2026-27 Comprehensive Program Review

Program: Sociology

Division: BSSL

Writers: Aki Hirose

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Aki Hirose

Email your completed form to Karin Spirn and your dean by November 2, 2026.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts and info for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Discipline Data Packets – institutional research about disciplines and student services
- ★ Course Success Rates Dashboard – allows you to research your program's success rates

Detailed information and instructions appear at the end of this form. For help, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu.

Section 1: Program Reflection and Planning

These questions appear on all Program Reviews including comprehensive and updates.

1. Please describe your program's most important **achievements** in year 25-26.

- Enrollment: Total course enrollment in the Fall semester decreased from 406 in 2024 to 347 in 2025. This is a significant drop. For the Spring semester, enrollment in 2026 (i.e., 249) appears to have remained the same as in 2025 (248). Student demographic data show that while the number of female students decreased from 212 in Fall 2024 to 207 in Fall 2025 (5 fewer female students), the number of male students decreased from 155 in Fall 2024 to 113 in Fall 2025 (42 fewer male students). Even though female students always outnumbered male students in our program, this is a noteworthy change.
- Course success rate: We met the program-set standard. Our program success rate is 80%.
- Sociology Club: Our students successfully launched the Sociology Club last year and stayed active throughout year 25-26 by participating in several events and meetings.

2. Please describe your most important **challenges** in year 25-26

- We are concerned about the sudden increase in academic dishonesty incidents involving AI usage from both equity and pedagogical points of view, especially for online courses. Writing is one of the most important activities that students can engage in social science. We feel that we are losing fair and

pedagogically meaningful space to properly assess student performance.
- While enrollment for online courses is stable, enrollment for in-person topical courses is still unreliable.
- Our SLO assessment is weak. We need to collect data more regularly.
- As the library continues to lose its subscription to databases, research assignments are increasingly difficult to maintain.

3. What are your upcoming **plans**? Please note any ways that these support student achievement and equity.

- We plan to strengthen our SLO assessment activity towards the next three-year assessment cycle.

Section 2: SLOs/SAOs

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review, with brief annual check-ins on the Program Review Updates. The following resources will be useful when completing this section:

- Three-Year Assessment Template
- Aggregated and Disaggregated Data from the following sources:
  - ELumen (if saved--no longer available online)
  - CurrIQunet
  - Student Success Dashboard

1. During the 2023-2026 three-year assessment cycle that just concluded, what did your program set out to learn through your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessments?

- We did not come up with a specific plan for the previous cycle.

2. Based on your analysis of your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessment data, what conclusions did you draw about student outcomes and equity in your program?

- We did not collect enough data to generate any meaningful conclusions about student outcomes.

3. Explain potential plans to improve student outcomes and close equity gaps.

- We plan to collect data more regularly for the next cycle.

4. Describe any obstacles that you encountered in your assessment process and any supports that would be helpful.

- Data collection is insufficient. We need to collect them more regularly from each class.

Section 3: Data Discussion

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review. Workshops and office hours will be offered in Fall 2026 to support Program Review writers.

1. RPIE Data Review: Discuss any significant trends in the data provided by the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (or any other data you use for decision-making and planning).

*(**Note**: Not all Programs have RPIE data available; if your program does not have a data packet or dashboard data, you may note that in the response box and reach out to the RPIE team.)*

Data may come from:

- RPIE Data Packets
- Transfer data
- Succes Rates Dashboard (scroll down on page)
- Requested data from the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE)
- SLO/SAO data
- Data from program-created surveys or investigations
- Any other relevant source of quantitative or qualitative data

- As mentioned above, total course enrollment in the Fall semester decreased from 406 in 2024 to 347 in 2025. This is a significant drop. For the Spring semester, enrollment in 2026 (i.e., 249) appears to have remained the same as in 2025 (248). Student demographic data show that while the number of female students decreased from 212 in Fall 2024 to 207 in Fall 2025 (5 fewer female students), the number of male students decreased from 155 in Fall 2024 to 113 in Fall 2025 (42 fewer male students). Even though female students always outnumbered male students in our program, this is a noteworthy change.

2. Equity: Did your data reveal any patterns of inequity? If so, please explain those patterns and any actions that should be taken at the program or college level.

- Our program set-standard is 66%. For the 2025-26 year, we met the standard (80%). When we break this number down by race/ethnicity, some alarming patterns emerge. Course success rate for Filipino students is the highest (89%), followed by Asian students (84%), White students (83%), Latine students (75%), and African American students (70%). When gender is considered, a group with the lowest success rate is African American female students (68%). However, the number of African American students is very small (N=23), making an accurate comparison with other groups difficult (e.g., Asian

students = 151. Similarly, the number of Filipino students is also low (32), compared to Latine students (141) or white students (155).

3. Course Modality (Instructional Programs Only): In reviewing your program's data packet and Succes Rates Dashboard, are there differences in success rates by modality (i.e. face-to-face, asynchronous, synchronous, hybrid, or hyflex)? If so, reflect on what might account for differences and any actions that should be taken. (Non-instructional programs may also choose to reflect on online vs. in-person services if applicable).

- In some courses (e.g., SOC 1), in-person sections tend to show a higher success rate than asynchronous (90% vs. 81%), while some other courses (e.g., SOC 3) show the opposite result (78% in-person vs. 92% asynchronous). It is difficult to conclude one way or the other.

4. Program-Set Standard (Instructional Programs Only): The program-set standard is a baseline that alerts programs if their student success rates have dipped suddenly below 95% of the rolling 5-year average. There is no punishment for not meeting the standard, and many valid reasons this may occur. When a program does not meet this standard, they are asked to examine possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate. | Program-set standard data can be found on this page

5a. Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion in AY25-26?

Yes__X__ No____

5b. If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests. Success rates for individual courses can be found on the Success Rates Dashboard.

Section 4: Special Topics

These questions have been chosen for this year's Comprehensive Program Review to meet reporting mandates (for accreditation, Ed. Code, or other sources).

1. Mission: Describe 1-3 examples of how your program's work has aligned with the college's mission, vision, values, and/or educational master plan over the past three years. (Possibilities might include new initiatives, resource allocation/use, program improvements, or other activities).

- Mission, Vision, and Values
- Educational Master Plan

- In all of our Sociology courses, major topics always involve issues relating to equity. We take main social dimensions that affect equity seriously. As such, all courses teach students to think critically about the effects of race, class, and gender, as well as other factors such as disability, religion, sexuality, social connections, and so on.

2. Regular Substantive Interaction (Instructional Programs Only)

To meet our college, ACCJC, state, and federal standards, **all online instructors** must demonstrate "**regular and substantive interaction**" (RSI) with students. That is, we must be clearly providing instruction and interacting with our online students, just like we would in an on-campus class. The following reflection questions allow us to capture how RSI is occurring in our classes.

The following documents explain requirements and best practices for RSI:

- ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education
- Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements

2a. If your program offers DE courses, how are Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements met in your area? Examples appear on the DE addendums of your Course Outlines of Record. Place an X next to each method used in your courses.	
X	Course materials make clear to students how often and when the instructor will interact with students (e.g. syllabus/home page lists email/office hours/other ways to communicate and typical response times)
	Provides direct instruction over Zoom (e.g. regularly scheduled live online class sessions in synchronous/hybrid/hyflex courses)
	Provides direct instruction through instructor-created videos (e.g. lecture videos created using Studio in asynchronous courses)
X	Provides additional information from various sources/mediums to engage students with course content (e.g. instructor-curated content in Canvas pages that help deepen students understanding of course content)
X	Facilitates discussions (e.g. through Canvas discussion boards, Pronto, Studio, or Hypothesis)
X	Provides feedback on students' coursework (e.g. through detailed rubrics and/or assignment comments in Speedgrader; note: a grade alone does not quality as RSI, nor does auto-graded feedback students may get through completing publisher content)
X	Responds to students' questions (e.g. through timely responses to student messages in Canvas Inbox, discussion boards, social annotation assignments)
X	Facilitates student success through ongoing outreach (e.g. posts announcements; uses "Message Students Who" to encourage struggling students to attend office hours or access free tutoring)
	Other [explain]:

2b. What challenges if any have you faced in implementing RSI? What additional training or resources might instructors in your program need to increase the quality of RSI in online courses?

Section 5: Program Review Feedback

What questions or suggestions do you have about this year's Program Review forms or process?

Detailed Instructions

Instructions

1. Send an electronic copy of this form to Program Review chair, Karin Spirn, and your Dean by Monday, November 2.
2. Please respond to questions with enough detail to present your information; it doesn't have to be long.
3. If the requested information does not apply to your program, write "Not Applicable."
4. Even if you don't have much to report, we want to hear from you, so your voice is part of the college planning process.
5. Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.

Sections: There are five sections to the document:

1. Program Reflection and Planning
2. SLO/SAO Review
3. Data analysis
4. Special topics
5. Feedback on the PR template and process

Time Frame: This Program Review should reflect your program status during the 25-26 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2026-27. It is fine to discuss topics beyond these time frames, but please specify the time frame in your responses.

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Uses: This Program Review will inform the audience about your program. It is also used in creating division summaries, determining college planning priorities, and determining the allocation of resources. The final use is to document the fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

Equity: Here is the LPC definition of equity, which is a guiding principle in reviewing programs: "Equity is parity in student educational outcomes. It places student success and belonging for students of color and disproportionately impacted students at the center of focus."

Please note: Program Review is NOT a vehicle for making requests. All requests should be made through appropriate processes (e.g., Instructional Equipment Request Process) or directed to your dean or supervisor.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Fall 2023 Program Reviews
- ★ Program Review FAQs

For help with your program review, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu