the Social Science Program and its majors—and thus a win for the University and, with regard to the SSIS departments, a win for the College, too. Perhaps the greatest win, given the ongoing need for highly qualified teachers, will be had by our community. It would seem that the development of the Action Plan must involve frank assessment of the realities of economic resources, especially given the current crisis brought on by the pandemic, noted by Dean Hyson during the Exit Interview. Resource issues naturally interconnect with considerations of the sequencing of steps. In an ideal economic situation, the External Review report's call for increased assigned time for the Program Coordinator would perhaps be the first step to undertake, but is this possible at the current juncture? Whether or not, it would seem some steps, such as addressed in the next recommendation, should be given priority.

Recommendation #2: Advisory Council and Program Planning
The Self-Study and the External Review report agree on the need to reinvigorate an advisory council (although the Self-Study uses the previous name, "Advisory Committee"). The fact that the Self-Study process included review by chairs and other faculty from contributing departments (Economics, Geography, History, and Political Science) seems to bode well. But while financial resources might not be an impediment on this front, the issues noted in the External Review report of insufficient "dedicated time and opportunities to consider how to support and develop the Social Science program" (p. 4) are daunting and likely will require ambitious, concerted, and sustained efforts on the part of the Dean and the Program.

Recommendation #3: Interdisciplinary Social Science Focus

The External Review report includes a specific suggestion for development of a three-course core, along with encouraging significantly increased engagement with Ethnic Studies (including requiring an Ethnic Studies course), in part because of the new CSU Ethnic Studies requirements. Whereas it is not appropriate for the Internal Reviewer to weigh in on such specific curricular recommendations, it does seem that careful consideration of the three-course core would at least serve as a valuable touchstone for curricular redesign. And regarding the general nature of the curriculum, an outsider looking in is struck by the 60-unit requirement, especially given that programs at other institutions have much lower unit counts; the CSU Chico BA, for example, requires 45-46 units, and the CSU Stanislaus BA requires 38 (as a minimum). The Self-Study mentions in connection with the possibility of a 4-year BA-credential pathway "completely rethinking of the current 60-unit curriculum" (p. 22). Perhaps consideration of this more general issue will be a naturally accompany follow-up to this recommendation, and to the next.

Recommendation #4: Pathways/Tracks
In one of its many keen observations, the Self-Study notes that "recent data from the CSU Student Success Dashboard shows 38 percent of Social Science majors enter postgraduate programs, which is higher than the Sacramento State average of 25 percent" (p. 19). The enthusiasm expressed in the Self-Study for developing a non-teacher preparation track (and possibly also a 4-year BA-credential pathway) is echoed in the External Reviewers' recommendation, although they caution that lack of sufficient resources might curtail development of this track while simultaneously working to enhance the pre-credential track. In any event, with regard to the non-teaching track, they call for "internships into state and local governments" (p. 6). It would seem that exploring all viable internship and related opportunities, such as the Capital Fellows Programs, would be an important component of developing this new track.

Recommendation #5: Assessment and Program Development
The Self-Study, while setting forth the very assessment information that the External Reviewers criticize, makes clear the interest in enhancing "formative assessment," especially as this would relate to other anticipated developments, such as the non-teaching track. Regarding the criticism, the External Review report, along with offering this recommendation, lists Assessment as one of the six challenges. Curiously, when commenting on the Program Curricular Alignment challenge the report asserts that there are no "stated Program Learning Objectives" (p. 2); but obviously there are. Later on, the report clarifies that the main concern involves lack of sufficient articulation of Program Learning Outcomes or Student Learning Objectives, and voices concern over the "list of 20 'PLOs' provided by the university" that "actually reflect core competencies…that should be fulfilled through GE rather than PLOs or SLOs specific to given programs" (p. 3). This sentiment does not seem to align with our University's common practice of seeking to meet such competency goals not only via GE but also within degree programs. Furthermore, our campus' approach to assessment is evolving, as evinced by the 2019-2020 annual assessment report template. That said, the External Reviewers' call for the Program's coordination with OAPA when enhancing its approach to assessment is helpful. Part of this process should be ensuring easy accessibility for students and others to the Program's mission statement, from which the PLOs, SLOs, and Assessment Plan should flow. To paraphrase a statement made by Dr. Pizzaro during the Exit Interview, there needs to be a vision: What is this program, and what do we want it to be?

Despite the current economic challenges, the stars are aligned for enhancing the already successful Social Science Program per the desire of all contributors to this program review. Development now of an effective, implementable Action Plan is the crucial next step.

ACTION PLAN

Degree: BA Social Science

Academic Unit: Social Science Program

College: College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

Date: December 8, 2021

Program Review Finding Cite self-study, external review, internal review, and/or accreditation documentation	2 YR List goal, success indicator, responsible parties, and resource implications.	4 YR List goal, success indicator, responsible parties, and resource implications.	6 YR List goal, success indicator, responsible parties, and resource implications.
To Maintain Success			
• Internal/ External Review: "The External Review report includes a specific suggestion for development of a three-course core, along with encouraging significantly increased engagement with Ethnic Studies"	• Faculty council consider integration of Area F into the core Social Science curriculum. -		
• Internal/External Review and Self-Study: Identification of challenges with assessment of the non-teaching track major.	• Faculty council will develop program learning outcomes for a new non-teaching pathway that will be distinct from the teaching pathway.	• Implement the new non-teaching pathway (either as a distinct major, or as a concentration in the	• Examine the number and growth rate of transfer students in both pathways.

		existing BA Social Science program).	• Identify the sources of flows into the major from other majors on campus (especially from impacted programs) to develop effective advising. • Examine the following metrics for the two pathways for both native and transfer student populations: - Graduation rates - Retention rates - Time to degree
- The goal is to develop a non-teaching pathway with a robust interdisciplinary curriculum that serves a range of student interest and career objectives. This will be done in consultation with faculty from stakeholder colleges.			
To Improve Student Learning (consider university/college goals on learning, research/scholarship, diversity)			
• Self-Study and External/Internal Review: Reconsider the existing 60-unit major, especially for non-teaching majors.	• Faculty council consider development of a three-course core for the existing major, and develop a new non-teaching track for Social Science.	• Faculty will determine which course titles, descriptions, and outcomes need to be developed for the non-teaching pathway to align with program learning outcomes.	• Faculty council will use assessments to evaluate how new courses allow students to achieve desired learning outcomes and depth of learning in order to propose additional curricular change.
• External/Internal Review: "It would seem that exploring all viable internship and related opportunities, such as the	• Faculty council will collaborate with Teaching Credentials branch of the College of Education to explore development of an	• Faculty Council will explore internship and career development opportunities for students in the BA in	

Capital Fellows Programs, would be an important component of developing this new track."	Integrated Teacher Education Pathway (ITEP) for Social Science students.	Social Sciences (teaching and non-teaching tracks).	
• External/Internal Review: Development of a 4-year BA-credential pathway and post graduate (longer term) pathway options to credential	• Review curriculum given changes and revisions from CTC and CSET	• Develop curriculum and career pathway maps for 4-year and post-grad pathway options	• Assess student and advisor responses to pathway maps and other advising tools and impact on career plans and student success indicators
To Improve Student Success (consider university/college goals on recruitment, retention, graduation, diversity, engagement)			
	• Director and Social Science faculty advisors will develop clear transfer pathways for local community colleges to share with counselors. • Director will meet once per year with Admissions at Sac. State to discuss existing and possible new pathway for students. • Examine academic advising using metrics from Navigate to identify student populations who need additional advising (e.g. academic probation, those with high completion units)	• Director of Social Science program will engage in outreach at community college events and local high schools.	• Re-examine DFW rates to identify where and why students are struggling in the program curriculum.

To Build Partnerships and Resource Development to Enhance the Student Experience (consider university/college goals on university as place, university experience, community engagement)			
• External and Internal Review: 'dedicated time and opportunities to consider how to support and develop the Social Science program'	• Regular meetings of the Faculty Council, 2-3 times per semester.	• Faculty council will increase in size by one member to include a representative from Ethnic Studies and/or Women's and Gender Studies. This will assist in the development of the new non-teaching interdisciplinary pathway.	
• Internal Review: Calls for improved collaboration with Teaching Credentials branch the College of Education		• Faculty council will consider integrating a representative from Teaching Credentials.	

	Merge the Director position in Liberal Studies and Social Science to foster improved collaboration for the interdisciplinary teacher preparation majors.	Assess directorship and support staff structure and the ability of the merged leadership position to make progress on action plans for two programs.	Reassess success of merged leadership structure in meeting student and program needs
To Improve Strategic & Budget and Operational Effectiveness and to Insure Sustainability (consider university/college goals on innovative teaching, scholarship, research, university as place, university experience)			
• External Reviewer report: "The program has the potential to increase enrollment and to address student interests in ways that other departments and degrees cannot, but doing so will require dedicated faculty."	• Faculty council consider the establishment of a faculty position in Social Sciences. The Director will collaborate with the college dean to explore the possibility of establishing an interdisciplinary faculty line.	• Develop RTP policies and procedures for a possible interdisciplinary faculty line in Social Science.	• Depending upon budgetary and institutional constraints, advertise for a dedicated faculty position in Social Science.

Department Chair Name/Signature
Kristin A. Van Gaasbeck
Director, Liberal Studies and Social Science Programs
Professor, Department of Economics

[signature]

07.27.2021

College Dean Name/Signature
Dianne Hyson, Dean
College of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies

[signature]

December 8, 2021