🏛 **Dept - (SSH) Sociology** › Department › Program Review

ℹ️ Department Chairs/Program Leads: Please press the edit symbol in the right-hand corner to update. Below, the text in bold corresponds both to the name of the box when editing this page and also to the first-column on the APRU worksheet. If you have questions, please contact: papemary@fhda.edu. ✖

▼ 🏛 **Dept - (SSH) Sociology** ✎

2018-19 Annual Program Review Update Submitted By: Jennifer Myhre

APRU Complete for: 2018-19

Program Mission Statement: The mission of our lower division classes is to develop students' sociological imagination and to introduce them to the discipline. The Sociology program consists of undergraduate or lower division courses that provide a foundational understanding of the discipline, a breadth of coursework in the discipline, and preparation for university transfer.

I.A.1 What is the Primary Focus of Your Program?: Transfer

I.A.2 Choose a Secondary Focus of Your Program?: Personal Enrichment

I.B.1 Number Certificates of Achievment Awarded:

I.B.2 Number Certif of Achievment-Advanced Awarded:

I.B.3 #ADTs (Associate Degrees for Transfer) Awarded: 58

I.B.4 # AA and/or AS Degrees Awarded:

I.B.5 Strategies to Increase Awards :

I.C.1. CTE Programs: Review of Perkins Core Indicator and SWP Outcomes Metrics: n/a

I.C.2 CTE Programs: Labor Market Demand and Industry Trends :: n/a

I.D.1 Academic Services & Learning Resources: #Faculty served:

I.D.2 Academic Services & Learning Resources: #Students served:

I.D.3 Academic Services & Learning Resources: #Staff Served:

I.E.1 Full time faculty (FTEF): 4.8

I.E.2 #Student Employees:

I.E.3 Ratio % of Full -time Faculty Compared to % Part-time Faculty Teaching: +0.6% (Full Time faculty=39.6% up from 39.0%)

I.E.4 # Staff Employees:

I.E.4 #Staff Employees:

I.E.5 Changes in Employees/Resources: Because of class cancellations, we have lost two of our adjuncts with REP, who did not receive *any* sections this year. Of our other 3

faculty members, the other three will have lost their access to health insurance because we have had only 1-3 sections to split amongst these three each quarter.

II.A Enrollment Trends: Enrollment decreased for our department as it has for the rest of the college between 2016-17 (2,395) and 2017-18 (2,017), after having consistently increased over the prior several years.

II.B Overall Success Rate: Our current success rate is 77%, which is equivalent to the college wide average. We have seen a 1% increase in overall success rate over the last three years.

II.C Changes Imposed by Internal/External Regulations: As discussed above, the brutal class cancellation policies have significantly decreased our course offerings in Sociology. We are down to as few as ten sociology sections (scheduled only by SOC) per quarter from regularly offering 20 or more. One of our classes, SOC5, is no longer being scheduled because each time it was offered it was canceled. Functionally, two of our adjunct faculty were laid off (in a year when college administration bragged that "there would be no layoffs.") The other three adjuncts lost their health insurance and are down to a load of .3 or less for the year.

As discussed in previous program reviews, the anxiety produced by the accreditation process and the need to fulfill the ACCJC's particular emphasis on a technocratic and bureaucratic student learning outcomes assessment process as well as the District's falling enrollments and their impact on the budget has meant that the rich and community building conversations that we used to hold about pedagogy and curriculum through the Conversation/Application/Reflection process in the Social Sciences and Humanities process were replaced by paperwork and enrollment management. This has led to an overall degradation of a community of practice in our division in addition to decreasing morale.

In addition, we continue to be concerned about the punitive effects of the Student Success Act implementation, especially for those students without access to middle class cultural capital. Furthermore, this legislation fundamentally undermines the mission of the community college as a democratic institution responsive to local communities and committed to the principle of lifelong learning.

There has been an overall workload creep in terms of the amount of bureaucracy and paperwork faculty have been asked to do (including things like this program review) and administrivial tasks increasingly take up time that we would rather be spending in service to our students. It increasingly feels like the core work of teaching and serving our students is viewed as ancillary by the institution.

III.A.1 Growth and Decline of Targeted Student Populations: 2017-18 Enrollment: We saw a very slight increase in the enrollment of targeted populations in the sociology department. For AY 2017-18, targeted groups comprised 49% of the overall students enrolled in sociology courses, up slightly from the previous year.

III.A.2 Targeted Student Populations: Growth and Decline:

III.B.1 Closing the Student Equity Gap: Success Rates: Targeted groups in the

Sociology department had a success rate of 73%, compared to 81% for non-targeted groups. However, our success rate for targeted groups is 3% higher than the college-wide average. The most successful subgroups in the 2017-18 academic year in Sociology, were Asians (84%) and Filipinx (79%). The White (75%) and Latinx (73%) subgroups were next. The subgroups we are failing to support in academic success are African-Americans (67%) and Pacific Islanders (58%; however we only had 15 Pacific Islanders last year, so this number should be interpreted with that in mind).

The department made a commitment years ago to maintaining diversity in our faculty and continued professional development in the areas of student equity and multicultural curriculum. We have maintained faculty diversity since then. We have also continued that professional development. Faculty members in sociology participate in our cohort programs that serve targeted students, such as FYE, PUENTE, REACH and the Umoja program. Faculty in Sociology have been active both in college and division service around developmental level education and also equity work. Mari Tapia and Steve Nava are also active as facilitators in the UndocuAlly training series.

III.B.2 Closing the Student Equity Gap: Withdrawal Rates: Targeted groups in the Sociology department had a withdrawal rate of 10%, compared to 9% for non-targeted groups in AY2017-18. The subgroup comparison should be taken with a grain of salt, since the number of students are very small. For example, Pacific Islanders had a withdrawal rate of 19% but that was 5 students. Most subgroups hovered within 5% of each other: White students had a withdrawal rate of 12%, African-American students had a withdrawal rate of 11% (10 students), and Latinx students had a withdrawal rate of 10%. The subgroups in which the fewest number of students withdrew were Asians (7%) and Filipinx (9%).

III.B.3 Closing the Student Equity Gap: 2017-18 Gap: NOTE: This box is not appropriately formatted for the data you are asking us to report here, which should be in a table with columns for each year and rows for each subgroup. And why can't the program review just add a table like this if this is the comparison you are interested in? What is your goal here? As teachers, we would never give an assignment to students that simply asked them to move numbers from one sheet of paper to another. Finally, what do you mean by success GAP? Gap between what? Are you asking for the success RATES?

African-Americans (note that enrollment for this group is presently under 100 students from a peak of 203 four years ago)
61% (13-14)
67% (14-15)
82% (15-16)
74% (16-17)
67% (17-18)

Latinx
72% (13-14)
71% (14-15)

76% (15-16)
71% (16-17)
73% (17-18)

Filipinx
78% (13-14)
82% (14-15)
72% (15-16)
84% (16-17)
79% (17-18)

Pacific Islander (note that enrollment for this group is under 30 students max)
67% (13-14)
85% (14-15)
88% (15-16)
81% (16-17)
58% (17-18)

Asian
84% (13-14)
81% (14-15)
83% (15-16)
84% (16-17)
84% (17-18)

White
77% (13-14)
79% (14-15)
80% (15-16)
76% (16-17)
75% (17-18)

III.C Action Plan for Targeted Group(s): We are not sure what to make of the current gaps. If we use Whites as the comparison group, then the equity gap is less than 5% for Latinx students and Filipinx students are actually doing *better* than White students. If we use Asians as the comparison group, then Whites, Latinx and African-Americans are the ones who have an equity gap. Using Asians as the comparison group is problematic because it is problematic to lump together all Asian students when we know from our own institutional research that Asian subpopulations have very different educational experiences and success rates. This is why various folks on campus fought to get more sophisticated breakdown of data across those Asian subpopulations.

The groups who success rates we are most concerned about are African-Americans and

Pacific Islanders. Our plan to address this is to continue to deepen our relationship as a department with the UMOJA, REACH and Men of Color programs, to continue the equity work department members are already doing and to make sure that our curriculum reflects the contributions of these subpopulations.

III.D Departmental Equity Planning and Progress: Our department has historically had a high rate of participation in our department, division and campus wide activities related to equity, including for the C.A.R. activities and assessment, which is centered around issues that contribute to the equity gap and ways to improve teaching and content to address equity shortcomings, the (former) Developmental and Readiness Education taskforce, the Student Success and Retention Services programs, the Equity Core Team, the Equity Advisory Council, and the UndocuAlly trainings. Our faculty have continued to be involved in staff development focused on developmental and targeted groups.

III.E Assistance Needed to close Equity Gap:

III.F Integrated Plan goals: current student equity data and action plan:

IV.A Cycle 2 PLOAC Summary (since June 30, 2014): 150%

IV.B Cycle 2 SLOAC Summary (since June 30, 2014): 330%

V.A Budget Trends: As discussed in previous program reviews, we continue to be concerned about the disappearance of a budget for photocopying.

What we are most concerned about now is the layoff of adjunct faculty as a result of the system wide enrollment crisis. Though Opening Day rhetoric stressed over and over again that there would be NO layoffs this academic year, the practice of very early class cancellation policies has meant that in reality, adjunct faculty ARE being laid off. We believe that the following changes might begin to stem the downward spiral of enrollments:
1) Remove information about Total Seats Available and Seat Open from the Open Course listings on the De Anza website and from Myportal. These figures are working to depress enrollment in low enrolled classes during the registration period. Right now students are avoiding low enrolled classes because they know there is a good chance such classes will be canceled and they do not want to have to make major changes to their schedule when this happens.
2) Do not cancel classes until the first day of the quarter. This was the way that De Anza College originally built its enrollment when we first were founded. We have found that classes that have had enough enrollment to make it past the cancellation dates have picked up as many as 15 students or more in the last few days before the quarter starts.

V.B Funding Impact on Enrollment Trends: As discussed earlier, our enrollment is down from last year.

V.C.1 Faculty Position(s) Needed: None Needed Unless Vacancy

V.C.2 Justification for Faculty Position(s):

V.D.1 Staff Position(s) Needed: Growth position

V.D.2 Justification for Staff Position(s):: Division Scheduler, an analyst who can write the program reviews for the departments in our division, and who can coordinate SLOs

for our department. Currently the scheduling for the division, as well as the coordination of SLO assessment, the writing of program reviews, interviewing new adjuncts, evaluating new and current adjuncts, and revising curriculum are all falling on faculty chairs to complete. These tasks, pull our already limited energy and time out of providing the best resources, support and feedback for our students, particularly the students who need us the most. When faculty must take scheduling assignments home, complete overly technocratic and complicated program reviews and curriculum revision processes (as many as 7 forms per course!!), schedule and conduct SLO and PLO assessments, it negatively impacts our teaching and therefore negatively impacts student success. It means that students get less feedback on assignments, are given less mentoring, and are exposed to less creative and innovative lessons and teaching techniques.   Even as we write this program review, we are not giving feedback to student analytical essays.

V.E.1 Equipment Requests: No Equipment Requested

V.E.2 Equipment Title, Description, and Quantity:

V.E.3 Equipment Justification:

V.F.1 Facility Request: A social sciences and humanities computer lab, $92,125.00

V.F.2 Facility Justification: Currently, there is no computer lab on campus that can be reserved by faculty in the Social Sciences and Humanities for the purposes of teaching students in real-time data analysis techniques, online research, library and web-based research, and writing. There is no computer lab available for SSH students working on SSH assignments. This will become an increasing disadvantage for SSH students with the termination of student fees and the increasing use of electronic documents. In addition, students without space to conduct or work on projects for the project-based learning approach in our courses will be at a disadvantage compared to their well-resourced counterparts. We could go on at great length about the need for such a lab—feel free to contact us for a full pitch on the subject.

V.G Equity Planning and Support: As mentioned above, C.A.R. conversations have called attention to the need to secure technology for project based learning and active learning approaches within our classrooms to reduce the equity gap. However these approaches are only effective if students have equal access to resources. Because of the digital divide, many students have internet access only through their cell phones, if at all. Some students use their phones to compose essays for class. This is how the ipads and laptops mentioned above, not to mention the social science computer lab, can greatly impact student success rates and help our department narrow the equity gap.

V.H.1 Other Needed Resources: J-STOR subscription, $28,338.95

V.H.2 Other Needed Resources Justification: The available databases such as Proquest does NOT include any of the core journals for sociology. We would cultivate students' research skills, as well as their ability to parse and critique academic scholarship if our college actually had access to the most commonly used database of academic journals, which is J-STOR. We would also be able to prepare our students better for transfer, because students will be expected to be familiar with the J-STOR database at their receiving institutions. This subscription would benefit the entire campus as well. For example, it includes dozens of discipline-specific teaching journals (such as Teaching

Sociology) that would enhance pedagogy across all specialties.

V.J. "B" Budget Augmentation: We will need a sizable increase in our B budget for copying fees with the elimination of student fees. Many will argue that all materials should simply be placed online but there is a significant DIGITAL DIVIDE among our students and many of them do not have consistent access to a computer. Requiring students to access documents online will systematically disadvantaged those students who are already most marginalized and vulnerable.

V.K.1 Staff Development Needs:

V.K.2 Staff Development Needs Justification:

V.L Closing the Loop: We can assess the impact of any additional resources by looking at whether our targets for our SLOs are met with higher pass rates and comparing newer pass rates or overall student success rates with those of previous years. We can also use previous year's project grades and compare them to new project grades to determine if access to these resources had an impact.

Last Updated: 03/22/2019

#SLO STATEMENTS Archived from ECMS: 15