

LDC Annual Discipline Update YEAR A: Pilot Spring 2020

SECTION 1: BASIC PROGRAM/DISCIPLINE INFORMATION

SAC Name: Integrated Studies SAC

SAC Chair(s): Martha Bailey, Emily Herff

SAC Administrative Liaison: Christopher Rose

Other Division Dean(s): Matthew Altman, Jeremy Estrella, Dana Fuller, Julie Kopet, Laura Sanders

Department Chair(s): Andrew Cohen, Chris Edwards, Justin Elardo, Teela Foxworth, Sylvia Gray, Jaimie Powell, Matt Stockton (HUM 100 has been taught at Sylvania by various FTF under several FDCs)

Classes/Services offered at: CA RC SE SY

Given the unique nature and history of the Integrated Studies SAC, the following historical synopsis is included to put the data that follows into context:

The Integrated Studies Subject Area Committee (SAC) was unique among the PCC SACs at its creation about a year before its last Program Review. At that time, it brought together three small discipline areas, none of which had Full-time Faculty with the area as a primary assignment. The SAC began with Chicano-Latino Studies, Humanities, and Religious Studies, and these areas had their first ever Program Review in 2015. From its inception, the SAC has had two Part-time Faculty serve as co-chairs.

After that Program Review, the SAC began to grow. International Studies, Social Justice, and Interdisciplinary Studies were each created to with a single class, the first two to support a Focus Award, and the third to meet requirements of the Build EXITO Grant Program. Native American Studies began with several classes, designed to articulate with the related Portland State University (PSU) Program, and Ethnic Studies was developed at the request of students, to meet student needs and to connect to Oregon curricular mandates in K-12, as well as related university offerings.

The creation of these new areas meant that, by the 2018-19 academic year, the SAC was housing eight disparate disciplinary areas, some of which had Full-time Faculty participation, but, still, at that point, having no faculty assigned to any of the areas as their primary focus. The SAC determined that it was time to reorganize and made that request to administration. In the 2019-20 academic year, Chicano-Latino Studies; Ethnic Studies, which had just added one new Full-time Faculty; Native American Studies; and Social Justice left Integrated Studies to become part of the newly created RING SAC. In academic year 2020-21, the Race and Racism class, which has existed as HUM 214 since its creation, will become an Ethnic Studies class.

The changes left Integrated Studies SAC with Humanities, Interdisciplinary Studies, International Studies and Religious Studies, which are the only disciplines included in the Program Review. Humanities, over the last five years, in addition to handing off Race and Racism, has also given up the Africa Studies series, with similar classes in Art, History and Literature being created by those SACs. The SAC continues to function without any Full-time Faculty with primary assignments in the SAC areas, although Full-time Faculty teach some HUM 100 classes, all the IDS classes, and some INTL 201 classes. Religious Studies has no Full-time Faculty who teach any of its courses.

As you read through the report, sections broken out by discipline were answered by faculty teaching in those disciplines.

1A. Program Staffing: Combined numbers (Numbers are broken out by discipline below).

Please indicate the number of each type of staff in your discipline college wide.

For prior academic year: Summer 2018 - Spring 2019

Cost Center:	# of Full time faculty	Release FTE (any reason)	FT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Overload IFTE 4 term total	PT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Other Employees (tech staff , IAAs casual, please identify roles)
Cascade	0	0	0	0	3.808	
Rock Creek	0	0	0	0.544	18.768	
Southeast	0	0	0.816	0	0	
Sylvania	0	0	0.816	0	0.816	
Other (centers, shared, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	
District Total	0	0	1.632	0.544	23.392	

Program Staffing by Discipline:**Humanities:**

Cost Center:	# of Full time faculty	Release FTE (any reason)	FT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Overload IFTE 4 term total	PT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Other Employees (tech staff , IAAs casual, please identify roles)
Cascade	0	0	0	0	2.72	
Rock Creek	0	0	0	0.544	9.792	
Southeast	0	0	0.816	0	0	
Sylvania	0	0	0.544	0	0.816	
Other (centers, shared, etc.)	0	0				
District Total			1.36	0.544	13.328	

Interdisciplinary Studies:

There was one IDS class but it was grant funded, so there was no FTE for it, and it is not included in the data.

International Studies:

Cost Center:	# of Full time faculty	Release FTE (any reason)	FT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Overload IFTE 4 term total	PT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Other Employees (tech staff , IAAs casual, please identify roles)
Cascade	0	0	0	0	0.272	
Rock Creek	0	0	0	0	0.272	
Southeast	0	0	0	0	0	
Sylvania	0	0	0.272	0	0	
Other (centers, shared, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	
District Total	0	0	0.272	0	0.544	

Religious Studies:

Cost Center:	# of Full time faculty	Release FTE (any reason)	FT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Overload IFTE 4 term total	PT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Other Employees (tech staff , IAAs casual, please identify roles)
Cascade	0	0	0	0	0.816	
Rock Creek	0	0	0	0	8.976	
Southeast	0	0	0	0	0	
Sylvania	0	0	0	0	0	
Other (centers, shared, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	
District Total	0	0	0	0	9.792	

SECTION 2: REFLECTING ON DATA Found in Discipline Sections below

SECTION 3: REFLECTION ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

3A. Assessment Reports:

(To be completed by Academic Affairs, with space for notes from program if needed)

_____ Current Multi Year Plan on file *

no 2018 - 2019 Plan and EOY submitted (Plan but no EOY)

**Note from Academic Affairs: All LDC MYPs are officially "out of date" for this year, but since we are in the middle of changing expectations, we did not ask for new MYPs this Fall. This will be expected next year to will need to be changed next year to reflect new assessment options.*

Note from Program: With all the changes that were happening (see historical synopsis above) Learning Assessment for 2018-19 was not completed. However, we have artifacts and will be assessing them along with 2019-20 artifacts to do a combined report in June 2020.

3B. Please respond to the question below, which relates to your SACs 2019-20 Learning Assessment Report to the Learning Assessment Council (LAC).

Context Statement

The Integrated Studies SAC has been challenged with meeting the college's expectations for assessment, partly because its unusual status as a loose confederation of subject areas related only by their interdisciplinary nature and the fact that nearly all of the instructors are PT.

The Fall 2016 outlined a plan to participate in the national Multistate Collaborative (MSC), with all classes from CHLA, HUM, R and SJ contributing artifacts. In Spring, the SAC submitted student work from just 3 courses (5 sections), and there were 19 students who had 68 credits or more (study parameters). Data was provided to the SAC from both internal (college-wide) and MSC scoring in Fall 2017; it is unclear whether the SAC reviewed those results.

The 2017-2018 assessment plan focused on HUM 100, Critical Thinking was assessed using the AAC&U LEAP VALUE rubric, and scored by faculty (all in HUM?) but the data presented suggested scoring that was not breaking out by dimension (72% of 100 students reported to have met the benchmark of 3) so it would have been impossible to use this assessment for improving teaching and learning. Also, assuming there were multiple raters, the method for norming was not clear.

In 2018-2019, a plan was submitted to assess Cultural Literacy using the newly developed PCC CL rubric across a large range of courses. The plan seemed sound, with regards to purpose and goal and plan (faculty selecting the assignment and redacting the work, a coordinator to organize the sample, conduct norming and scoring to occur in Spring term.) It is not clear whether this happened, as no EOY report was submitted.

With the development of PCC rubrics for the outcomes required for the Gen Ed courses, and the need to develop assignments aligned to those rubrics for Gen Ed approval, the SAC has the starting materials for a very relevant assessment project, using assignments have been developed for Gen Ed Approval. IDS and R courses were reviewed by GEARS in January 2020; HUM and INTL were due March 27 review at the May GEARS meeting. If any of the assignments were given to students in Winter term, or are planned for Spring term, we strongly encourage you to consider conducting norming (online) and scoring (asynchronously) in

Spring term. If you have made other plans for assessment year (no plan was received this Fall), please feel free to follow through with that one.

We understand that a SAC composed nearly entirely of all PT faculty (and or those with primary assignment in a different discipline) faces some logistical and practical problems. Still, we hope that assessment of student work for the purpose of improving teaching and learning can be appreciated as a valuable aspect of teaching.

Peer Reviewers' Comments and Question

Since there was no report submitted, and thus no Peer Review for 2019, the summary above and question below were developed by the Dean of Academic Affairs.

Question: *What are your plans for assessment for 2019-20? Please provide details as possible. What challenges do you see in completing this work, and what ideas do you have for addressing them? Is there any coaching or mentoring that would be helpful, and if so, for what aspect(s) of the work? What point do you believe you can get to by the June 30 due date for the report?*

SAC Response: We will be using artifacts to assess Cultural Literacy, using the last DSAC rubric. The artifacts are from 2018-19 and 2019-2020, and we will compare the results for the two years. Our only challenge is having time, given that we moved to this Program Review format at the beginning of Spring 2020, and have been working on it, teaching remotely, and still have the Learning Assessment work to complete. We have had a brief norming session, and believe we can meet the June 30 due date for the report.

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / CONTEXT / ACHIEVEMENTS / CHALLENGES

Found in discipline sections below.

SECTION 5 IS IN PART B, YEAR 2

Humanities: Sections 2 and 4:

SECTION 2: REFLECTING ON DATA

2A. Enrollment

Enrollments (SFTE) per year; Location (where course is taught); Modality

SEE APPENDIX A DATA TABLES 2A (1- 4)

2A1. What conclusions or observations are suggested by this data?

Out of all of the Humanities offerings, HUM 100 is the highest enrolled both online and face to face. HUM 100 was No. 23 on the list of Gen Ed Courses for 2016-18 taken by Associate Degree Graduates, as reported by the Curriculum office in 2019. The success rate overall is good for both, although somewhat higher in F2F courses which is in keeping with success rate trends overall between online and face to face learning. HUM 201, 202, and 203 have significantly lower enrollment and are only taught face to face. This

suggests a need to retool those classes to align better with enrollment trends. White and Hispanic students tend to do better overall in these courses and female students show greater success rates than male students. This suggests that we work to make sure that the course content widens and diversifies to include cultural reference points for more student backgrounds.

2A2. Do the data suggest adjustments in your discipline with regards to enrollment? If yes, what ideas/strategies do you have that you would like to implement or have help with?

HUM 100 is ideal to fit with the upcoming initiatives in First Year Experience classes and would be a good way to create structure and boost enrollment in both. For HUM 201, 202, and 203, those classes have not been changed for several years and there has been discussion about redesigning the curriculum and possibly reducing the offering especially now that there is no requirement to offer sequences of courses. We might also look at creating a collection of sources and ideas for instructors to draw on to help create a more diverse bank of sources and topics to work with to help reach more students.

2A3. Are there other data reports that you would find informative/useful with regards to enrollment? How would this information support decision-making for the program?

Not to our knowledge.

2B. Course Success Rates

% A, B, C or P divided by total count of grades A-F, P, NP W and I; all courses in the subject area

% Passing By Course and Modality

SEE APPENDIX A, DATA TABLE 2B-1

2B1. Are there any courses and/or modalities with consistently lower or higher pass rates than others?

Face to face does better than web based classes for HUM 100 and it is the only course in this department with online offerings.

2B2. Are there any actions to be taken to understand/address lower success rates?

Make sure the content is consistent and clear. Work on incorporating writing instruction into the course content in some way to help with student success.

2B3. In courses with relatively high success rates, are there some distinguishing characteristics that might account for those results? What can be learned that might be applied to courses with lower success rates?

HUM 100 has a clearer course description to it. The lower numbering also seems to attract more students initially. Consistent course offerings are a bonus and clear course objectives are helpful to students.

We should apply these things to the HUM 201 202 and 203 sequence as well in order to create consistent offerings with clear descriptions.

Enrollment and % Passing By Course and Student Demographics

SEE APPENDIX A, DATA TABLES 2B-2, 2B-3 (a-c) AND 2B-4

2B4. Do the data suggest adjustments related to student success for different student populations? If yes, what adjustments will you make?

Female students tend to do better than male students and white and Hispanic students score higher than African American students. This suggests that we need to diversify our course content to create more cultural reference points for all students and to make sure that we are working within the courses to create assignments and assessments with diversity and equity in mind.

2B5. Are there any other data reports you would find useful to have related to student success. How would this data inform decisions relating to teaching and learning? Not at this time.

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / CONTEXT / ACHIEVEMENTS / CHALLENGES

4. Is there anything you would like to share about your discipline at this time? (e.g. notable achievements, challenges, issues, broad goals, additional context)? (Please limit response to 300 words)

The Humanities offers students the chance to discover what is possible in life through an academic multidisciplinary approach to the human experience. Faculty lead students on a journey that requires critical thinking and self reflection on a broad swath of issues and ideas each week. As the world began face the challenges of the pandemic, many Humanities instructors integrated the challenges of COVID19 into their curriculum and aligned it with student's lived experience. For example, when examining personal and collective values, students reflected on how guiding principles evolved or changed due to the pandemic. Also, instructors who required students to attend live cultural events pivoted and found online opportunities to meet this requirement of the course.

The creation of the HARTS (Humanities and the Arts) Initiative and the HARTS Council, by faculty from a variety of disciplines, led to the development of a different version of HUM 100 by Sylvania Full-time Faculty. The course functions as an overview of and introduction to a wide variety of disciplines within the Humanities. This term, HARTS has launched the online publication *Wellspring*, offering works from the Humanities *designed to* lift up student and faculty work and reflections during this unprecedented time.

As PCC shifted the mode of delivery to either remote or online learning, 80 percent of the Humanities faculty used their experience as knowledgeable online educators to transition easily. Before the pandemic, 60% of the enrollment in the HUM100 courses stem from the online sections (Appendix A 2016-16, 2017-17 and 2018-19 enrollment data). Before the pandemic, 19.6% of all PCC classes were taught online (per Laura Massey). The success rate of students in online courses is approximately 10% lower than those participating in F2F courses (similar to comparable disciplines.) When comparing to other General Education courses, HUM courses have similar success rates to WR 121. However, HUM has lower success rates compared to Com 111 but much higher than Math 111. Our success rates, in terms of gender and ethnicity, closely mirror with the overall college statistics indicating that we can do better for our marginalized populations. Members of the SAC are participating in the Cultural Literacy group that is looking at how to better assess this important element of the undergraduate experience at PCC. The work being completed by the Cultural Literacy group should provide our SAC with a rubric and best practice guidelines to improve course content that will inspire success from students who represent different genders, socio-economic backgrounds and ethnicities.

Interdisciplinary Studies: Sections 2 and 4:

SECTION 2: REFLECTING ON DATA

2A1. What conclusions or observations are suggested by this data?

IDS 234 (previously 299) has been offered once per year for the past 4 academic years. It has been feasible to run the course with very low enrolment (6-11 students) because faculty pay has been supported by the BUILD EXITO grant through Portland State University. IDS 234 was initially built as a required part of the BUILD EXITO program, and the plan has been to expand enrollment to any student with an interest in the norms, practices and culture within fields related to Biomedical research.

Because of the small class size and the nearly 100% success rate for students, there is not enough information to support any strong conclusions. Over the 4 iterations of this class (or the experimental prototypes), only one student was unsuccessful in completing the course. Anecdotally we know that the students enrolling in IDS 234 (and the BUILD EXITO program) are often high achieving, but high needs students. Students were well supported through this class in part by the extremely low student:faculty ratio (ranging between 1.5 to 2.75 students per faculty) and the 4-faculty team teaching model. One major strength of a multiple faculty teaching team is that the different personalities provide students with a range of possible mentors. Also each student may have a better rapport with different faculty members.

As the BUILD EXITO program model is changing, in coming years the course will need to be supported by normal faculty FTE rather than the grant supported release time, which will likely mean that we'll need to run the course with fewer faculty and more students. The challenge will be to maintain the high level of learning support for students while reducing total person hours expended. One possible avenue would be to pursue additional internal or external funding to supplement regular institutional support. Another avenue to explore is utilizing additional faculty as guest speakers and guest lecturers. This has been done successfully in the past, and could be expanded however as the number of faculty teaching the course is reduced. Maintaining a teaching team of at least two faculty is a high priority.

2A2. Do the data suggest adjustments in your discipline with regards to enrollment? If yes, what ideas/strategies do you have that you would like to implement or have help with?

The enrollment numbers must be increased to make this course viable going forward. This coming year we have a pool of 23-25 students that are planning to enroll (recruited through BUILD EXITO). This will be a good test of an increased student to faculty ratio (~12 students per faculty).

As we move forward we'll need to recruit students through other avenues like CG, the STEAM centers and academic advising.

2A3. Are there other data reports that you would find informative/useful with regards to enrollment? How would this information support decision-making for the program?

Not at this time

2B. Course Success Rates

% A, B, C or P divided by total count of grades A-F, P, NP W and I; all courses in the subject area

% Passing By Course and Modality
SEE APPENDIX A, DATA TABLE 2B-1

2B1. Are there any courses and/or modalities with consistently lower or higher pass rates than others? N/A

2B2. Are there any actions to be taken to understand/address lower success rates? N/A

2B3. In courses with relatively high success rates, are there some distinguishing characteristics that might account for those results? What can be learned that might be applied to courses with lower success rates?
N/A

Enrollment and % Passing By Course and Student Demographics
SEE APPENDIX A, DATA TABLES 2B-2, 2B-3 (a-c) AND 2B-4

2B4. Do the data suggest adjustments related to student success for different student populations? If yes, what adjustments will you make?

The student numbers for IDS 234 are too low to make any conclusions.

2B5. Are there any other data reports you would find useful to have related to student success. How would this data inform decisions relating to teaching and learning?

Possibly previous course performance and breakdown by student major or pathway.

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / CONTEXT / ACHIEVEMENTS / CHALLENGES

The main challenges have already been mentioned elsewhere, but this SAC is quite small and populated entirely by contingent faculty and a few with full-time appointments in other SACs. This highlights weaknesses in the college's SAC organizational scheme (such as critical mass and unrepresented voices) A higher level of financial and administrative support for SAC activities is necessary; the workload of managing the SAC should not be falling so heavily on faculty.

International Studies: Sections 2 and 4:

SECTION 2: REFLECTING ON DATA

2A1. What conclusions or observations are suggested by this data?

If we compare the enrollment data with the beginning of the program it's clear that there has been a decline in enrollment. Without having other types of data to make definitive conclusions, we would say that this decline follows the general national decline in college/university enrollment.

2A2. Do the data suggest adjustments in your discipline with regards to enrollment? If yes, what ideas/strategies do you have that you would like to implement or have help with?

I think there needs to be a more consistent scheduling across campus. I believe that inconsistencies in scheduling has been part of the decline in enrollment.

Another issue perhaps is the consistency in curriculum. The multidisciplinary nature of this program necessitates a tighter approach from the faculty that teach the course.

2A3. Are there other data reports that you would find informative/useful with regards to enrollment? How would this information support decision-making for the program?

Not to our knowledge.

2B. Course Success Rates

% A, B, C or P divided by total count of grades A-F, P, NP W and I; all courses in the subject area

% Passing By Course and Modality

SEE APPENDIX A, DATA TABLE 2B-1

2B1. Are there any courses and/or modalities with consistently lower or higher pass rates than others?

INTL 201 is only taught face to face.

2B2. Are there any actions to be taken to understand/address lower success rates? N/A

2B3. In courses with relatively high success rates, are there some distinguishing characteristics that might account for those results? What can be learned that might be applied to courses with lower success rates?
N/A

Enrollment and % Passing By Course and Student Demographics

SEE APPENDIX A, DATA TABLES 2B-2, 2B-3 (a-c) AND 2B-4

2B4. Do the data suggest adjustments related to student success for different student populations? If yes, what adjustments will you make?

Overall, in keeping with national trends, the last three academic years' data show that female students' enrollment for the course was higher than that of male students' enrollment and the success rate in percentage was higher for the female students than male students. There was no enrollment for non-binary students. And enrollment for unknown gender is less than five percent for each academic year.

Data suggests that the course needs to reach out to genderqueer students. CCOG for the course should include content that may interest student populations who identify themselves outside the gender binary.

Since there is a visible gender division among different disciplines, to increase enrollment for students who identify themselves male, the course can reach out to areas of study that show a strong enrollment of male students. (Engineering, for example.) Also, in future meetings, we might discuss implicit bias in our course curriculum, classroom management and/or grading.

Ethnicity data reveals a mixed picture: the diversity of students was high in the 2017-2018 academic year compared to others. This might be related to the high enrollment pattern for that academic year, instructors who taught the course, or which campus the class was offered. Among nine different classified ethnic groups, as would be expected, WH students enrolled the most for the course for the last three academic years. However, the highest success rate was seen among the AS students. AL and HPI were the lowest enrolled ethnic groups among the nine classifieds. Unfortunately, BAA students experienced the lowest achievement in the course. Even though the enrollment for HIS students was low, compared to other groups, they have the second highest success rate for the course.

Data suggests that the course could reach out to international students and students of color. To achieve this goal, instructors could publicize their courses to academic advisors who work with international students and to identity centers that work with students of color. The CCOG for the course can be modified to better meet the needs of students of color. Likewise, maintaining a diverse cohort of instructors seems essential to attract and retain students of color. Finally, while some students, due to lived experience (for example DACA students), understand the connections between international and domestic social justice issues, we, as instructors, could emphasize more than we do the continuity of “systems of power”.

2B5. Are there any other data reports you would find useful to have related to student success. How would this data inform decisions relating to teaching and learning?

It might help to gather student data on special needs, such as learning disability, mental health, and such to measure student success. It might also aid us to gather data on the social class background of each student (income, family history of education, marital status, number of children, occupation). As part of YESS, we, at the college, say we care about working class and working poor students (white and otherwise.) But, we don't receive data on social/economic class, beyond Pell Grant eligibility.

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / CONTEXT / ACHIEVEMENTS / CHALLENGES

4. Is there anything you would like to share about your discipline at this time? (e.g. notable achievements, challenges, issues, broad goals, additional context)? (Please limit response to 300 words)

Since INTL 201 has never been a part of any program review, a little history is in order that will give context to our current challenges:

During the academic year 2013 -2014, International Studies 201 was created. During a series of meetings, a group of 30 to 40 advisors, administrators and faculty from across the college were asked to envision what a course should be, including drafting a CCOG. During the same time period, Marlene Eid and Bryan Hull, Internationalization coordinators, met with PSU International Studies chair and other PSU faculty with an eye towards maximum transferability and alignment of INTL 201.

In Spring 2014, Dave Stout and Nancy Wessel, Division Deans, invited part-time and full-time instructors to join a cohort of 4-5 instructors to teach International Studies 101. The faculty would be selected on the following criteria: discipline, campus, academic & personal background, record in working collaboratively, strong teaching credentials, ability to promote the course, and dedication to the internationalization initiative. Out of the selection process, the cohort selected included: James Harrison, CA History; Jeffer Daykin, RC History (PT); Christina Friedle, SY Geography; Maria Figuera-Wilson, SY Sociology; and Bryan Hull, SY Comp/Lit. Paid a stipend to develop the course, those five faculty met throughout 2014 - 2015. One “takeaway” from the cohort was to share a “unit” with members that each could teach in their own respective course. As well, it was a kind of “norming” to make sure that the class was taught in the interdisciplinary manner it was conceived. While the course easily passed through the Curriculum Committee in December 2014, deciding Instructor Qualifications took until the end of 2016.

After the official cohort finished, the group met twice a year until Spring 2017 to discuss scheduling, enrollment patterns, course curriculum and teaching strategies. James Harrison sadly then retired, leaving no one to teach the course at the CA campus. Summer 2017, Bryan Hull wrote to Nancy Wessel, asking her if she had anyone to replace James for the coming academic year, but there was no reply. Soon after, Jeffer Daykin left PCC for his career. It is here that the cohort model ran aground. We had no formal structure set up for hiring or what we would do in the wake of one of cohort members “moved on”. When new instructors were brought in to teach the class, it was done by haphazard, informal agreements between instructors and department chairs, which also created scheduling conflicts and struggles. For example, classes were scheduled at the exact same day and time at both CA and SY. We still have no formal mechanism to hire or assess new instructors who were not part of the original cohort. As a result, the group and the course both need an equitable path forward. (See goals in Update B).

Religious Studies: Sections 2 and 4:

SECTION 2: REFLECTING ON DATA

2A. Enrollment

Enrollments (SFTE) per year; Location (where course is taught); Modality

SEE APPENDIX A DATA TABLES 2A (1- 4)

2A1. What conclusions or observations are suggested by this data?

On enrollment and modality: most of the enrollment is in online learning modality. World Religions has strong face-to-face enrollment some terms, on one or more campuses, but there is no clear pattern as to why that is the case. The online sections continually fill, although the number of sections has decreased. The other classes all have higher enrollment online, and two, R 201 and R 212 quickly moved to online only, after being taught a couple of times face-to-face. The overall Religious Studies enrollment for the past three years has remained pretty much constant, with the mix of classes taken by students shifting.

The location data is misleading. Rock Creek has scheduled Religious Studies classes at Sylvania for many years. The following data was pulled from the Dean’s Enrollment Report for the relevant years. What we are not able to do is separate student success in the R 210 sections at Sylvania from those at Rock Creek.

- 2016-17, 6 sections: 5 R 210 1 R 211
- 2017-18, 7 sections: 5 R 210, 1 R 211, 1 R 212
- 2018-19, 5 sections: 4 R 210, 1 R 211

So, the majority of face-to-face classes have been taught at Rock Creek and Sylvania, to varying numbers of students. The number of face-to-face sections at Cascade declined as more online sections were available, from being offered four times/year to being offered once/year. Southeast only ever had R 210 scheduled once per year. It was supporting PCC Students on a Warner Pacific scholarship who had the class as a requirement. It is not clear whether that changed, or if those students also decided to take the class online, but the class was cancelled in Spring 2018 and has not been offered since at Southeast.

2A2. Do the data suggest adjustments in your discipline with regards to enrollment? If yes, what ideas/strategies do you have that you would like to implement or have help with?

At this point in time, the data do not point to any clear adjustments with regard to enrollment. We believe more students would benefit from taking a Religious Studies class. As we move to the Academic and Career Pathways model, we would like to find ways to promote those benefits to students, particularly students planning careers in the health sciences, where an “increasing need for cultural and religious sensitivity” has been identified by the Joint Commission for the Accreditation of Hospitals.

2A3. Are there other data reports that you would find informative/useful with regards to enrollment? How would this information support decision-making for the program?

Having access to the Dean’s Enrollment report, which we specifically requested, gave us a more fine-grained view of enrollment, which we found helpful in looking for patterns.

2B. Course Success Rates

% A, B, C or P divided by total count of grades A-F, P, NP W and I; all courses in the subject area

% Passing By Course and Modality

SEE APPENDIX A, DATA TABLE 2B-1

2B1. Are there any courses and/or modalities with consistently lower or higher pass rates than others? Most of the classes, no matter the modality, have pass rates around 80%, with some minor variations. The one exception is R 201, which runs around 60%.

2B2. Are there any actions to be taken to understand/address lower success rates?

R 201, when it moved online, was designed as a threaded course: students had to complete certain learning activities to see and participate in the next set of materials. The students who are able to follow that pattern typically do very well in the class. Students who have trouble or who get behind due to life circumstances tend to drop the class. Recent student feedback about the course design have led to a decision to revamp the class over Summer 2020, when it is not being taught. The results of changes will be evident after the 2020-21 academic year.

2B3. In courses with relatively high success rates, are there some distinguishing characteristics that might account for those results? What can be learned that might be applied to courses with lower success rates? There are no courses with consistently higher success rates.

Enrollment and % Passing By Course and Student Demographics

SEE APPENDIX A, DATA TABLES 2B-2, 2B-3 (a-c) AND 2B-4

2B4. Do the data suggest adjustments related to student success for different student populations? If yes, what adjustments will you make?

There does not seem to be any consistent pattern around student populations, in terms of success. Often we are looking at fairly small numbers, and would guess that the differences have more to do with individual students than with group characteristics.

2B5. Are there any other data reports you would find useful to have related to student success. How would this data inform decisions relating to teaching and learning?

We would love to know numbers who had Ws or Is, versus those who had D, F, and NP. We would also like to have some idea of last participation date for those who don't pass. It is not uncommon, anecdotally, to have students sign up for a Religious Studies class, make it to Week Two and then stop participating in class, until finally encouraged to withdraw. Others stay in class, without participating, sometimes for Financial Aid reasons, and receive failing grades. The general sense is that most students who do not pass do so because they stop engaging. If that is the case, it speaks to a different need than if students are engaging to the end while failing to give evidence of learning.

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / CONTEXT / ACHIEVEMENTS / CHALLENGES

4. Is there anything you would like to share about your discipline at this time? (e.g. notable achievements, challenges, issues, broad goals, additional context)? (Please limit response to 300 words)

Religious Studies began with one course, World Religions, under the old Humanities SAC. At our last Program Review, we had two courses, with Asian Religions preparing to go fully online. Since then, both Intro to the Old Testament and Intro to the New Testament have been added. The New Testament class has developed into a fully online course, worked on by a faculty team with support from Distance Learning.

All of our classes support transfer students who use them to meet requirements at their transfer institutions. For students going into Health Care disciplines, knowledge about patient religious beliefs is required or recommended by employers. In addition, many students take World Religions for Gen Ed credit: it was #31 on the 2019 list of Gen Ed courses taken by Associate Degree Graduates provided by the Curriculum office. The American Academy of Religion has recently put out Religious Literacy Guidelines on "What U.S. College Graduates Need to Understand about Religion", a document with which PCC classes are in line.

We are seeing a decline in the number of students taking Religious Studies classes, in line with the overall decline in institutional enrollment. We've also been impacted some by the closure of local transfer colleges, most recently, Concordia University. Nevertheless, we continue to offer most classes every term, but we have fewer classes in both face-to-face and online modalities.

One area that our students do well with is use of library resources. Our subject area librarian reports that Religious Studies faculty and students engage actively with library print and electronic resources. Religion books and DVDs are shelved in the 200s in the Dewey Decimal system, and this collection has one of the highest circulation rates of any of the humanities collections. Religion streaming videos, eBooks and database collections are also well used, and the library's Religion research guide receives more traffic than the guides for most other humanities courses. This may be because Religious Studies faculty collaborate with librarians to

curate the collection, and create assignments that encourage students to explore resources beyond assigned readings.

Our biggest challenge is the fact that not only do we not have any faculty teaching full-time in Religious Studies, no Religious Studies faculty member is full-time at PCC in any area. While Religious Studies has been able to meet institutional requirements, using work, and attention to institutional requirements and changes, by a small number of interested faculty with assignment rights, when assignment rights are eliminated, there is no guarantee that there will be faculty teaching who are willing and able to maintain curriculum and work with learning assessment. Because we know Religious Studies courses are important for PCC students to meet their career goals, and because Religious Studies curriculum needs to be maintained by faculty with specific Religious Studies knowledge, and because we recognize that it is unlikely a full-time faculty position will be created in the foreseeable future, we suggest that one Multi-Year Contract be created specifically requiring the faculty member accepting the position provide support for the Religious Studies curriculum and assessment.

SECTION 6: ADMINISTRATIVE FEEDBACK AND FOLLOW UP

This section is for Administration to provide feedback.

To be prepared by Division Dean(s) and reviewed by DOI(s)

6A. Strengths and successes of the discipline as evidenced by the data, analysis and reflection:

6B. Areas of concern, if any:

6C. Recommended Next Steps:

___ Proceed as planned on discipline review schedule

___ Further review / Out-of-Cycle in-depth review

6D. Additional Comments:

LDC Annual Discipline Update YEAR B: Pilot Spring 2020

SECTION 1: BASIC DISCIPLINE INFORMATION

SAC Name: Integrated Studies SAC

SAC Chair(s): Martha Bailey, Emily Herff

SAC Administrative Liaison: Christopher Rose

Other Division Dean(s): Matthew Altman, Jeremy Estrella, Dana Fuller, Julie Kopet, Laura Sanders

Department Chair(s): Andrew Cohen, Chris Edwards, Justin Elardo, Teela Foxworth, Sylvia Gray, Jaimie Powell, Matt Stockton (HUM 100 has been taught at Sylvania by various FTF under several FDCs)

Classes/Services offered at: CA RC SE SY

See YEAR A for Historical Overview for this SAC.

1A. Program Staffing: Combined numbers (broken out by discipline below).

Please indicate the number of each type of staff in your discipline college wide.

For prior academic year: Summer 2018 - Spring 2019

Cost Center:	# of Full time faculty	Release FTE (any reason)	FT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Overload IFTE 4 term total	PT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Other Employees (tech staff , IAAs casual, please identify roles)
Cascade	0	0	0	0	3.808	
Rock Creek	0	0	0	0.544	18.768	
Southeast	0	0	0.816	0	0	
Sylvania	0	0	0.816	0	0.816	
Other (centers, shared, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	
District Total	0	0	1.632	0.544	23.392	

Program Staffing by Discipline:

Humanities:

Cost Center:	# of Full time faculty	Release FTE (any reason)	FT Fac IFTE 4 term	Overload IFTE 4 term	PT Fac IFTE 4 term	Other Employees (tech staff , IAAs casual, please identify roles)
--------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	--

			total	total	total	
Cascade	0	0	0	0	2.72	
Rock Creek	0	0	0	0.544	9.792	
Southeast	0	0	0.816	0	0	
Sylvania	0	0	0.544	0	0.816	
Other (centers, shared, etc.)	0	0				
District Total			1.36	0.544	13.328	

Interdisciplinary Studies:

There was one IDS class but it was grant funded, so there was no FTE for it, and it is not included in the data.

International Studies:

Cost Center:	# of Full time faculty	Release FTE (any reason)	FT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Overload IFTE 4 term total	PT Fac IFTE 4 term total	Other Employees (tech staff , IAAs casual, please identify roles)
Cascade	0	0	0	0	0.272	
Rock Creek	0	0	0	0	0.272	
Southeast	0	0	0	0	0	
Sylvania	0	0	0.272	0	0	
Other (centers, shared, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	
District Total	0	0	0.272	0	0.544	

Religious Studies:

Cost Center:	# of Full time faculty	Release FTE (any reason)	FT Fac IFTE 4 term	Overload IFTE 4 term	PT Fac IFTE 4 term	Other Employees (tech staff , IAAs casual, please identify roles)

			total	total	total	
Cascade	0	0	0	0	0.816	
Rock Creek	0	0	0	0	8.976	
Southeast	0	0	0	0	0	
Sylvania	0	0	0	0	0	
Other (centers, shared, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	
District Total	0	0	0	0	9.792	

SECTION 2 IS IN PART A, YEAR 1

SECTION 3: REFLECTION ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

3A. Assessment Reports:

(To be completed by Academic Affairs, with space for notes from program if needed)

_____ Current Multi Year Plan on file *

no 2018 - 2019 Plan and EOY submitted (Plan but no EOY)

**Note from Academic Affairs: All LDC MYPs are officially "out of date" for this year, but since we are in the middle of changing expectations, we did not ask for new MYPs this Fall. This will be expected next year to will need to be changed next year to reflect new assessment options.*

Note from Program: Note from Program: With all the changes that were happening (see historical synopsis in Part A) Learning Assessment for 2018-19 was not completed. However, we have artifacts and will be assessing them along with 2019-20 artifacts to do a combined report in June 2020

3B. Please respond to the question below, which relates to your SACs 2019-20 Learning Assessment Report to the Learning Assessment Council (LAC).

Context Statement

The Integrated Studies SAC has been challenged with meeting the college's expectations for assessment, partly because its unusual status as a loose confederation of subject areas related only by their interdisciplinary nature and the fact that nearly all of the instructors are PT.

The Fall 2016 outlined a plan to participate in in the national Multistate Collaborative (MSC), with all classes from CHLA, HUM, R and SJ contributing artifacts. In Spring, the SAC submitted student work from just 3 courses (5 sections), and there were 19 students who had 68 credits or more (study paramters). Data was provided to the SAC from both internal (college-wide) and MSC scoring in Fall 2017; it is unclear whether the SAC reviewed those results.

The 2017-2018 assessment plan focused on HUM 100, Critical Thinking was assessed using the AAC&U LEAP VALUE rubric, and scored by faculty (all in HUM?) but the data presented suggested scoring that was not broking out by dimension (72% of 100 students reported to have met the benchmark of 3) so it would have been impossible to use this assessment for improving teaching and learning. Also, assuming there were multiple raters, the method for norming was not clear.

In 2018-2019, a plan was summited to assess Cultural Literacy using the newly developed PCC CL rubric across a large range of courses. The plan seemed sound, with regards to purpose and goal and plan (faculty selecting the assignment and redacting the work, a coordinator to organize the sample, conduct norming and scoring to occur in Spring term.) It is not clear whether this happened, as no EOY report was submitted.

With the development of PCC rubrics for the outcomes required for the Gen Ed courses, and the need to develop assignments aligned to those rubrics for Gen Ed approval, the SAC has the starting materials for a very relevant assessment project, using assignments have been developed for Gen Ed Approval. IDS and R courses were reviewed by GEARS in January 2020; HUM and INTL were due March 27 review at the May GEARS meeting. If any of the assignments were given to students in Winter term, or are planned for Spring term, we strongly encourage you to consider conducting norming (online) and scoring (asynchronously) in Spring term. If you have made other plans for assessment year (no plan was received this Fall), please feel free to follow through with that one.

We understand that a SAC composed nearly entirely of all PT faculty (and or those with primary assignment in a different discipline) faces some logistical and practical problems. Still, we hope that assessment of student work for the purpose of improving teaching and learning can be appreciated as a valuable aspect of teaching.

Peer Reviewers' Comments and Question

Since there was no report submitted, and thus no Peer Review for 2019, the summary above and qeustion below were developed by the Dean of Academic Affairs.

Question: *What are your plans for assessment for 2019-20? Please provide details as possible. What challenges do you see in completing this work, and what ideas do you have for addressing them? Is there any coaching or mentoring that would be helpful, and if so, for what aspect(s) fo the work? What point do you believe you can get to by the June 30 due date for the report?*

SAC Response: We will be using artifacts to assess Cultural Literacy, using the last DSAC rubric. The artifacts are from 2018-19 and 2019-2020, and we will compare the results for the two years. Our only challenge is having time, given that we moved to this Program Review format at the beginning of Spring 2020, and have been working on it, teaching remotely, and still have the Learning Assessment work to complete. We have had a brief norming session, and believe we can meet the June 30 due date for the report.

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / CONTEXT / ACHIEVEMENTS / CHALLENGES

Answered in discipline sections below.

SECTION 5 : PLANNING

Answered in discipline sections below.

Humanities: Sections 4 and 5:

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / CONTEXT / ACHIEVEMENTS / CHALLENGES

4. Is there anything you would like to share about your discipline at this time? (e.g. notable achievements, challenges, issues, broad goals, additional context)? (Please limit response to 300 words)

The Humanities offers students the chance to discover what is possible in life through an academic multidisciplinary approach to the human experience. Faculty lead students on a journey that requires critical thinking and self reflection on a broad swath of issues and ideas each week. As the world began face the challenges of the pandemic, many Humanities instructors integrated the challenges of COVID19 into their curriculum and aligned it with student's lived experience. For example, when examining personal and collective values, students reflected on how guiding principles evolved or changed due to the pandemic. Also, instructors who required students to attend live cultural events pivoted and found online opportunities to meet this requirement of the course.

The creation of the HARTS (Humanities and the Arts) Initiative and the HARTS Council, by faculty from a variety of disciplines, led to the development of a different version of HUM 100 by Sylvania Full-time Faculty. The course functions as an overview of and introduction to a wide variety of disciplines within the Humanities. This term, HARTS has launched the online publication *Wellspring*, offering works from the Humanities *designed to* lift up student and faculty work and reflections during this unprecedented time.

As PCC shifted the mode of delivery to either remote or online learning, 80 percent of the Humanities faculty used their experience as knowledgeable online educators to transition easily. Before the pandemic, 60% of the enrollment in the HUM100 courses stem from the online sections (Appendix A 2016-16, 2017-17 and 2018-19 enrollment data). Before the pandemic, 19.6% of all PCC classes were taught online (per Laura Massey). The success rate of students in online courses is approximately 10% lower than those participating in F2F courses (similar to comparable disciplines.) When comparing to other General Education courses, HUM courses have similar success rates to WR 121. However, HUM has lower success rates compared to Com 111 but much higher than Math 111. Our success rates, in terms of gender and ethnicity, closely mirror with the overall college statistics indicating that we can do better for our marginalized populations. Members of the SAC are participating in the Cultural Literacy group that is looking at how to better assess this important element of the undergraduate experience at PCC. The work being completed by the Cultural Literacy group should provide our SAC with a rubric and best practice guidelines to improve course content that will inspire success from students who represent different genders, socio-economic backgrounds and ethnicities.

SECTION 5: PLANNING

5A. New Discipline Objectives

Based on the results of your reflection from Part A (Year 1), list any new objectives for the next two years.

Objective	Implementation Timeline	Progress Measures
Maintaining/updating HUM Curriculum, including	First check in Fall 2021	Enrollment, increasing

monitoring Gen Ed changes		student success in classes
On-going assessment of student learning through signature assignment	2020-21 Year	Number of students meeting expected levels
Revise Humanities and Technology sequence (HUM 201, 202, 203)	Fall 2020, to start by 2021-22 year	New curriculum approved and scheduled

5B: Resource Requests

List below any resource requests and indicate if these are needed to meet the objectives noted above. Please list in priority order

Resource Request	Approx \$	Related to Program Objective? Which?	Type of Request (check the appropriate boxes)				
			FT Fac or Staff	Facilities or equip	Other	Ongoing	One time
Full-time faculty in HUM to guide work required to maintain and revise curriculum, work with assessment, other college initiatives	\$80,000	All	X				
If a full time hire is not possible, providing funds to support part-time faculty work on curriculum, assessment, etc.	\$2,000	All				X	

5B1: How will the resource requests support the discipline's challenges and the objectives identified above?

Maintaining the curriculum with no assigned full-time faculty is challenging. Those who teach HUM 100 have responsibilities to their primary disciplinary assignments. The remaining HUM classes are only taught by part-time faculty. Many part-time faculty work at several different institutions to make a living. The burden of working on curriculum, completing assessment and other requirements is quite difficult, if it falls to the part-time faculty, which has been the case to this point. If it is not possible to add a full-time HUM faculty, there needs to be funding for part-time faculty to do the work required.

5B2: Aside from financial support, what do you need from administration in order to carry out your planned improvements?

Clear communication to part-time faculty around training opportunities related to expectations of assessment and other SAC concerns.

Interdisciplinary Studies: Sections 4 and 5:

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / CONTEXT / ACHIEVEMENTS / CHALLENGES

The main challenges have already been mentioned elsewhere, but this SAC is quite small and populated entirely by contingent faculty and a few with full-time appointments in other SACs. This highlights weaknesses in the college's SAC organizational scheme (such as critical mass and unrepresented voices) A higher level of financial and administrative support for SAC activities is necessary; the workload of managing the SAC should not be falling so heavily on faculty.

SECTION 5: PLANNING

5A. New Discipline Objectives

Based on the results of your reflection from Part A (Year 1), list any new objectives for the next two years.

Objective	Implementation Timeline	Progress Measures
<i>Increase awareness of and enrollment in IDS 234 (and other courses)</i>	IDS faculty will work on this fall quarters before the course offering in winter	Student numbers (especially outside the EXITO program)

5B: Resource Requests

List below any resource requests and indicate if these are needed to meet the objectives noted above. Please list in priority order

Resource Request	Approx \$	Related to Program Objective? Which?	Type of Request (check the appropriate boxes)				
			FT Fac or Staff	Facilities or equip	Other	Ongoing	One time
Help producing promotional materials/flyers	?		y				y

5B1: How will the resource requests support the disciplines's challenges and the objectives identified above?

Faculty are not graphic designers or marketers; getting help with publicity/marketing strategies would help recruit students to the courses.

5B2: Aside from financial support, what do you need from administration in order to carry out your planned improvements?

Help from advising and coordination with CG to publicize IDS offering and to direct the appropriate students to the course.

Continued administration support for the highly successful team teaching model we have employed.

International Studies: Sections 4 and 5:

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / CONTEXT / ACHIEVEMENTS / CHALLENGES

4. Is there anything you would like to share about your discipline at this time? (e.g. notable achievements, challenges, issues, broad goals, additional context)? (Please limit response to 300 words)

(This section is NOT a repeat of what is in Template A)

International Studies is a highly unique field of study defined by its interdisciplinary focus. Students gain not only the knowledge to understand the issues and challenges that face the global community, but the tools and training to address issues of development, the environment, political and economic aspects of globalization, human rights, peace and conflict resolution, and international law and organizations. The class also supports the Global Studies Focus Award, which was created and is overseen by the Internationalization Steering Committee.

PCC International Studies faculty have invited guest speakers to enhance the students' understanding of International Studies. Some of the more recent examples include: Dr. John Clint Work, currently working in Washington DC for the NGO "38 North", Dr. Shawn Smallman and Dr. Evguenia Davidova from Portland State University speaks not only about International Studies as a discipline but also their individual areas of research. We have hosted Lyla Bashan, MS who is a native Oregonian now working as a Foreign Service Officer with the United States Agency for International Development and author of the book Global: An Extraordinary Guide For Ordinary Heroes. Elizabeth Viljoen, MS has shared with students about South Africa and Dr. Marlene Eid (PCC Psychology instructor) shares about Palestine both personal experiences and academic research. We have also had Amanda Giuliana Chao, MA share about the power art has in global issues and hosted Sabina Haque who is an artist of South Asian descent and part-time faculty member at Portland State University as well as hosted Yusuf Iqbal who is the founder and director of local non-profit Americans for Rohingya and the Oregon Rohingya Society. Through hearing from individuals in the field of International Studies, students have begun to expand their global awareness and lense on the world around them.

The increase of students obtaining the Global Studies Focus Award at Portland Community College, is a clear indication of the growing interest and acknowledgement of the discipline. Since 2016, 46 students have met the qualifications and received the award. A student from Spring 2020 reported to one of our instructors that " I can't thank (PCC) enough for (providing) such excellent and enthusiastic teachers of International Studies. I feel very privileged! I'm very excited for class on Wednesday and to hear from Dr. Smallman. I'm actually going to PSU in the fall for my BA in Urban Development and Public Affairs which has many branches to choose from, and before taking this class I had no idea what I was going to do. But now, I know for sure I'll be going for International and Global Studies - so THANK YOU!"

SECTION 5: PLANNING

5A. New Discipline Objectives

Based on the results of your reflection from Part A (Year 1), list any new objectives for the next two years.

Objective	Implementation Timeline	Progress Measures
Formalizing a districtwide scheduling process	2020 -2021	Deans/department chairs

		meet with faculty to discuss collaboratively enrollment patterns and scheduling issues
Formalizing an assessment process for instructors	2020 -2022	By the conclusion of 2022, have instructors who teach the class assessed for meeting SAC expectations
Launching our signature assignment.	Faculty teach using assignment once or twice , and, if necessary, assess its strengths and weaknesses, modify and discuss with one another, launch the revised assignment to see if we achieve improved outcome	Are our students successful in completing the signature assignment? Do we improve it so that there is wide student success going forward? Do we get positive feedback on artifacts evaluated by the Learning Assessment Council? If not, do we work to improve instruction as a group?

5B: Resource Requests

List below any resource requests and indicate if these are needed to meet the objectives noted above.
Please list in priority order

Resource Request	Approx \$	Related to Program Objective? Which?	Type of Request (check the appropriate boxes)				
			FT Fac or Staff	Facilities or equip	Other	Ongoing	One time
As enrollment allows, rotate the course between all four campuses, so that it is taught as least once a year at SY, CA, RC and SE.		Formalizing district-wide scheduling			X		

5B1: How will the resource requests support the disciplines's challenges and the objectives identified above?
It completes the goal for regular and agreed on scheduling of the INTL 201 to meet the needs of the Global Studies Focus Award and goals of the Internationalization Steering Committee which shepherded the creation of the class.

5B2: Aside from financial support, what do you need from administration in order to carry out your planned improvements?

We need administrators to push faculty assessment forward, as well as meet collaboratively with current discipline faculty to discuss scheduling and hiring options.

Religious Studies: Sections 4 and 5:

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / CONTEXT / ACHIEVEMENTS / CHALLENGES

4. Is there anything you would like to share about your discipline at this time? (e.g. notable achievements, challenges, issues, broad goals, additional context)? (Please limit response to 300 words)

Religious Studies began with one course, World Religions, under the old Humanities SAC. At our last Program Review, we had two courses, with Asian Religions preparing to go fully online. Since then, both Intro to the Old Testament and Intro to the New Testament have been added. The New Testament class has developed into a fully online course, worked on by a faculty team with support from Distance Learning.

All of our classes support transfer students who use them to meet requirements at their transfer institutions. For students going into Health Care disciplines, knowledge about patient religious beliefs is required or recommended by employers. In addition, many students take World Religions for Gen Ed credit: it was #31 on the 2019 list of Gen Ed courses taken by Associate Degree Graduates provided by the Curriculum office. The American Academy of Religion has recently put out Religious Literacy Guidelines on “What U.S. College Graduates Need to Understand about Religion”, a document with which PCC classes are in line.

We are seeing a decline in the number of students taking Religious Studies classes, in line with the overall decline in institutional enrollment. We’ve also been impacted some by the closure of local transfer colleges, most recently, Concordia University. Nevertheless, we continue to offer most classes every term, but we have fewer classes in both face-to-face and online modalities.

One area that our students do well with is use of library resources. Our subject area librarian reports that Religious Studies faculty and students engage actively with library print and electronic resources. Religion books and DVDs are shelved in the 200s in the Dewey Decimal system, and this collection has one of the highest circulation rates of any of the humanities collections. Religion streaming videos, eBooks and database collections are also well used, and the library’s Religion research guide receives more traffic than the guides for most other humanities courses. The may be because Religious Studies faculty collaborate with librarians to curate the collection, and create assignments that encourage students to explore resources beyond assigned readings.

Our biggest challenge is the fact that not only do we not have any faculty teaching full-time in Religious Studies, no Religious Studies faculty member is full-time at PCC in any area. While Religious Studies has been able to meet institutional requirements, using work, and attention to institutional requirements and changes, by a small number of interested faculty with assignment rights, when assignment rights are eliminated, there is no guarantee that there will be faculty teaching who are willing and able to maintain curriculum and work with learning assessment. Because we know Religious Studies courses are important for PCC students to meet their career goals, and because Religious Studies curriculum needs to be maintained by faculty with specific Religious Studies knowledge, and because we recognize that it is unlikely a full-time faculty position will be

created in the foreseeable future, we suggest that one Multi-Year Contract be created specifically requiring the faculty member accepting the position provide support for the Religious Studies curriculum and assessment.

SECTION 5 : PLANNING

OK to add rows to the tables below, but please limit the response to this question, 5A and 5B1 and 2, to two pages (one front/back)

5A. New Discipline Objectives

Based on the results of your reflection from Part A (Year 1), list any new objectives for the next two years.

Objective	Implementation Timeline	Progress Measures
Maintaining/updating R Curriculum, particularly monitoring Gen Ed changes	First check in Fall 2021	Enrollment, increasing student success in classes
On-going assessment of student learning through signature assignment	2020-21 Year	Number of students meeting expected levels

5B: Resource Requests

List below any resource requests and indicate if these are needed to meet the objectives noted above.

Please list in priority order

Resource Request	Approx \$	Related to Program Objective? Which?	Type of Request (check the appropriate boxes)				
			FT Fac or Staff	Facilities or equip	Other	Ongoing	One time
One MYC for R Curriculum/Learning Assessment	Regular teaching pay + \$1000/year maximum for R related work	Both				X	

5B1: How will the resource requests support the disciplines's challenges and the objectives identified above? Maintaining Religious Studies as a viable discipline requires having at least one faculty member assigned to carry out work on curriculum and assessment, and liaise with the rest of the faculty. With all faculty only part-time at PCC, many with other "main" jobs apart from PCC, and with the coming changes in institutional organization, it is vital that Religious Studies have one faculty member identified and supported in that role. That person would also stay on top of other institutional requirements for the discipline, such as catalog updates and instructor qualifications. The cost is for the time above and beyond teaching: up to now, it has been covered by the faculty person being SAC Co-Chair and participating in work by Academic Affairs, plus some work done by other faculty at SAC meetings; some R faculty never participate in SAC work, although all are informed and invited.

5B2: Aside from financial support, what do you need from administration in order to carry out your planned improvements? Help in creating, staffing and supporting the MYC. And continued inclusion in work being done on Pathways, Gen Ed, and other academic initiatives.

SECTION 6: Feedback and Follow up

This section is for Administration to provide feedback.

6A. Strengths and successes of the discipline as evidenced by the data, analysis and reflection:

6B. Areas of concern, if any:

6C. Recommended Next Steps:

___ Proceed as planned on discipline review schedule

___ Follow up conversation needed with SAC, Dept Chair(s) and Deans

6D. Additional Comments:

Appendix A

Sylvania Campus

Course #	2016-17			2017-18			2018-19		
	F2F	OL	HY	F2F	OL	HY	F2F	OL	HY
HUM 100							4.4		
HUM 214	2.6			1.6			4.8		
INTL 201	4.4			5.5			1.7		

Table 2A-1: Enrollments (SFTE) by Year, Modality, and Course for Sylvania Campus

Cascade Campus

Course #	2016-17			2017-18			2018-19		
	F2F	OL	HY	F2F	OL	HY	F2F	OL	HY
HUM 100	5.5	4.3		3.4	4.7		3.5	3.9	
HUM 201	2.1					0.8			0.8
HUM 202	1.5			1.4					
HUM 203	1.8			1.7					
HUM 204	0.6			0.5					
HUM 214	3.3			3.1			5.2		
HUM 221			2.9			3.4			1.0
INTL 201	1.2			0.8			2.2		
R 201								1.4	
R 210	2.3			1.6			1.6		
R 212								1.0	

Table 2A-2: Enrollments (SFTE) by Year, Modality, and Course for Cascade Campus

Rock Creek Campus

Course #	2016-17			2017-18			2018-19		
	F2F	OL	HY	F2F	OL	HY	F2F	OL	HY
HUM 100	24.0	43.3		28.6	43.7		18.6	34.3	
HUM 201	1.4			1.6			0.8		
HUM 202	1.3			1.2			1.9		
HUM 203	2.7			2.3			1.4		
HUM 214	1.8			4.8			3.0		
HUM 221					2.5			10.3	
IDS 234				0.5			1.0		
IDS 299	0.7								
INTL 201							1.2		
R 201		7.0			9.1			3.6	
R 210	16.5	32.9		15.9	35.5		8.5	27.7	
R 211	1.6			4.0	5.0		0.8	15.7	
R 212	1.1			1.3				4.1	

Table 2A-3: Enrollments (SFTE) by Year, Modality, and Course for Rock Creek Campus

Southeast Campus

Course #	2016-17			2017-18			2018-19		
	F2F	OL	HY	F2F	OL	HY	F2F	OL	HY
HUM 214	2.2			3.5			6.1		
INTL 201				1.8					
R 210	2.2								

Table 2A-4: Enrollments (SFTE) by Year, Modality, and Course for Southeast Campus

Appendix A

Course #	2016-17								2017-18								2018-19							
	Overall		F2F		Online		Hybrid		Overall		F2F		Online		Hybrid		Overall		F2F		Online		Hybrid	
	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S
HUM 100	875	79.3	328	84.5	547	76.2			911	78.0	361	83.1	550	74.7			737	74.6	297	80.5	440	70.7		
HUM 201	37	75.7	37	75.7					26	92.3	17	88.2			9	100.0	16	93.8	8	87.5			8	100.0
HUM 202	32	90.6	32	90.6					30	93.3	30	93.3					22	86.4	22	86.4				
HUM 203	51	84.3	51	84.3					47	85.1	47	85.1					16	81.3	16	81.3				
HUM 204	5	80.0	5	80.0					5	60.0	5	60.0												
HUM 214	113	72.6	113	72.6					145	73.8	145	73.8					213	76.5	213	76.5				
HUM 221	33	84.8					33	84.8	67	74.6			29	79.3	38	71.1	129	72.1			117	73.5	12	58.3
IDS 234									6	100.0	6	100.0					11	90.9	11	90.9				
IDS 299	8	100.0	8	100.0																				
INTL 201	63	76.2	63	76.2					88	92.0	88	92.0					57	82.5	57	82.5				
R 201	79	60.8			79	60.8			103	59.2			103	59.2			56	62.5			56	62.5		
R 210	610	80.0	236	80.9	374	79.4			597	78.2	196	77.0	401	78.8			428	81.5	113	87.6	315	79.4		
R 211	16	93.8	16	93.8					102	82.4	44	93.2	58	74.1			185	77.8	9	100.0	176	76.7		
R 212	12	91.7	12	91.7					13	84.6	13	84.6					60	78.3			60	78.3		

Table 2B-1: Enrollments (Enrl) and Percent Successful (% S) by Year, Modality, and Course

Course #	2016-17								2017-18								2018-19							
	Male		Female		Non-Binary		Unknown		Male		Female		Non-Binary		Unknown		Male		Female		Non-Binary		Unknown	
	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S
HUM 100	335	78.2	519	80.0			21	81.0	351	77.5	539	78.1	< 5		20	85.0	278	75.9	435	72.9	< 5		24	91.7
HUM 201	15	73.3	20	80.0	< 5		< 5		9	88.9	17	94.1					9	88.9	7	100.0				
HUM 202	14	92.9	17	88.2			< 5		14	100.0	16	87.5					13	92.3	8	75.0	< 5		< 5	
HUM 203	22	90.9	28	78.6			< 5		31	77.4	15	100.0	< 5				10	80.0	5	80.0	< 5		< 5	
HUM 204	< 5		< 5						< 5		< 5													
HUM 214	40	70.0	71	73.2			< 5		58	67.2	82	80.5			5	40.0	92	73.9	109	78.9	< 5		11	72.7
HUM 221	14	78.6	18	88.9			< 5		26	69.2	41	78.0					51	68.6	69	71.0			9	100.0
IDS 234									< 5		< 5						6	83.3	5	100.0				
IDS 299	< 5		6	100.0																				
INTL 201	37	70.3	25	84.0			< 5		31	90.3	55	92.7			< 5		28	82.1	27	81.5			< 5	
R 201	22	45.5	56	66.1			< 5		30	73.3	68	52.9			5	60.0	24	54.2	30	73.3	< 5		< 5	
R 210	210	81.9	379	79.7	< 5		19	68.4	175	77.1	403	78.4			19	84.2	148	80.4	260	83.5			20	65.0
R 211	10	90.0	< 5				< 5		34	79.4	67	83.6			< 5		65	78.5	111	77.5			9	77.8
R 212	< 5		10	90.0					5	60.0	7	100.0			< 5		17	64.7	41	82.9			< 5	

Table 2B-2: Enrollments (Enrl) and Percent Successful (% S) by Year, Gender, and Course

Appendix A

2016-17

Course #	AI		AS		BAA		HIS		HPI		INT		WH		2+		UNK	
	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S
HUM 100	10	90.0	53	84.9	49	69.4	94	78.7	6	66.7	15	93.3	530	78.5	74	77.0	44	93.2
HUM 201	< 5		< 5				9	88.9			< 5		14	71.4	6	50.0	< 5	
HUM 202			< 5		< 5		6	83.3					18	94.4	< 5		< 5	
HUM 203	< 5		< 5		< 5		6	100.0			< 5		28	82.1	6	83.3	< 5	
HUM 204					< 5		< 5						< 5					
HUM 214	< 5		7	100.0	11	54.5	24	66.7					48	77.1	17	64.7	5	80.0
HUM 221	< 5		< 5		< 5		< 5				< 5		20	80.0	< 5		< 5	
IDS 299					< 5		< 5						< 5		< 5			
INTL 201			< 5		5	80.0	8	87.5			6	66.7	29	79.3	8	62.5	< 5	
R 201			10	40.0	< 5		< 5		< 5		< 5		55	67.3	7	28.6		
R 210	12	66.7	42	83.3	31	77.4	60	85.0	< 5		< 5		376	79.8	47	70.2	34	85.3
R 211			7	100.0			< 5						5	100.0	< 5			
R 212			< 5										10	90.0				

Table 2B-3a: Enrollments (Enrl) and Percent Successful (% S) by Ethnicity and Course for 2016-17

2017-18

Course #	AI		AS		BAA		HIS		HPI		INT		WH		2+		UNK	
	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S
HUM 100	7	57.1	51	80.4	46	67.4	143	79.7	5	100.0	9	88.9	522	79.9	75	61.3	53	84.9
HUM 201			< 5		< 5		5	100.0	< 5				11	100.0	< 5		< 5	
HUM 202			< 5		< 5		< 5				< 5		20	90.0	< 5		< 5	
HUM 203			5	100.0	< 5		< 5				< 5		27	77.8	< 5		< 5	
HUM 204					< 5								< 5		< 5			
HUM 214	< 5		6	66.7	22	77.3	26	69.2	< 5		< 5		60	75.0	16	56.3	11	90.9
HUM 221			7	57.1	6	83.3	< 5		< 5				44	75.0	< 5		< 5	
IDS 234	< 5						< 5						< 5					
INTL 201	< 5		12	83.3	< 5		15	93.3	< 5		< 5		38	92.1	6	100.0	6	83.3
R 201	< 5		17	64.7	< 5		6	66.7			< 5		58	58.6	12	41.7	< 5	
R 210	6	83.3	34	88.2	44	72.7	74	68.9	< 5		9	88.9	333	79.6	52	75.0	41	85.4
R 211			8	87.5	15	60.0	8	62.5			< 5		54	87.0	9	100.0	7	85.7
R 212			< 5								< 5		6	83.3	< 5			

Table 2B-3b: Enrollments (Enrl) and Percent Successful (% S) by Ethnicity and Course for 2017-18

2018-19

Course #	AI		AS		BAA		HIS		HPI		INT		WH		2+		UNK	
	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S
HUM 100	10	50.0	49	73.5	41	68.3	113	63.7	6	83.3	8	75.0	411	78.3	65	76.9	34	76.5
HUM 201					< 5		< 5		< 5		< 5		9	100.0	< 5			
HUM 202			< 5		< 5		< 5				< 5		16	81.3	< 5			
HUM 203							< 5						10	80.0	< 5		< 5	
HUM 214	< 5		11	72.7	36	69.4	36	77.8	< 5		< 5		75	78.7	29	72.4	18	94.4
HUM 221	< 5		7	57.1	12	83.3	8	87.5			< 5		81	74.1	11	54.5	6	50.0
IDS 234			< 5		< 5								< 5		< 5		< 5	
INTL 201			5	100.0	5	40.0	9	88.9	< 5		5	80.0	24	83.3	7	85.7	< 5	
R 201			8	62.5	< 5		< 5				< 5		32	68.8	7	42.9	< 5	
R 210	< 5		32	71.9	23	87.0	48	81.3	6	66.7	9	88.9	245	81.6	38	81.6	24	87.5
R 211	< 5		13	76.9	17	58.8	10	100.0	< 5				118	79.7	13	69.2	10	80.0
R 212			< 5		< 5		< 5		< 5				38	71.1	< 5		7	85.7

Table 2B-3c: Enrollments (Enrl) and Percent Successful (% S) by Ethnicity and Course for 2018-19

Appendix A

Course #	2016-17				2017-18				2018-19			
	Offered		Not Offered		Offered		Not Offered		Offered		Not Offered	
	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S	Enrl	% S
HUM 100	435	75.6	440	83.0	454	73.6	457	82.5	340	72.1	397	76.8
HUM 201	18	61.1	19	89.5	14	92.9	12	91.7	7	100.0	9	88.9
HUM 202	17	88.2	15	93.3	12	91.7	18	94.4	9	88.9	13	84.6
HUM 203	23	87.0	28	82.1	19	89.5	28	82.1	6	50.0	10	100.0
HUM 204	< 5		< 5		< 5		< 5					
HUM 214	64	76.6	49	67.3	83	69.9	62	79.0	113	76.1	100	77.0
HUM 221	20	85.0	13	84.6	28	67.9	39	79.5	57	66.7	72	76.4
IDS 234					5	100.0	< 5		9	88.9	< 5	
IDS 299	< 5		< 5									
INTL 201	24	87.5	39	69.2	41	87.8	47	95.7	21	76.2	36	86.1
R 201	43	60.5	36	61.1	46	47.8	57	68.4	23	56.5	33	66.7
R 210	269	74.7	341	84.2	270	74.8	327	81.0	168	80.4	260	82.3
R 211	7	100.0	9	88.9	48	79.2	54	85.2	61	70.5	124	81.5
R 212	< 5		8	100.0	7	85.7	6	83.3	18	94.4	42	71.4

Table 2B-4: Enrollments (Enrl) and Percent Successful (% S) by Year and Pell Eligibility