

SOCIOLOGY

Program Review 2016

Our mission within the PCC sociology program is to support students in cultivating a sociological imagination - connecting their personal experience to broader social and historical contexts. In doing so, students develop the skills to identify, analyze and intervene in the larger social forces that shape their lived experiences, their communities and the broader social world.

1. PROGRAM | DISCIPLINE OVERVIEW

- A. What are the educational goals or objectives of this program/discipline? How do these compare with national or professional program/discipline trends or guidelines? Have they changed since the last review, or are they expected to change in the next five years?

“The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways.
The point; however, is to *change* it.”

Karl Marx¹ - A founding thinker within sociology

In 1959, the celebrated sociologist C. Wright Mills set an agenda for sociology. In his book, *The Sociological Imagination*, Mills outlined the sociological perspective and tied it inextricably to our capacity to engage as responsible members of a democratic community. According to Mills, “The sociological imagination enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within a society” (p. 6).² It enables us to link the seemingly isolated experiences of our lives (biography) to the historical epoch in which they are situated as well as to the much larger systems of power that characterize that epoch. This analytic skill, Mills suggested, is a prerequisite for democracy. We cannot act responsibly within our communities – we cannot wisely self-govern – without the ability to link our lived experiences to the social systems we inhabit and to the various other experiences of the many peoples with whom we live. In short, we cannot develop effective public policy without acknowledging larger patterns in society.

The sociological imagination continues to be a necessary analytic tool for making sense of the times in which we live. Today we face a number of social and ecological crises – global climate change, mass extinction, declining economic opportunity, as well as persistent and stark inequities across a wide variety of social groups (e.g. race, class, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, and so on.). Most individuals experience poverty, police brutality, discrimination and pollution as individual-level problems, but the sociological imagination reminds us that they are actually inseparably linked to larger social forces of climate disruption, capitalism, unequal education, the war on drugs/mass incarceration and militarization of the police force. Moreover, they are experienced differently by various social groups (i.e., African Americans experience police brutality and the militarization of the police force differently than do white people).

To its credit, PCC has taken on projects designed to address many of these issues within the institution and to train students to address them in the broader community. While PCC initiatives have emerged from a variety of places within the College, Sociology offers a set of skills and perspectives and a team of scholars who are well situated to contribute to social

¹ Marx, Karl. 1845. Theses on Feuerbach, Thesis 11.

² Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

justice and sustainability initiatives. Consistent with the long tradition of public sociology, many sociologists at PCC work to link teaching and college service to the perennial work of social justice and social transformation.

The American Sociological Association (ASA)³ in part defines sociology as:

- the study of society
- a social science involving the study of the social lives of people, groups, and societies
- the study of our behavior as social beings, covering everything from the analysis of short contacts between anonymous individuals on the street to the study of global social processes

The mission of the PCC Sociology program draws from this ASA definition while also emphasizing Mills' concept of the sociological imagination. At PCC our aim is to:

...support students in cultivating a **sociological imagination** - connecting their personal experience to broader social and historical contexts. In doing so, students develop the skills to identify, analyze and intervene in the larger social forces that shape their lived experiences, their communities and the broader social world.

Derived from this mission, the Sociology program has the following learning goals:

Sociology students will:

- Develop a sociological imagination - connecting personal experience to broader social and historical contexts
- Apply social theories and empirical evidence to analyze larger social forces
- Analyze the construction of culture and its relationship to systems of inequality
- Articulate a sociological perspective in written form
- Apply a sociological understanding of social change to intervene in the larger social forces that shape their lived experiences, their communities and the broader social world

B. Briefly describe changes that were made as a result of SAC recommendations and/or administrative responses from the last program review.

Per SAC recommendations and administrative responses to the established goals in our 2011-2016 program review (see Appendix 1), the Sociology SAC took the following steps. Please note that many of the issues addressed here (in 1B) are discussed in greater detail in following sections of this document.

³ From the American Sociology Association <http://www.asanet.org/about/sociology.cfm>

Goal 1: Assess the enrollments and effectiveness of the program and its role at the college and throughout the district.

- Once we transitioned to the 4-credit model, without the sequence, we saw enrollment drop in several courses. We continue to be concerned about the low enrollments in SOC 205 Social Change in Society and SOC 206 Social Problems.
- We monitored enrollment on each campus and determined whether additional courses and faculty are needed. Department Chairs and Division Deans communicated more with each other, across the district, which facilitated scheduling. Instructors noted that we need to receive more communication from some Department Chairs earlier in the scheduling cycle.
- SAC members marketed courses to students and advisors, especially SOC 205 and specialty courses. We plan to update our PCC website, develop a brochure, and do more outreach to students and academic advisors.
- We reviewed PCC Focus Awards and Certificate Programs to make recommendations to include sociology topic courses in programs such as Criminal Justice, Peace and Conflict Studies, the Sustainability Focus Award, and the Social Justice Focus Award. We determined that more sociology courses are needed in Focus Awards and Certificate Programs to offer insights on the influence of social contexts on broader social issues.

Goal 2: Support the needs of full-time and part-time faculty

- The new full-time position at Rock Creek has been a very positive addition to our SAC, addressing student demand and balancing workloads.
- Along with the Faculty Federation, we monitored the full-time/part-time ratio; worked to protect assignment rights of part-time instructors; and discussed issues of workload equity, given increases in administrative tasks of full-time instructors, expanded writing assignments and assessment, and class sizes in online courses.
- Better training and support for part-time faculty were provided through the Teaching & Learning Centers and the creation of a SAC-based instructor orientation packet. We continue to identify sources for professional development.
- Contingency plans and resources for courses were created in case of emergencies. Backup faculty were trained in additional courses, particularly in Desire2Learn.
- Challenges continue to exist in scheduling meetings when part-time faculty can attend. The volume of work hours were not addressed during the 2011-2016 PR Cycle.

Goal 3: Facilitate SAC chair workload, rotation, and training

- SAC Chair tasks were identified based on the Contract and past SAC Chair experiences. Efforts were also made to delegate workloads between SAC members and to create a fair and regular rotation for SAC chairs among full-time faculty at the different campuses. Appropriate delegation and workload distribution is still needed among faculty.

- There is improved training, mentoring, and support of the SAC chair, from the College and former SAC chairs.

Goal 4: Improve research data on student success

- We have worked with Institutional Effectiveness and have been pleased with the support and quality of resources and data related to student success and retention. We also now receive information from our Division Deans and Department Chairs.
- Assessment has been a core focus of our SAC work over the last five years, with greater awareness of assessment techniques, more intentional review of assignments, increased engagement among instructors to offer feedback and support, and revisions of course materials based on feedback.
- The pre-test and post-test assessment model was used one year, but we did not find the data to be robust enough so we began reviewing artifacts from classes, using norming exercises, rubrics, and participating in the Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment (MSC) project.

Goal 5: Improve resource support for effective teaching

- Increasing numbers of resources on students in distress were made available through division meetings and the Teaching and Learning Centers. Faculty have taken advantage of the online forms.
- SAC Chairs have kept our SAC membership list up to date on our MyPCC Groups Page and Gmail list.
- Professional development needs are more clearly available through Division Deans and Professional & Organizational Development.
- As noted above, we have created an orientation packet for all sociology faculty. Some part-time faculty also attend the part-time in-service provided by the TLCs.
- Needs in classrooms and offices were documented and shared with Division Deans, although clarity is needed regarding resources can be requested and the appropriate process for requesting them. Instructors continue to request and receive resources from the library.

Goal 6: Improve student access and success

We are very committed to increasing student access and success. To achieve these goals, we participated in the following efforts over the last five years:

- We developed a textbook selection matrix, based on instructor and CCOG priorities, which we have used to review textbooks. One core goal was to keep prices at reasonable levels, so we have also negotiated custom texts with publishers and the bookstore. A number of sociology faculty are also collaborating with the library to find, use and share Open Educational Resources.

- We have sought information from Department Chairs, Division Deans, and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness on enrollment and retention. We continue to discuss the impact of prerequisites on student access and success.
- We held meetings with Portland State University's Sociology Department faculty to discuss articulation agreements and student transfer and support. We have also reviewed and negotiated articulation agreements with the University of Oregon and Oregon State University.
- Instructors use Course Progress Notification (CPNs) to reach out to students and offer support. Instructors also utilize the Student of Concern form to alert the college and illicit support with difficult students.

Goal 7: Protect academic freedom

We have discussed this important pedagogical issue, including:

- Intellectual property rights, particularly with distance learning courses.
- How to address sensitive and politically-charged topics, such as current issues related to "Whiteness History Month."

Goal 8: Improve collegiality in SAC

In response to hiring new faculty and recognizing changing group dynamics, our SAC committed to improving collegiality in our SAC. To achieve this goal, we:

- Worked with a facilitator to help establish guidelines for a modified consensus decision-making process and meeting guidelines, as well as on-line communication.
- Were encouraged to communicate openly about concerns and mediate conflicts.
- Made efforts to increase equity in funding, support and power between campuses.
- Utilize Google docs and MyPCC to share teaching best practices, assignments, etc.
- Created a D2L site for sharing Open Educational Resources for sociology courses.
- Increased efforts to clarify tasks and encourage follow-through.
- Included more curricular, topical and pedagogical discussions in SAC meetings, albeit limited at times by administrative duties.

2. Outcomes and Assessment

- A. Course-Level Outcomes: The College has an expectation that course outcomes, as listed in the CCOG, are both assessable and assessed, with the intent that SACs will collaborate to develop a shared vision for course-level learning outcomes.
- i. What is the SAC process for review of course outcomes in your CCOGs to ensure they are assessable?

In our 2011 Program Review, we identified the following as core learning outcomes, versions of which have been assigned at the course-level and can be reviewed on current CCOGs. Students will:

- Develop their sociological imaginations, in order to examine how social contexts shape our lives.
- Apply sociological theories and research to course material and current events in order to assess the causes and consequences of social organization, social change, and human behavior.
- Communicate sociological perspectives and principles clearly.
- Participate as active citizens in their societies and communities demonstrate respect for diversity, critical thinking, and collaboration.

These 2011 “learning outcomes” illustrate what the SAC now recognizes as “learning goals” rather than learning outcomes. The American Sociological Association’s 2005 publication “Creating an Effective Assessment Plan for the Sociology Major”⁴ offers this definition of learning goals:

Learning goals are broad, abstract statements of the desired long-term outcomes of the curriculum and the program. They are derived from the mission statement and are logical outgrowths of it. Learning goals describe in general terms the achievable knowledge, skills, attitudes and values, and relationships with society and with constituencies in society that a department wants and expects students to develop as a result of being a sociology major (p. 9)

Learning outcomes are derived from learning goals and then are associated with specific courses and assessments.

Mission → Learning Goals → Learning/Course Outcomes → Assessment Tools

⁴ American Sociological Association. 2005. *Creating an effective assessment plan for the sociology major*. Available at http://www.asanet.org/documents/teaching/pdfs/Assessment_Final_Copy_2005.pdf

In October 2015, a SAC subcommittee was formed to revise the 2011 “learning goals” and develop common, assessable course outcomes applicable for most core courses in the sociology program. The subcommittee collected information from the PCC History SAC, the American Sociological Association (ASA), and the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA), and has shared information via Google docs.

As a result of this collaborative process, in December 2015, we identified the following learning goals for sociology, which are derived directly from our revised mission statement presented in 1A.

The mission of the sociology program at PCC is to support students in cultivating a sociological imagination - connecting their personal experience to broader social and historical contexts. In doing so, students develop the skills to identify, analyze and intervene in the larger social forces that shape their lived experiences, their communities and the broader social world.

Learning goals (revised from 2011) of the program include the following:

Sociology students will:

- Develop a sociological imagination - connecting personal experience to broader social and historical contexts
- Apply social theories and empirical evidence to analyze larger social forces
- Analyze the construction of culture and its relationship to systems of inequality
- Articulate a sociological perspective in written form
- Apply a sociological understanding of social change to intervene in the larger social forces that shape their lived experiences, their communities and the broader social world

Following the ASA (2005), our next step is to develop specific learning outcomes or “learning objectives” which “are specific statements of learning outcomes that stem from the learning goals. They are realistic, measurable, and straightforward. They tell us how to determine if the learning goals have been achieved” (p. 9).

Given our recent assessment work with the LEAP VALUE rubric on Written Communication and our assumption that Communication will remain a PCC Core Outcome after the current revision, we decided to start by writing a learning objective/course outcome for written communication. As noted in Sociology’s Core Outcomes Mapping Matrix, Communication is mapped at 3-4 (level indicators) for all sociology courses; therefore, all sociology courses should include a communication learning outcome, and all sociology students should be learning and assessed on communication.

Learning Goal: Articulate a sociological perspective in written form

Learning Objective/Outcome: Express sociological ideas in a clear and coherent manner in written form

To pair with this outcome, we developed a rubric that defines what written communication means in sociology and to guide our assessment of student work (See Appendix 2).

The four criteria include:

- Topic Development and Organization of Ideas - includes thesis or topic statements, content clearly supports thesis or topic statements
- Sources/Evidence - integration of appropriate, relevant and credible sources
- Citations - ideas are correctly attributed to the appropriate source/s, uses a citation system consistently and accurately
- Grammar and Sentence Structure - grammar, syntax, punctuation, spelling

With the learning outcome and rubric in hand, our next step, according to the ASA (2005), is to develop assessments (mechanisms or tools) for measuring student achievement of this learning outcome. The Sociology SAC has already invested a great deal in assignment design via our contributions to the Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment (MSC) in 2014-15. Moving forward, we plan to continue to utilize course-embedded assignments.

In preparation for our program assessment work in 2016-17, all sociology faculty will be asked to develop new writing assignments or to revise their current writing assignments so that faculty have an assignment that aligns with our written communication rubric. The assessment subcommittee will offer several samples that faculty may choose to use or adapt for their own classes.

In Fall 2016, all sociology faculty will be asked to administer an aligned written assignment in every course they teach. The SAC aims to randomly sample student artifacts for written communication from all sociology courses. We plan to assess this sample of student artifacts with the rubric outlined here.

Once PCC finalizes the current list of PCC Core Outcomes, the Sociology SAC plans to ensure that all sociology course outcomes are assessable by repeating this process for the remaining Core Outcomes.

This is the process:

- Map newly revised PCC Core Outcomes to the sociology curriculum
- Develop measurable learning outcome/s (course outcomes) aligned with the PCC Core Outcomes, and Sociology's learning goals (and mission)
- Develop an assessment rubric for the learning outcome/s

- Utilize backwards design to revise or create new assignments to be embedded in courses
 - Randomly sample and score student artifacts with the appropriate rubric
- ii. Identify and give examples of changes made in instruction to improve students' attainment of course outcomes, or outcomes of requisite course sequences (such as are found in MTH, WR, ESOL, BI, CH, etc.) that were made as a result of assessment of student learning.

At this point, changes in instruction have been made by individual sociology instructors, not to the broader curriculum. Our assessment projects have involved individual faculty volunteering to collect artifacts from embedded assignments based on enrollment in their classes. Consequently, assessment results are only applicable to those faculty and their assignments. Changes primarily have involved improving assignment instructions and developing grading rubrics.

Our review of the assessment literature informs us that pre-assessment, intervention, and re-assessment are each important steps in the program assessment process. NILOA (2014)⁵ characterizes this “loop” process as “weigh the pig, feed the pig, weigh the pig.” According to NILOA, however, many programs focus on the mechanisms of assessment (e.g., sample size, interrater reliability, etc.) while overlooking meaningful program-level intervention and re-assessment. NILOA authors emphasize that once a program has assessable learning outcomes in place and mapped to the curriculum, appropriate intervention questions may include:

- Is the map accurate?
- Are faculty actually following the curriculum map?
- Is there a breakdown in communication or coordination across faculty or sections taught?
- Once these questions are answered, faculty propose learning modifications and lay out a plan for improvement.

B. Addressing College Core Outcomes

- i. Update the Core Outcomes Mapping Matrix.
<http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/core-outcomes/mapping-index.html> For each course, choose the appropriate Mapping Level Indicator (0-4) to match **faculty expectations for the Core Outcomes for students who have successfully completed the course**. (You can copy from the website and paste into either a Word or Excel document to do this update, and provide as an Appendix.)

⁵ Fulcher, Keston H., Megan Good, Chris M. Coleman, and Kristen L. Smith. December 2014. A simple model for learning improvement: Weigh pig, feed pig, weigh pig. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA).

See Appendix 3

- C. For Lower Division Collegiate (Transfer) and Developmental Education Disciplines:
Assessment of College Core Outcomes
- i. Reflecting on the last five years of assessment, provide a brief summary of one or two of your best assessment projects, highlighting efforts made to improve students' attainment of the Core Outcomes.

Starting in Spring 2014, the Sociology SAC participated in the Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment (MSC), a pilot study under the partnership of SHEEO (State Higher Education Executive Officers Association) and AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities). The goal of the project was to determine whether participating in a collaborative, multi-state assessment project would provide useful assessment feedback regarding how well students, with 75% of their program completed, achieve general measures of critical thinking, written communication, and quantitative literacy. The MSC project required colleges and universities to submit student artifacts from embedded assignments that could be assessed using the LEAP VALUE rubrics for critical thinking, written communication, or quantitative literacy. Artifacts were collected from colleges and universities in nine states including Oregon. A national team of faculty and academic professionals scored the artifacts and returned the results to each institution.

With support from PCC Academic Affairs and the Learning Assessment Council, Sociology agreed to participate in the MSC in lieu of regular assessment activities. Sociology's plan was to submit artifacts to the MSC and then to analyze assessment data received from the MSC for critical thinking and written communication outcomes. In addition, Sociology planned to score a subset of artifacts ourselves and to compare the national data, the PCC in-house data, and the Sociology SAC data.

All sociology faculty were invited to submit artifacts from embedded (not common) assignments for which either 1) critical thinking criteria as defined by the LEAP VALUE rubric or 2) written communication as defined by the LEAP VALUE rubric could be measured. Faculty teaching the following courses agreed to participate: SOC 204, 205, 206, 211 & 213.

As there is no mechanism at PCC to require faculty (whether full-time or part-time) to participate in program assessment, we were pleased that 60% of faculty members volunteered to participate in this project representing all 6 full-time faculty members and 5 of 12 (42%) part-time faculty members. Twenty of 43 (54%) of sociology sections offered in Fall 2014 were included in the sample.

PCC Academic Affairs identified 135 students from participating sections (by CRN) who completed 75% of their program. Academic Affairs reviewed the artifacts to ensure all identifying information was removed before sending the artifacts on to the national Multi-State Collaborative project coordinator. Academic Affairs coded the artifacts so results could be returned to the SAC at the artifact-level, which provided the SAC with the opportunity to

interpret results. In addition, Academic Affairs coordinated an “in-house” norming and scoring of all PCC artifacts, including artifacts from students who were not 75% completed.

Sociology faculty contributed 87 qualifying artifacts, which Academic Affairs divided across two of the MSC outcomes - critical thinking (n=37) and written communication (n=50). Our overall sample size was smaller than we expected due to student ineligibility as a result of the 75% program completion requirement. Many of the students enrolled in sociology courses have not completed 75% of their program, as determined by Academic Affairs. Of the 135 students who were eligible, 87 agreed to participate and completed the required assignment.

In addition to contributing artifacts to the MSC for national scoring, sociology faculty facilitated and/or participated in various assessment conferences, workshops, and committees from 2013-2016.

- LAC Core Outcome Assessment Class for PCC Faculty
- AALHE Fourth Annual Assessment Conference, June 2-4, 2014 Albuquerque, New Mexico
- PCC Learning Assessment Council
- PSU MSC training, May 2014
- PCC MSC Assignment Design Workshops (Summer 2014, Winter 2015)

Project Goals:

The Sociology SAC was curious as to whether a coordinated assessment project could provide useful assessment data, but we also saw participating in this project as an opportunity to improve our norming and scoring skills, especially with standard assessment rubrics (e.g., LEAP VALUE).

Specifically, we wanted to know:

1. if a standard (i.e., not discipline-specific) rubric would work to assess sociology outcomes
2. whether there would be any noticeable differences in scoring by a) a national, multi-disciplinary team, b) a local but also multi-disciplinary team, and c) a local sociology team for either outcome

Unfortunately, the MSC scoring was significantly delayed and the SAC did not receive national scoring results until Fall 2015, so our comparative analyses were also delayed. Full scoring tables for Critical Thinking and Written Communication are included in Appendix 4.

Lessons Learned:

1. According to the approach of purposeful assignment design or “backwards design,” having learning objectives in mind ahead of assignment development helps faculty design better assignments and strengthen teaching strategies, leading to improved student attainment of those outcomes. Moreover, we realize it is important to be transparent about those outcomes with students via assignment instructions and/or grading rubrics so students know how they will be assessed prior to completing an assignment.

2. Norming and scoring artifacts from embedded assignments can provide faculty with evidence (or lack thereof) of student learning. We are concerned, however, that there may be inconsistency in terms of what a “4” standard looks like, especially across different scoring teams, who did not norm to the rubric together. We found that our SAC scored artifacts lower than did the PCC in-house team. It would be helpful to see sample student work at the different rubric levels as part of the norming process.
3. It also was difficult for us to know how to weigh the scores themselves. Within the SAC several people scored each artifact and, with the raw data, we could see how much agreement there was among raters. For each artifact scored by the in-house PCC team, we received two scores. From the national team, we received only one score for each criterion for each artifact. We do not know if that is a calculated score averaged across multiple raters or if just one person scored each artifact. Obviously the greater the number of scorers per artifact, the more confident we can be regarding consistent scoring.
4. We found it challenging to “translate” generic rubric language to apply it to sociology. We found some standard criteria more useful to what’s important to sociology than other criteria. In order for us to assess student achievement of PCC Core Outcomes via the sociology program (i.e., how well does the sociology program helping students achieve PCC Core Outcomes), we need assessable sociology learning outcomes at the course level that are mapped to the PCC Core Outcomes.

Next Steps:

1. In Fall 2015, the SAC created a subcommittee tasked with developing consistent, assessable course outcomes for the core sociology courses (SOC 204, 205, 206). The committee collected information from the History SAC at PCC as well as from the American Sociological Association on how to assess sociology programs, drafted a mission statement, learning goals and a learning outcome for written communication (see 2.A.i.).
2. Sociology program learning outcomes will be assessable and mapped to both PCC Core Outcomes and across the sociology curriculum. Following PCC History’s model, we will also create rubrics for assessing student achievement of our learning outcomes.

Challenges:

1. The literature on program assessment (rather than individual instructor assessment) emphasizes that assessment must involve the full faculty and all course sections. Because there is no mechanism for requiring faculty participation (full-time or part-time), limited compensation for part-time faculty, and limited job security for part-time faculty, we currently depend on voluntary participation in assessment work - this includes assignment design, artifact collection, scoring, analysis, developing interventions (i.e., changes to curriculum), and then following that changed curriculum.
2. While we agree that program assessment is necessary, we would appreciate it if PCC were to invest in developing additional faculty expertise in assessment. The current organizational structure for assessment requires individual faculty to invest a great deal of time and energy to gain some level of assessment expertise on their own before

attempting to persuade SAC members to participate. It would be helpful if the College provided an “assessment resource czar” to assist SACs (along with the LAC and assessment coaches). The College’s investment in TLC programming is helpful for individual faculty members improving their own teaching, but does not often address program level intervention and assessment.

3. As has been noted by most in the modern assessment community, assessment should be faculty led. In a recent NILOA report⁶, Timothy Reese Cain argues: “Assessment experts, whether from the faculty or not, are important. They can bring knowledge, help educate faculty, coordinate institution-wide efforts, and help provide the context and framing that make data useful. At the same time, to protect the faculty’s academic freedom, the outcomes defined, plans designed and practices enacted must be under faculty control” (2014, p. 13). The Sociology SAC appreciates PCC’s stated commitment to faculty-led assessment and also for its recognition that there is no “one-size-fits-all” in assessment work. Faculty should not be pressured to follow a singular model, but rather should have the flexibility to enact projects that are specific to their disciplines (NILOA 2014). Unfortunately, the current use of the checklist template utilized by the LAC peer review process does not provide that flexibility.
4. Sociology has yet to “close the loop” by reassessing the same outcome after a program-level intervention, so while we have learned a lot about assessment and assignment design, we do not yet have evidence that this work has improved student learning. Further, unless we have full participation of the faculty, it may be difficult to derive meaningful and actionable program-level data even after we “feed” and “re-weigh” the pig.
 - ii. Do you have evidence that the changes made were effective (by having reassessed the same outcome)? If so, please describe briefly.

To date, we have not had the opportunity to “re-assess” any course outcome, so we do not have evidence of improvement of student attainment of course outcomes due to curricular changes. As described in 2Ai, we are developing an assessment plan that will focus on programmatic changes in the future.

- iii. Evaluate your SAC’s assessment cycle processes. What have you learned to improve your assessment practices and strategies?

While the MSC experience has been helpful to the SAC, data from the MSC national scorers was significantly delayed, which affected our multi-year assessment plan. In future years, we plan to rotate outcomes assessed on a regular basis and “closing the loop” by following a pre-assessment, intervention, re-assessment cycle.

⁶ Cain, Timothy Reese. November 2014. Assessment and academic freedom: In concert, not conflict. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA).

- iv. Are there any Core Outcomes that are particularly challenging for your SAC to assess? If yes, please identify and explain.

The Sociology SAC has decided not to assess Professional Competence. Until we have sociology majors at PCC, we do not expect to prepare professional sociologists.

3. Other Curricular Issues

- A. Which of your courses are offered in a Distance Learning modality (online, hybrid, interactive television, etc.), and what is the proportion of on-campus and online? For courses offered both via DL and on-campus, are there differences in student success? (Contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, either Laura Massey or Rob Vergun, for course-level data). If so, how are you addressing or how will you address these differences? What significant revelations, concerns, or questions arise in the area of DL delivery?

Sections by Modality							
	Classroom		Web DL		Hybrid CLWEB		Total CRNs
	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	N
All 2010-11	104	61.5	48	28.4	17	10.1	169
All 2011-12	111	56.1	64	32.3	23	11.6	198
All 2012-13	111	55.2	67	33.3	23	11.4	201
All 2013-14	102	59	62	35.8	9	5.2	173

Source: Portland Community College, Institutional Effectiveness

During the period of this Program Review, PCC offered the following sociology courses online:

- SOC 204 Sociology in Everyday Life
- SOC 205 Social Change in Societies
- SOC 206 Social Problems
- SOC 211 Peace & Conflict
- SOC 213 Diversity in the United States

During the period of this program review, face-to-face courses have accounted for an average of 58% of our annual course offerings, while DL courses have accounted for 32% and hybrid courses have accounted for under 10%. Roughly half of our DL course offerings are for our flagship course, SOC 204, while SOC 205 accounts for roughly one quarter (See Appendix 5).

Student success rates are consistently lower in our online courses. For example, in 2014-2015, SOC 204 students in face-to-face courses passed at a rate of 76%, while their online counterparts passed at a rate of 66% (See Appendix 6). We do not have the data to fully explain these disparities, however many sociology faculty observe higher attrition rates in DL courses. Based on faculty observations, lower success rates are largely due to students failing to complete online courses. Faculty members have utilized a variety of strategies to address this

problem, including consistently reaching out to students by email and CPNs. Some faculty have also begun calling each student by phone in Week 1, and continuing phone contact as needed throughout the term.

While these strategies have almost certainly helped students persist in their studies and succeed in our courses, much more needs to be done to improve the success of online students. Sociology faculty have expressed concern that while many online students are extremely committed and excel in the online environment, others are underprepared for a distance learning experience - lacking sufficient technological skills, organization and self-discipline. Anecdotally, faculty have also found that many students expect DL courses to be “easier” and deadlines to be “more flexible” than in face-to-face courses.

To improve student success in online classrooms, it may be necessary to build still-stronger bridges between students and faculty and to shift the students’ expectations of online learning. This can take place at the course level with improved communication between faculty and students, as well as at the college level by directly addressing these issues within the D2L orientation.

B. Has the SAC made any curricular changes as a result of exploring/adopting educational initiatives (e.g., Community-Based Learning, Internationalization of the Curriculum, Inquiry-Based Learning, Honors, etc.)? If so, please describe.

The Sociology SAC has been greatly involved in interdisciplinary collaboration, including participation in College initiatives around internationalization and the development of focus award programming. The SAC participated in the development of two interdisciplinary courses: SOC 211 Peace and Conflict and SOC/EC/PS 221 Globalization and International Relations. Members of the Sociology SAC have also been central to the interdisciplinary effort to create SJ 299: Social Justice Theory and Practice.

Members of the sociology faculty are also deeply involved in a variety of educational initiatives at PCC. That important work translates into individual- and course-level curricular changes.

Below are some examples of faculty participation in educational initiatives. This list is intended to provide only examples, so it is far from exhaustive.

- PCC has a strong commitment to sustainability, as is evident in their mission statement, core outcomes, operations, and new Sustainability Focus Award, which is facilitated by the Sustainable Practices for Academics and Resources Council (SPARC). Sociology faculty Kim Smith is a member of SPARC and has helped develop sustainability programs across the district and region. In addition to teaching the Introduction to Environmental Sociology course, which is a requirement for many CTE green certificate programs, she is the coordinator of the Greater Portland Sustainability Education Network (GPSEN). GPSEN is a multi-sector network that promotes sustainability education across the Portland Metro region and is acknowledged as a Regional Center of Expertise (RCE) on

education for sustainable development (ESD), by the United Nations University. One core project that is offered in Dr. Smith's Environmental Sociology course and through PCC is the EcoChallenge. This inspiring program has been developed by GPSEN partner and educational leader, the Northwest Earth Institute. The EcoChallenge is an annual event that challenges people to choose actions that reduce their environmental impact and change behaviors that make a difference for themselves and the planet. It is an excellent example of sociological influences and the ability to change attitudes and practices.

- Sociology faculty Lisa George is the Community-Based Learning (CBL) Faculty Coordinator for two campuses, Rock Creek and Cascade, where she mentors and coaches instructors who are implementing or would like to implement CBL in their courses. She also provides district-wide presentations that cover the how-to's and pedagogical benefits of CBL. Many sociology faculty members regularly utilize CBL in their classes.
- Multiple faculty members, including Michael Dawson and Jamee Kristen, have participated in several Open Educational Resources trainings. Sociology faculty currently share educational resources with each other via a dedicated Sociology OER D2L shell.
- Sociology faculty, including Ben Cushing and Jamee Kristen, have played an important role in developing the new Social Justice Focus Award, which seeks to develop an interdisciplinary understanding of systems of power, privilege, and domination including the personal, social, cultural, economic, and political consequences on communities, the environment, and society. The Focus Award provides students with the opportunity to explore approaches to social change and social movements and engage in practical campus- and community-based experiences with organizations addressing these issues.
- Sociology faculty Ben Cushing served as a Faculty Mentor in the Faculty Diversity Mentorship Program.
- Sociology faculty ricci elizabeth has played a central role in creating Whiteness History Month (WHM): Context, Consequences and Change, which is a multidisciplinary, district-wide, educational project examining race and racism through an exploration of the construction of whiteness, its origins and heritage. The Project seeks to inspire innovative and practical solutions to community issues and social problems that stem from racism. Two additional sociology faculty presented during WHM – Ben Cushing and Michael Dawson.
- Sociology faculty have also played an important role in PCC's Anderson Conference. For example, this year faculty member Mark George screened his film "Whitewashed" and led a discussion on whiteness. Last year, faculty member Ben Cushing provided the Keynote Address, title "Collaboration for What?"

- Sociology faculty Maria Wilson-Figueroa is an active contributor to the International Studies program. She is the Faculty Advisor for the Latino Club and a Faculty Mentor within the Faculty Diversity Mentorship Program.
- Sociology faculty Mark Patrick George has served on the PCC Diversity Council and participates and has co-facilitate the AWARE group meetings (Alliance of White Anti-Racist Educators) at the Cascade campus.
- Sociology faculty Jamee Kristen co-chaired the Peace and Conflict Studies Focus Award faculty committee with political science faculty, Michael Sonnleitner.

As stated above, this list is hardly exhaustive. Our faculty are deeply committed, and their dedication manifests in a rich variety of ways.

C. Are there any courses in the program offered as Dual Credit at area High Schools? If so, describe how the SAC develops and maintains relationships with the HS faculty in support of quality instruction.

Not Applicable

D. Please describe the use of Course Evaluations by the SAC. Have you developed SAC-specific questions? Has the information you have received been of use at the course/program/discipline level?

Course evaluations are a crucial line of communication between students and faculty, giving faculty insights that enable them to refine their teaching practice.

Sociology faculty developed a SAC-specific evaluation question focused on a central concept in our discipline: the sociological imagination. The questions is:

Has this course influenced your perception of your place in the society in which you live? If so, how?

This question clearly aligns with the Sociology program's mission, which is, in part, "to support students in cultivating a sociological imagination - connecting their personal experience to broader social and historical contexts" and so provides helpful (albeit indirect) feedback to faculty regarding student understanding of the sociological imagination.

Course evaluations are the province of individual faculty members, and not the SAC. The SAC does not have access to faculty evaluations, and we neither review nor discuss them as a group.

Individual members of the SAC use course evaluations in a variety of ways according to their own needs. For example, some faculty have for years used evaluations to refine their courses,

while others have found that low response rates in the past have rendered evaluations less than meaningful. Some faculty members utilize a midterm course evaluation while others customize their end-of-term evaluations with instructor-level questions. Most sociology faculty have experienced the massive increase in response rates - resulting from new college policies - as a major improvement. Given this institutional change, individual faculty members are now better equipped to use course evaluations to refine their own pedagogy and curriculum.

E. Identify and explain any other significant curricular changes that have been made since the last review.

As mentioned in section 3B above, the sociology program added a new interdisciplinary course to our offerings: SOC/EC/PS 221: Globalization and International Relations. A core class in the Peace and Conflict Studies program, this course provides an introductory survey of economic, political, social, and cultural dimensions of globalization and evaluates their impacts on international relations. It examines patterns of conflict and cooperation among countries including the influence of international institutions, NGOs, and global corporations. It introduces selected issues such as war and peace, global security, environment, elites and concentration of power, wealth and income distribution, cultural and ethnic identities and explores possible peaceful solutions to these global problems.

4. Needs of Students and the Community

A. Have there been any notable changes in instruction due to changes in the student populations served?

Since the Sociology SAC's last Program Review, PCC has experienced a number of changes in its student population. First, according to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness student enrollment in sociology courses at PCC peaked in 2011-12, with a total enrollment of 4,605 sociology students for that academic year. However, that number declined to 4,213 as of the 2014-15 academic year. The Cascade and Sylvania Campuses have experienced the largest declines in student enrollment relative to sociology courses. However, during this same time period the Rock Creek campus experienced a significant increase (33%) in the number of students taking sociology courses, growing from 1,000 students in 2010-11 to 1,335 in the 2014-15 academic year. The Southeast Campus has also experienced a significant increase in the number of students taking sociology courses with 254 students enrolling in those classes as of 2014-15 (a +300% increase from 2011-12).

Secondly, and although sociology is a discipline disproportionately pursued by students identifying as female (consistently 2/3rds of all PCC sociology students), the student population taking sociology courses has become slightly more racially/ethnically diverse in the past five years. For instance, since our last Program Review there has been a 5% decrease in the number of white students (distributed across all campuses) and a 3% increase in the number of Hispanic students enrolling in sociology courses at PCC (occurring largely at Rock Creek and the Sylvania Campuses). There have also been slight increases in the number of African American (1% - distributed relatively evenly across the Cascade and Sylvania campuses) and Multi-Racial students (1% - distributed relatively evenly across all campuses) enrolling in sociology courses.

Third, PCC has also experienced a slight shift in the age cohorts taking sociology courses district wide. For example, in the last five years Sociology has experienced a slight decline in every cohort over the age of twenty. Simultaneously there has been a slight increase (3%) in students who are between the ages of 18-20 taking sociology courses. As of the 2014-15 academic year this age cohort also comprised the largest number of students enrolled in sociology courses.

Fourth, the number of veterans enrolling in sociology courses at PCC has significantly increased since our last Program Review, peaking in the 2013-14 academic year. According the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the number of veterans attending classes at PCC has increased from 93 in the 2012-13 academic year to a total of 297 in 2014-15. The majority of this growth in students who are veterans has occurred on the Sylvania campus.

Lastly, in the last five years PCC has also experienced a slight increase in number of degree seeking students (1%) compared to non-degree seeking students (-1.4% decrease). The College has also seen a decline in the number of full-time students (-2.5%) and a slight increase in the number of part-time students (+2.7%).

These shifts in student population have resulted in a number of instructional changes worthy of noting. Given the continued difficult economic period many PCC students face, sociology faculty report working to utilize more open source textbooks and other low cost course materials in classes in order to lower the financial stresses many PCC students face (e.g. using earlier and cheaper editions of required texts, academic articles/studies in lieu of textbooks, etc.). Faculty members also report using the economic crisis as a "teachable moment" in their classes by using it to encourage students to apply their "sociological imagination." Faculty have done this by incorporating the current economic climate in class discussions, exercises, and sociological analyses, particularly with regard to why and how the financial crisis occurred, as well as what the crisis means for students' current financial standing and future aspirations.

Given the demographic shifts noted above, particularly in relation to increases in the number of younger students and the increasing ethnic diversity among PCC students, faculty members also report working diligently to make their classes inclusive and sensitive to PCC's diverse and at times, younger student body. Those changes have included adjustments to course curriculum/content so that it is inclusive and representative of the students in our classes. Faculty also report working to bridge the differences between high school and college level expectations many students don't fully comprehend prior to attending PCC. SAC members are also deliberate about making sure students whose first language is not English have the support and resources they need to succeed (e.g. referrals to campus writing and learning centers, relevant student organizations/groups). Faculty also work to be sensitive to the classroom climate/culture and how students want to be identified in classes given the spectrum of gender and sexualities present within our student body. Noting the increase in PCC's veteran population, a number of sociology faculty have also worked closely with veterans who have specific needs related to their military service by facilitating their access to relevant PCC resources. They also report incorporating veterans' issues into course content.

B. What strategies are used within the program/discipline to facilitate success for students with disabilities? What does the SAC see as particularly challenging in serving these students?

As a program, we highly value the needs of students with disabilities, and we believe strongly in equal access for all students.

Over the past several years, we have noticed a marked increase in requests for ADA accommodations. Face-to-face courses have required closed-captioning in films, class notetakers, extended testing times, enhanced copies of handouts, and sensitivity to particular anxiety issues. ADA accommodation requirements have also significantly impacted the online classroom. We have been grateful to the D2L team for helping ensure that course materials meet all ADA requirements.

C. Has feedback from students, community groups, transfer institutions, business, industry or government been used to make curriculum or instructional changes? If so, please describe (if this has not been addressed elsewhere in this document).

Over the past three years, our program has worked closely with the Sociology Department at Portland State University to ensure that both SOC 204 and SOC 205 transfer to that institution as SOC 200. We have, as individual faculty members, worked with various community organizations in the context of Community-Based Learning. Faculty members have also worked closely with community partners in the context of other educational initiatives, such as Whiteness History Month and Sustainable Practices for Academics and Resources Council (SPARC). Finally, the newly created Social Justice Focus Award (and its core course SJ 299) emerged directly from the consistent student concern: “given all of these social problems, what can one do?”

5. Faculty: Reflect on the composition, qualifications and development of the faculty

A. How the faculty composition reflects the diversity and cultural competency goals of the institution.

In line with PCC's diversity and cultural competency goals, the Sociology SAC seeks to achieve "education excellence by being accountable and committed to diversity" in all areas of our work. This includes our faculty composition, our functioning as a culturally competent SAC, the course content we teach, in addition to our pedagogical approaches and the teaching methodologies we employ.

In fact, it is important to note that sociology faculty received two of the nine 2016 diversity awards from the PCC Office of Equity and Inclusion. Ricci Elizabeth received the Equity & Inclusion – Activism award and Ben Cushing received the Equity & Inclusion – Curriculum, Teaching and Facilitation award.

With that said, and though the SAC reflects some diversity in terms of its gender composition and the age ranges of its members, like PCC, we continue to lack a diverse faculty in terms of race and ethnicity.

Specifically, as of 2014-15, the Office of Inclusion and Social Equity reports that the Sociology SAC was comprised of 20 people (6 full-time/14 part-time), with 10 members identifying as male and 10 identifying as female. Among that entire group, 16 members identified as White, 1 identified as Black/African American, 2 identified as Hispanic, and the racial/ethnic identity of 1 faculty member is unknown. When analyzing the racial/ethnic distribution among all full and part-time faculty, of the 6 full-time faculty members, 4 identify as white and 2 members identify as people of color. Among the 14 part-time faculty, 13 members identify as white and only 1 person identifies as a person of color (Black/African American).

It should be also noted that our current faculty composition reflects no increase in the number of faculty of color since the last Program Review was conducted in 2010-2011. Additionally, all faculty members of color in the SAC teach at either the Cascade or Sylvania campuses and Rock Creek reports no faculty of color teaching on that campus in the last five years. With that and the above data in mind, please note that we found the rigor of available demographic data on SAC faculty problematic because it fails to track/document when part-time faculty teach at multiple campuses. Consequently, that data fails to provide unique head counts of faculty, potentially distorting both the total number of faculty teaching and the actual racial/ethnic composition of the SAC.

- B. Changes the SAC has made to instructor qualifications since the last review and the reason for the changes.

General instructor qualifications for sociology courses have remained unchanged since 2008:

Sociology faculty must have a minimum of a Master's degree in sociology or a sub-discipline of sociology (i.e. demography, urban studies, criminology, gerontology, peace studies, womens' studies, or as defined by the SAC). The sub-discipline degree must have at least 32 hours of graduate-level course work in sociology, with not more than half in research methods. There may be exceptions for special topic classes, as specified by the SAC.

- *Social Work and other social science disciplines, such as Anthropology, Psychology, or Political Science, are not considered sub-disciplines of Sociology.*

At the request of the Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS) focus award committee, in 2011, the Sociology SAC approved changes to instructor qualifications for SOC 211 (always cross-listed with PS 211) and SOC 280B (always cross-listed with PS 280B) to the following:

Masters in Political Science, Sociology, Conflict Resolution, Peace Studies, or Peace and Conflict Studies

- C. How the professional development activities of the faculty contributed to the strength of the program/discipline? If such activities have resulted in instructional or curricular changes, please describe.

Sociology faculty recognize the great value of the College's support for professional development activities. Over the past several years, faculty have benefited from professional development funding from the Office of Professional and Organizational Development, the Teaching and Learning Center, committees (such as the Internationalization Committee) and their respective division deans. This funding has supported faculty in attending multiple national conferences and training. We have also taken advantage of in-house professional development opportunities, such as trainings, workshops and peer-to-peer support.

Below is sample (not at all exhaustive) of some of professional development work taken on by sociology faculty:

- Many faculty (Ben Cushing, Jamee Kristen, Lisa George, Maria Wilson Figueroa, Mark George and ricci elizabeth) participated in the Critical Pedagogy Workshops offered by the PCC Teaching and Learning Center, and facilitated by Amara Perez.
- Multiple sociology instructors (Ben Cushing, Lisa George, ricci elizabeth) attended NCORE - the National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in American Higher Education.

- Ben Cushing participated in facilitation training through The Fireweed Collective. He currently facilitates and organizes the Race and Inclusion Conversations, sponsored by the Rock Creek Diversity Council.
- Jamee Kristen and Ben Cushing co-facilitated faculty conversations about “Democracy in the Classroom” through the TLC.
- Jamee Kristen participated in the PCC Faculty Assessment training in Fall 2013 and attended the Association for the Assessment of Learning in Higher Education (AALHE) national conference in Albuquerque in Spring 2014. She also participated in the Teaching TALKS: Multi-State Collaborative Project conference at PSU in Spring 2014, and several assessment-related webinars hosted by SHEEO and the AAC&U. All have played into her leading the SAC’s program assessment efforts the last three years.
- Lisa George presented at the past three Anderson Conferences. As a TLC Coordinator, she was program chair for The Responsive Educator: Reaching and Teaching Diverse Learners. She also led a session at Cascade Spring Institute on Diverse Identities and a session on micro-aggressions at the Cascade PT In-Service.
- Maria Wilson Figueroa was the keynote for the Anderson Conference this year. She attended the CCID International Seminar for Community Colleges Conference in the Spring of 2013 and the CIEE-International Faculty Development Seminar in India, Summer 2013. She also participated in a “Critical Friends” seminar in August 2015.
- Several members of the SAC (Andrew Butz, Ben Cushing, Maria Wilson-Figueroa, ricci elizabeth and Ken Szymkowiak) participated in a PCC MSC workshop on assignment design for the Multi-State Collaborative, facilitated by Kendra Cawley and Jamee Kristen (Summer 2014).
- Andrew Butz was advanced in late 2011 to doctoral candidacy at the University of British Columbia. In late 2012, his co-authored paper “Local Approaches to Counter a Wider Pattern? Poverty in Portland, Oregon” was published in The Social Science Journal.
- Kim Smith has done a variety of professional development efforts through international activities and sustainability trainings. She has also attended several Pacific Sociological Association meetings.
- Michael Dawson and Jamee Kristen have completed several trainings on Open Educational Resources.
- Jamee Kristen recently completed the Quality Matters (QM) “Improving Your Online Course” professional development.

- Heidi Esbensen presented a paper, “Illuminating the Experiences of Single Fathers: Social Sanctions and Raising Daughters Alone,” at the March 2016 Pacific Sociological Association meetings in Oakland, CA.
- Aimee Krouskop is currently completing FOOT and OIO trainings in preparation for becoming an online instructor at PCC.
- Mark George presented at the most recent Anderson Conference and attended the November 2015 PCC workshop on "Disability Cultural Competency: Diversity, Equity, and Social Justice."

6. Facilities and Academic Support

- A. Describe how classroom space, classroom technology, laboratory space, and equipment impact student success.

Sociology faculty appreciate the design of most PCC classrooms - with large open spaces, movable furniture, and whiteboards.

However, we are concerned that consistent online system outages significantly undermine online learning. Online students are less successful when they cannot reliably access D2L during the window of time they have set aside to do their online work. System outages also impact face-to-face classes, preventing access to online presentation materials, such as Films on Demand and google docs.

- B. Describe how students are using the library or other outside-the-classroom information resources.

Sociology faculty greatly value the PCC Library - its resources and its staff. Most faculty members regularly utilize library services and databases such as JSTOR, EBSCO and Films On Demand for course content and student research assignments. Many faculty also use these databases to access academic journals for professional development.

As tuition, fees and book prices continue to rise, many of our faculty have also been eager to participate in the library’s initiative on Open Educational Resources (OER). Free, high quality learning materials are increasingly important for our students, and many sociology faculty have worked to integrate these materials into their courses. To facilitate sharing of course materials, the SAC manages a D2L site created solely for this purpose. The D2L shell consists of content modules typical for SOC 204, SOC 205 and SOC 206.

A number of our SAC members utilize the research expertise of our librarians, bringing classes to the library for research workshops in computer labs.

And finally, we highly value the work of Sara Robertson, the sociology librarian, in her consistent and proactive support of our program, especially building a sociology research resource page: <http://guides.pcc.edu/sociology> Many faculty regularly integrate this resource into assignments and lessons.

- C. Does the SAC have any insights on students' use of Advising, Counseling, Disability Services, Veterans Services, and other important supports for students? Please describe as appropriate.

Sociology faculty work closely with student services, including Advising, Counseling, Disability Services, Veterans Services, Multicultural Centers, Women's Resource Centers, and Queer Resources Centers. Since our courses ask students to examine complex and often painful issues related to power, inequality and identity, these student services are particularly important to our students.

Those faculty members involved in the Social Justice Focus Award have succeeded in strengthening the bridge between student development services and LDC coursework. Working alongside student leaders and student center coordinators, we have significantly deepened the social justice leadership training offered within the centers. SJ 299 - and the Social Justice Focus Award more generally - helps students elevate their leadership skills by providing both analytical and practical skills for social change. Sociology faculty are an important part of this effort to bridge the "two sides of the house."

7. For CTE Programs only

Not Applicable

8. Recommendations

A. What is the SAC planning to do to improve teaching and learning, student success, and degree or certificate completion?

Related to teaching and learning, the SAC faculty plan to continue:

- assessment work on learning outcomes and program intervention, including incorporating new PCC Core Outcomes into the sociology curriculum
- pedagogy discussions
- professional development, including applying for POD funds to attend conferences and other relevant workshops

In an effort to work for student success, the SAC faculty plan to:

- compile a list of all PCC resources for student success
- continue to develop strong collegial relationships with TLC/MCC/QRS/WRS faculty
- connect students to relevant financial support resources, veteran's centers, students counseling services, and other student support services
- strategize and prepare for the new student population created by Oregon Promise who may need additional support for student success
- continue the use of CPNs and other tools to keep students abreast of their progress
- continue to use the Student of Concern process
- work to assertively reach out to students when attrition occurs
- continue to utilize an applied pedagogy and to take advantage of assorted community based learning opportunities for students
- clarify course level benchmarks of student success
- continue to identify and take advantage of Open Educational Resources/low cost resources for students
- continue to collaborate and sharing of resources among faculty

In terms of student completion, the SAC faculty plan to:

- continue to expand our use of Open Educational Resources
- be mindful and strategic about the scheduling of sociology courses

B. What support do you need from the administration in order to carry out your planned improvements? For recommendations asking for financial resources, please present them in priority order. Understand that resources are limited and asking is not an assurance of immediate forthcoming support, but making the administration aware of your needs may help them look for outside resources or alternative strategies for support.

The Sociology SAC calls for greater College support for faculty work in both instructional and non-instructional capacities.

1. MyPCC and PCC Network – Reduce recurring network slowdowns and outages both on campus and off campus. Network slowness and outages affect many aspects of our work, including communications, access to D2L, as well as video streaming and other web access in classrooms
2. Increased Compensation for Part-Time Faculty – Part-time faculty need to be paid for all work, including SAC-related work.
 - Compensation for part-time faculty office hours
 - Additional financial support for part-time faculty participation in SAC activities
 - 10 hours an academic year per SAC is insufficient funding for part-time participation in assessment activities
5. Program Assessment Support – Similar to support provided to instructors for providing disability accommodations (e.g., accessibility) and for D2L instructional design, we need a full-time assessment resource person who has training and experience in program-level assessment in higher education.
 - The current organizational structure for assessment requires individual faculty to invest a great deal of time and energy to gain some level of assessment expertise on their own before attempting to persuade SAC members to participate. It would be helpful if the College provided an “assessment resource czar” to assist SACs (along with the LAC and assessment coaches). The College’s investment in TLC programming is helpful for individual faculty members improving their own teaching, but does not often address program level intervention and assessment.
 - As has been noted by most in the modern assessment community, assessment should be faculty led. The Sociology SAC appreciates PCC’s stated commitment to faculty-led assessment and also for its recognition that there is no “one-size-fits-all” in assessment work. Faculty should not be pressured to follow a singular model, but rather should have the flexibility to enact projects that are specific to their disciplines (NILOA 2014). Unfortunately, the current use of the checklist template utilized by the LAC peer review process does not provide that flexibility.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: College Recommendations from Previous Program Review

APPENDIX 2: Sociology Written Communication Learning Outcome Rubric

APPENDIX 3: Core Outcomes Mapping

APPENDIX 4: Critical Thinking and Written Communication Assessment Scoring Data

APPENDIX 5: Course Offerings & Modality with some Distance Learning

APPENDIX 6: Face-to-Face and Distance Learning Student Success

APPENDIX 7: List of Current Sociology Faculty by Campus

APPENDIX 1: Recommendations from Previous Program Review, 2006-2011

Goal 1: Assess the enrollments and effectiveness of the program and its role at the college and throughout the district.

Administrative Suggestions/Observations: Ask department chairs or division deans to provide enrollment data in courses that were affected by the 4-credit conversion and the loss of sequence.

Goal 2: Support the needs of full-time and part-time faculty

Administrative Suggestions/Observations: We are aware of the impact of growth on FT/PT faculty ratios. A Sociology instructor position has been added at Rock Creek. We applaud your efforts to use writing as an assessment however, we do not recommend a reduction in class size.

Goal 3: Facilitate SAC chair workload, rotation, and training

Administrative Suggestions/Observations: As delineated in Goal #3, continue to look at delegation of work by the SAC chair to other SAC members and set up rotation schedule for SAC Chair, including the possibility of co-chairs with overlapping terms. The contract covers teaching loads and other responsibilities. There are many professional activities which might meet the non-teaching requirements of faculty. We suggest that faculty members work with Faculty Department Chairs and/or Division Deans to ensure engagement in professional activities most relevant to serving students and programs within contractual guidelines.

Goal 4: Improve research data on student success

Administrative Suggestions/Observations: Continue to work with Institutional Effectiveness to develop the pre-and post-test model to assess outcomes.

Coverage of how outcomes assessment leads to course and discipline improvement needs to be provided. Program/discipline review guidelines identify particular areas to address during the discipline review process. You identify a variety of assessment tools, and note that these allow for revisions and improvement in teaching, but do not provide examples of revisions or improvements. Similarly, you mentioned using student evaluations to revise courses, but offered no detail. Assessment of outcomes (at the course, discipline and core outcome level) should be included, and we found this weakly addressed in your report. SACs are asked to consider how the assessments of outcomes lead to changes, and documentation of assessment driven change must be provided.

You have noted a lack of a tracking process for students once they leave PCC. You would like more data, and a way to work with that data, which is something that the office of Institutional Effectiveness can assist with.

Discuss data collection with division deans and Instructional Effectiveness, so that SAC Chairs will have enrollment reports.

Per our request to collaborate with SACs to identify research needs and conduct research that facilitates program analysis, we were recommended to contact Laura Massey in Instructional Effectiveness to work with you on research data.

Goal 5: Improve resource support for effective teaching

Administrative Suggestions/Observations: Ask the Deans of Student Development to provide some faculty training to support students in distress.

Contact the division deans to clarify and provide clear and organized contact lists, organizational charts, and resource information to determine appropriate support personnel.

In order to support professional development for all faculty and streamline access, it is recommended to continue efforts to provide better training and support for PT faculty and provide an orientation packet as outlined in Goal #2. Promote TLC engagement for faculty.

In response to our request to enhance transportation services, office spaces, library resources, and classroom facilities, the suggestion was to meet with bond committee members on the campuses to discuss space issues.

APPENDIX 2: Sociology Written Communication Learning Outcome Rubric

Sociology Written Communication Learning Outcome Rubric
(adapted from the LEAP VALUE rubric for Written Communication)

Topic Development and Organization of Ideas - includes thesis or topic statements, content clearly supports thesis or topic statements

0= Does not provide thesis and/or topic statements

1= Provides thesis and/or topic statements with *no or limited* supporting content

2= Provides thesis and/or topic statements with supporting content through *most* of the work

3= Provides thesis and/or topic statements with supporting content *throughout* the work

Sources/Evidence - integration of appropriate, relevant and credible sources

0= Does not integrate appropriate, relevant or credible sources

1= Integrates appropriate, relevant and credible sources to develop ideas through *some* of the work

2= Integrates appropriate, relevant and credible sources to develop ideas through *most* of the work

3= Integrates appropriate, relevant and credible sources to develop ideas *throughout* the work

Citations - ideas are correctly attributed to the appropriate source/s, uses a citation system consistently and accurately

NA= Assignment does not call for use of a citation system

0= Does not use a citation system at all

1= Citation system attempted, but used inconsistently and/or inaccurately

2= Citation system is accurately and consistently used in *most* of the work

3= Citation system is accurately and consistently used *throughout* the work

Grammar and Sentence Structure - grammar, syntax, punctuation, spelling

0= Numerous grammatical, syntax, punctuation and/or spelling errors throughout the work

1= Several grammatical, syntax, punctuation and/or spelling errors throughout the work

2= A few grammatical, syntax, punctuation and/or spelling errors throughout the work

3= Uses correct grammar, syntax, punctuation and spelling throughout the work

APPENDIX 3: Core Outcomes Mapping

Mapping Level Indicators

- 0 - Not Applicable
- 1 - Limited demonstration or application of knowledge and skills.
- 2 - Basic demonstration and application of knowledge and skills.
- 3 - Demonstrated comprehension and is able to apply essential knowledge and skills
- 4 - Demonstrates thorough, effective and/or sophisticated application of knowledge and skills.

Core Outcomes

- 1 - Communication
- 2 - Community and Environmental Responsibility
- 3 - Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
- 4 - Cultural Awareness
- 5 - Professional Competence
- 6 - Self-Reflection

Course #	Course Name	CO1	CO2	CO3	CO4	CO5	CO6
204	Sociology in Everyday Life	3	3	3	4		4
205	Social Change in Societies	3	3	4	3		3
206	Social Problems	3	4	4	3		3
211	Peace and Conflict (also PS)	3	4	4	4		4
213	Diversity in the United States	3	3	4	4		4
214 A, B, C	Illumination Project: Tools for Creative Social Activism 1, 2, 3	4	4	4	4		4
215	Social Issues and Movements	3	4	4	3		3
218	Sociology of Gender	3	3	4	4		3
219	Religion and Culture: Social Dimensions	3	3	4	4		4
221	Globalization and International Relations (also PS, ECON)	3	3	4	4		3
228	Introduction to Environmental Sociology	3	4	4	3		3
234	Death: Crosscultural Perspectives	3	4	4	4		4

280A	Cooperative Education	4	4	4	3		3
280B	Community Service and Action Seminar	4	4	4	4		4
298	Independent Study: Sociology	4	4	4	4		4

APPENDIX 4: Critical Thinking Assessment Scores

Artifact	Scoring Group	Explanation of issues		Evidence		Influence of Context & Assumptions		Student's Position		Conclusions and Related Outcomes	
		Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores
1035 n=8	SOC SAC	1.4	0,1,1,1, 2,2,2,2	1.5	1,1,1,1, 2,2,2,2	1.1	0,1,1,1, 1,1,2,2	1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,1	1.5	1,1,1,1,2 ,2,2,2
	PCC In-House	1	1,1	1.5	1,2	1.5	1,2	1	1,1	1	1,1
	MSC	2		2		2		2		2	
1026 n=8	SOC SAC	2.1	2,2,2,2, 2,2,2,3	1.6	1,1,1,2, 2,2,2,2	1.5	1,1,1,1, 2,2,2,2	1.4	1,1,1,1, 1,2,2,2	2	1,2,2,2,2 ,2,2,3
	PCC In-House	2	1,4	1.5	1,2	1	1,1	1	1,1	1.5	1,2
	MSC	2		1		2		1		2	
1038 n=8	SOC SAC	2.1	1,2,2,2, 2,2,3,3	1.1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,2	1.3	1,1,1,1, 1,1,2,2	1.3	1,1,1,1, 1,1,2,2	1.4	1,1,1,1,1 ,2,2,2
	PCC In-House	2	2,2	1	1,1	1	1,1	1	1,1	0.5	0,1
	MSC	1		1		1		1		0	
1165 n=7	SOC SAC	2.9	2,2,2,3, 3,4,4	1.7	1,1,1,2, 2,2,3	2.7	2,2,2,3, 3,3,4	2.4	1,2,2,2, 3,3,4	2.4	2,2,2,2,2 ,3,4
	PCC In-House	3	3,3	2	2,2	2.5	2,3	1.5	1,2	2.5	2,3
	MSC	3		2		2		2		2	
1159 n=7	SOC SAC	3	2,3,3,3, 3,3,4	2.1	1,2,2,2, 2,3,3	2.1	1,1,2,2, 3,3,3	2.1	1,2,2,2, 2,3,3	2.3	1,2,2,2,2 ,3,4
	PCC In-House	3.5	3,4	2.5	2,3	3	2,4	3	2,4	3	2,4
	MSC	3		2		2		2		2	
1037 n=6	SOC SAC	1.7	1,1,2,2, 2,2	0.8	0,0,1,1, 1,2	2.2	1,2,2,2, 3,3	1.7	1,1,1,2, 2,3	1.8	1,2,2,2,2 ,2
	PCC In-House	2.5	2,3	1	1,1	2	2,2	1.5	1,2	1.5	1,2
	MSC	2		2		1		1		2	
1163 n=6	SOC SAC	2.5	2,2,2,3, 3,3	2	1,2,2,2, 2,3	2.7	2,2,3,3, 3,3	2.2	2,2,2,2, 2,3	2.3	2,2,2,2,3 ,3
	PCC In-House	3	3,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	1,4	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	3		2		2		1		2	
1036 n=6	SOC SAC	2.7	2,2,3,3, 3,3	2	1,2,2,2, 2,3	1.8	1,2,2,2, 2,2	1.8	1,1,2,2, 2,3	2	1,2,2,2,2 ,3
	PCC In-House	4	4,4	2	1,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	2		1		1		1		1	

APPENDIX 4: Written Communication Assessment Scores

Artifact	Scoring Group	Context of & Purpose for Writing		Content Development		Genre & Disciplinary Conventions		Sources & Evidence		Control of Syntax & Mechanics	
		Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores	Mean	Raw Scores
1209 n=8	SOC SAC	2.6	2,2,2,3, 3,3,3,3	2.5	2,2,2,2, 3,3,3,3	2.4	2,2,2,2, 2,3,3,3	2	2,2,2,2, 2,2,2,2	2	2,2,2,2,2,2, 2,2
	PCC In-House	3	3,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	2		1		2		1		2	
1207 n=8	SOC SAC	1.3	1,1,1,1, 1,1,2,2	1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1	0.8	0,0,0,1, 1,1,1,2	0	0,0,0,0, 0,0,0,0	1.5	1,1,1,1,2,2, 2,2
	PCC In-House	3	2,4	1.5	1,2	2	1,3	1.5	1,2	2.5	1,4
	MSC	2		3		2		1		2	
1206 n=8	SOC SAC	1.8	1,1,2,2, 2,2,2,2	1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,1	1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,1	1.1	1,1,1,1, 1,1,1,2	1.3	1,1,1,1,1,1, 2,2
	PCC In-House	2.5	2,3	2	2,2	3	3,3	3	3,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	2		2		2		2		1	
1178 n=5	SOC SAC	1.4	1,1,1,2, 2	1.8	1,1,2,2, 3	1.4	1,1,1,2, 2	1.8	1,2,2,2, 2	1.6	1,1,1,2,3
	PCC In-House	3	3,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3	3	3,3
	MSC	4		3		3		1		3	
1183 n=6	SOC SAC	2.2	1,2,2,2, 3,3	2.2	1,2,2,2, 3,3	2.3	1,2,2,3, 3,3	2.2	1,2,2,2, 3,3	2.3	1,2,2,3,3,3
	PCC In-House	3.5	3,4	3	2,4	3	3,3	2	2,2	3.5	3,4
	MSC	3		3		3		4		3	
1179 n=6	SOC SAC	2.3	1,2,2,2, 3,4	2.5	1,1,3,3, 3,4	2	1,1,2,2, 2,4	2.2	1,1,2,2, 3,4	2.3	1,2,2,2,3,4
	PCC In-House	3	3,3	3	3,3	3.5	3,4	3	3,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	3		3		3		2		3	
1185 n=6	SOC SAC	1	1,1,1,1, 1,1	0.8	0,0,1,1, 1,2	0.3	0,0,0,0, 1,1	0.2	0,0,0,0, 0,1	1.2	1,1,1,1,1,2
	PCC In-House	1.5	1,2	1.5	1,2	1	1,1	1	1,1	2	2,2
	MSC	3		2		3		1		3	
1186 n=6	SOC SAC	1.3	1,1,1,1, 2,2	1.7	1,1,2,2, 2,2	1	0,1,1,1, 1,2	1.8	1,2,2,2, 2,2	1.8	1,1,2,2,2,3
	PCC In-House	2	2,2	2	1,3	2	2,2	2.5	2,3	2.5	2,3
	MSC	2		1		2		1		1	
1198 n=5	SOC SAC	0.6	0,0,1,1, 1	0.4	0,0,0,1, 1	0.2	0,0,0,0, 1	0.6	0,0,1,1, 1	1	1,1,1,1
	PCC In-House	1	1,1	0.5	0,1	1	1,1	1	1,1	1	1,1
	MSC	3		2		2		0		2	
1203 n=6	SOC SAC	2	1,2,2,2, 2,3	1.8	2,2,2,2, 2,3	1.7	1,1,2,2, 2,2	1.5	1,1,1,2, 2,2	2.3	2,2,2,2,3,3
	PCC In-House	2.5	2,3	2	2,2	2	2,2	2	2,2	2.5	2,3
	MSC	2		2		1		0		2	

APPENDIX 5: Course Offerings & Modality with Some Distance Learning

Data Source: PCC Institutional Effectiveness

2009-2010	Classroom		Web DL		Hybrid CLWEB		Hybrid TVWEB		Total CRNs
	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	N
All 2009-10 CRNS	104	66.7	29	18.6	15	9.6	8	5.1	156
SOC 204	44	72.1	9	14.8	4	6.6	4	6.6	61
SOC 205	23	85.2	4	14.8	27
SOC 206	19	86.4	3	13.6	22
SOC 211	3	50	.	.	3	50	.	.	6
SOC 213	2	50	2	50	4
SOC 223	.	.	2	50	2	50	.	.	4
SOC 230	.	.	2	50	2	50	.	.	4
SOC 231	.	.	3	100	3
SOC 232	2	14.3	8	57.1	4	28.6	.	.	14
SOC No DL	11	100	11
2010-2011	Classroom		Web DL		Hybrid CLWEB		Total CRNs		
	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	N		
All 2010-11 CRNS	104	61.5	48	28.4	17	10.1	169		
SOC 204	48	65.8	20	27.4	5	6.8	73		
SOC 205	22	84.6	4	15.4	.	.	26		
SOC 206	17	81	4	19	.	.	21		

SOCIOLOGY | PROGRAM REVIEW | 2016

SOC 211	3	50	.	.	3	50	6		
SOC 213	2	40	3	60	.	.	5		
SOC 223	.	.	2	50	2	50	4		
SOC 230	.	.	2	50	2	50	4		
SOC 231	.	.	5	83.3	1	16.7	6		
SOC 232	.	.	8	66.7	4	33.3	12		
SOC No DL	12	100	12		
2011-2012	Classroom		Web DL		Hybrid CLWEB		Total CRNs		
	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	N		
All 2011-12 CRNS	111	56.1	64	32.3	23	11.6	198		
SOC 204	55	62.5	29	33	4	4.5	88		
SOC 205	20	83.3	4	16.7	.	.	24		
SOC 206	17	77.3	5	22.7	.	.	22		
SOC 211	5	62.5	.	.	3	37.5	8		
SOC 213	2	33.3	4	66.7	.	.	6		
SOC 223	.	.	2	50	2	50	4		
SOC 230	.	.	2	50	2	50	4		
SOC 231	.	.	3	50	3	50	6		
SOC 232	.	.	15	62.5	9	37.5	24		
SOC No DL	12	100	12		

2012-2013	Classroom		Web DL		Hybrid CLWEB		Total CRNs		
	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	N		
All 2012-13 CRNS	111	55.2	67	33.3	23	11.4	201		
SOC 204	55	61.1	31	34.4	4	4.4	90		
SOC 205	17	81	4	19	.	.	21		
SOC 206	16	72.7	6	27.3	.	.	22		
SOC 211	3	42.9	.	.	4	57.1	7		
SOC 213	4	44.4	5	55.6	.	.	9		
SOC 223	.	.	2	50	2	50	4		
SOC 230	.	.	2	50	2	50	4		
SOC 231	.	.	5	62.5	3	37.5	8		
SOC 232	1	4.8	12	57.1	8	38.1	21		
SOC No DL	15	100	15		
2013-2014	Classroom		Web DL		Hybrid CLWEB		Total CRNs		
	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	# of CRNs	% of Row	N		
All 2013-14 CRNS	102	59	62	35.8	9	5.2	173		

SOC 204	52	61.2	29	34.1	4	4.7	85		
SOC 205	15	78.9	4	21.1	.	.	19		
SOC 206	14	60.9	9	39.1	.	.	23		
SOC 211	3	60	.	.	2	40	5		
SOC 223	.	.	2	66.7	1	33.3	3		
SOC 230	.	.	2	100	.	.	2		
SOC 231	.	.	5	83.3	1	16.7	6		
SOC 232	.	.	11	91.7	1	8.3	12		
SOC No DL	18	100	18		

APPENDIX 6: Face-to-Face and Distance Learning Student Success

Data Source: PCC Institutional Effectiveness

2010-11			On-Campus		Distance Learning	
Campus	Subject	Course	Enrollments	Pass%	Enrollments	Pass %
Sylvania	SOC	204	712	76.7%	233	74.7%
Rock Creek	SOC	204	391	72.4%	328	76.2%
Sylvania	SOC	205	282	78.7%	93	83.9%
Sylvania	SOC	206	130	88.5%	130	79.2%
Sylvania	SOC	213		NA	103	87.4%
Sylvania	SOC	223	35	82.9%	78	66.7%
Sylvania	SOC	230	24	70.8%	74	47.3%
Sylvania	SOC	231	10	80.0%	136	86.8%
Sylvania	SOC	232	54	75.9%	247	82.6%
2011-12			On-Campus		Distance Learning	
Campus	Subject	Course	Enrollments	Pass%	Enrollments	Pass%
Sylvania	SOC	204	718	75.1%	452	73.9%
Rock Creek	SOC	204	470	77.0%	508	64.2%
Sylvania	SOC	205	196	81.1%	99	87.9%
Sylvania	SOC	206	108	74.1%	95	73.7%
Sylvania	SOC	211		NA	44	75.0%
Sylvania	SOC	213		NA	139	68.3%
Sylvania	SOC	223		NA	114	59.6%
Sylvania	SOC	230		NA	88	54.5%
Sylvania	SOC	231		NA	218	85.8%
Sylvania	SOC	232		NA	400	77.8%

2012-13			On-Campus		Distance Learning	
Campus	Subject	Course	Enrollments	Pass%	Enrollments	Pass %
Rock Creek	SOC	204	332	73%	580	58%
Sylvania	SOC	204	777	77%	378	67%
Sylvania	SOC	205	138	83%	100	72%
Sylvania	SOC	206	93	59%	102	69%
Rock Creek	SOC	206	17	77%	64	52%
Sylvania	SOC	211		NA	29	69%
Rock Creek	SOC	211	23	61%	12	50%
Sylvania	SOC	213	32	78%	139	59%
Sylvania	SOC	223		NA	109	62%
Sylvania	SOC	230		NA	78	60%
Sylvania	SOC	231		NA	216	81%
Sylvania	SOC	232		NA	337	77%
2013-14			On-Campus		Distance Learning	
Campus	Subject	Course	Enrollments	Pass%	Enrollments	Pass %
Rock Creek	SOC	204	355	79%	451	61.9%
Sylvania	SOC	204	701	72%	432	65.3%
Sylvania	SOC	205	121	84%	98	77.6%
Rock Creek	SOC	206	32	81%	92	72.8%
Sylvania	SOC	206	112	79%	134	64.2%
Rock Creek	SOC	211	16	63%	14	57.1%
Sylvania	SOC	211		NA	9	88.9%
Sylvania	SOC	223		NA	110	57.3%
Sylvania	SOC	230		NA	67	76.1%
Sylvania	SOC	231		NA	204	84.3%
Sylvania	SOC	232		NA	278	78.1%

APPENDIX 7: List of Current Sociology Faculty by Campus

*Full time faculty in bold

Cascade Campus

ricci elizabeth

Mark Patrick George

Rock Creek Campus

Josh Bass

Ben Cushing

Michael Dawson

Heidi Esbensen

Lisa George

Jamee Kristen, FDC, SAC Chair

Aimee Krouskop

Niki Toussaint

Southeast Campus

Colin Gilmore

Sylvania Campus

Andrew Butz

Jordan Durbin

Terry Daugherty

Heather Guevara

Jerry Loveless

Kim Smith

Ken Szymkowiak

Maria Wilson-Figueroa

Khalil Zonoozy