LDC Program Review – Annual Discipline Update for 2021-2022 PART A

SECTION 1: BASIC PROGRAM/DISCIPLINE INFORMATION

SAC Name: Sociology

Disciplines included in this SAC: Sociology. Gerontology uses both SOC and GRN prefixes (SOC 223, 230, 231 and 232), but is considered its own SAC. SOC 211, SOC 221 and SOC 234 are cross-listed with Political Science (PS 211, 221), Economics (ECON 221), and Anthropology (ATH 234).

SAC Chair(s): Jamee Kristen (RC)

Faculty Department Chair(s): Jamee Kristen (RC), Justin Elardo (CA), Rhonda Collier (SY), Teela Foxworth (SE)

Program Dean/ SAC Administrative Liaison: Dana Fuller

Pathway Dean: Daniel Wenger (Interim)

Please highlight where your classes are offered.

Classes/Services offered at: **CA / RC / SE / SY / NB / HC /** WCC / Metro / CLIMB
Other: Online and Remote

SECTION 2: REFLECTING ON DATA

All data cited below can be found here:
https://www.pcc.edu/institutional-effectiveness/program-profiles/

Please include data from at least the last three years and up to the last five years. A 3-year enrollment review is recommended. SACs may have unique circumstances and reasons for looking more or less broadly.

2A.Enrollment (SFTE) per year; Location (where course is taught); Modality

SEE Student FTE Tab

This enrollment review includes data from the last five years (rather than three) because the sociology faculty wanted to see whether our declining enrollment (as documented in last year's ADU) is a recent (i.e., in the last two years) phenomenon attributable at least in part to COVID-19 and the fast pivot to remote instruction or if it is part of a longer five-year trend, starting prior to COVID-19. Onsite/Remote and Online enrollment is included. Hybrid enrollment is not included due to the extremely small number of offered sections during this timeframe.

Overall, sociology's decline in enrollment appears to be a longer-term trend, evident from academic years 2016-17 through 2020-21 so it cannot be attributed solely to COVID-19 stressors and pivot to remote instruction.

An exception to that conclusion is online enrollment which has been more continuously declining with a larger drop again in 2020-21. Declining online enrollment may be partially explained by procedural changes dealing with minimum enrollment and prior fill rates used to determine the number of sections offered each term. It may also be partially explained by increased "competition" with remote sections that also offer students the convenience of not commuting while also providing some synchronous instruction.

Sociology Enrollment by Modality Overall

	All courses SFTE	Onsite & Remote SFTE	Online SFTE
2020-21	270.5	148.8 remote	121.7
2019-20	286.7	140.6 (103.2 onsite + 37.4 remote)	142.4
2018-19	309.9	159.3 onsite	145
2017-18	350.1	188.4 onsite	155.8

2016-17	344.7	188.6 onsite	147.3
% change (decrease) over last 5 years	-21.53%	-21.10%	-17.37%
% change (decrease) over last 3 years	-12.71%	-6.59%	-16.07%

Sociology Enrollment by Location - Onsite/Remote Modality only for all courses

In 2020-21, SFTE by campus actually reflects the number of full-time and MYC faculty on each campus since all SOC courses were taught in either online or remote modalities (i.e., no onsite classes). Scheduling priority was assigned by faculty classification, rather than campus designation. Online courses continue to be assigned by faculty classification, rather than campus designation, so are not addressed in this section. Online enrollment was included in the previous table.

The greatest loss of **onsite/remote enrollment** over the last five years has been at the Sylvania campus (-42.2%). Rock Creek has experienced a loss of 19.2%. Both Cascade and Southeast campuses experienced small increases in enrollment over the last five years.

All Courses	Total SFTE	SY		CA		RC		SE	
		SFTE	% of total	SFTE	% of total	SFTE	% of total	SFTE	% of total
2020-21	270.5	39.7	26.7%	47.5	24.2%	88.3	32.1%	25.5	17.1%
2019-20	286.7	41.1	29.2%	39.8	18.5%	99.6	35.7%	23.6	16.8%
2018-19	309.9	57	35.8%	27.4	14.4%	111.3	30.9%	30.1	18.9%
2017-18	350.1	59.3	31.5%	38.6	17.4%	119.7	33.4%	33.5	17.8%
2016-17	344.7	68.7	36.4%	40.2	18.9%	109.2	31.3%	25.2	13.4%
5 yr % change	-21.1	-42.2%		+0.8		-19.2		+1.2	

Focus on SOC 204, 206 & 205

For the remainder of this report, we look more closely at just three sociology courses: SOC 204 (Introduction to Sociology), SOC 206 (Social Problems), and SOC 205 (Social Change). In this order, these are our highest enrolled and highest impact courses. In addition, given the extremely small number of hybrid sections taught, our observations and conclusions apply to just campus-based (onsite and remote) and online sections for these three courses.

Rationale:
- SOC 223, 230, 231, and 232 are taught primarily by Gerontology faculty, and managed by the Gerontology SAC
- SOC 211 and 221 are cross-listed with Political Science (211, 221) and Economics (221) so are also taught by faculty in those disciplines. SOC 234 is taught primarily by Anthropology faculty as ATH 234. The data do not distinguish between sections taught by SOC faculty and those taught by faculty in other disciplines.
- SOC 214A, 214B, and 214C (Illumination Project) are taught by just one sociology faculty member and these courses are only offered at the Sylvania campus. 214A is offered in the fall, 214B is offered in winter, and 214C is offered in the spring.
- After SOC 205, enrollment in other SOC courses dropped considerably: For 2020-21, total SFTE for SOC 204 was 146.1 (of 270.5), which is 54% of the total SFTE. SOC 206 SFTE was 32, and 205 was 16.5. The next highest (non-Gerontology) course, SOC 213, was 14.0. After SOC 213, all other course-specific SFTE were each below 6. SOC 204, 206 and 205 combined represent 72% of SOC SFTE.

	All locations and modalities SFTE 2020-2021	% of total SFTE
SOC 204	146.1	54%
SOC 206	32	12%
SOC 205	16.5	6%

Sociology 204, 206 and 205 Course Specific Enrollment by Modality

With the exception of SOC 205 onsite/remote, SOC 204, 205 (online) and 206 each experienced enrollment declines.

- SOC 204 onsite/remote enrollment declines were greatest over the five year period (-22.79%), with less of a decline over the more recent three year period (-3.13%). Online enrollment declined more steadily over the last five years (-30.4%), continuing to substantially decline over the last three years (-22.4%).
- SOC 206 online enrollment was greatest over the five year span (-32%) with less loss in the last three years (-8.5%). Onsite/remote enrollment, however, continued a steady decline across both time spans.
- SOC 205 onsite/remote enrollment has increased across the five year span, but decreased 39% over the more recent three year period. Online enrollment has held steady at an 8.4% decline.

	SOC 204			SOC 206			SOC 205		
	Total SFTE	Onsite/ Remote SFTE	Online SFTE	Total SFTE	Onsite/ Remote SFTE	Online SFTE	Total SFTE	Onsite/ Remote SFTE	Online SFTE
2020-21	146.1	102 remote	44.1	32	21.4 remote	10.7	16.5	8.9 remote	7.6
2019-20	165	105.7 (78.1 onsite + 27.6 remote)	56.6	24.8	13.2 (11 onsite + 2.2 remote)	11.6	18.2	10.6 (8.4 onsite + 2.2 remote)	7.6
2018-19	164.5	105.3 onsite	56.8	38.2	26.5	11.7	24	14.5	8.2
2017-18	197.7	130.8 onsite	65	46	29	17.1	16.9	9.4	5.8
2016-17	201.1	132.1 onsite	63.4	43.2	27.4	15.7	17.6	8	8.3
5 yr % change	-27.3%	-22.79%	-30.4%	-26%	-22%	-32%	-6.3%	+11%	-8.4%
3 yr % change	-11.2%	-3.13%	-22.4%	-16%	-19%	-8.5%	-31%	-39%	-8.4%

2A1. Do these data suggest any questions that the SAC would like to pursue?

Recognizing that the discipline serves both a Social Science General Education function as well as introductory coursework for Sociology major transfer students, our question is: **What can faculty members do to improve enrollment in sociology courses?**

We have the following ideas:
- Update the sociology website with the new template; this includes updating faculty profiles, and encouraging faculty to create individual webEasy pages
- Continue to support faculty member Ben Cushing's work with the Sociology statewide Major Transfer Map process and the development of aligned sociology program outcomes.
- Identify and communicate how our General Education courses serve students in other programs and certificates, especially now within the new Pathway structure. Build relationships with faculty to encourage student enrollment (e.g., criminal justice, nursing, education, and climate science - SOC 228 Introduction to Environmental Sociology is part of some Green Certificates).
- Coordinate with academic advising to provide information about course offerings and to talk about which programs and which students sociology courses in a General Education capacity might best support.
- Cross-promote sociology courses taught by different sociology faculty.
- Connect with Career Services and provide advisors and students with information about career options with a sociology degree.
  https://sociology.ucsc.edu/undergraduate/graduation/asacareersinsoc.pdf
- Increase sociology program visibility at high schools.

2A2. Do the data suggest adjustments be made in your discipline, such as schedule or course offerings, with regards to enrollment? If yes, what ideas/strategies do you have that you would like to implement or have help with in the upcoming academic year?

Other than to continue to provide a range of course offerings, with all four modalities, and at days and times that best meet student needs, we are unaware of adjustments to be made to the schedule or course offerings at this time.

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

We have been working toward compiling a list of programs that require or recommend sociology courses so that we can better partner with faculty teaching in those programs. It would be helpful to have a centralized database with this information, so when programs propose or make changes, we could track and follow up with faculty and administrators.

2A4. Is your program aware of any external influences that strongly affect recent enrollment? For example, state requirements, transferability challenges, other university policies, etc. Please explain.

The SAC is unaware of any external *curricular* influences that may have strongly affected recent enrollment.

2B. Course Success Rates

Data Definition: Success rate represents the percentage of students who successfully complete a course. It is calculated as:

$$\% \ S = \frac{\textit{Number of students receiving a grade of A, B, C, P, PR, or CM}}{\textit{Number of students receiving a grade of A, B, C, D, F, P, NP, I, W, PR, CM, N, UP}}$$

PR, CM, N, and UP are non-credit grades used in the Adult Basic Education program.

Success rates for gender and race are not calculated when the enrollment is less than 5. For any success rate that is not calculated, the total for that column is also not calculated.

% Success By Course and Modality

SEE Modality Tab

SOC 204, 205, 206 and % Success By Course and Modality

Yellow highlight indicates pass rate below 75%.

	Total		Onsite		Remote		Online	
	ENRL	%S	ENRL	%S	ENRL	%S	SFTE	%S
All Courses								
2020-2021	3058	77.9	0		1666	77.1	1392	78.9
2019-2020	3237	80.1	1137	84.5	434	80	1624	77.2
2018-2019	3512	77.6	1778	81.3			1672	73.8
SOC 204								
2020-2021	1639	75.9	0		1139	75.67	500	76.6
2019-2020	1850	79.1	858	82.8	320	77.8	641	74.9
2018-2019	1855	75.7	1175	79.7			654	69.0
SOC 205								
2020-2021	190	77.4	9		99	72.7	91	82.4
2019-2020	211	79.6	95	86.3	26	76.9	90	73.3
2018-2019	277	80.9	164	86.0			98	72.4
SOC 206								
2020-2021	362	78.2			241	79.3	121	76
2019-2020	277	85.2	120	90	26	88.5	131	80.2
2018-2019	433	77.4	298	81.5			135	68.1

2B1a. Are there any courses with lower or higher pass rates than others (over time, over many sections, or a notably higher or lower rate)? If so, which ones?

SOC 204, 205 and 206 have similar pass rates to the SOC average of all courses, with no major changes from 2018-19 to 2020-21. In fact, the overall pass rate as well as specific course pass rates for SOC 204 and 206 have stayed the same or improved over this time period.

2B1b. Are there any modalities with lower or higher pass rates than others (over time, over many sections, or a notably higher or lower rate)? If so, which ones?

There are no notably higher or lower pass rates by modality. Pass rates for students in online sections are slightly lower than pass rates for students enrolled in onsite or remote sections. This is consistent with commonly recognized challenges with online retention and completion. Pass rates for students in remote sections are lower than pass rates for onsite sections. There are some declines in success for "remote" students over the two year period we have offered remote instruction.

2B2. Strategy Insights

What strategies have you used to maintain high success rates? What can be learned that might be applied to courses with lower success rates? What are possible actions to be taken to understand/address lower success rates? Please clearly explain how your discipline intends to explore content/curriculum, pedagogy/teaching and/or course material selection using culturally responsive teaching approaches throughout the next year. Try to identify a realistic one year goal.

Based on strategies used in the past to support achievement and our sense that students who continue to be engaged do well in our courses, sociology faculty are asked to start keeping track of students carefully and to implement timely outreach when students start to struggle. Our goal is to increase retention and completion, specifically in SOC 204, which represents 54% of our SFTE. We will look for patterns distinguishing online, remote and onsite attrition for Winter and Spring terms.

Faculty are encouraged to **implement retention tracking and outreach strategies** designed to help us know more about why students unsuccessfully complete our courses:
- Beginning with Winter term, faculty are encouraged to systematically track students in real time by downloading class rosters to spreadsheets and recording important information about each student as gleaned from discussions and other interactions. Faculty are also encouraged to record communications with students and any major challenges the student shares with the faculty member. CPNs can also be recorded as "sent" in the spreadsheet.
- If students start to waver in their participation in the course, faculty are encouraged to reach out right away with a friendly email or phone call, voicing concern and offering help. If the student does not respond, the faculty will try one more time by email before sending a CPN.
- At the end of Winter term, faculty are encouraged to create a list of all students who received a D, F, NP, I or W grade with the following information: course number and modality, student last date of attendance or submission of an assignment, communications, plus any other qualitative information the faculty member has tracked about the student, such as personal struggles, illness, travel, work challenges, etc. The

faculty will meet in April to share what we have learned about our less successful students and brainstorm how we might better support them during Spring term.

Enrollment and % Passing By Course and Student Demographics

SEE Gender, Race, and Pell Tabs

SOC 204, 205, 206 and % Success By Course and Gender Identity

With the exception of students who identify as male in SOC 204 in 2018-2019 (74.8%), pass rates for students disaggregated by gender identity are above 75% for all courses, including SOC 204, 205 and 206 specifically over the last three years. Yellow highlight indicates pass rate below 75%.

	2020-2021		2019-2020		2018-2019	
	ENRL	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**
All Courses						
All Students	3058	77.9	3237	80.1	3512	77.6
Female	2021	78.2	2073	80.7	2242	78.5
Male	906	76.6	994	78.7	1140	75.7
Nonbinary	61	78.7	36	75	6	100
Unknown	79	84.8	134	84.3	124	78.2
SOC 204						
	2020-2021		**2019-2020**		**2018-2019**	
	ENRL	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**
All Students	1639	75.9	1850	79.1	1855	75.7
Female	1068	75.9	1122	79.9	1144	76.2
Male	508	75	630	77.1	638	<mark>74.8</mark>
Nonbinary	24	75	16	75	1	
Unknown	39	87.2	82	82.9	72	75

SOC 205						
	2020-2021		**2019-2020**		**2018-2019**	
	ENRL	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**
All Students	190	77.4	211	79.6	277	80.9
Female	115	77.4	128	78.1	169	78.1
Male	67	77.6	72	80.6	93	83.9
Nonbinary	4		2		3	
Unknown	4		9	88.9	12	91.7

SOC 206						
	2020-2021		**2019-2020**		**2018-2019**	
	ENRL	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**
All Students	362	78.2	277	85.2	433	77.4
Female	216	77.8	181	84	256	77.7
Male	133	78.2	83	88	166	76.5
Nonbinary	8	75	4		2	
Unknown	5		9	77.8	9	77.8

SOC 204, 205, 206 and % Success By Course and Race/Ethnic Identity

For all courses, success rates have held steady or improved for students who identify as Native American, Asian, International, White, Multiracial, and for students whose race/ethnic identity is "Unknown" over the last three years. The groups that continue to have lower pass rates (below 75%) are Black, Latinx and NHOPI. Over the last three years, however, the success rate has improved for students who identify as Black or NHOPI. Yellow highlight indicates pass rate below 75%.

	2020-2021		2019-2020		2018-2019	
	ENRL	%S	ENRL	%S	ENRL	%S
All Courses						
All Students	3058	77.9	3237	80.1	3512	77.6
Native American	26	84.6	17	82.4	36	72.2
Asian	210	84.3	231	86.1	235	77.9
Black	195	72.3	220	64.5	201	65.2
Latinx	567	68.4	565	81.2	531	75.5
NHOPI	18	66.7	27	85.2	18	55.6
International	27	88.9	55	74.5	100	85
White	1609	81.3	1610	81.7	1835	79.1
Multiracial	255	75.7	274	78.1	326	78.5
Unknown	151	78.1	238	78.2	230	79.1
SOC 204						
	2020-2021		2019-2020		2018-2019	
	ENRL	%S	ENRL	%S	ENRL	%S
All Students	1639	75.9	1850	79.1	1855	75.7
Native American	16	75	12	91.7	19	73.7
Asian	133	84.2	149	85.2	145	75.2

Black	109	70.6	148	63.5	114	60.5
Latinx	322	67.1	342	79.8	287	70.4
NHOPI	12	66.7	9	88.9	9	66.7
International	15	86.7	41	70.7	67	79.1
White	828	78.4	868	81.5	921	78.2
Multiracial	126	73.8	142	76.1	160	81.3
Unknown	78	82.1	139	76.3	133	75.9

SOC 205

	2020-2021		2019-2020		2018-2019	
	ENRL	%S	ENRL	%S	ENRL	%S
All Students	190	77.4	211	79.6	277	80.9
Native American	1		1		1	
Asian	14	71.4	15	86.7	21	76.2
Black	10	70	12	75	15	100
Latinx	37	62.2	41	80.5	50	82
NHOPI	1		3		2	
International	2		1		6	100
White	95	85.3	97	78.4	142	83.1
Multiracial	19	78.9	20	65	26	61.5
Unknown	11	63.6	21	95.2	14	78.6

SOC 206

	2020-2021		2019-2020		2018-2019	
	ENRL	%S	ENRL	%S	ENRL	%S
All Students	362	78.2	277	85.2	433	77.4
Native American	1		2		7	85.7
Asian	25	88	18	100	25	80

Black	34	<mark>64.7</mark>	21	<mark>71.4</mark>	33	<mark>48.5</mark>
Latinx	68	<mark>70.6</mark>	51	90.2	69	81.2
NHOPI	1		2		3	
International	2		4		12	91.7
White	178	83.1	135	84.4	211	77.7
Multiracial	34	<mark>70.6</mark>	22	90.9	40	80
Unknown	19	84.2	22	77.3	33	87.9

SOC 204, 205, 206 and % Success By Course and Pell Status

For all courses, students who were offered Pell have a slightly higher success rate than students who were not. Success for all students in "all courses" is above 75%. Yellow highlight indicates pass rate below 75%.

	2020-2021		2019-2020		2018-2019	
	ENRL	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**
All Courses						
All Students	3058	77.9	3237	80.1	3512	77.6
Offered	1348	75.1	1479	76.6	1595	75.5
Not Offered	1710	80.1	1758	83.1	1917	79.4
SOC 204						
	2020-2021		**2019-2020**		**2018-2019**	
	ENRL	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**
All Students	1639	75.9	1850	79.1	1855	75.7
Offered	723	<mark>71.1</mark>	844	75.6	843	<mark>73.7</mark>
Not Offered	916	79.7	843	<mark>73.7</mark>	1012	77.4

SOC 205						
	2020-2021		**2019-2020**		**2018-2019**	
	ENRL	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**
All Students	190	77.4	92	<mark>73.9</mark>	98	80.6
Offered	211	79.6	90	<mark>72.2</mark>	121	85.1
Not Offered	277	80.9	124	85.5	153	77.1

SOC 206						
	2020-2021		**2019-2020**		**2018-2019**	
	ENRL	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**	**ENRL**	**%S**
All Students	362	78.2	143	82.5	219	75.3
Offered	277	85.2	136	80.9	141	89.4
Not Offered	433	77.4	198	<mark>72.2</mark>	235	81.7

2B3. The data may indicate a pattern of inequities (in, race, or Pell eligibility) in student enrollment or success. Please clearly explain how your program intends to explore content/curriculum, pedagogy/teaching and/or course material selection using culturally responsive teaching approaches throughout the next year. Try to identify a realistic one year goal.

To improve equitable student success, beginning in Winter term, the faculty are encouraged to adopt (or continue to adopt) these **culturally responsive teaching strategies** endorsed by the College:

- Adopt low cost textbooks.
- Complete Course Details Pages when enrollment opens.
- Create webEasy pages and welcome/introduction videos and provide a link in Course Details Pages.
- Revise course syllabi to reflect best practices in inclusive syllabi design. Attend the PCC Center for Teaching Excellence workshops on Building Inclusive Syllabi.
- Follow backward and transparent design principles when revising General Education Signature Assignments.
- Create a "softer" and more welcoming first week of the term by helping students navigate D2L Brightspace, providing course orientation or assignment videos, and discussing study skills (e.g., "how to be successful in this class").

In addition, some faculty are exploring these strategies:
- Increase the sense of belonging among students and between faculty and students by creating student mentoring opportunities or study groups.
- Consider thoughtful ways of connecting students to campus multicultural centers.
- Design curriculum that connects course outcomes to real world contexts through case studies, problem solving, and examples relevant to student lives. For example, Service-learning/Community-Based Learning connects courses, students & community partners with solutions to problems and issues people care about.
- Audit content authors to ensure diverse representation.
- Engage nationally known collaborators (speakers).
- Design lessons that promote collaborative and cooperative learning.
- Participate in Pathway book club discussions on the book Extra Bold: A Feminist Inclusive Anti-Racist Nonbinary Field Guide for Graphic Designers.
- Participate in the newly established SAC-based "community of practice" focused on culturally responsive teaching in sociology. Starting in January, this monthly meeting will provide an opportunity for faculty to share resources, ideas, experiences, etc. from our actual teaching practice and ongoing professional development.

2B4. What support does your SAC need to fully explore inequities in enrollment or student success? For example, are there any other data reports you would find useful to have related to student success?

The SAC would appreciate access to a curated list of evidence-based teaching strategies shown to support student success as well as coordinated professional development opportunities.

SECTION 3: REFLECTION ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

3A. Assessment Reports - Note: The SAC replaced the original questions with the Integration Year Plan and Report, as submitted to the LAC.

Please note: The following questions link directly to your Annual Learning Assessment Reports for the Learning Assessment Council. Feel free to cut and paste between this document and your other assessment documentation.

In general terms, describe the integration project plan for the year. What are the SAC's preliminary plans for changes to teaching? What steps will the SAC take to carry out the project?

Following our fall meeting, we determined that we would pursue an integration year with the goal of improving our teaching and assignment design as it relates to Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy. Since then, I (Ben Cushing) have been in communication with Librarian Meredith Farkas about working together on this integration year project.

This Winter term, the SAC will hold a meeting and workshop with Meredith, in which we will:
- Clarify the distinction between Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy
- Discuss what information literacy skills we want students to develop and demonstrate in SOC 204
- Explore ways to improve teaching Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy
  - Identifying library resources and discuss ways to integrate them into our courses
  - Explore scaffolding Information Literacy within class activities and assignments
- (Re)design assignments to better assess Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy with particular attention to revising our SOC 204 signature assignment.

Spring term, faculty will implement changes they deem appropriate based on the winter workshop.

What questions about student learning did your initial assessment bring up? How do you hope your proposal will impact student learning? [For example, what gaps in student learning might your plan address?]

- In what ways are we currently teaching Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy?
- How can we modify our teaching practices to improve students' learning of Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy?
- How can we design assignments to better measure students' learning of Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy?
- What resources already exist at PCC to support our efforts?

What course(s) or part of the curriculum will your integration year focus on? Why have you selected this focus?

We will direct our efforts toward our flagship course: SOC 204 Introduction to Sociology. SOC 204 represents the majority of all SOC sections offered at PCC: 54% of all SFTE. We believe that focusing on this class will have the largest positive impact for our students.

How will faculty be involved in the project? Who needs to be involved? [It is important to engage a significant portion of the faculty who teach the course(s). The working assumption here is that for systemic changes to teaching to take hold, there needs to be involvement from faculty in the development of new teaching practices.]

All faculty will be strongly encouraged to attend the winter SAC meeting/workshop, and PT faculty attending will be compensated for their time from the SAC's 10-hour assessment budget. Decisions and take-away lessons will be shared out by email to any SAC members who don't attend. I [Ben Cushing] will also be available to SAC members to field questions or offer support.

What resources or additional learning will you draw on in order to carry out your plan? [For example: consult with the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence, readings, research, professional development, expertize, experience, data collection or analysis]

We will be relying a great deal on the PCC Library - including online library resources and the expertise of librarians.

What specific changes to teaching does the SAC anticipate making this year? Describe the parts of the teaching process the SAC wants to focus on and how these changes might address the achievement gaps. [*For example, revising curriculum, changing teaching methods, adjusting learning goals, integrating additional learning supports, and considering co-curricula.*]

The SAC will be revising our Signature Assignments for SOC 204. We will also build skills around teaching Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy, with an emphasis on scaffolding and interfacing with the library. Individual faculty members will integrate what they learn into their own teaching practices.

Your LAC coach is available to help with any step. What might you need help with moving forward?

We have really appreciated the support from LAC leadership in the past. Thank you! We do not need any additional support at the moment, but we will reach out if that changes.

3B. Response to LAC Assessment Question

Please respond to the question below, which relates to your SAC's 2020-2021 Learning Assessment Report to the Learning Assessment Council (LAC).

Commendations: This is a very well-done assessment. We are pleased to see you using the Gen Ed rubrics to test your own assignments. We appreciate seeing the disaggregated data and seeing how you are using it to improve on different aspects of the signature assignments. We also are glad to see such wide participation from the SAC.

Suggestions: We recommend reassessing this outcome either in 2021-2022 or shortly thereafter to ensure signature assignments are improving.

Question: What are you planning on assessing next year? Are there ways the LAC can assist the SOC SAC in finding other avenues of student learning that need assessment? Finally, does the SAC have any ideas regarding greater emphasis on methods of inquiry in the coming year?

SAC Response:

Last year (2020-2021), our assessment data helped us identify areas of strength in student performance related to Social Inquiry and Analysis, as well as areas of needed improvement. For each of the rubric criteria, the following percentage of students met or exceeded the benchmark of level 2:

- Social Context: 92.4%
- Methods of Inquiry: 68.1%
- Information Literacy: 72%
- Diversity: 77.3%

Perhaps unsurprisingly, our students excelled in the area of social context; a core tenant of our discipline. However our students performed less strongly in the areas of Methods of Inquiry and Information literacy.

This year, our SAC will focus on improving student performance of Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy.

In this integration year, the Sociology SAC will:
- clarify faculty members' understanding of the distinction between Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy
- improve our teaching of Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy
- tighten up our assignment design as it relates to Methods of Inquiry and Information Literacy

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES or OPPORTUNITIES

4A. Is there anything further you would like to share about your program's achievements at this time?

Many sociology instructors contributed to PCC and community professional development opportunities this past year. For example:

- Since 2020, three Sociology faculty - Ricci eX, Andrew Butz, & Randy Blazak - have been contributing members on [PCC's Preferred Future Council - Confronting Nationalism Response Team](#).
- Kim Smith presented on the power of education to achieve the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for a variety of organizations, including PCC's SPARC (Sustainable Practices for Academics and Resources Council) Virtual Faculty Workshop. She also collaborated with PCC's ASPCC student leaders to facilitate two workshops for students on how to address eco-anxiety and climate grief by developing tools for hope and resilience.

4B. Are there any challenges not described above that you would like to note here?

This has been a challenging year for many - faculty, staff, and students alike. Navigating COVID-19 closures and reopening, remote instruction, and the College reorganization, along with ongoing work and family responsibilities has been difficult.

4C. Do you see any opportunities in the near or long term that you would like to share?

Given that the discipline of Sociology focuses on stratification and equity, our faculty are situated well to support PCC in its new strategic plan and the YESS - Yes for Equitable Student Success - initiative.