Program Efficacy Report
Spring 2015

Name of Department: Sociology

Efficacy Team: Guy Hinrichs, Joel Lamore

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): Continuance

> **The Sociology department offers a range of courses to support GE and transfer. The department faces a number of challenges well-described in the efficacy documents: a need for additional full-time faculty and classroom space as well as success rates below department goals. Nonetheless, the program is sound, with a solid, strategic understanding of its needs, challenges, accomplishments and the internal and external trends that impact the program. The efficacy document is a model of thoroughness and good analysis, well supported by relevant data, which thus allows a valid evaluation of the program's efficacy.**

Strategic Initiative	Institutional Expectations	
	Does Not Meet	**Meets**
Part I: Access		
Demographics	*The program does not provide an appropriate analysis regarding identified differences in the program's population compared to that of the general population*	*The program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the demographic data and provides an interpretation in response to any identified variance.* *If warranted, discuss the plans or activities that are in place to recruit and retain underserved populations.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The discussion of demographics is thorough -- actually a model for how to engage demographic data with clear analysis. There is a serious discussion of the gender disparity, how it compares to campus makeup, as well as national trends in sociology studies and majors. No major solutions are discussed, but there is some attention to smaller things that could positively affect the imbalance.

Pattern of Service	*The program's pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.*	*The program provides <u>evidence</u> that the pattern of service or instruction meets student needs.* *If warranted, plans or activities are in place to meet a broader range of needs.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program thoroughly examines patterns of service, from needs of courses for transfer and related majors, to course by course breakdown of when and how often courses are offered. Though there is a general discussion about whether those patterns seem adequate, it is separated from course by course breakdown. It might have been clearer and allowed for more detail if the pattern analysis had also been organized course by course, though this is perhaps a level of detail and thoroughness which goes beyond reasonable expectations. There is also coverage of online vs classroom course options as well as short-term offerings.

Part II: Student Success		
Data demonstrating achievement of instructional or service success	*Program does not provide an adequate analysis of the data provided with respect to relevant program data.*	*Program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals.* *If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program provides an excellent discussion of retention and success numbers. The weakness of online courses is put forward as a quite plausible partial explanation for the slightly below average numbers in each area compared to campus and discipline rates. Inclusion of a number of charts and stats strengthen the discussion. Supplemental data includes discussion of impact of C-ID as well as healthy numbers for awarded AA-T degrees.

Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes	*Program has not demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.*	*Program has demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program's SLOs have been created and evaluated. The discussion of SLOs and evaluation is thorough in terms of the process established (which seems organized and timely). An example of how SLO evaluations influenced courses, assessments, or reevaluation of SLOs would have been useful, however. PLO for transfer degree is developed and grid is correct. Despite that fact that PLOs (and AA-T assessed) are relatively new, there is evidence of discussion, and the analysis notes the rubrics used. What can be discussed about the Core Competencies (which are in flux) is covered. The department seems on top of requirements as they currently stand.

Part III: Institutional Effectiveness		
Mission and Purpose	*The program does not have a mission, or it does not clearly link with the institutional mission.*	*The program has a mission, and it links clearly with the institutional mission.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The department does not have a mission statement, but a discipline organization statement is followed. The committee was not sure if the college has a position on this, though it seems reasonable to allow an alternative with such authority. The weakness is that the language of the national discipline group does not align easily to the college mission. There is a discussion of how the department meets college mission, though key elements regarding diversity and quality are implied instead of clearly stated and discussed. Though the committee felt the program meets the requirement, it is the weakest section of the report.

Productivity	*The data does not show an acceptable level of productivity for the program, or the issue of productivity is not adequately addressed.*	*The data shows the program is productive at an acceptable level.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

Analysis of productivity (which is high) is good, with good explanation about the need for more classes to meet strong need (which is also documented) and the need to hire more FT faculty to insure more of the courses are taught by faculty with more resources to devote to students.

Relevance, Currency, Articulation	*The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.* *Out of date course(s) that are not launched into CurricuNet by Oct. 1 may result in an overall recommendation no higher than Conditional.*	*The program provides evidence that the curriculum review process is up to date. Courses are relevant and current to the mission of the program. Appropriate courses have been articulated or transfer with UC/CSU, or plans are in place to articulate appropriate courses.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The department's courses are up to date in content review and have no articulation issues. The discussion of the catalog shows the program to be aware of coming need for changes and review that would be reflected in updating the catalog in the near future.

Part IV: Planning		
Trends	*The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.*	*The program <u>identifies and describes</u> major trends in the field. Program addresses how trends will affect enrollment and planning. Provide data or research from the field for support.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program provides a fairly comprehensive discussion of a wide variety of internal and external trends which impact the program from success and retention, to transfer issues, to support services and budget issues. The analysis and planning for each is brief, but clear and appropriate.

Accomplishments	*The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.*	*The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

Accomplishments of the program were well described. Many of the courses have stronger prerequisites, making the sociology courses a model for helping students better succeed in college-level courses by having relevant English and math skills. Alignment to C-ID for relevant courses was also completed. In addition, despite the department being mostly PT faculty, there was rise in involvement from them in department business. Several other accomplishments are discussed in similar detail.

Weaknesses/challenges	*The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.*	*The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

Since the report has already been so thorough, the discussion in this section repeats challenges pointed out before – need for FT faculty, classroom space, uneven job prospects, etc. Despite the repetition of these challenges, the discussion of them is thorough. In addition, the department's analysis and planning regarding these challenges is clear.

Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate		
	Program does not demonstrate that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.	*Program demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.*
	Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.	*Program has plans to further implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program has adequate coverage of all three areas. Internal and external partners are identified (though perhaps more outside partnerships could be forged), technology is integrated into the program, and the department clearly contributes to campus climate – though of the three, campus climate seems weakest, and yet the program would seem to have much to offer the campus climate.

Part VI: Previous Does Not Meets Categories	
Program does not show that previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.	*Program describes how previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback (N/A if there were no "Does not Meets" in the previous efficacy review): MEETS

The program has no previous Does Not Meets.