APR Report for the Year 2017-2018
2018-2019 Cycle

Section I: Program Description

IA1. Program (Select your program from the drop down list)

Other

IA2. Other Program (If your program is not on the above list, write it in here)

Sociology AA-T

IB. Program Lead (Your first and last name)

Michelle Oja

IC. Program Mission Statement

Provide the Program's Mission Statement.

This curriculum provides a systematic study of human behavior in social groups. The primary focus is on the importance of social groups within the larger society, sociology seeks to explain the broad range of human behavior as it is influenced by the social context. It focuses on how people coordinate their activities to achieve both individual and collective goals. Courses examine the theories, techniques, and principles basic to the study of human behavior within social groups. This curriculum provides a solid foundation upon which to build the sociology major at a four year school. The degree guarantees transfer to a CSU as a junior.

ID. Program Summary

Provide a brief summary on the current status of the program being reviewed.

The program is designed to prepare Sociology majors to transfer to California universities, although many courses support other programs and divisions. There are six required courses in the program, including two outside of the department (a statistics course (either PSYC 2200 or STAT 1510) and PSYC 2205, a research methods course. There are no full-time Sociology professors, but about 5 adjunct faculty who teach from one to three sections a semester.
Course success and SLO attainment are highly variable from semester to semester and section to section.
Enrollment is good in the majority of sections, although often lower in face-to-face courses than online courses (except for SOC 1510: Introduction to Sociology, which had strong enrollment in all sections).
Success rates have been gradually improving through the years, but most courses are still below the 2016 college average of 71.8%. A few classes are above that, but below the 2020 goal of 75.4%. In particular, SOC 2120 (American Social Problems) and SOC 2141 (Sociology of Marriage) had low success rates every year except the most recent year. Those are also the two courses that are offered online more than they are offered on campus.
The number of majors peaked in 2016-17 to 89 Sociology majors, but declined to 77 the next year. The number of

Section II: Looking Back—2017-2018

IIA. Present the Results (Rubric Criterion 3)

Provide a descriptive summary of the outcomes from the 2017-2018 cycle of program review.

The follow goals are form the prior program review:
I. Goal 1: Stabilize and improve success rates across Sociology sections and semesters.
a. Benchmark: Current range of success rates are 42%-100% (60 percentage point range)
b. Proposed Outcome: Success rate range between 67% (institutional set standard) and 95%.
c. Potential Actions to Reach Goal: No potential actions were funded or implemented.
d. Actual Outcome: Success rate range between 59%-77%
i. Goal not reached, but progress was made.
II. Goal 2: Improve SLO proficiency attainment.
a. Benchmark: Many course SLOs have 25-35% of students not meeting expectations.
b. Proposed Outcome: Have no course SLOs with 25% or higher of students not meeting expectations.
c. Potential Actions to Reach Goal: No potential actions were funded or implemented.

IIB. Probe the Results: I Wonder . . . (Rubric Criteria 1, 3)

In this section, judge whether the activities you implemented in 2017-2018 to reach your goals were effective. Did the activities have an effect on the outcome? Please describe WHY you believe your outcomes came out the way they did. Did you reach your goals? If yes, explain why. If you did not reach your goals, explain why.

There were two goals from the prior annual program review, each with multiple activities that could have been implemented by the college administration, but were not. Measurement of both goals showed improvement, but did not reach the proposed outcome (see above for details). It is unclear why progress was made despite no proposed activities being implemented, and no major changes in the division or faculty this year.

IIC. Ideate Innovations: What if . . . (Rubric Criteria 1, 5)

In this section, describe activities you believe would have an effect on your 2018-2019 outcome measures.

What if the division chair worked with the research office to identify adjunct who have very low success rates, then mentored those adjunct, scheduled those faculty in more on-campus courses, or reduced their course load?
Potential outcome measures: success rates
What if the division chair or Dean of Instruction worked with the SLO technician to identify adjunct who have high proportions of students not meeting SLO expectations, then mentored those adjunct or reduced their course load? More release time for division chairs would help, especially for division chairs who have degree programs with high proportions of adjunct faculty.
Potential outcome measures: SLOs (course, PSLOs, ISLOs)
What if the division chair worked with the SLO technician to identify adjunct who have high proportions of women, younger students, and/or students of color not meeting SLO expectations, then mentored those adjunct or provided

Section III: Looking Forward—2018-2019

III. List Your 2018-2019 Goals—Be Quantitative!

List your 2018-2019 APR goals in terms of their expected changes on the outcome measures as indicated earlier. Each goal that requires resources, impacts other areas, or otherwise is substantive requires the submission of an APR Goal form. Keep in mind the scoring rubric criteria:

1. The relationship between program review narrative and the APR Goal is evident and strongly supported by evidence.
2. The APR Goal directly implements institutional planning document goals.
3. The outcome directly implements institutional planning outcomes, and is transferrable and/or scalable institutionally.
4. APR Outcome indicators, methods and/or timelines use institutional measures, transferrable/scalable institutionally
5. Before/after benchmarks and timelines are completely specified, identical methods, transferrable/scalable.

I. Goal 1: Improve success rates in sections performing below 70%.
a. Benchmark: In 2017-18, there were 7 sections of Sociology with success rates below 70%
b. Proposed Outcome: Have 5 or fewer sections of Sociology with success rates below 70%
c. Potential Actions to Reach Goal: Division chair requests data and determines if particular faculty seem to be related to low success rates or if the problem is more generalized to all adjunct (Sociology) faculty. Actions after investigating the problem include mentoring, scheduling changes, or professional development. These activities could be implemented by the division chair, administration (Dean of Instruction, Vice President of Instruction), and/or the Professional Development Committee.
d. Timeline: Data requests can begin immediately (Spring 2019), but the activities would take a semester or more to implement and follow (begin Fall 2019, then assess Spring 2020).
e. Plans:
i. SAP:
1. Lagging Indicators
a. 1. Increase degrees/certificates
b. 2. Increase transfers
2. Leading Indicators
a. 1. Increase course success rates
b. 11. Meet FTES targets
c. 22. Meet PD Plan goals
ii. Educational Master Plan
1. Student Learning/Success:
a. Strengthen the campus wide culture that fosters and supports student success and completion. Everyone is a "completion specialist."
b. Improve retention and student success.
2. Institutional Planning/Effectiveness:
a. Establish a comprehensive staff development program based on best practices and new technologies.
iii. Professional Development Plan:
1. 1.3.1 (Provide training on instructional delivery methods)
2. 3.1.2 (Provide online/DE delivery training for instructional and counseling faculty)
iv. 2017-19 Integrated Plan: Basic Skills Initiative, Student Equity, and Student Success and Support Program
1. Increase successful course completion by 5%.
2. Increase transfer course completion by 5%.
3. Increase degree/certificate, CTE, and transfer completion by 5%
v. Guided Pathways
1. 1. Cross Functional Inquiry (College constituents (including staff, faculty across disciplines and counselors

Section IV (Optional): Evaluation of Program Review and Planning Process

IVA. Evaluation of Program Review and Program Planning Process

In this cycle of program review, what aspects of the program review and program planning process worked best and why?

It was nice that SLO data was provided with the SAO data, and all in Excel so that it could be organized.

IVB. Evaluation of Program Review and Program Planning Process

In this cycle of program review, what aspects of the program review and program planning process would you change and why?

A success rate goal would be useful. I think any success rate below 80% was highlighted in yellow (but am not sure about this), despite the fact that our current SAP says that the 2020 goal is 75.4%. I could not find the current Institutional Set Standard. Discussing institutional benchmarks might be useful before having program leads and division chairs interpreting data.
It would be useful to have boxes set up for our proposed goals so that we could enter in benchmark data, and then next year enter in the data after implementation of activities. It's difficult to be data-driven when the structure is not friendly to stating outcome measures.
Further, there's a LOT of data provided; it would be nice if people with expertise in compiling, synthesizing, and summarizing data provided more limited/focused data and a narrative describing the data. This could be IR&P staff, but