

Peralta Community College District

Berkeley City College
College of Alameda
Laney College
Merritt College



Laney College Social Sciences Program Review 2015

Social Sciences Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Report

1. College: Laney College

Discipline, Department or Program: Social Sciences

Date: 10/16/2015

Members of the Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Team: Scott Godfrey and Blake Johnson

Members of the Validation Team:

2. Narrative Description of the Discipline, Department or Program:

The Social Sciences Department at Laney College includes Psychology, Sociology, History, Political Science, and Labor Studies (as a CTE Program that will be reported on separately). Generally, the Social Sciences deals with the study of human behavior, and the goal of the Social Sciences Department at Laney is to give students a holistic understanding of how human behavior shapes their place in the local community, the state, the nation, and the global community.

With this in mind, the ongoing goal of the Department is to empower students with a sense of agency and an understanding of human-based phenomena with the goal of encouraging civic engagement and social awareness. Moreover, given Laney's mission statement, the Department is focused on reaching our diverse population and providing the steps needed to achieve real equity in the Bay Area and beyond.

Currently, the Department offers an AA degree in Social Sciences, which covers a wide breadth of disciplines, as well as AAT degrees in Psychology, Sociology, Political Science, and is awaiting approval for our History AAT submission.

3. Curriculum:

Curriculum Review Report - Laney College

Department: Social Sciences
Date of Report: 9/29/15
List Faculty Involved in Developing this Report: Blake Johnson

Current Courses

1. Copy the four fields below from the Active Course List				2. Has this course been updated within the last three years?		3. If course has not been updated for three or more years, do you plan to update or deactivate it?		4. If course has not been updated for three or more years, complete the two fields below.	
Discipline	Course Number	Course Name	Date of Last Update	Yes	No	Update	Deactivate	Who will submit an update or deactivation for this course?	When will update or deactivation be submitted?
HIST	2A	History of European Civilization	Spring 2015	X					
HIST	2B	History of European Civilization	Spring 2015	X					
HIST	3A	World History to 1500	Spring 2015	X					
HIST	3B	World History from 1500	Spring 2015	X					
HIST	7A	U.S. History to 1877	Spring 2015	X					
HIST	7B	U.S. History from 1865	Spring 2015	X					
HIST	19	History of California	Spring 2015	X					
POSCI	1	Government and Politics in the United States	11/16/12	X		X		Scott Godfrey	Fall 2015
POSCI	2	Comparative Government	11/16/12	X		X		Scott Godfrey	Fall 2015
POSCI	3	International Relations	3/15/13	X					
POSCI	4	Political Theory	10/4/13	X					
POSCI	6	The U.S. Constitution and Criminal Due Process	1/23/07		X	X		Scott Godfrey	Fall 2015

POSCI	21	Overview of the California Court System and State Law	4/15/11		X	X		Scott Godfrey	Fall 2015
POSCI	49	Independent Study in Political Science	N/A		X	X		Scott Godfrey	Fall 2015
PSYCH	001A	Introduction to General Psychology	11/1/13	X					
PSYCH	6	Social Psychology	3/10/14	X					
PSYCH	007A	Psychology of Childhood	5/14/14	X					
PSYCH	12	Human Sexuality	3/7/14	X					
PSYCH	21	Lifespan Human Development	3/7/14	X					
PSYCH	24	Abnormal Psychology	3/7/14	X					
PSYCH	28	Introduction to Research Methods in Psychology	3/7/14	X					
PSYCH	248GB	Themes and Issues on Aging: Concepts, Approaches, and Methods in the Study of Aging	2/5/10		X		X	Blake Johnson	Fall 2015
PSYCH	501	Perspectives on Aging Issues: Choices, Coping, Optimization and Growth	5/22/07		X		X	Blake Johnson	Fall 2015
SOC	1	Introduction to Sociology	2/23/14	X					
SOC	2	Social Problems	2/21/14	X					
SOC	5	Minority Groups	5/14/14	X					

SOC	13	Sociology of the Family	2/21/14	X					
SOC	120	Introduction to Research Methods	3/7/14	X					

Active Programs

5. Name of Program	6. What percentage of the units in this program of study can be completed online?	7. What changes are needed to this program?	8. Who will submit a modification of this program?	When will the program modification be submitted?
Political Science ADT	17%-33%	None		
Psychology ADT	35%-65%	Updated title for elective ANTH class	Blake Johnson	Fall 2015
Sociology ADT	33%-50%	None		
Social Sciences A.A.	100%	Course options need to be updated	Blake Johnson	Fall 2015

9. To respond to question in the field below, a) conduct conversations with faculty in your department and b) refer to course and programs that your program already has in process in Curricunet.

What are the discipline, department or program of study plans for curriculum improvement (i.e., courses or programs to be developed, enhanced, or deactivated)?

Social Sciences is currently incorporating 5 new full-time faculty, collectively representing 56% of the full-time faculty present, represented in each of the 4 disciplines (History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology) so conversations have begun regarding updating core curriculum, and expanding course offering to better meet student needs and faculty strengths. Collectively, a conversation is also beginning regarding closer Social Sciences cooperation to better develop and maintain the Social Sciences A.A. program as well as developing closer ties to other programs at Laney (in particular programs with overlapping interests and goals such as Ethnic Studies) to enhance student and faculty experience.

History is going to propose its AAT degree this Fall and should it be accepted that will form the fourth ADT degree offered within the Social Sciences.

4. Assessment:

- How does your discipline, department or program ensure that students are aware of the learning outcomes of the courses and instructional programs in which they are enrolled? Where are your discipline, department or program course and program SLOs published? (For example: syllabi, catalog, department website, etc. If they are on a website, please include a live link to the page where they can be found)

A major challenge to promoting a positive, consistent, and effective assessment cycle is a lack of full-time faculty. From 2012 to 2014 the Social Sciences had, effectively, 2 full-time Psychology instructors for 4 disciplines (History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology) and part-time faculty who were often, directly and indirectly, called upon to try to fill in, as much as possible, gaps caused by understaffing. Because of this chronic understaffing (understaffing that was so severe that there have been 7 full-time hires and the return of 1 full-time faculty between July 2014 and July 2015...) part-time faculty were forced to operate with minimal program support for assessment; resulting in numerous gaps and an “assessment culture” that could most accurately be described as “sporadic.”

Given the challenges of assessment in a period where there were few people with the knowledge base, awareness of, or designated responsibility to establish or coordinate assessment, there are many areas to develop in the Social Sciences regarding the awareness and publication of learning outcomes. What the Social Sciences maintained in this difficult period of understaffing was a bare minimum of posting course SLOs in every course syllabi and an intermittent awareness of PLOs and ILOs—depending on how aware part-time instructors were of the existence of PLOs and ILOs.

Moving forward, the Social Sciences is going to be posting ILOs, PLOs and SLOs on individual discipline websites starting in November 2015 with a goal of completing basic pages by the end of 2015. The Social Sciences is also planning to launch a central Social Sciences website to interlink the departments as well as describe the Social Sciences program learning outcomes for the Social Sciences A.A. degree in Spring 2016.

- Evidence of the approval status for all SLOs for every course offered in your department. Note that if the course has been updated through CurricUNET in 2007 or later, SLOs have been approved.

Cluster	Department	Number	Course Name	Approval Date
SOSCI	HIST	007A	History of the United States to 1877	3/20/15
SOSCI	HIST	007B	History of the United States Since 1865	3/20/15
				1/1/98
SOSCI	HIST	19	History of California	(Awaiting Approval—updated in Spring 2015)
SOSCI	POSCI	1	Government and Politics in the United States	11/16/12
SOSCI	POSCI	2	Comparative Government	11/16/12
SOSCI	POSCI	3	International Relations	3/15/13
SOSCI	POSCI	4	Political Theory	10/4/13
SOSCI	POSCI	6	The U.S. Constitution and Criminal Due Process	1/23/07
SOSCI	POSCI	21	Overview of the California Court System and State Law	4/15/11
SOSCI	POSCI	49	Independent Study in Political Science	
SOSCI	PSYCH	001A	Introduction to General Psychology	11/1/13
SOSCI	PSYCH	6	Social Psychology	3/10/14
SOSCI	PSYCH	007A	Psychology of Childhood	5/14/14
SOSCI	PSYCH	12	Human Sexuality	3/7/14
SOSCI	PSYCH	21	Lifespan Human Development	3/7/14
SOSCI	PSYCH	24	Abnormal Psychology	3/7/14
SOSCI	PSYCH	28	Introduction to Research Methods in Psychology	3/7/14
SOSCI	PSYCH	248GB	Themes and Issues on Aging: Concepts, Approaches, and Methods in the Study of Aging	2/5/10
SOSCI	PSYCH	501	Perspectives on Aging Issues: Choices, Coping, Optimization and Growth	5/22/07
SOSCI	SOC	1	Introduction to Sociology	2/23/14

SOSCI	SOC	2	Social Problems	2/21/14
SOSCI	SOC	5	Minority Groups	5/14/14
SOSCI	SOC	13	Sociology of the Family	2/21/14
SOSCI	SOC	120	Introduction to Research Methods	3/7/14

- Briefly describe at least three of the **most significant changes/improvements** your discipline, department or program made in the past three years as a response to course and program assessment results. Please state the course number or program name and year of assessment for each example.

Given the above note regarding understaffing the past 3 years, it is unsurprising that there have likely been few significant changes/improvements made to Social Science courses in the last three years based off of formal submitted assessment cycles. There have been only a small handful of completed assessment cycles and there is no documented evidence of significant changes/improvements to courses based off of formal assessment between Spring 2012 and Spring 2015. The generally consistent course success and retention rates for courses are suggestive that the formal assessment process has not produced significant changes/improvements to Social Science courses the past three years.

- Briefly describe three of the **most significant examples** of your discipline, department or program plans for course and /or program level improvement for the next three years as result of what you learned during the assessment process. Please state the course number or program name and attach the relevant data from your Laney Assessment Spreadsheet or the TaskStream report “Assessment Findings and Action Plan” section for each example.

Plan 1. The creation of a Social Science Common Assessment Plan (SSCAP) to develop continuous, common assessment for all Social Science courses. This process began in Fall 2015 as the Social Sciences volunteered to serve as a “pilot program” for designing common assessment plans meant to positively implement full assessment cycles in which all faculty, full-time and part-time, are able to take part in a supportive, reflective, and interactive manner. Our goal is to align ILOs-PLOs-SLOs and to be able to develop and practice an established system of assessment practices that will make the process both easier as well as more meaningful to instructors.

Plan 2. Related to the Social Science Common Assessment Plan, all of our faculty, full-time and part-time, are engaged in the assessment effort Fall 2015 and moving forward beginning in Spring 2016 faculty within the individual Social Science disciplines will be encouraged and supported to develop assessment schedules for their discipline (preferably mapped to occur before curriculum updates so that we can follow the closer ties between curriculum-assessment-instruction being encouraged by the College) so we can better articulate our own “learning loop” tying together curriculum-assessment-instruction into a more productive, and successful, cycle of success for instructors, students, and the institution as a whole.

Plan 3. At an individual faculty level the department chairs are committing to provide both increased support as well as oversight to encourage and enable faculty to better fully engage in the assessment cycle. Part of this process will be a clearer delineation of the assessment cycle and timeline, clear guidelines for and examples of assessment, the maintenance of an online depository of resources to help with assessment, and ongoing on-demand support well as monthly meetings and individual meetings as necessary to support faculty as they begin to engage in the Social Science Common Assessment Plan. Likely as a more established, positive, and effective assessment cycle begins in the Social Sciences we can shift to a more dynamic system of mutual support and, hopefully, effective instructional innovation tied to assessment findings.

- Describe how assessment results for Distance Education courses and/or programs compare to the results for the corresponding face-to-face classes.

Assessment results have yet to ever be collected for specifically DE courses in the Social Sciences. Fall 2015 will be the first semester this is done. Our plan is to have assessments for every DE course we are offering (11 total across all 4 disciplines) and for this to become a beginning point for a very robust process of review, revision, and assessment moving forward for our DE courses.

- Describe assessment results for courses with multiple sections. Are there similar results in each section?

Of the multiple courses that are offered in more than one section in the Social Sciences (HIST 7A, HIST 7B, POSCI 1, PSYCH 1A, SOC 1 principally) there has been no established process of comparing assessment results due to the general lack of full-time faculty that the Social Sciences has had over the last 3 years to oversee the process and, an acknowledged, lack of compensation for part-time faculty to oversee assessment. As of Fall 2015, with the influx of new full-time faculty, conversation and planning has begun to both coordinate and compare assessment results of courses with multiple sections. A longer-term goal is to coordinate assignments and establish a more structured assessment process for courses with multiple sections in order to promote more common learning outcomes across sections and instructors. In the short term, we are focusing on developing common assignments and rubrics. Much of what we have begun to work on regarding a Social Science Common Assessment Plan is meant to facilitate the ability to make effective comparisons across multiple sections of a class.

- Describe your discipline, department or program participation in assessment of institutional level outcomes (ILOs).

Again, as of Fall 2015, the Social Sciences has fully committed to 100% assessment of ILO 2 (Critical Thinking) and individual disciplines are being encourage, and will be assisted as necessary, to map SLOs to ILOs where warranted as part of our Common Assessment Plan. Here we are building off of the success of the Fall 2014 effort to assess ILO 1 (Communication), which a majority of the Social Sciences did complete, as part of the College-wide effort.

- How are your course and/or program level outcomes aligned with the institutional level outcomes? Please describe and attach either your Laney Assessment Spreadsheet or “Goal Alignment Summary” report from TaskStream.

Currently the 3 Social Sciences Program Goals are essentially taken from ILOs 1, 2, 4 and are thus “aligned” insofar as they are repetitive.

1. Civic Responsibility and Community Engagement (ILO 4)
2. Critical Thinking (ILO 2)
3. Communication (ILO 1)

Given the repetition and the unique characteristics of what a Social Science program, and Social Science disciplines, can and should provide students, Social Sciences is prioritizing updating and revising PLOs to both align with ILOs while also reflecting the unique values and learning outcomes of our program and disciplines.

At individual course levels all of our courses are currently in, or being put into, alignment with relevant ILOs and a target for Spring 2016 will be to not only have updated PLOs at the Social Science level, but to have full alignment as possible in all courses between SLOs-PLOs-ILOs.

5. Instruction:

- Describe effective and innovative strategies used by faculty to involve students in the learning process.

As of Fall 2015, the Social Sciences Department holds monthly meetings to support and encourage an ongoing dialogue regarding our general thoughts and ideas regarding pedagogy as well as assessment and curriculum concerns. Through the course of our conversations, some strategies that our instructors have shared are:

- Giving low-stakes writing assignments – the idea being to encourage students to engage in writing and hone their skills without the pressure involved in assignments like term papers or in-class essays;
 - Encouraging students to work on their note taking skills by giving “lecture bonus” questions from previous classes, which can be accrued at the end of the semester and added to students’ final grades – the point here is to encourage students to revisit previous classes and build a semester-long narrative regarding course material rather than simply compartmentalizing each class’ notes and trying to study for exams by using flash cards;
 - Beginning classes by having students lead discussions recapping the previous class’ material – the idea here is to put the responsibility in the hands of students for taking part in each class, and if a student were to miss the previous class, they are brought up to speed by their peers, thus creating learning communities;
 - Using dyads by having students pair with a different classmate every twenty minutes or so to make sure that each can answer instructor-provided questions pertaining to that day’s material. The idea here is to encourage students to get to know their classmates, encourage a communal atmosphere, and act as a check on how well each dyad member has been keeping up with that day’s class thus far;
 - Maximizing instructional time by having students access information through Moodle, while away from class, and thus flipping the classroom, and having students demonstrate and apply their knowledge while in class;
 - Giving semester-long assignments that include activities like creating political parties. This activity is designed to give students a base upon which to build by applying material that is introduced throughout the semester. For example, when covering a topic like the news media, the instructor may have students consider how their party may work to attract media attention and thus free publicity to further the stated political platform;
 - Giving semester-long research projects that are “scaffolded” to make sure that each stage of the class’ material is used to build on a more holistic understanding of the class.
- How has new technology been used by the discipline, department or program to improve student learning.

While making the best of an imperfect situation – many of our classes are not held in smart rooms, and Laney’s WIFI signal was often unreliable before the installation of a new network this semester – our instructors have made use of smart classrooms (when available), smart carts, and portable projectors to provide students with some of the additional learning opportunities afforded by new technology. Our instructors have also discussed the following ways in which they use technology to improve student learning:

- Using Moodle to give online exams for in-person classes – the idea behind this practice is to find innovative ways to maximize instructional time. Moreover, depending on the number of exams that one may give, this captures two or three more class sessions for other types of learning activities.

- Providing students with questions to be answered and interspersing class with film clips as a way to reach students with a variety of learning styles – the idea here is to keep students continuously engaged in class;
 - Using cell phones to bring students into classroom discussions – this idea came about when one of our instructors understood that there were students in class who likely didn't understand the material, but were likely too intimidated or embarrassed to speak out on their own behalf. The instructor writes his cellphone number on the board and asks students to text questions during class that the instructor answers in real time;
 - Have students look up definitions of terms during class time by using their smartphones – the idea here is to take advantage technology that's literally at hand while encouraging students to engage in active learning during class time;
 - Using Moodle forums to encourage students to engage in out of class dialogue – the idea behind using this type of assignment is to have students engaged with material beyond the confines of the classroom. Instructors who give this type of assignment see the benefits of more student participation, but have also raised concerns with one of Moodle's shortcomings, which is that instructors don't have the ability to privately respond to forum postings;
 - Regarding one of the above activities (having students create political parties) the instructor has students also create and share political commercials by using the video cameras that most students have on their phones;
 - Several instructors use Moodle as a storehouse for material that is covered throughout the semester. The idea being that students have a well-organized location through which to access course material.
- How does the discipline, department, or program maintain the integrity and consistency of academic standards with all methods of delivery, including face-to-face, hybrid, and Distance Education courses?

The Department is currently in the process of assessing all part-time faculty members; including those who are currently teaching online classes. Moreover, since eight out of ten of our full time faculty members are under tenure review, each is being assessed several times per year.

In addition, as part of our monthly meeting agendas, we are now encouraging conversation within disciplines to coordinate and promote consistent academic and grading standards.

Among the topics under discussion:

- Common syllabi
 - Common assignments
 - Shared assessment
 - Norming grades
 - Classroom/online engagement techniques
- How do you ensure that Distance Education classes have the same level of rigor as the corresponding face-to-face classes?

To date, as a Department, College, and District, we have done a poor job of ensuring that our DE classes offer the same, or similar, learning experiences of our face-to-face classes and have overly relied upon individual instructors to self-assess their courses. This began to change last year as the Department as a whole became more aware of the challenges of DE instruction and became committed to providing increased oversight of, as well as support for, our DE courses.

An example of our continuing commitment to expanding our knowledge-base and general understanding of the challenges to DE, some of our instructors either have or are in the process of taking online education classes offered through Peralta and other institutions.

As with our in-person classes, we are currently assessing all online classes as well this semester.

- Briefly discuss the enrollment trends of your discipline, department or program.
 - Overall enrollment trends in the past three years.

SOCSCI Enrollment

Headcount	Term									
	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	
Total	477	1,510	1,664	578	1,587	1,696	521	1,315	1,542	

Up until Spring 2015 our enrollments have remained consistent and largely depended on the course offerings. As of Fall 2015 with our additional faculty and course offerings we anticipate continuing regular semester enrollments of several hundred more students per semester.

- An explanation of student demand (or lack thereof) for specific courses.

Demand for our survey courses (History 7A and History 7B, Political Science 1, Psychology 1A, Sociology 1) in all disciplines has remained high as we consistently maintain per-class enrollments at 40 students or above.

Course enrollment in other non-survey classes has varied in the past, but we are confident that with the new addition of multiple ADTs we will see more consistent enrollment to support 1 or more sections of these courses every year.

SOCSCI Productivity Rate

Productivity	Term									
	2012 SUMMER	2012 FALL	2013 SPRING	2013 SUMMER	2013 FALL	2014 SPRING	2014 SUMMER	2014 FALL	2015 SPRING	
Total	20.44	21.55	22.29	19.26	21.78	20.32	18.67	19.45	18.75	

Laney College Productivity Rate

Productivity	Term									
	2012 SUMMER	2012 FALL	2013 SPRING	2013 SUMMER	2013 FALL	2014 SPRING	2014 SUMMER	2014 FALL	2015 SPRING	
Total	16.76	17.63	17.41	16.40	16.53	16.48	15.05	15.40	15.41	

- Productivity for the discipline, department, or program compared to the college productivity rate.

Social Science productivity has consistently been about 20% higher than the collective Laney productivity rate throughout the period between Summer 2012 and Spring 2015. Moving forward we expect to maintain a productivity rate between 19 and 21.

- Salient factors, if known, affecting the enrollment and productivity trends you mention above.

Due to consistent student demand and resultant productivity over the past three years, Social Sciences has not experienced enough variation to demonstrate that any factors have negatively or positively influenced our enrollment.

- Are courses scheduled in a manner that meets student needs and demands? How do you know?

Again, consistently high per-class enrollment suggests that our class schedules meet student needs and demands. We currently offer all of our main survey courses in morning, afternoon, evening and/or DE sections in order to accommodate as many students as possible.

- Recommendations and priorities.

Given the “newness” of our department it is currently difficult to offer recommendations regarding instruction. At a College and District level we need to provide better instructional support (including services for students) and a much more robust and active professional development system. At a departmental level we are doing our best to model this through monthly meetings and potential special trainings.

Our priorities are to continue working to incorporate new faculty and strengthening departmental ties to promote increased faculty collaboration and support to promote the highest level of instruction in our classes by maintaining and revising our curriculum, engaging in common assessment, and working together to achieve a sustainable increase in student success and equity.

6. Student Success and Student Equity:

- Describe course completion rates (*% of students that earned a grade “C” or better or “Credit”*) in the discipline, department, or program for the past three years. How do the discipline, department, or program course completion rates compare to the college course completion standard?

SOCSCI Student Success

	Term									
	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	
Success%	77.03%	63.70%	56.76%	75.19%	52.67%	57.28%	72.83%	60.36%	64.77%	

Laney College Completion Standard

	Term									
	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	
Success%	74.07%	68.72%	66.34%	73.40%	66.34%	67.98%	72.79%	68.95%	69.11%	

Department/discipline course completion rates

Success	Course	Term									
		2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	
	HIST 3 - MODERN WORLD HIST	NA	45.24%	52.94%	NA	38.10%	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	HIST 3B - Modern World History	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	59.09%	NA	57.14%	31.58%	
	HIST 7A - HIST/U.S. TO 1877	68.09%	57.14%	45.93%	66.33%	51.40%	44.67%	69.00%	50.86%	62.50%	
	HIST 7B - HIST/U.S. SINCE 1865	77.03%	52.10%	50.38%	50.00%	51.13%	54.80%	41.86%	44.04%	58.93%	
	POSCI 1 - GOVT/POLITICS IN US	69.32%	53.41%	55.45%	72.32%	35.10%	54.24%	63.30%	63.59%	62.17%	

POSCI 2 - COMPARATIVE GOVT	NA	55.56%	NA	NA	44.12%	45.71%	NA	70.00%	85.71%
POSCI 21 - OVERVIEW/CALIF COURT SYSTEM	NA	36.00%	NA	NA	23.68%	NA	NA	65.00%	81.25%
POSCI 3 - INTERNATL RELATIONS	NA	NA	38.78%	NA	33.33%	55.88%	NA	60.00%	58.82%
POSCI 4 - POLITICAL THEORY	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	52.38%
POSCI 6 - CRIMINAL DUE PROC.	NA	54.55%	NA	NA	58.33%	73.33%	NA	61.54%	NA
PSYCH 12 - HUMAN SEXUALITY	NA	73.81%	76.32%	78.57%	71.11%	45.83%	91.67%	46.88%	63.16%
PSYCH 1A - INTRO TO GEN PSYCH	82.50%	69.44%	57.77%	86.96%	57.56%	51.77%	91.95%	56.18%	53.20%
PSYCH 21 - LIFESPAN HUMAN DEVEL	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	84.44%
PSYCH 6 - SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	50.00%
PSYCH 7A - PSYCH OF CHILDHOOD	NA	77.78%	71.43%	NA	73.81%	75.00%	NA	71.43%	83.13%
SOC 1 - INTRO TO SOCIOLOGY	80.87%	73.93%	53.33%	84.71%	66.52%	69.54%	88.89%	76.34%	73.82%
SOC 2 - SOCIAL PROBLEMS	NA	87.06%	79.39%	73.91%	60.00%	60.47%	52.17%	71.08%	76.62%
SOC 49 - I/S - SOCIOLOGY	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100.00%	NA
SOC 5 - MINORITY GROUPS	NA	32.35%	NA	NA	38.46%	NA	80.00%	NA	NA
Grand Total	77.03%	63.70%	56.76%	75.19%	52.67%	57.28%	72.83%	60.36%	64.77%

Social Sciences completion rates are broadly in line with Laney College completion standards with a degree of semester-by-semester variance (above and below). Notable areas of concern, courses with completion rates that are recently more than 10% below Laney standards, for the program include:

- **HIST 3B:** Completion rates vary dramatically as only one course is offered a semester. The instructor of the course over the last several semesters has been revamping her course in response to the recent Spring 2015 decline and has been evaluated by faculty and given a set of recommendations to apply.
- **POSCI 4:** Recently offered by a first year FT instructor and was the first POSCI 4 offered at Laney in many years. Predictably completions rates were not as high as they likely will be going forward as the instructor gets a better sense of student learning experience and outcomes in the course.
- **PSYCH 1A:** Given that Psychology has 2 new FT faculty as of Fall 2015, and the retirement of another FT faculty, 56% of the PSYCH 1A instructors from previous semesters have left. Our new faculty is aware of the challenges inherent in PSYCH 1A (which requires an extensive research paper as part of the mandated course requirements) and as a collective program we are talking about assessment and engagement techniques to potentially improve student outcomes.
- **PSYCH 6:** Taught by a now retired faculty person in the Spring, much like PSYCH 1A our new faculty are aware of the challenges of the class and are seeking to better meet students needs to improve outcomes.
- Are there differences in the course completion rates when disaggregated by age, gender, ethnicity or special population (current or former foster youth, students with disabilities, low income students, Veterans)? If so, please describe.

Equity is an area of major concern and it is difficult to analyze the disaggregated data available through the district due to the lack of a baseline, margin of error based on sample size variation, and the absence of any controlling factors that would allow for an accurate granular analysis (for example, composites or breakdowns of students so that you can potentially isolate impacting factors—if a student is an older, African-American male military veteran with a learning disability how do we know what is/are particular areas of equity concerns unless we have a number of other students with just one of those factors? Or, to get really into it, how can we account for the accumulation of factors that might cause

lower completion rates?). Given the data that we do have, we can subjectively and anecdotally, note that students coming from impoverished backgrounds, largely—but not at all exclusively—persons of color, have lower completion rates in SOCSI courses across the board and this seems particularly true in courses with more rigorous writing requirements.

- Describe course completion rates in the department for **Distance Education** courses (100% online) for the past three years. How do the department’s Distance Education course completion rates compare to the college course completion standard?

SOCSICI DE Student Success

Success	Term								
	2013			2014			2015		
100% DE	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	Summer
HIST	NA	NA	43.59%	NA	64.10%	64.29%	NA	58.97%	
HIST 7A - HIST/U.S. TO 1877	NA	NA	43.59%	NA	NA	64.29%	NA	58.97%	
HIST 7B - HIST/U.S. SINCE 1865	NA	NA	NA	NA	64.10%	NA	NA	NA	
POSCI	30.30%	27.27%	43.75%	38.18%	66.00%	62.86%	35.56%	27.27%	
POSCI 1 - GOVT/POLITICS IN US	30.30%	27.27%	43.75%	38.18%	76.92%	62.86%	35.56%	27.27%	
POSCI 2 - COMPARATIVE GOVT	NA	NA	NA	NA	45.71%	NA	NA	NA	
PSYCH	63.64%	45.24%	NA	31.58%	47.78%	NA	NA	NA	
PSYCH 1A - INTRO TO GEN PSYCH	63.64%	45.24%	NA	31.58%	47.78%	NA	NA	NA	
SOC	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	77.78%	
SOC 1 - INTRO TO SOCIOLOGY	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	77.78%	
Grand Total	49.35%	37.33%	43.66%	34.00%	58.52%	63.64%	35.56%	55.56%	

Laney College DE Student Success

Success%	Term									
	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	2015 Summer
Success%	70.05%	57.60%	50.86%	57.64%	51.30%	54.86%	62.58%	54.77%	51.44%	

Social Sciences DE completion rates have generally been below Laney College DE completion standards with a degree of semester-by-semester variance (above and below). There have been some recent sustainable improvements beginning in HIST and SOC and there is a strong ongoing emphasis of focus on assigning DE classes to prepared faculty engaged in effective online pedagogy. Social Sciences strongly believes the Spring 2015 success, above the Laney College standard, will be more reflective of Social Science DE courses moving forward.

Of current DE offerings POSCI 1 remains a major challenge with a consistently low success rate. We are evaluation an online POSCI 1 this semester and in Spring 2016 one of our new FT POSCI faculty will be offering an online course after having completed Peralta’s EDT sequence and we are expecting that student outcomes will start to improve. It will remain a source of concern and focus.

- Are there differences in the course completion rates when disaggregated by age, gender, ethnicity or special population (current or former foster youth, students with disabilities, low income students, Veterans)? If so, please describe.

Yes. See response regarding “equity” above, but in DE the small sample size issue is only magnified. There is not enough information to be able to analyze or conclude anything beyond the subjective and anecdotal observation above.

- Describe course completion rates in the department for **Hybrid** courses for the past three years. How do the department’s Hybrid course completion rates compare to the college course completion standard?

SOCSCI Hybrid Student Success

Success	Term			
	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring
Hybrid				
PSYCH	40.00%	NA	40.63%	51.52%
PSYCH 1A - INTRO TO GEN PSYCH	40.00%	NA	40.63%	51.52%
Grand Total	40.00%	NA	40.63%	51.52%

Laney College Hybrid Student Success

	Term									
	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	
Success%	60.54%	58.81%	68.39%	68.33%	58.44%	55.12%	68.27%	62.05%	61.76%	

To date Social Sciences has offered only 1 course as a hybrid course and achieved disappointing results. Recent attention, both within the department as well as the larger division, has turned to how to schedule and maintain hybrid courses in a manner consistent with not only good pedagogical practice, but also Title 5 requirements. There is also a great deal of concern over our hybrid class this semester (Fall 2015) in terms of how it was scheduled and whether it is meeting Title 5 requirements. Moving forward this merits both more attention and possible intervention and the Social Sciences is hopeful that more clarity, guidance, and support by the College and District will be given to hybrid courses as they are currently existing in a grey area without oversight at all levels of the California Community College system.

- Are there differences in course completion rates between face to face and Distance Education/hybrid courses? If so, how does the discipline, department or program deal with this situation? How do you assess the overall effectiveness of Distance Education/hybrid course?

Course completion rates have been markedly lower overall in DE and hybrid courses and this largely reflects the limited oversight, training, and support afforded faculty assigned to these courses coupled with little to no support for students taking DE and hybrid courses.

Steps were taken last year, and continue this year, to provide stricter assignment of DE courses to faculty either experienced in DE or with DE training. As a learning community there has been increased engagement and communication regarding improving DE provided by the Social Sciences to at least meet current established Social Sciences standards and to increase side by side with our in-class instruction success rates.

The Social Sciences currently provides improving DE/hybrid courses that, like many other programs, are still developing stronger practices seeking better student outcomes. More than most, however, we are actively, thoughtfully, and collaboratively working together to improve DE/hybrid instruction and set a standard for other programs to seek to meet.

- Are there differences in the course completion rates when disaggregated by age, gender, ethnicity or special population (current or former foster youth, students with disabilities, low income students, Veterans)? If so, please describe.

Yes. See responses regarding “equity” above. Again, there is not enough information to be able to analyze or conclude anything beyond the subjective and anecdotal observations above.

- Describe the discipline, department, or program retention rates (After the first census, the percent of students earning any grade but a “W” in a course or series of courses) for the past three years. How does the discipline, department, or program retention rate compare to the college retention standard?

SOCSCI Retention

	Term									
	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	
Retention%	84.68%	85.36%	72.95%	87.40%	75.47%	70.34%	85.93%	79.61%	80.86%	

Laney College Retention Standard

	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring
	Retention%	84.30%	83.71%	79.07%	84.20%	81.31%	79.46%	84.68%	81.53%

Social Sciences retention rates are broadly in line with Laney College completion standards with a degree of semester-by-semester variance (above and below).

Retention is at least partially linked to student success and, just as we are working together with our new faculty as a department, we are focused on retaining students and promoting positive early intervention and reengagement strategies to maximize positive student outcomes through personal outreach, positive communication, and continued engagement with our students. We are developing updated and revised curriculum, common assessment through an entire assessment cycle, and open and engaged discussion of instruction/pedagogy to create a “Learning Loop” (connecting curriculum, instruction, and assessment) for faculty to actively engage in individually and as a department.

- Are there differences in the retention completion rates when disaggregated by age, gender, ethnicity or special population (current or former foster youth, students with disabilities, low income students, Veterans)? If so, please describe.

Yes. See responses regarding “equity” above. Again, there is not enough information to be able to analyze or conclude anything beyond the subjective and anecdotal observations above.

- What has the discipline, department, or program done to improve the number of degrees and certificates awarded? Include the number of degrees and certificates awarded by year, for the past three years. What is planned for the next three years?

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	Total
Political Science for Transfer (AAT)			1	1
Social Sciences (AA)	104	138	141	383

Over the last 3 years much of the focus of the Social Sciences was on launching the 3 AAT degrees it now has (Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology) and preparing for the 4th (History—which will be submitted for approval Fall 2015). Given that Social Sciences was so understaffed during this period that 7 full-time faculty (out of 9) were hired Summer 2014 and Summer 2015 (5 in Summer 2015) and that 1 other full-time faculty returned to the Social Sciences in Fall 2014 it should be unsurprising that little attention was able to be paid to improving the numbers of degrees awarded to students within the Social Sciences. Notably, it has not been until Spring 2016 that we have been able to offer research methods classes in Psychology and Sociology that are necessary for the transfer degree. We are now in a position to mindfully create effective “degree loops” for our courses so that we can ensure that in any 2 year span our students will have multiple opportunities to meet degree requirements for all of our degrees.

Now that the Social Sciences is closer to being adequately staffed with full-time faculty there are a number of conversations ongoing about both updating and advertising our transfer degrees as well as updating our Social Science A.A. to revise the courses eligible for the A.A. as well as begin to offer interdisciplinary Social Science courses to better meet student needs and to promote faculty collaboration and innovative instruction. Starting with the Social Science A.A. revision in Fall 2015, our goal is to better advertise and recruit for our programs in Spring 2016 to educate students, staff, and faculty about what the Social Sciences has to offer. Moving forward we are planning to start adding to our courses and degrees in 2017. In the short-term our goal is to better make use of what we have already to offer and in the long-term our goal is to have more to offer.

7. Human, Technological, and Physical Resources (including equipment and facilities):

- Describe your current level of staff, including full-time and part-time faculty, classified staff, and other categories of employment.

Full-time faculty headcount 9 (as of Fall 2015)

Part-time faculty headcount 8 (as of Fall 2015)

Total FTEF faculty for the discipline, department, or program 11.8 (as of Fall 2015)

Full-time/part-time faculty ratio 9/8 (as of Fall 2015)

Classified staff headcount 0

- Describe your current utilization of facilities and equipment.

Social Sciences currently occupies 5 faculty offices on the 6th floor (sharing a PT office in 613 and sharing a faculty office with classified staff—an unacceptable situation—in 611) of the Tower Building and holds

classes in several classrooms – primarily in the E and F areas of campus. We are currently holding classes in the D and A areas of campus as well and a number of our classes as of Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 are experiencing issues being assigned appropriate classrooms. With our recent expansion of faculty and classes we did encounter major difficulties with classroom assignments in the Fall 2015 semester and are trying to coordinate common classrooms for our disciplines (E-254 for Sociology, for example) with a longer term goal of maximizing classroom use while allowing Social Science disciplines to have “classroom homes.”

As of this semester, approximately half of the classrooms that we use are smart rooms, equipped with permanent computer and media delivery systems. For those rooms that don’t have this equipment, we have the option of acquiring a Smart Cart.

A past issue with facilities and equipment, however, has been the spotty nature of the WIFI signal in our classrooms, so we could not reliably stream video. With the installation of new wiring, this problem has been mitigated; however, the issue still remains that if an instructor is pressed for time in getting from one class to the next, moving a Smart Cart can be a drag on time, which can eat into instructional time.

- What are your key staffing needs for the next three years? Why? Please provide evidence to support your request such as assessment data, student success data, enrollment data, and/or other factors.

Having hired 7 new full-time faculty in the last two years (5 added this Fall) we are now much more fully staffed as of Fall 2015 then we were in the Summer 2012-Spring 2015 period. We are currently focused on incorporating our new faculty while maintaining course offerings from our experienced part-time faculty. While we should have additional full-time faculty for our disciplines, as should every department and/or program at Laney, we are satisfied that are current staffing level will allow us to meet our obligations and goals to provide high-quality instruction while functioning as both an effective set of disciplines as well as a larger cluster. Barring an unforeseen change in our faculty numbers or student demand for our courses we do not foresee requesting additional positions in the next three years.

- What are your key technological and facilities needs for the next three years? Why? Please provide evidence to support your request such as assessment data, student success data, enrollment data, and/or other factors.

Though this issue has been somewhat of a mantra for Laney faculty and students for some time, we would like to add our voices to the chorus and request clean, well-maintained, smart classrooms to provide students and instructors alike with a positive and supportive learning environment. Given the consistent absence of such to date, it is impossible to provide quantitative data to support our need; subjectively it is a common, and well-known, issue at Laney that classroom facilities are of noticeably lower quality than at other district colleges. Moreover, one could certainly argue that our facility needs raise major equity concerns and are not in keeping with our Title 5 obligations to provide not only high quality instruction, but also a high quality classroom.

8. Community, Institutional, and Professional Engagement and Partnerships:

- Discuss how faculty and staff have engaged in institutional efforts such as committees, presentations, and departmental activities. Please list the committees that full-time faculty participate in.

At present the four full-time faculty who have worked at Laney for a year or longer currently participate in: 4 committees (Learning Assessment, Technology, and Budgeting, Distance Education Subcommittee),

one is on the Faculty Senate, 2 are co-chairing the Social Sciences (now, as of Fall 2015, the 3rd largest Program in enrollment at Laney), one is assisting department chairs in the Program Review with data support, and collectively all are participating in a Learning Assessment pilot project to develop better assessment strategies. Additionally, 3 served on hiring committees over the Summer and one is serving on 4 TRCs.

New faculty are currently attending monthly departmental meetings and discussions and, when possible, Faculty Senate meetings to become more familiar with the institution and all are planning to participate more fully in institutional support beginning next year.

- Discuss how faculty and staff have engaged in community activities, partnerships and/or collaborations.

Again, the lack of full-time faculty over the last 3 years had a major impact on the Social Sciences. It prevented the development of community activities, partnerships, and collaborations as part-time faculty had little time or institutional support to develop community ties. Moving forward, this is a major goal of many full-time faculty and there are already efforts underway to expand the Social Sciences presence at Laney and in the community by supporting collaborations (such as with Ethnic Studies, the Oakland Museum of California History, and the OUSD) as well as sponsoring cultural and community events (film series, musical performances, speakers) and student clubs (such as Laney's Chess Club).

- Discuss how adjunct faculty members are included in departmental training, discussions, and decision-making.

As the Social Sciences Department understands the invaluable contribution of adjunct faculty, we include adjunct instructors in all department meetings, trainings, and significant communications. We also seek collaboration with adjunct faculty in scheduling decisions.

9. Professional Development:

- Please describe the professional development needs of your discipline or department. Include specifics such as training in the use of classroom technology, use of online resources, instructional methods, cultural sensitivity, faculty mentoring, etc.

Given that much of the faculty is new, it is difficult to describe professional development needs as much of the focus of the Social Sciences is currently on incorporating faculty and promoting a positive culture. Generally, there is a need for more professional support for new faculty as well as for faculty who have been at Laney for longer, both full-time and part-time, periods of time. Orientations and professional development workshops would be invaluable at both equipping our instructors with information that would enable them to better serve students as well as better serve the College and District.

More generally, it is long past time to develop a functional system of course release devoted to serving professional development. It seems more than reasonable that an instructor, who is supposed to be evaluated every three years, should also have release time for professional development on a similar timeline. Enrolling instructors into a system of workshops for a semester in return for course releases would allow instructors, both full-time and part-time, the needed time and information to be able to update teaching practices and curriculum and likely payoff in higher success and retention rates. Barring providing the time and space for professional development little is likely to change given the "one and done" system of professional development at Laney at the start of every semester.

- How do you train new instructors in the use of Distance Education platforms? Is this sufficient?

The Social Sciences Department has not, as of yet, held a formal training in regards to DE platforms. We do, however, encourage all faculty members to complete the EDT classes that are offered through Merritt College and several of our more experienced faculty offer ongoing technical support and guidance—one of our faculty is also on the DE Subcommittee and is an active proponent of “best practices” regarding DE. Moving forward this remains an area of particular concern and focus and we are collectively reviewing and discussing “best practices” in regard to our DE courses. There is, however, little we can do as a discipline to address the very real need to provide more support to students in DE classes and this also remains a point of discussion and planning in the Social Sciences—how to provide students with quality DE courses as well as the continued support to achieve positive learning outcomes in these courses. Moreover, the true value of certain classes being transposed into a DE environment is an ongoing conversation within the Social Sciences.

10. Discipline, Department or Program Goals and Activities:

- Briefly describe and discuss the discipline, department or program goals and activities for the next three years, including the rationale for setting these goals. NOTE: Progress in attaining these goals will be assessed in subsequent years through annual program updates (APUs).
- **Goal 1. Student Success: Defining and developing “student success.”**

As a department we are engaged in discussions regarding “student success” as inclusive both of the official definition of a “student finishing a course with a ‘C’ or above” as well as less official, but no less important, successful outcomes such as underprepared students actively developing and improving skills for future success in a course that they might not have been adequately prepared for to that point. Given that many of our courses are more reading and writing intensive than many of our students are experienced with, or prepared for, we are particularly encouraging our faculty to identify, intervene, and support students who might otherwise be overlooked or ignored. More broadly, we are continuing on our current path of collaboration, discussion, and assessment; continuously seeking the best modes of instruction for our students; continuing to discuss innovative and effective styles of instruction to provide the best outcomes for our student population; working more closely with existing support services to support struggling students and students developing foundational or basic skills. Assessing student outcomes from our individual and common efforts with curriculum and instruction to compare effectiveness and develop individual and common pedagogical practice to better support student success. In particular we will be discussing at the end of this academic year setting goals and targets for student success for classes in the 2016-2017 academic year and moving forward. These will certainly not be prescriptive so much as a common goal for instructors to commonly seek to meet and support each other toward.

- **Goal 2. Instruction: Maintain and build high-quality, consistent, and effective face-to-face and DE instruction.**

Continuing to meet monthly as faculty to discuss ideas and effective methods of instruction; working individually and collaboratively to compare current practices and results with alternative instruction in seeking to better meet student needs and desired learning outcomes. Linking curriculum, assessment, and instruction into the common learning loop with which all faculty will engage.

- **Goal 3. Curriculum: Develop and maintain up-to-date and high quality curriculum.**

Review and update curriculum as necessary (including the Social Sciences A.A.); work with new faculty to revise and/or propose new courses; work with developing interdisciplinary social science courses; ensuring curriculum remains consistent and of the highest quality. Collectively we are working together to review, revise, and update curriculum and are discussing next steps to building our collaborative program. We are actively connecting curriculum, assessment, instruction, and student success to promote a “learning loop” in which all faculty can engage.

- **Goal 4. Assessment: Develop and maintain a common, active, ongoing, and effective Assessment Cycle.**

In Fall 2015 the Social Sciences volunteered to serve as a “pilot” program to promote more consistent and effective assessment in all of our courses. We have already produced working plans and rubrics for our assessments this semester and are meeting on a monthly basis to review progress and provide support as needed to instructors. Our collective goal is to assess ILO 2 (Critical Thinking) in 100% of our classes in Fall 2015. Moving forward we are seeking to develop a consistent, collaborative, and positive assessment cycle for or curriculum and instruction to promote student success (a positive “learning loop.”)

- **Goal 5. Professional Development, Community, Institutional and Professional Engagement and Partnerships: Becoming a model for Laney and Peralta of an engaged, supportive, and effective department.**

Collectively the department is planning on a major expansion of its campus presence in the next year after new faculty have an opportunity to learn more about the College as a community and institution. We have already begun to expand our presence on committees and this will continue moving forward as we are committed to seating representatives on both instruction-related committees (curriculum, learning assessment, DE) as well as institution-related committees (technology, budgeting, facilities). At a departmental level we are developing closer ties and doing our best to create a welcoming, supportive, and positive working environment through faculty discussion and engagement as well as more lighthearted efforts included creating a departmental mascot (“Doug the Social Sciences Unicorn”) that students and, some, faculty alike have enjoyed this semester.

Appendix A

Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Prioritized Resource Requests Summary for Additional (New) Resources

College: Laney College

Discipline, Department or Program: Social Sciences

Contact Person: Scott Godfrey

Date: 10/16/15

Resource Category	Description	Priority Ranking (1 – 5, etc.)	Estimated Cost	Justification (page # in the program review narrative report)
Human Resources: Faculty				
Human Resources: Classified				
Human Resources: Student Workers				
Technology	Smart classrooms	2		N/A
Equipment				
Supplies				
Facilities	Clean and well-maintained classrooms; Faculty offices occupied by faculty (611)	1		N/A
Professional Development				
Other (specify)				

Appendix B

PCCD Program Review Alignment of Goals Template

College: Laney College

Discipline, Department or Program: Social Sciences

Contact Person: Scott Godfrey

Date: 10/16/15

Discipline, Department or Program Goal	College Goal	PCCD Goal and Institutional Objective
<p>Goal 1. Student Success: Defining and developing “student success.”</p> <p>Goal 2. Instruction: Maintain and build high-quality, consistent, and effective face-to-face and DE instruction.</p>	<p>GOAL 1 STUDENT SUCCESS Develop new and strengthen existing interventions and strategies to increase students’ access and success</p>	<p>A: Advance Student Access, Equity, and Success</p>
<p>Goal 3. Curriculum: Develop and maintain up-to-date and high quality curriculum.</p>	<p>GOAL 2 ACCREDITATION Take the necessary actions to reaffirm Laney College’s accreditation.</p>	<p>C: Build Programs of Distinction</p>
<p>Goal 4. Assessment: Develop and maintain a common, active, ongoing, and effective Assessment Cycle.</p>	<p>GOAL 3 ASSESSMENT Ensure completion of the Assessment cycle for SLOs, ILOs, SSOs, IAOs and PLOs.</p>	<p>D: Strengthen Accountability, Innovation and Collaboration</p>
<p>Goal 5. Professional Development, Community, Institutional and Professional Engagement and Partnerships.</p>	<p>GOAL#4 RESOURCES Increase, develop and manage the College’s resource capacity in the areas of personnel, finances, facilities, technology and partnerships in order to advance the quality of education provided.</p>	<p>B: Engage and Leverage Partners</p>

Appendix C

Program Review Validation Form and Signature Page

College: Laney

Discipline, Department or Program: Social Sciences

Part I: First Level Validation: Assessment of department performance and/or needs in specific areas (to be completed by section leads and division dean).

Program Review Elements	Validation	Comments
	<p><i>In Progress: department is moving to align with college goals</i></p> <p><i>Meets college goals: department aligns with college goals</i></p>	<p>Laney College Goals:</p> <p>#1 Student Success: Develop new and strengthen existing interventions and strategies to increase students' access and success.</p> <p>#2 Accreditation: Ensure a collaborative process to successfully complete the necessary actions that lead to the reaffirmation of Laney College's accreditation on an unconditional (non- warning) status.</p> <p>#3 Assessment: Ensure completion of the Assessment cycle for SLOs and PLOs.</p> <p>#4 Resources: Increase, develop and manage the College's resource capacity in the areas of facilities, technology, personnel, finances and public and private partnerships, in order to advance the quality of education provided.</p>
3. Curriculum: To be completed by curriculum committee representative.	<input type="checkbox"/> In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Meets College Goals	
4. Assessment To be completed by assessment coordinators.	<input type="checkbox"/> In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Meets College Goals	
5. Instruction	<input type="checkbox"/> In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Meets College Goals	
6. Student Success	<input type="checkbox"/> In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Meets College Goals	
7. Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Meets College Goals	
8. Community, Institutional, and Professional Engagement and Partnerships	<input type="checkbox"/> In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Meets College Goals	
9. Professional Development	<input type="checkbox"/> In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Meets College Goals	
10. Discipline, Department or Program Goals and Activities	<input type="checkbox"/> In Progress <input type="checkbox"/> Meets College Goals	

Part II. Overall Assessment of the Program Review Report (to be completed by deans).

Review Criteria	Comments:
<p>1. The narrative information is clear and all elements of the program review are addressed.</p> <p>2. Conclusions and recommendations are well-substantiated and relate to the analysis of the data.</p> <p>3. Discipline, department or program planning goals are articulated in the report. The goals address noted areas of concern.</p> <p>4. The resource requests are connected to the discipline, department or program planning goals and are aligned with the college goals.</p>	

Part III. Program Review Rating (to be completed by division dean).

Rating	Comments (Required if Improvement Needed)
<input type="checkbox"/> 1. Accepted. Complete the signatures below and submit to the Vice President of Instruction.	
<input type="checkbox"/> 3. Improvement Needed Provide improvement plan that indicates areas in the report that require major revision. Discuss report along with a reasonable timeline for re-submission. Notify the Vice President of Instruction of the need to re-submit. Please note that program reviews that are late run the risk of not being included in the various resource prioritization processes of the college and the district.	

Commented [S1]: Include bullet points to isolate the major changes and signature lines for both dean and department chair.

Improvement Needed Signatures

Discipline, Department or Program Chair (Acknowledgement of Improvement Needed)

_____ Signature _____ Date

Division Dean

_____ Signature _____ Date

