

PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE 2015-2016

Program: Sociology

Division: ALSS

Date: 10/12/2015

Writer(s): Akihiko Hirose

SLO/SAO Point-Person:

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Purpose: To document significant program accomplishments, plans and needs between Triennial Program Reviews. This update should provide a snapshot of your program.

Time Frame: This update should reflect on program status during the 2014-15 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2016-17.

Topics: The first section of this Program Review Update focuses on general program reflection and planning. The second and third sections focus on reflection and planning regarding Student Learning Outcomes.

Scope: While this Program Review Update does ask for some analysis of data, detailed data reports in the form of appendices should be reserved for the Triennial Program Review.

Instructions:

- 1) Please fill in the following information as completely as possible.
 - 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, please write "No Changes Since the Program Planning Update."
 - 3) Send an electronic copy of this form to the Program Review Committee Chair and your Dean by _____.
-

Part One: Program Snapshot

A. Have there been any significant changes to your program, your program's data or your program's needs since the previous Program Planning Update?

If there are any changes, describe the relevant information and its significance in the space below.

These changes might have originated from within the program or because of an external source (the institution or the state, for example). Possible sources of relevant information might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Data generated by your program
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research
- CEMC Data
- Retirements
- State Mandates
- Labor Market Data

The most significant change that the Sociology program experienced during AY 2014-2015 was the hiring of a new full-time instructor. The program always had only one full-time faculty and had been requesting another full-time position for a very long time. The position was finally approved and a search was conducted and successfully completed at the end of AY 2014-2015 resulting in doubling the number of full-time faculty members. This is a long-awaited hiring and an extremely important improvement for the program since the program's limited human resources have been one of the major contributing factors for many issues facing the program. While one additional faculty will not solve all issues faced by the program, it is an important step towards the future growth of the Sociology program.

In terms of the changes involving student demographics, the total enrollment of the program increased slightly from 1254 in 2013-14 to 1282 in 2014-15. This is steady and continuous increase from 1241 in 2012-13. Accordingly, the total student headcount also shows an increase from 563 in Fall 2013 and 521 in Spring 2014 to 586 in Fall 2014 and 546 in Spring 2015.

The Sociology program did not participate in the Program Review Update in 2014-2015. The program instead successfully completed the California state mandated 5 year review of the Sociology AA-T program.

B. What objectives, initiatives, or plans from the 2014 Program Planning Update (PPU) have been achieved and how?

As stated above, the Sociology program did not participate in 2014 Program Review Update. The plans from the previous program review include the program's human resource update, establishing and improving a website for Sociology majors and potential majors, exploring the development of hybrid format courses, purchasing new documentaries, and establishing a SOC 5 prerequisite.

Much of the effort was concentrated on the first objective of hiring a new full-time faculty member. As a result, a search was successfully completed and the program secured a new full-time instructor position starting Fall 2015.

C. What obstacles has your program faced in achieving objectives, initiatives, or plans?

The biggest obstacle for achieving the program's objectives was the lack of human resources. More specifically, the program only had one full-time faculty for many years, creating severe obstacles in implementing the program's plans.

D. What are your most important plans (either new or continuing) for next year?

Continuing objectives from the previous program review include establishing and improving a website for Sociology majors and potential majors, exploration into the development of hybrid format courses, purchasing newer documentaries, and establishing a SOC 5 prerequisite. Although all of these objectives are very important for the program to address, the program will now focus more on the refinement of its Student Learning Outcomes. The lack of human resource did not allow the program to focus on major tasks related to SLO improvement, but since the program secured a new full-time instructor, the program intends to review its SLOs and the effectiveness of the curriculum. Furthermore, the program will actively revisit the issue of hybrid formatted courses. As the program continues to grow, exploring more effective and efficient instructional methods remains imperative. Thus, the potential and feasibility of hybrid courses comprised of regular, face-to-face and online instruction will be assessed.

E. Do plans listed under question (D) connect to this year's planning priorities (listed below)? If so, explain how they connect.

Planning Priorities for 2015-16

- ***Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards***
- ***Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance***

- *Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes*
- *Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses.*

The program's plan to assess and improve its SLOs strongly relates to one of its planning priorities for 2015-16 that focuses on the development of processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessments of SLOs. As a result, the program's reworking of its SLOs would help to integrate the assessment of SLOs into the instructional process at the college level.

F. Instructional programs: Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion? _yes _no

(This data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/y9ZBmt>)

If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.

N/A

G. How have students been impacted by the work of your program since the last Program Planning Update (PPU)?

The lack of additional full-time faculty in spite of the program's steady growth meant the program could not focus on some of the program plans and objectives. The impact might not have been directly felt by the students, but the consequences were nonetheless assumed to be somewhat negative.

Part Two: SLO/SAO Assessment Review

Review your program's SLO assessment results for AY 2014-2015 and respond to the following questions.

- A. Discuss how assessment results in at least one course in the program indicate success in student learning (OR) Discuss how assessment results of at least one SAO in the program indicate success in service to students.**

Based on an analysis of SLO assessments among the courses that completed an SLO assessment (SOC 1, SOC 12, SOC 4, SOC 6) during 2014-2015 (i.e., Fall 2014, Spring 2015, and Summer 2015), 28.5% of students achieved the level of 'mastery' and 28.5% of students achieved the level of 'above proficiency.' Even though the percentage of students in the category of 'mastery' decreased from 31.2% in 2013-2014, the SLO assessment of 2013-2014 only assessed SOC 1; therefore, it is difficult to effectively compare the progress (or lack thereof) from the previous year.

- B. Discuss assessment results that indicate a need for improvement.**

The lack of data makes a fair assessment of the results somewhat difficult. At the same time, the analysis of the assessment results shows a need for a more systematic collection of SLO data.

- C. Instructional Programs: For the course(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program, or someone in your program, made changes or plans to make changes in pedagogy as a result of SLO assessment results.**

Non-Instructional Programs: For the areas(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program made changes or plans to make changes as a result of SAO assessment results.

N/A

- D. Instructional Programs Only: Give an example of a change in the number of units and/or lab hours based on assessment data, if applicable.**

N/A?

- E. Instructional Programs: Discuss how distance education course assessment results compare to face-to-face courses, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program has distance education courses.)**

Non-Instructional Programs: Discuss how SAO assessment results for online services compare to face-to-face services, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program provides services online.)

The comparison between the results of SOC 1 and SOC 1 DE shows mixed results. One SLO assessment result (“apply social theory to world events”) indicates that 40% of regular SOC 1 students achieved the level of ‘proficient,’ 26% of students achieved the level of ‘above proficient,’ and 13% of students achieved the level of ‘mastery.’ By comparison, 33% of SOC 1 DE students achieved the level of ‘proficient,’ 22% of students achieved the level of ‘above proficient,’ and 30% of students achieved the level of ‘mastery.’ However, another SLO assessment (“outline multiple social theories”) which is related to the SLO above in terms of content shows a drastically different result. 56% of SOC 1 students achieved the level of ‘mastery’ whereas only 50% of SOC 1 DE students achieved the same level. This gap potentially suggests that the degree of reliability between these two SLOs is not as high as it should have been. Therefore, SLOs and corresponding measurement tools need to be reassessed to make sure their reliability and validity are sufficient.

In addition, GE courses continue to suffer from the lack of a sustained high completion rate compared to regular courses.

F. Did your program discover the need for additional resources (for AY 15-16 or 2016-17) based on the assessment results? YES NO

If yes, please explain.

The program identifies the need to explore the possibility and feasibility of a hybrid course format (i.e., ‘flipped classroom’) where more active learning methods might be allocated to the regular meeting time and other ‘mundane’ and mechanical learning methods can be allocated to the online format. In this way, hybrid courses may contribute not only to the improvement of effective pedagogical strategies, but also to the issue of physical classroom shortage.

Part Three: SLO/SAO Continuous Improvement Process

A. SLO Planning through AY 2016-17

As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program's plans starting now and continuing through the academic year 2016-17. Focus on how the program's SLO process will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.

1. SLO/SAO assessments: How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning or services? (*NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. Each program must assess at least 25% of its courses every semester. Programs with SAOs should assess at least 50% of their SAOs every year*).

Examples might include (Your responses may vary.):

- changing number of units/lab hours
- changing pedagogy/curriculum
- changing assessments
- changing service hours
- changing modes of service delivery

The Sociology program intends to reevaluate its SLOs and the implementation of assessment. We identify that some of the Sociology SLOs are outdated and need significant improvement. We also consider that the lack of SLO assessments and the insufficient data collection in the program as whole need to be addressed. We believe that the two issues are related. Thus, a comprehensive reevaluation of the program's SLOs needs to be completed and a systematic plan must also be implemented.

2. Have your assessment results shown a need for new/revised SLO/SAOs? YES NO

If yes, complete the table below:

Estimated number of courses for which SLOs will be written or revised:	9
Estimated number of SAOs that will be written or revised:	N/A

- a. What courses or SAOs will your program assess during this academic year (2015-16)?

SOC 1, SOC 3, SOC 5

- b. Instructional programs only: In order to budget to pay part-time faculty to work on SLOs during the academic year 2015-16, estimate the number of part-time faculty in your program who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

Number of Part-Time faculty who will participate in the SLO process (creating, assessing or discussing SLOs)	
Fall 2015	4
Spring 2016	4