

2023-24 Program Review

Program Name: Economics
Program Contact: Steven Lehigh
Academic Year: Fall 2023

1. Description of Program

The Economics program provides two courses, introductory Macroeconomics (Econ 100) and Microeconomics (Econ 102), primarily to students seeking to transfer or obtain an AA/AS degree. The department offers approximately 9 sections a semester, roughly split evenly between the two courses. The department is relatively small, currently consisting of one full time faculty member and two adjunct faculty members.

The department offers an AA-T in Economics, streamlining the transfer process for students interested in majoring in Economics. In addition, the courses are a core element for students majoring in Business or related fields, and are popular GE electives for students, especially those majoring in math and science (CSM SP #1, DSP #2.) The department seeks to maintain quality teaching in the classroom and access to assistance outside the classroom, ultimately pursuing the goals outlined in the College Mission and Values. Specifically, we seek to develop critical thinking skills, and provide relevant information to promote students' intellectual pursuits and promote academic excellence as well as provide an environment for students to achieve academic success.

Economics faculty are actively engaged on campus and the district level in a variety of ways including:

- Participating in professional development activities related to student equity (CSM M&V, CSM SP #1,#2, DSP #1), anti-racism (CSM SoS, CSM M&V, CSM SP #1,#2, DSP #1), LGBTQ+ student experiences (CSM M&V, CSM SP #1,#2, DSP #1), Canvas/technology/QOTL training (CSM M&V, CSM SP #3, DSP #3)
- Co-chair of CSM Finance Committee, member of the District Committee on Budget and Finance, member Committee on Teaching and Learning, member committee (CSM M&V, CSM SP #3, #4, #5, CSM EMP, DSP #3, #4)
- The Faculty Diversity Internship Program (CSM SP #2, #3)
- Regularly serving as foundation faculty for students in the Honors Project (CSM M&V, CSM SP #1, DSP #1, #2),
- Engaging with various student support entities on campus including the DRC, Guided Pathways, Middle College counselors and our long-standing partnership with the Learning Center to maintain high quality tutoring and review sessions for our courses each semester. (CSM M&V, CSM SP #1, #2, #3, DSP #1, #2)
- Hiring committees for faculty and administrators at both campus and district levels. (CSM EMP, DSP #3, #4)
- Tenure review and evaluation committees. (CSM EMP, CSM SP #3, #4, DSP #3)
- Faculty Union representative and liaison. (CSM SP #4, DSP #4)

2. Results of Previous Program Review

- a) Describe the results of your previous Program Review's action plan and identified equity gaps.

A. Student Success/Equity Gaps

As identified in our previous program review, persistent gaps exist in success rates for Hispanic, Black and Pacific Islander students. While these gaps narrowed during the “pandemic” semesters, initial data for the past year (22-23) suggest that may have been more a matter of circumstance as opposed to tangible progress. Beginning in Fall 2022, the department began offering classes in a post pandemic context. Offerings were no longer on zoom or online/synchronous in any capacity, but there has been a permanent shift in modality trends. We are now offering 9 sections per semester, 4 in person, 5 asynchronous/online.

Given this transitional shift in campus conditions, student expectations and modality over the past three years, it has been a challenge to decipher real trends in the data. Taking out the data from 20-21 and 21-22, the success data from 22-23 is in the range of our pre-pandemic numbers. More time is needed to assess how these numbers are being influenced by broader changes such as the shift in modality, the impact of SB893 (are students signing up more for classes and potentially dropping more?), guided pathways etc. Increasing enrollment trends may also be a factor (who are the students causing the surge in enrollment? What are their needs/expectations?) The department continues to pursue opportunities for professional development, the tutoring program at the Learning Center and our learning communities to improve performance in our success metrics.

B. Assess Impact of AB705/Guided Pathways

The expectation was that we would start to see an increase in students with less math completion due to the dropped pre-req, and as a byproduct an increase in students with less college experience (more first year students.) Obtaining data this specific from PRIE has presented some challenges, it is unclear that we will be able to complete this analysis as intended. We plan to work with PRIE in the coming cycle to see what might be viable in this space.

Some observations we have been able to make in the data. There has been an uptick in the percentage of students in the “under 19” category, from 41% in 17-18 to almost 50% in 22-23. My best assumption is that this age group might still include a significant amount of second year students, so it may not be a perfect proxy, but the fact that the age demographic is skewing younger is a sign that things are changing. Anecdotally, when I have polled my students, I have many more first year students in my classes now than years past. The promising sign is that the success rates in that demographic have improved and are notably higher than the other age categories.

C. Modality impacts on tutoring

Econ tutoring fully returned to in person at the Learning Center in 22-23 and we expect to receive the relevant data from them this year. It will take a couple cycles worth of data to get a full picture of the impact. Observations from this past year indicate that there is

quite a shift in how students engage on campus with tutors with more classes going remote. Two elements are at play:

1. With more classes online, students may not be able to come to campus, or be on campus regularly. We are offering tutoring every day of the week to try to be as flexible as possible. While we don't currently offer an online option, that does not appear to be the issue from my experience. When I have offered online office hours, review sessions etc. for my asynchronous courses, participation and engagement is significantly lower than previously in face-to-face classes.
 2. Participation from in person students was lower, on a percentage basis, last semester than prior to the pandemic. Obviously, we'd expect total numbers to be down, but what was also surprising was proportionately less students were utilizing the review sessions that in past semesters. It is unclear what the cause for this is at this point, but anecdotally campus engagement seems to be down across the board so maybe there is some other trend going on or if it persists as we continue to emerge from the pandemic.
- b) Explain any curriculum or programmatic changes since last program review
- Only change of note is the shift in course modality. We are now regularly offering 5 of our 9 sections as asynchronous online courses.
- c) Discipline-level and SLO (Student Learning Outcomes) assessment.

Given the shift in modality towards more asynchronous online courses, a broad cross sectional SLO assessment survey was completed to assess possible differences in modality that could be used as the foundation for future assessment attempts. Students in both Econ 100 and 102, online and face to face, were asked to assess how well they felt the courses successfully addressed the expected SLOs using a 1 to 5 scale (5 being the best score). The results were:

Econ 100	In Person		Online	
	% = 4 or 5	Avg Response	% = 4 or 5	Avg Response
SLO 1	95%	4.5	72%	4.0
SLO 2	95%	4.6	73%	4.0
SLO 3	70%	4.3	60%	3.8

Econ 102	In Person		Online	
	% = 4 or 5	Avg Response	% = 4 or 5	Avg Response
SLO 1	80%	4.1	86%	4.1
SLO 2	94%	4.2	75%	4.0
SLO 3	78%	3.9	68%	3.8

*Note - “% = 4 or 5” is the percentage of respondents that answered 4 or 5

Takeaways – Students in the online course overall felt less strongly about the SLOs being met. We can see that the percent of students giving a 4/5 was lower for 5 out of the 6 SLOs. Interestingly, even with that being the case, the average scores were almost

identical for Econ 102. Whereas the average for Econ 100 is .5 lower for each SLO. For comparison, student success is similar between the modalities overall, 74% F2F vs 72% online (I'm not counting synchronous online in this analysis since we no longer offer those courses), using that as a proxy for an SLO "performance based" metric, it seems as if there is some disconnect here. It would be interesting to know if this is course-based/instructor driven outcome or something that is more universal to a difference between in person vs online courses. Do students simply feel more connected because they interact in a class 3 hours a week in a way they don't online? In my experience, many online students are assignment driven and do not spend the equivalent of three extra hours interacting with the material. Even though the grades might end up in a similar spot, the takeaway/impact from the course might not be resonating as well.

3. Current Program Review (200-400 words)

Please use the statistics below, which are college-wide, as a reference. Please refer to the Program Review website for individual program data.

College Stats 2022-23	Ethnicity	First Gen	Age	Gender	Total
Headcount (unduplicated)	Latinx 32% White 26% Asian 20% Filipino 7% Multiracial 7% Black 3% Pacific Islander 2% Unknown 3% Native American 0%	45% of our students are the first in their family to go to college.	66% 24 yrs. and under 18% Ages 25-34 17% over 35 yrs.	49% Female 48% Male 3% Non-disclosed or non-binary	13,180 students
Enrollments (duplicated)	Latinx 35% White 26% Asian 16% Filipino 6% Multiracial 8% Black 3% Pacific Islander 3% Unknown 3% Native American 0%	47% of enrollments were by students who are the first in their family to go to college.	76% 24 yrs. and under 13% Ages 25-34 11% over 35 yrs.	48% Female 50% Male 2% Non-disclosed or non-binary	37,014 enrollments

- a) **Student population equity:** Discuss any gaps in student success, persistence, satisfaction, utilization or enrollment across student populations (statistics provided for ethnicity, first-generation, age, gender and total enrollment), or student population served.

2023-24 Program Review

Findings	Analysis	Resources	Plans to Address Opportunity Gaps
1. Based on ethnicity, success gaps persist in groups identifying as Hispanic, African American, Pacific Islander and Filipino, relative to White and Asian students.	Some of the groups have relatively small sample sizes, but the trends seem significant enough. Hispanic students represent our largest group at 33%.	Continued support at the College, District and community level academically, with school costs, housing and food support.	We need more nuanced data to understand why students are not succeeding. The trends in our data are consistent with other similar departments (like accounting) and the college as a whole. In order to more directly address the gaps, we need a better understanding as to what issues are macro (outside of the classroom) vs dept level.
2. International student enrollment remains low.	We are only given international enrollment for students identifying as Asian but I'm assuming this is a good proxy for international enrollment as a whole. We have declined from 21% in 18-19 to under 8% for the last 4 years and a low of 5% last year.	Outreach from international education. Need a better understanding of enrollment management/issues.	Check in with our group from international ed to make sure we're providing adequate access for enrollment and ensure that at a minimum our numbers are in line with the college/district. If there are plans to grow international ed to previous levels we will need adequate enrollment management to handle those impacts as our dept is quite popular with int. students and thus sensitive to swings in enrollment.
3. Female student enrollment is below college average.	While the college average is close to 50%, we are consistently below 40%	Counseling/Career/Guided Pathways outreach to ensure equity in the way students choose classes and their majors. Better understanding of why affiliated courses (Bus, Acct) have higher percentages.	Continued participation in college events to advertise our major. Work with counseling and other departments to ensure we are accessible to all students.

b) **Modes of Delivery equity:** Discuss any gaps in student success, persistence, satisfaction, utilization or enrollment, and student population served across different delivery modes. Please comment on in person services/instruction vs hybrid services options/instruction vs completely online services/instruction.

Changes since last Program Review	Analysis of Gaps	Plans to Address Opportunity Gaps
1. This represents our first few semesters with a significant portion of online sections	So far, the success rates between modalities don't show any significant differences	Continue professional development opportunities.

4. Planning

a) **Discipline-level and SLO (Student Learning Outcomes) assessment/Student Services and SAO (Service Area Outcomes) assessment for 2023-2025:** Describe learning or area assessment plans for this Program Review cycle, **including any activities planned to address equity or delivery mode gaps.** Your summary should explain:

SLOs/SAOs	Assessment Plan	Resources for SLO/SAO assessment
Course SLOs for Econ 100 and 102	Build upon assessment that was completed this cycle examining potential differences between online and face to face courses.	Potential collaboration with PRIE on set up, data if necessary.

b) Program goals

Based on your current review of your program’s equity gaps, learning assessments and challenges and opportunities, identify specific goals and plans. Please note that whereas SLOs/SAOs involve assessing and measuring a specific skill or knowledge students will be able to do/understand upon successful completion of a course, program, service, and/or degree/certificate, program goals reflect overall aspects of your program or service you hope to improve.

Goals

1. Goal - Improve Equity Gaps

Actions – Continued collaboration with the Learning Center on maintaining a robust tutoring program, analyze areas of opportunity, success and challenges within that program. Participation in Professional Development. College/District wide advocacy for resources to address pertinent student needs outside of class, such as SB 893, financial oversight through CSM finance committee and DCBF, sparkpoint etc. Collaborate with dept and campus faculty to reflect on assessments, course structure and access such as textbook costs. Request more thorough data collection.

Measurable Outcomes – Improvement in Student Success metrics

Responsible Party – Primarily Steven Lehigh, other Dept Faculty where appropriate

2. Goal – Analyze/Improve female enrollment

Actions – Participate in campus outreach events. Discuss issue with counseling, Guided Pathways leadership and Accounting/Business faculty to identify some of the potential causes.

Measurable Outcome – Higher Enrollment

Responsible Party – Steven Lehigh

2023-24 Program Review

3. **Goal** – Increase internship and career information opportunities
Actions – Work with CSM Career Center and related departments, such as business and accounting to better coordinate and promote opportunities and information to our students.
Measurable Outcomes – Complete outlined actions
Responsible Party – Steven Lehigh