

The “Politics” (POSCI) Program at College of Alameda

Peralta Community College District

2016-2017 Annual Program Update

~ Robert J. Brem

Date		BI Data	
Submitted:	October 27 th 2016	Access Date:	September 2016
Discipline:	Political Science (POSCI)	Campus:	College of Alameda
Dean:	Myron Jordan	Department Chair:	Ed Loretto (HIS, AFR, POSCI)

This Annual Program Update (APU) is an evolutionary document emerging through the revision of all previous APUs from this department since 2005. This effort is guided by process & outcomes evaluation of the department in its progress. In doing this, and referring to our S.W.O.T. analysis; we seek to harness internal strengths and address internal weaknesses and external (and internal) threats while seeking to take advantage of external (and internal) & opportunities; in our efforts towards achieving our mission over time. While editing with new headers and current data; this format enables the illustration of some continuity and progress of program evolution and success and challenges over time. This APU includes preliminary data from our new PLO/SLO EFF assessment protocol. We also include student success data from CCUL Program Implementation. One serious setback was the loss of another crucial key faculty member to other employment. Also, we did not have sufficient staff and time to do data analysis for this review more substantively. Granting challenges of a primarily part time faculty driven team and institutional challenges; we strive to at least use this document as a touchstone in our efforts in contributing to the mission of the College of Alameda.

College of Alameda Mission Statement

It is the Mission of College of Alameda to serve the educational needs of its diverse community by providing comprehensive and flexible programs and resources that empower students to achieve their goals.

Contents:

		Page
I	Overview	2
II	Enrollment	4
	• Demographic Data Students served by POSCI/ CCUL	5
III	Student Success	9
	• EFF Data on Student Learning outcomes re: “success”	9
	• Degrees Awarded	10
	• Diversity Patterns of Awarded degrees and certificates	10
	• Diversity Patterns Relative to Student Success	12
	• Student Retention	15
IV	Faculty	15
	• 2015-16 APU Data	17
V	Qualitative Assessment	19
VI	Course SLOs and Assessments	20
VII	Program Learning Outcomes and Assessment	22
VIII	Prioritized Resource Request Summary	23
IX	Alignment of Goals: Department with COA & District	24
X	Appendices – Directory of A thru I	n/a

I Overview ~ Political Science (and Community Change and Urban Leadership)

The department now has:

- two (2) degrees and one (1) certificate;
- comprised of 15 “Active” courses in catalog for the discipline;
- 9 of these have been offered in past two years;
- **all 15 POSCI courses have SLOs defined; and all of the courses we have offered in past few years have been evaluated through the 2015-16 school year (for 100% compliance);**
- we are also a Faculty Diversity Internship Program (FDIP) Mentor Department .

In the face of the threat of competitive disadvantage and “market share” amongst the Peralta College Sister Departments;

- we are further developing our signature CCUL program with “stackable certificates” and
- new degrees in **Social Justice Studies (SJS) Area of Emphasis Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC)** (Public Service and Community Change)
- we also developing an Emergency Management focus for our Public Administration Track

In the context of the **“Politics” Department Vision and Mission:**

We envision our students as engaged persons enabled to lead in the creation of a world that is:
Socially Just, Environmentally and Economically sustainable, and Psychologically Fulfilling.

We fulfill this vision in our mission offering Associate of Arts Degrees in Political Science and a Certificate of Proficiency in Violence Prevention. Our program emphasizes community engagement, future consciousness, and transformational leadership in creating social change. We aim to empower our students in building their capacity to effectively engage with the 21st Century Modern World System as citizens, workers, and persons. An emphasis is placed on highlighting how politics is relevant to the lives of students as whole persons in their day to day world of lived and shared reality. Overall, we fulfill this commitment by facilitating learning experiences for the people we serve in: 1) the expansion of foundational knowledge of the socio-political world, 2) increasing their proficiency with critical political thinking to be better able to engage their “knowledge in use” skills, and 3) building their capacity for personal psycho-social political efficacy.

The work of the department in this 2016-17 cycle is framed by a series of propositions describing the emerging situation within which we see our department needing to operate in order to thrive as a comprehensive department:

- **Granting:** the “*state of the discipline*” (political science and public administration) in the context of 21st Century needs of our East Bay Community in the context of the Modern World System as it has emerged over the past decade;
- **Granting:** the COA Vision, Mission, and Institutional Learning Outcomes – in part dedicated to being a “*Learning Community College*” ;
- **Granting** the ongoing projects in our department, which , if successful, would substantially contribute to the school “learning community” in its mission;
- **Granting** a history of institutional incapacities & ligatures leading to problematic programmatic progress & success to which we must adapt and improvise to overcome;
- **Granting** the emergence of significantly revitalized POSCI Departments at Laney & BCC; with their geographic and infrastructural advantages now magnified with four new full time active faculty (where: as of the last APU in 2012 there was only one relatively inactive full time faculty between both).
 - **Thus;** COA, which had dominated this discipline district wide for a decade, is now at a comparative competitive disadvantage with those institutions; AND:
 - **Noting** Merritt College gave up its formerly comprehensive POSCI program in 2014 for this same reason and we fear COA may face this in its own future;

- **Therefore;** it is argued here: **it logically follows** that investing in the political science programming contextualized to the themes of *Community Change and Urban Leadership* (see appendix A) and an *Educating For the Future (EFF) Curricular Framework* should be enhanced and emphasized with a higher level of Institutional Support than other programs due to its strategic importance to our community and its functionally robust capacity to act as a focal point for seeking to potentially catalyze a unified vision for the COA Liberal Arts Departments as “*Learning Community*” dedicated to social justice in a healthy community. With the notion this “Signature Programming” will render us more competitive in achieving Market Share success as an institution in a complex catchment area.

COA POSCI- 2016-17 S.W.O.T. Analysis (extends previous SWOT Analyses)

Strengths – the “Politics” & CCUL Program at College of Alameda continues to be a robust comprehensive program in design and in terms of a strong and committed faculty with a highly innovative 21st Century Oriented Curricular Vision (see Appendix D); and we are a FDIP Mentor site; and albeit diminished; we as yet hold “Great Expectations” for our future **IF** we can adapt to and improvise and overcome challenges we face:

- We have a small department with great growth potential and a creative and **excellent collaborative faculty team**.
- Team commitment to a “Culture of Care and Response” and Support for “at risk” students through a commitment to BSI Standards (See Appendix B)
- We have a good reputation and maintain high hopes for this spreading beyond our service area thereby expanding same.
- We have strong collegial interaction and willingness to be creative with related departments and **despite profound resistance from them; we remain willing to expand this cooperation to our sister departments at other Peralta Colleges**.
- We have developed ties with related departments at CSU-East Bay (our primary transfer school). We have strong administrative support in some key leverage points.
- We have developed ties with Three Area High School / College Preparatory academies (Lionel Wilson, OUSD and AUSD) and are actively teaching courses on sight as part of our 2+2+2+2 tracks. .
- Our **CCUL initiative** and our **proto-Model of a 21st Century Curricular Pedagogical Framework** (in need of severe revision and updating) has been a strength and cooperation with the COA LCs is a major innovative strength.
- We are also an active Internship training department for the Peralta Faculty Diversity program and with the CSU East Bay MPA Program.

Weaknesses –

- Certain historical and evolving “institutional incapacities” leading to **ambiguous degrees of support**, and visionary diffusion with a defacto deference to “good enough” ideations vs. “greatness” ideations (c.f. Collins and Senge); this includes a lack of support in terms of key personnel (e.g. researcher & effective PIO function), sufficient 21st century pedagogy oriented technology infrastructure); all undermining the capacity of COA and therefore this department to effectively and substantively support innovative programming and nonlinear conceptualizations are problematic relative to effectiveness in terms of sufficiency to rise to the challenges with which we are all faced.
- Team instabilities: due to the nature & organizational realities of p/t faculty realities and current and potential **losses of staff** (in POSCI and sister liberal arts departments as well) undermines efforts to “gel” team efforts.
 - We lost our full team this past year to being hired away. And with only one core member we were unable to exploit our gains. As a result, we lost five months of prime time in which to advance program.
- Attempts at interdepartmental cooperation across campuses within the district continues to show little evidence of efficacy and have in fact deteriorated with renewed vitality in formerly less robust programs at Laney and BCC which now seek to leverage their infrastructural and geographic advantages

Opportunities – in challenging and “dark times” (c.f. Stivers) - programs with the institutional and administrative capacity to grasp nonlinear conceptualizations at innovate and great programming and curriculum solutions are better able to adapt, improvise, and overcome (c.f. Denhardt, Wheatley, Senge, and Collins). We are in fact attempting to manifest success in these areas:

- **The Community Change and Urban Leadership Initiative** And an accompanying **Educating for the Future Curricular Framework** are both under continued development and offer **an opportunity for a world class program**. However, this program will **probably** not last further than the next academic year due to certain institutional and community incapacities to support the program (see *Threats* below). We however still proceed as if we can make it and act in order to be deserving of making it. Whether we are successful remains to be seen. We have had some major success this past year – however this is offset by our team losses.
- We believe in the face of renewed competitive action from sister colleges that CCUL and **renewed community partnerships** (e.g. APC {for service learning sites}, AUSD {with whom we have been in discussion about concurrent enrollment in CCUL and co-teaching sites}) is the only chance for COA to remain competitive and thrive in a niche of Social Justice Studies and 2+2+2+2 Career Ladders (see Appendix A and G).

- We believe that there is logic in all four campuses behaving somewhat like a single “department” “with somewhat of an integrated vision which would enable us to cooperate with the CSU and UC systems in the Bay Area more effectively. We see that such a thing would enable the formation of a sustainable set of “politics” clubs such as: Model United Nations (already established), Model Congress, Model Court, and a Sustainability Club. **However, intercampus rivalries effectively curtail this.**

Threats: We see systemic threats; some at the State and others at the district and college levels of analysis:

- **Of highest concern would be; even though we have been “awarded” funding (PASS) we are effectively cut off from accessing it and are at risk of having people work without have the ability to poay them due to institutional bureaucratic insufficiencies. This therefore remains: a substantial lack of reliable demonstrated support:** financial, infrastructural, and administrative. .
- Certain “*organizational & institutional culture*” based organizational behavior patterns continue to undermine attempts at innovation. This includes Byzantine procedural challenges (not otherwise specified); and funding decision patterns which need to be constantly addressed for minimal program funding needs; thus consuming crucial affective morale bandwidth which leaves team less capable of engaging in the struggles of program development in face of increasing unfavorable odds..
- Overall, *our program is hampered by a significant lack of a 21st Century technology and equipment infrastructure.* Lack of sufficiently functioning equipment (e.g. copy machines, scanners, projectors, etc.) render our teaching modalities defacto limited to mid-20th Century standards. This is only mediated by innovative efforts of individual faculty members to creatively work around these deficits. We have been unable to get software we need (and have been trying to access for 10 years. Yes; 10 years; due to incredibly Byzantine requisition protocols).
- One key threat continues to be the inability to retain team members in the development of CCUL due to loss through alternative employments in lieu of favorable conditions at Peralta. The further losses we anticipated last year in this report; came true this year with the loss of our entire team other than one full time faculty. And yes, as we predicted, this has been catastrophic to our efforts. Consequentially, our community connection efforts are weakened and though our full time staff is present, the remaining support faculty team members are not able to step in and replace the losses.
- CSU East Bay POSCI/MPA Departmental instability due to quarter/semester conversion has made their willingness to be more active in being the primary 2+2+2 Transfer Partner skittish in any efforts above the informal level.

II Enrollment and Diversity:

Up until the last operating year (2015-16); **enrollment patterns** suggested an **upward trend overall** (Table 1) – depending upon number of sections we offer (Table 2), however this trend is irregular (Table 3); which itself is determined by the number of sections we offer and competition from sister colleges for enrollment in traditionally lower enrolled classes (e.g. POSCI 2 & 4). This coming year will be the first time they have four f/t faculty and this will mean more sections and this may impact upon COA enrollment. *Referring to Appendix F - 2008 to 2015 POSIC Enrollment Patterns in Peralta; we note that there is evidence that when BCC and Laney are active; our enrollments drop.* This is a threat to which we must respond by being substantively a different “*niche*” department ad CCUL is that response.

Table 1

School	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015
COA	378	367	336	460	311	275	405	551
BCC	302	338	379	430	374	439	555	820
Laney	296	413	417	313	343	376	288	705
Merritt	137	158	114	114	187	177	187	266

Table 2

COA POSCI Sections offered		
SUB	SECT	CENSUS
Fall 13	7	295
Sprg 14	12	448
Fall 14	13	403
Sprg 15	14	399
Fall 15	13	551
Sprg 16	15	n/a

The COA POSCI **Demographic Profile** shows our constituents quite diverse with spikes in terms of: (a) between the ages of 19 and 24 (Table 5), (b) women (Table 7), and (c) Asian descent - with persons of African-American descent being our second largest ethnic group (Table 6). **From 2012 till Spring 2016; COA has had the highest number of POSCI-1 Students in the District** (Table 4) and we have tended overall to offer as many

POSCI sections as our larger sister colleges and our enrollments had been higher. *However, now the reinvigorated Laney and BCC programs (see SWOT) have resulted in more offerings and this is already beginning to affect our course enrolments and ability offer traditionally lower enrolled classes (e.g. POSCI 2 & 4). Only our own internal outreach and recruitment efforts have enabled us to obtain sufficient students for our courses.*

Table 3 **Total COA POSCI Enrollment for Eleven Subjects** (September 29, 2015 Data)

	2012 Sum	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Sum	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Sum	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	2015 Sum	2015 Fall
Grand Total	115	388	546	79	295	447	113	405	406		

As our development efforts proceed in our expanded **Professional Student Pathway to Success Career Ladders in the Community Change and Urban Leadership** (CCUL - see Appendix A); we anticipate the possibility of being better positioned to meet *real substantive student needs*; while expanding student enrollment in POSCI. There is demonstrated student and community interest in CCUL program offerings. While these programs have been undermined by State and Institutional complicating factors (See SWOT), this interest is still extant and is, we suggest, still worth supporting with renewed institutional support. Students we have thus far served in CCUL show our capacity to serve student success

Demographic Data Students served by COA POSCI/ CCUL:

Referring to Table 3 below; what have been the substantive outcomes of our work with the funding we have received thus far? Despite overwhelming difficulties and doubts as to whether CCUL could deliver results; we have achieved or exceeded our goals. Outcomes in terms of student success on this one program;

As of this date, CCUL has:

- Served 102 students in four sections of courses.
 - Fall 2015 POSCI-08
 - Spring 2016 POSCI-08 POSCI-26 POSCI-35
- Launched our second cohort of Pathway to Law School Students.
 - We will launch our third cohort in Fall 2016
- Launched our third cohort of Violence Prevention Certificate Students.
- We have had our first 2+2+2 MPA Pathway Student reach the Master Program at CSU East Bay.
- We will be graduating our first two Pathway to Law School students (one with IGETC and one with an AA degree); with their Law Pathway course sequence completed.
- Our equity measures in terms of our targeted service populations are as follows (Table 3):

Table 3 CCUL Equity Demographic Data

AGE	N	%	ETHNICITY	N	%	GENDER	N	%
16-18	56	55.35%	Afr Amer	15	14.33%			
19-24	23	22.68%	Asian	9	8.80%			
25-29	12	11.73%	Hispanic	57	56.30%	Female	60	58.81%
30-34	4	3.65%	Multiple	10	9.88%	Male	40	39.21%
35-54	6	5.63%	Ntiv Amer	1	0.91%	Unknwn	2	1.98%
55-64	1	0.97%	White	9	8.79%			
			Unknown	1	0.98%			
Total	102	100.00%	Total	102	100.00%	Total	102	100.00%

DSPTS	N	%	FSTR YTH	N	%	LW INC	N	%	VTRN	N	%
No	98	96.25%	No	95	93.19%	No	9	8.73%	No	101	99.01%
Yes	4	3.75%	Yes	7	6.81%	Yes	25	24.34%	Yes	1	0.99%
						Unknown	68	66.93%			
Total	102	100.00%									

The data reveals CCUL has achieved or exceeded all targets. With our “proof of concept” we have demonstrated we are a world class program worthy of future institutional support.

Apprehensions:

We are apprehensive that the relatively robust numbers we now have compared to the Peralta Sisters shall diminish as the new faculty at Laney and BCC more aggressively start to offer more sections of courses such as POSC-2, 3, & 4 (see Appendix F). We note when discussions of rotating enrolment of such courses – to help Merritt and COA – was engaged upon, ***BCC claims their enrolments do not impact upon COA nor Merritt; and Laney responded that they did not wish to inconvenience their students to come to COA; so they will offer all courses each semester.*** We note that Laney has not had a robust offering until this past year; and with their relatively inactive department, their advantages (e.g. BART access and Geography) could not be brought to bear. However, they now have two new full time faculty and they are offering courses they never offered before.

The pattern played out with POSCI-6 – which COA dominated until 2008 when Laney and BCC started to offer these and after which point COA was never able to fill a section of 6 again. This is the pattern of which we are apprehensive relative to POSCI 2, 3, & 4. Again, our response strategy is centered around the Niche of CCUL.

Table 4

District POSCI Enrollment by Course and College (September 29, 2015 Data)

Only Courses offered by College of Alameda – for which we compete with other PCCD Colleges - included here

Course	2012	2012	2013	2013	2013	2014	2014	2014	2015	Total	2015	2015
	Sum	Fall	Spr	Sum	Fall	Spr	Sum	Fall	Spr			
POSCI 1 - GOVT/POLITICS IN US												
COA	92	257	410	79	254	356	113	356	339	2256		
BCC	86	182	317	119	292	307	176	398	275	2152		
Laney	90	254	304	114	245	271	110	217	267	1872		
Merritt	58	159	133	77	157	205	89	140	139	1157		
POSCI 2 - COMPARATIVE GOVT												
COA	23	0	30	0	0	19	0	20	15	107		14
BCC	0	50	38	0	43	38	0	41	31	241		
Laney	0	36	0	0	34	35	0	20	21	146		
Merritt	0	38	14	0	27	33	0	22	29	163		
POSCI 3 - INTERNATL RELATIONS												
COA (online)	0	33	37	0	21	35	0	29	31	186		
BCC	35	34	37	34	27	46	71	72	47	403		
Laney	0	0	49	0	27	34	0	25	34	169		
Merritt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
POSCI 4 - POLITICAL THEORY												
COA	0	42	28	0	20	22	0	0	21	133		
BCC	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	34	0	69		
Laney	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21		
POSCI 6 - US Constitution and Criminal Due Process												
COA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
BCC	0	33	0	0	42	0	0	39	40	154		
Laney	0	35	0	0	36	30	0	13	0	114		
Merritt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
COURSES ONLY OFFERED AT COA:												
POSCI 8 - Law and Democracy (Night)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		15
POSCI 26 - US/CA CONSTITUTION (Morning)	0	0	27	0	0	15	0	0	0	42		
POSCI 32 - LEARNING ORG GOVERNANCE (Mom)	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21		
POSCI 35 - INTRO/COMMUNITY VIOLENCE PREV (Nt)	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31		
POSCI 36 - PRAC VIOLENCE PREV STRATEGIES (Nt)	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14		
POSCI 49 - I/S - POLITICAL SCI	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		
Peralta POSCI Grand Total	384	1209	1438	423	1260	1446	559	1426	1310	9455		

Table 5

COA POSCI Enrollment by Age (September 28, 2015 Data)

Age	2012	2012	2013	2013	2013	2014	2014	2014	2015
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
Under 16	5	6	11	11	1	15	16	6	7
16-18	12	45	25	11	31	20	16	43	13
19-24	69	226	324	35	186	270	52	248	238
25-29	16	42	76	15	30	70	16	61	67
30-34	7	18	43	4	16	23	1	19	29
35-54	4	32	44	3	27	36	11	25	41
55-64		6	9		3	3	1	1	4
65 & Above		1	4			1			
Grand Total	113	376	536	79	294	438	113	403	399

Table 6 **COA POSCI Enrollment by Ethnicity** (September 28, 2015 Data)

Ethnicity	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring
American Indian/Alaskan Native		1	1		1	1		1	1
Asian	31	115	153	29	97	139	51	124	127
Black/African American	21	87	116	13	45	76	15	69	71
Filipino	4	12	15	6	13	21	5	27	15
Hispanic	18	49	94	10	41	58	11	61	46
Multiple	17	30	55	8	41	63	17	53	54
Other Non-white		1	4		2	2		1	1
Pacific Islander	2	1	4		4		2	2	7
Unknown/Non Respondent	7	35	30	4	15	19	2	10	20
White Non-Hispanic	13	45	64	9	35	59	10	55	57
Grand Total	113	376	536	79	294	438	113	403	399

Table 7 **COA POSCI Enrollment by Gender** (September 28, 2015 Data)

Gender	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring
Female	64	187	296	46	158	237	52	213	210
Male	48	177	233	31	130	192	61	184	181
Unknown	1	12	7	2	6	9		6	8
Grand Total	113	376	536	79	294	438	113	403	399

III. Student Success:

By an unconventional definition of “success” we have remained in contact with former CCUL graduates and they have gone on to do great work and credit CCUL for their launch. However, the APU definition of “Student Success” is defined as “course (or program) completion” with a grade “C” or better leading to “successful” course completion or the attainment of a degree or certificate.

Further, even though we have tracked “success” by the conventional district measures (below); our own EFF Learning Outcome protocol (see Appendix XX) has yielded some interesting data. *According to students own learning objectives on a holistic EFF measure (EFF Learning Matrix: knowledge mastery, critical thinking proficiency, and capacity for persona efficacy; as citizens, workers, and persons); and sampled each week over the semester, in all classes; the students assessed their understanding of the material for class each week with Likert Scale scores (high – 1 to low - 1). The cumulative data from Fall 2014 through Spring 2016 the students assessed their learning goals in the following proportions:*

EFF Observations of POSCI Students 2014 to 2016

N = 1470 (individual observations)

	Score	Resp	%
High	10	206	14%
--	9	313	21%
--	8	459	31%
--	7	297	20%
--	6	122	8%
--	5	44	3%
--	4	15	>1%
--	3	9	<1%
--	2	3	<1%
Low	1	2	<1%

Programmatic EFF 3 Summary Data N=50

Level of Understanding comparing day one to last day of class

	High level Change					Low Level Change					NR	
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		
Public Sector – “Citizen”												
knowledge	7	4	12	7	6	3	2				4	45
thinking	9	4	14	8	6			2	1		4	48
efficacy	8	5	16	4	2	4			1	1	5	46
Summary	24	13	42	19	14	7	2	2	2	1	13	
Private Sector – “Worker”												
knowledge	9	4	10	11	3	4	2				5	48
thinking	6	7	11	10	3	2			2		4	45
efficacy	9	10	6	5	4	4	4		1		5	48
Summary	24	21	27	26	10	10	6	0	3	0	14	
Social Sector – “Person”												
knowledge	12	10	11	7	3	1	2				4	50
thinking	9	9	12	3	3	3	2	1		1	4	47
efficacy	15	9	6	4	2	2		1		1	4	44
Summary	36	28	29	14	8	6	4	2	0	2	12	
Overall Summary												
	84	62	98	59	32	23	12	4	5	3	39	421
Overall Self-Rating – To what extent on the last day compared to the first, how well did students meet their learning goals?												
	11	12	9	5	4	2	1	0	0	0	6	50

Our overall analysis of the program – from our selected sample of all courses in 2015-16 - utilizing the retrospective post-test / pre-test EFF 3 Model; reveals that 72% of our students achieved their learning goals as self-assessed in their EFF 1 instruments on the first week of coursework.

This overall score is a result of three SLOs (PLOs) in nine categories of learning goals: knowledge, critical thinking, and life skills in each of three sectors – public, private, and social. We exceeded our goals and show proof of concept on the BLM-EFF in assessing program effectiveness.

Degrees Awarded:

Explicitly relative to degrees awarded utilizing here Table 8; if we only focus upon the *data we were “supposed” to analyze for this APU*, (2012 to 2015) it appears COA has only 10 AA degrees and 1 AA-T

awarded compared to the 23 AA-T degrees awarded by BCC; then it appears we are second to BCC and they are the most active department. *However, going back to 2006 we see that COA was the dominant department in the district until the hire of a full time faculty at BCC in 2011; and the reinvigoration of an – up until then – moribund program. And in this context, Laney was a non-entity until their two new hires in 2014-15. Here we see evidence of the hypothesis that the geographic and infrastructural advantage BCC and Laney have leads to a drop in our programmatic viability.*

Now BCC has 2 full time faculty and so too does Laney. I anticipate a drop in our AA awards as a result of the increasing viability of their programs unless COA can reposition itself as unique with its own draw points. This can only occur with the CCUL initiative which is undermined by the factors explored in our SWOT Analysis in section 1.

Table 8 **2006-2015 Number of POSCI Awards College** (September 28, 2015 Data)

POSCI	2006-2012	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Total
COA	16	7	2	1	26
AA	0	0	0	1	1
AA-T					
BCC	0	0	0	0	0
AA	0	0	5	18	23
AA-T					
Laney	0	0	0	1	1
AA	0	0	0	0	0
AA-T					
Merritt	0	0	0	0	0
n/a					
Total AA	16	7	2	1	26
Total AAT	0	0	5	20	25
All Total	16	7	7	21	51

Diversity Patterns of Awarded degrees and certificates:

Tables 9 & 10 reflect the similarity amongst Peralta Colleges in terms of diversity of students (ethnicity and gender) who received awards at COA in POSI. We note however that the History Department seeks to create a niche in Latin American history which we could dovetail with in terms of outreach to the Latino Community of greater Oakland area. We are in negotiations – through CCUL – increase our outreach in the Fruitvale District with our community based partners there (in Law and Violence Prevention tracks) and this could give us an opportunity to increase our “buzz” with this population. We are also looking at expanding our “Signature CCUL Program” with the creation of a Social Justice Area of Emphasis AA-T which would include a Queer Studies (LGBTQ) track and a Women’s Studies Track. This would be a draw in these populations if we are successful and do not face undue competition (in AA-T in the SJS AoE) from our larger more powerful neighbors relative to “market share.” Else, the department serves its populations well in terms of diversity.

Table 9 **2012 to 2015 District POSCI Degrees & Certificates**
By Ethnicity and College (September 28, 2015 Data)

POSCI Degrees and Certificates	American Indian /Alaskan Native	Asian	Black/ African-American	Filipino	Hispanic	Other Non-white	Pacific Islander	White Non-Hispanic	Multiple	Unknown	Total
COA	0	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	11
BCC	0	5	3	1	2	0	0	9	3	0	23
Laney	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Merritt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
District	0	10	5	2	4	0	0	9	5	0	35

Table 10
Data)

2013-2015 Number of POSCI Awards by Gender and College (September 28, 2015

	FEMALE	MALE	UNKNOWN	Total
COA	3	7	1	11
BCC	13	10	0	23
Laney	1	0	0	1
Merritt	0	0	0	0

Success Rates and Philosophy of Student Success:

In POSCI; the trends in success rate of students at COA are higher than at our sister institutions; and the success rates of students in POSCI at COA are higher than COA as an institution (Tables 11 & 12). We do try to be intentional in creating a “culture of care and response” rooted in our unique integrated learning outcomes protocols and team commitment to provide support for “at risk” students through a commitment to BSI Standards (See Appendix B). We are explicitly a persons centered client model of individualized attention for students here as opposed to the more conventional “social science” transfer obsessed model at BCC and Laney; whereas the department at Merritt is consciously a department simply servicing the need for American institutions requirements (having finally given up on being a comprehensive program in 2012).

Table 11

Overall Student Success by College (September 28, 2015 Data)

	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	Averages
COA	71.85%	68.08%	66.66%	74.76%	67.27%	67.71%	76.48%	66.77%	67.50%	69.68
BCC	71.60%	66.49%	65.00%	72.06%	64.37%	65.10%	70.72%	64.66%	65.10%	67.23
Laney	74.07%	68.72%	66.34%	73.40%	66.34%	67.98%	72.79%	68.95%	69.11%	69.74
Merritt	72.96%	67.98%	66.57%	74.37%	65.38%	69.05%	77.16%	68.03%	68.67%	70.02
Peralta	72.74%	68.02%	66.16%	73.57%	65.88%	67.51%	73.79%	67.38%	67.82%	69.21

Table 12

POSCI Student Success by College (September 28, 2015 Data)

	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	Averages
COA-POSCI	75.44%	68.72%	70.51%	83.54%	68.03%	67.79%	87.50%	66.00%	66.17%	72.63
BCC-POSCI	60.91%	71.66%	67.52%	73.33%	78.82%	71.53%	71.02%	62.31%	73.26%	70.63
Laney-POSCI	69.32%	52.48%	53.13%	72.32%	36.84%	55.14%	63.30%	63.73%	63.51%	58.86
Merritt-POSCI	67.24%	71.66%	59.18%	74.03%	54.24%	58.37%	74.16%	38.22%	48.81%	60.66
Peralta-POSCI	68.38%	65.65%	64.28%	75.12%	60.62%	64.24%	73.33%	60.48%	65.57%	66.41

In terms of success rates by course; we aim at a higher rate in each class than some of our classes tend to show in Table 13. However, we also note many of the courses with seeming problematic success rates are also evening classes and note there seems to be higher attrition rates with these courses than morning classes. This is also true of our online courses (e.g. POSCI-3) where attrition rates are notoriously high. This is a challenge we seek to address by being more individual person centered in reaching out to students showing signs of difficulties.

Table 13

COA POSCI Success by Course, Subject, and Year
 ~ Spring 2013 to Spring 2016 (September 28, 2015 Data)

Course	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	2015 Fall	2016 Spring	Averages
POSCI 1 - GOVT/POLITICS IN US	74.88%	83.54%	67.59%	69.38%	87.50%	65.54%	65.98%			73.80
POSCI 2 - COMPARATIVE GOVT	56.67%	NA	NA	63.16%	NA	80.00%	60.00%			66.75
POSCI 3 - INTERNATL RELATIONS	64.86%	NA	61.90%	54.29%	NA	62.07%	58.06%			61.49
POSCI 4 - POLITICAL THEORY	64.29%	NA	80.00%	72.73%	NA	NA	85.71%	NA		71.83
POSCI 8 – LAW & DEMOCRACY	%	NA	%	%	NA	NA	%			
POSCI 26 - US/CA CONSTITUTION	44.44%	NA	NA	60.00%	NA	NA	NA			52.22
POSCI 32 - LEARNING ORG GOVERNANCE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		65.00
POSCI 35 - INTRO/COMMUNITY VIOLENCE PREV	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		40.00
POSCI 36 – APPLIED PEACEMAKING STRATEGIES	50.00%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		50.00
POSCI 49 - I/S - POLITICAL SCI	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		100.00
Grand Total	70.51%	83.54%	68.03%	67.79%	87.50%	66.00%	66.17%			

Diversity Patterns Relative to Student Success:

Referring to Table 11 (on page 8 above) relative to overall Student Success at COA as a college; and referring to Tables 14, 15, and 16 (below) relative to student success at COA by Ethnicity, Age, and Gender; and finally in referring to Tables 17, 18, and 19; **overall student success rates in POSCI are lower** – by a matter of 3% points on average than COA as an institution in the same categories. We are relatively similar to our sister departments in Peralta in terms of student success and suggest that **the differences are due the relative difficulty of the discipline and sample size effects.** We note that a comment often heard/made is that there is a great deal of work and rigor in POSCI (at all colleges in Peralta) and the material is personally challenging due to issues of controversy and frustration (i.e. political emotionally charged content magnified in intensity by the rules of social game theory).

We have at this time an ad hoc proto-model curricular & pedagogical model of supportive effort for student success in terms of our *EFF Model of individualized support* and continue to work to these efforts including study skills workshops. Overall, our conclusion is that the most important focal point of efforts to increase student success in POSCI is in intensifying our student support model. ***We note that our proposals to create a more effective comprehensive and flexible curricular framework-toolkit*** (with

sufficient scope and breadth to empower our team to be better able to meet our students' needs); a **Framework for Pedagogical Effectiveness** have not been supported by the COA Staff

Development Committee; therefore, our model is incomplete and will remain so until such time as we can secure resource and time support complete the model and pilot it and implement it fully. Thus: to the extent we can, the department serves its populations well in terms of student success contextualized in terms of diversity factors.

Table 14 **COA Success by Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	COA Average
American Indian/Alaskan Native	76.92%	55.88%	64.44%	72.73%	54.55%	56.25%	66.67%	64.71%	52.00%	62.68%
Asian	81.99%	76.31%	75.41%	85.59%	76.07%	77.49%	88.08%	77.88%	77.84%	79.63%
Black/African American	59.31%	56.34%	56.65%	61.76%	56.63%	56.32%	62.81%	54.23%	55.39%	57.72%
Filipino	72.09%	68.42%	67.36%	71.92%	75.99%	66.60%	79.17%	72.62%	69.36%	71.50%
Hispanic	70.11%	68.15%	64.75%	70.97%	65.24%	64.57%	69.62%	61.88%	61.86%	66.35%
Multiple	66.07%	61.52%	62.35%	69.88%	65.47%	63.21%	70.20%	60.43%	60.19%	64.37%
Other Non-white	50.00%	70.97%	73.13%	90.00%	75.76%	79.49%	85.71%	91.67%	85.19%	77.99%
Pacific Islander	30.00%	70.00%	61.86%	76.92%	50.00%	70.97%	76.47%	66.67%	53.85%	61.86%
Unknown/Non Respondent	70.13%	69.85%	69.68%	72.31%	68.04%	69.02%	76.24%	66.67%	72.22%	70.46%
White Non-Hispanic	75.54%	74.45%	71.47%	78.61%	70.55%	74.41%	81.60%	73.04%	73.25%	74.77%
Grand Total	65.22%	67.19%	66.71%	75.07%	65.83%	67.83%	75.66%	68.98%	66.11%	68.73%

Table 15 **COA Success by Age**

Age	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	COA Average
Under 16	94.83%	90.00%	90.91%	91.89%	88.00%	78.38%	90.54%	90.70%	93.62%	89.87%
16-18	85.48%	74.29%	77.32%	79.33%	77.23%	74.14%	89.37%	73.46%	72.38%	78.11%
19-24	72.38%	64.78%	62.49%	76.00%	63.32%	64.81%	75.97%	63.30%	64.79%	67.54%
25-29	68.13%	69.06%	67.81%	69.77%	67.27%	68.92%	76.70%	65.33%	67.30%	68.92%
30-34	63.85%	71.17%	70.32%	74.85%	68.29%	69.23%	68.20%	70.93%	67.07%	69.32%
35-54	67.14%	72.85%	72.30%	70.33%	72.81%	72.41%	73.86%	73.22%	73.78%	72.08%
55-64	68.24%	75.19%	77.29%	73.97%	74.65%	76.36%	66.00%	71.58%	75.19%	73.16%
65 & Above	75.00%	75.68%	69.35%	81.82%	75.47%	72.88%	66.67%	76.32%	73.75%	74.10%
Grand Total	71.85%	68.08%	66.66%	74.76%	67.27%	67.71%	76.48%	66.77%	67.50%	74.14%

Table 16 **COA Success by Gender**

Gender	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	COA Average
Female	70.86%	68.46%	67.71%	72.81%	69.03%	68.00%	76.02%	67.27%	68.39%	69.84%
Male	73.85%	67.60%	65.34%	77.18%	65.20%	67.07%	77.81%	65.90%	66.29%	69.58%
Unknown	61.02%	68.46%	67.87%	75.47%	66.44%	73.76%	60.61%	75.93%	71.15%	68.97%
Grand Total	71.85%	68.08%	66.66%	74.76%	67.27%	67.71%	76.48%	66.77%	67.50%	69.46%

Table 17
Data)

COA POSCI Success by Course and Ethnicity (September 28, 2015

Course	American Indian/ Alaskan	Asian	Black/African American	Filipino	Hispanic	Other Non-white	Pacific Islander	White Non-Hispanic	Multiple	Unknown/ Non Respondent
POSCI 1 - GOVT/POLITICS IN US	100.00%	83.33%	54.55%	76.92%	57.89%	0.00%	28.57%	65.00%	48.89%	73.68%
POSCI 2 - COMPARATIVE GOVT	NA	25.00%	100.00%	100.00%	75.00%	NA	NA	33.33%	100.00%	NA
POSCI 3 - INTERNATL RELATIONS	NA	61.54%	50.00%	100.00%	100.00%	NA	NA	62.50%	25.00%	NA
POSCI 4 - POLITICAL THEORY	NA	100.00%	NA	NA	80.00%	NA	NA	100.00%	60.00%	100.00%
Grand Total	100.00%	79.69%	55.56%	80.00%	62.50%	0.00%	28.57%	67.24%	49.09%	75.00%

Table 18

COA POSCI Success by Course and Age (September 28, 2015 Data)

Course	Under 16	16-18	19-24	25-29	30-34	35-54	55-64
POSCI 1 - GOVT/POLITICS IN US	100.00%	64.71%	67.50%	66.67%	53.85%	56.25%	75.00%
POSCI 2 - COMPARATIVE GOVT	NA	NA	61.54%	50.00%	NA	NA	NA
POSCI 3 - INTERNATL RELATIONS	NA	75.00%	57.14%	37.50%	50.00%	100.00%	NA
POSCI 4 - POLITICAL THEORY	NA	50.00%	100.00%	60.00%	100.00%	100.00%	NA
Grand Total	100.00%	65.22%	67.93%	62.12%	56.67%	62.16%	75.00%

Table 19

COA POSCI Success by Course and Gender (September 28, 2015 Data)

Course	Female	Male	Unknown
POSCI 1 - GOVT/POLITICS IN US	66.67%	66.23%	42.86%
POSCI 2 - COMPARATIVE GOVT	75.00%	50.00%	0.00%
POSCI 3 - INTERNATL RELATIONS	55.56%	66.67%	0.00%
POSCI 4 - POLITICAL THEORY	100.00%	78.57%	NA
Grand Total	67.14%	66.67%	33.33%

Student Retention:

Retention is defined as the percent of students earning any grade but “W” in a course or series of courses. (The score here is computed for a class, take class completion with grade other than “W” and divide by enrollment at census. Grade other than W = A, B, C, D, F, I, Pass (P), No Pass (NP), In Progress (IP), Report Delayed (RD), No Grade (NG). Note that this metric is also known as 'course completion'. Also note that the term 'retention' is used, in other reports, to refer to the proportion of students enrolling in subsequent terms.) We note that **the POSCI Department at COA has a higher overall student retention rate than the other Peralta Colleges POSCI Departments** (Table 20). And while some of our more difficult CCUL classes have a lower retention rate; overall our POSCI core courses are higher than district average as well (Table 21).

Table 20 **POSCI Retention by College** (September 28, 2015 Data)

	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2014 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2015 Spring	Averages
COA-POSCI	91.23%	79.68%	82.05%	86.08%	80.61%	76.96%	90.18%	80.15%	77.78%	82.75
BCC-POSCI	77.27%	83.42%	78.77%	76.67%	83.60%	79.40%	80.00%	75.39%	83.26%	79.75
Laney-POSCI	84.09%	79.01%	69.89%	86.61%	76.05%	73.78%	84.40%	81.14%	83.84%	79.87
Merritt-POSCI	82.76%	75.94%	69.39%	77.92%	74.58%	75.11%	86.52%	60.21%	70.83%	74.81

Table 21 **COA POSCI Retention by Class** (September 28, 2015 Data)

	2012 Summer	2012 Fall	2013 Spring	2013 Summer	2013 Fall	2013 Spring	2014 Summer	2014 Fall	2014 Spring	2015 Average
COA Retention as a College	84.25%	84.34%	80.16%	86.11%	81.55%	80.75%	86.11%	82.03%	81.54%	
COA POSCI as a Department	91.23%	79.68%	82.05%	86.08%	80.61%	76.96%	90.18%	80.15%	77.78%	82.75
COA POSCI by Course										
POSCI 1 - GOVT/POLITICS IN US	91.21%	88.00%	86.59%	86.08%	81.03%	80.62%	90.18%	80.51%	78.40%	84.74
POSCI 2 - COMPARATIVE GOVT	91.30%	NA	66.67%	NA	NA	63.16%	NA	95.00%	73.33%	77.89
POSCI 3 - INTERNATL RELATIONS	NA	67.74%	81.08%	NA	66.67%	57.14%	NA	65.52%	58.06%	66.04
POSCI 4 - POLITICAL THEORY	NA	69.23%	78.57%	NA	90.00%	72.73%	NA	NA	100.00%	83.11
POSCI 26 - US/CA CONSTITUTION	NA	NA	44.44%	NA	NA	60.00%	NA	NA	NA	55.00
POSCI 32 - LEARNING ORG GOVERNANCE	NA	65.00%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	65.00
POSCI 35 - INTRO/COMMUNITY VIOLENCE PREV	NA	43.33%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	43.33
POSCI 36 - PRAC VIOLENCE PREV STRATEGIES	NA	NA	64.29%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	64.29
POSCI 49 - I/S - POLITICAL SCI	NA	100.00%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100.00

IV. Faculty:

Productivity is a ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent instructors (FTES/FTEF).¹ Tables 22 (and tables 25 to 30) reveals **the POSCI Department has higher productivity than**

- ¹ **Productivity** (FTES/FTEF) is a measure of class size and will differ across disciplines and types of classes. For lecture classes, Productivity = enrollment/2. For example, if there are 35 students in a lecture class, productivity = 35/2 = 17.5.
- FTEF** (Full Time Equivalent Faculty): Also known as load equivalency. A full-time instructor teaching 15 lecture hours per week for one semester = 1.0 FTEF. One lecture hour = 50 minute instructional period. One lab hour = .8 of one lecture hour equivalent. This is a semester, or term, measure.
- FTES** (Full Time Equivalent Student): This measure is used as the basis for computation of state support for California Community Colleges. For example, one student attending 15 hours a week for 35 weeks (one academic year) generates 1 FTES.

COA as an institution and in our sister departments at our sister colleges. The politics program & department has five **faculty associates**: a “contract” lead associate (full time faculty member with a split load of 0.6 in political science and 0.4 in psychology); and four p/t faculty associates; and one faculty diversity intern.

In anticipation of the possible success of CCUL (*pending we are able to adapt and improvise and overcome “threats” discussed in Section I of this APU*); **we anticipate needing a full-time faculty position to meet the challenges of department growth in terms of sections and programs we are offering** (refer to Tables 23 & 24 below {repeats of tables 1 & 2 in section I}). A major problem with our innovative programs is the volatility of part time staff capacity to meet the needs of administration and development of programs. The total number of sections we offer has been climbing. We offer courses in all sessions - regular, summer, and intersession – which the college holds. We schedule courses and have on occasion “lost” a couple more innovative courses – due to insufficient enrollment in these [**we have been coordinating with the COA Student Services Outreach Team to recruit more aggressively to fill all our courses**]. If one potential future wherein we are not successful in competing with Laney and BCC for market share; then the request for a f/t faculty member would be moot in the face of departmental retreat. Another potential pitfall for departmental success would be staff instability or loss.

Over the past four years, we have lost six crucial team members from our POSCI/HIST/COMM/CCUL team (including key leading team members in our violence prevention, civic engagement and Pathway to Law Initiatives; and worst: we lost our long time operations coordinator who helped build program since 2009, and we lost her replacement {both due to employment offers we could not match}). We note that in some cases we would not have proceeded with CCUL without them and now have a program without them. Certainly, we might not have sought PASS funding this past year if we knew we would not have team to proceed. This is a destabilizing and demoralizing dynamic in our efforts relative to these projects. We were able to replace the team in a very haphazard fashion and this team may still fall apart. If the program cannot launch by May 2017, we shall shut CCUL down as unworkable granting our institutional incapacities.

All of our departmental evaluations of staff are up to date as of this writing. These personnel are listed here in order of seniority:

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | 1 | Robert J. Brem | (contract); | Department Lead; | <i>Coordinator of CCUL</i> |
| | 2 | Gwyn Johnson | (p/t); | Department Associate; | <i>Operations Coordinator</i> |
| <i>of CCUL;</i> | | | | | |
| | 3. | Romeo Garcia | (p/t) | Department Associate; | <i>Operations Coordinator</i> |
| <i>of CCUL;</i> | | | | | |
| | 4 | Ron Lomax | (p/t); | Department Associate; | |
| | 5 | Judith Hurtado-Ortiz | (p/t) | Department Associate; | |
| | 6 | Hasmik Gegamyan | (p/t) | Department Associate; | |
| | 7 | Nicole Kelly | (p/t) | Department Associate; | |

Table 22 COA POSCI Productivity Compared to COA Campus (September 28, 2015 Data)

	2012 SUM	2012 FALL	2013 SPRING	2013 SUM	2013 FALL	2014 SPRING	2014 SUM	2014 FALL	2015 SPRING	2015 SUM	2015 FALL	2016 SPRING	2016 SUM	2016 FALL
C	17.37	18.45	17.35	15.86	17.46	16.68	14.63	16.52	16.28		16.26	15.90		
P	19.48	23.18	19.59	20.01	21.07	18.63	19.16	18.44	17.99		15.55	15.30		19.10

With our contract departmental lead faculty in support as overall coordinator. We now have a new operations coordinator of CCUL. She is very junior to CCUL (though highly experienced in her fields). The learning curve is a challenge. We noted last year that if we were to lose our lead team (e.g. through alternative employment scenarios); we would be compelled by reality to seriously entertain deactivating all further efforts on CCUL. This is where we found ourselves in May of 2016. As of this writing, our efforts for a robust POSCI / CCUL department are not operating within acceptable parameters of functioning.

Again, as noted above, the contract faculty member in our department has a 0.6 load in POSCI and a 0, 4 load in PSYCH. *This is good for the school and for the department in terms of innovative instruction and interdisciplinary curriculum coordination efforts.* This interdisciplinarity is in fact part of what drives our CCUL efforts so this split is defacto a crucial part of our work. This has actually been a crucial reason why the COA POSCI/PSYCH program - in learning community format - has become a successful Faculty Diversity Internship training department.

Our students benefit from such 21st Century contextualized curricular thinking. **In this context – and assuming that CCUL survives threats discussed above - and taking into account the productivity data for the POSCI Department (Tables 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30), which shows the POSCI Department as being of higher productivity than the other department in COA and in our sister departments at our sister colleges; we believe suggests the POSCI Department could use a full time faculty member to be dedicated to CCUL and other department initiatives** to ground our efforts at success because: with only part time faculty dedicated to such a project, innovative program collapse is an ongoing high probability risk. However, if CCUL is deactivated due to the threats discussed above (i.e. SWOT); then this request would be rendered moot.

For reasons already stated, we suggest it is a logical request to seek to hire a *second contract faculty* to give our program initiatives they deserve by virtue of our substantive contributions to the school mission. Our faculty productivity is favorably compared to the sister colleges and with greater potential for growth in ways that can be independently funded. Also refer to Section VI below relative to department accomplishments.

2015-16 APU Data for COA POSCI is shown in the following six tables²

Find unmodified 2015-2016 Department Productivity Data in Appendix G (*the data which follows here needs to be merged into those tables to make these current to this reporting year*). **The data in the following table is current; yet unanalyzed as we lacked the staff time to do the analysis.**

2015-16 Peralta POSCI Productivity by Department (Goal: > 15.99)

College of Alameda			Berkeley City College			Laney College			Merritt College		
Total classes Offered	Total Above 15.99	% Above 15.99	Total Offered	Total Classes Above 15.99	% Above 15.99	Total classes Offered	Total Above 15.99	% Classes Above 15.99	Total classes Offered	Total Above 15.99	% Classes Above 15.99
10	6	60%	17	12	71%	81	46	57%	14	10	71%

² Left unanalyzed as of this writing to expedite submission; as our team is exceedingly overloaded this semester and has not the time to do the APU report more sufficiently. See **Appendix G** for prior data referred to in this report

2013 – 16 Fall & Spring - COA POSCI Productivity

of Sections & productivity (goal = * > 17.5)

Fall 2013			Fall 2014			Fall 2015			Fall 2016		
Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity	
7	21.07	*	11	18.43	*	10	15.55		6	19.10	*
Spring 2014			Spring 2015			Spring 2016			Spring 2017		
Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity	
12	18.62	*	11	17.99	*	11	15.30				

District POSCI Productivity Fall 2015 & Spring 2016 (Goal: > 15.99)

College of Alameda			Berkeley City College			Laney College			Merritt College		
Total classes Offered	Total Above 15.99	% Above 15.99	Total classes Offered	Total Above 15.99	% Above 15.99	Total classes Offered	Total Above 15.99	% Above 15.99	Total classes Offered	Total Above 15.99	% Above 15.99
10	5	50%	18	11	61%	12	4	33%	6	5	83%

Fall 2015 (Goal: > 15.99)

10	5	50%	18	11	61%	12	4	33%	6	5	83%
----	---	-----	----	----	-----	----	---	-----	---	---	-----

Spring 2016 (Goal: > 15.99)

11	2	18%	14	12	86%	11	8	73%	1	1	100%
----	---	-----	----	----	-----	----	---	-----	---	---	------

College of Alameda ~ Fall and Spring 2013-2016 Productivity Data

Sections / Productivity

* Productivity > 17.5

Fall 2013			Fall 2014			Fall 2015			Fall 2016		
Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity	
7	21.07	*	11	18.43	*	10	15.55		6	19.10	*
Spring 2014			Spring 2015			Spring 2016			Spring 2017		
12	18.62	*	11	17.99	*	11	15.30				

Political Science Productivity ~ Fall & Spring 2013 - 2016 (* Productivity Above 17.5)

Fall 2013			Fall 2014			Fall 2015			Fall 2016		
Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity		Total classes Offered	Productivity	
7	21.07	*	11	18.43	*	10	15.55		6	19.10	*
Spring 2014			Spring 2015			Spring 2016			Spring 2017		
12	18.62	*	11	17.99	*	11	15.30		n/a	n/a	

2015 - 2016 Year Productivity for Peralta Political Science Departments by College

College of Alameda			Berkeley City College			Laney College			Merritt College		
Total classes Offered	Total Classes Above 15.99 productivity	Percentage of Classes Above 15.99 productivity	Total classes Offered	Total Classes Above 15.99 productivity	Percentage of Classes Above 15.99 productivity	Total classes Offered	Total Classes Above 15.99 productivity	Percentage of Classes Above 15.99 productivity	Total classes Offered	Total Classes Above 15.99 productivity	Percentage of Classes Above 15.99 productivity
21	7	33%	32	23	72%	23	12	52%	7	6	86%
By Semester Fall 2015 (16.26) and Spring 2016 (15.90)											
Fall 2015 (16.26)											
10	5	50%	18	11	61%	12	4	33%	6	5	83%
Spring 2016 (15.90)											
11	2	18%	14	12	86%	11	8	73%	1	1	100%

Table 23

	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015
COA	378	367	336	460	311	275	405	
BCC	302	338	379	430	374	439	555	
Laney	296	413	417	313	343	376	288	
Merritt	137	158	114	114	187	177	187	

Table 24

COA POSCI Sections offered		
SUB	SECT	CENSUS
Fall 13	7	295
Sprg 14	12	448
Fall 14	13	403
Sprg 15	14	399
Fall 15	13	551
Sprg 16	15	n/a

V. Qualitative Assessments:

<p>CTE and Vocational: Our CCUL Initiative (see Appendix A) addresses community needs relevant to public service, violence prevention, community development & leadership and street law training.</p> <p>This is “a defacto vocational politics program.” It was designed in consultation with community leaders in community based organizations in the Greater East Bay region.</p>	<p>Ongoing changes since the 2012 Program Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We now have a Law Pathway CTE track We are seeking to expand this our Signature CCUL initiative in terms of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a Social Justice Area of Emphasis interdisciplinary AA-T and stackable job preparation certificates. A Public Administration Emergency Management track with certificates <p>“Official” CTE Certification requires we use new TOP codes and this may be problematic; we’re addressing this.</p>
<p>Transfer and Basic Skills: our course offerings address transfer, basic skills, and program completion in its commitment to pedagogical excellence in support of “at risk” students (see Appendix B)</p>	<p>No Change- Refer to 2014-15 Program Review</p>

The department utilizes a "reflective practice and clinical supervision model" (c.f. Donald Schon) of professional development. That also guides our process and outcomes assessment and evaluation protocols in an appreciative inquiry narrative and contextual systems approach. This model is as yet still in development and is part of a curricular framework that needs substantive time resource support to be

completed (which has been denied by the COA Staff Development committee). Professionals in any "craft" pursue continued improvement in performance; and we seek in our regular History/Political Science and Learning Community inter-collegial discussions to identify pedagogical "best practices" for staff development purposes to identify what works and what works differently where, when, how; and do more of these. As well, we discuss what does not work so well, and do less of these. Our goal is to mutually support one another in achieving a "superior" GAF level of performance at the art and craft of teaching (moving from practitioners to masters of the craft).

VI. Course SLOs and Assessment (as of 10-31-2015)

Overall, for the past three years; the program offerings in politics at College of Alameda exceeded to high degree our learning outcomes success standards for all three SLOs and therefore for our PLOs as well as we utilize and integrated and contextual holistic model of learning outcomes assessment.

- 15 "Active" courses in catalog for the discipline
- 9 have been offered in past two years
- 15 with SLOs (100%)
- 3 courses for which SLO data has been collected (including multiple sections of POSCI-1)
- 3 Assessment of SLO data is in process for these courses

Methodological Approach to assessment: The political science department has actively participated in the design of an alternative **Learning Outcomes assessment model** that is a narrative contextual systems approach to assessment – totally integrated into teaching – is the approach of this department to outcomes of learning assessment. We are working to align this more closely with the **Lumina Foundation degree qualifications Framework in the Future**.³ *The biggest barrier to success here is a lack of institutional support (i.e. Staff Development) to give us the (release) time to bring the protocols and framework to a state of active completion; we are consistently in pilot mode as a result.* This **COA Approach** (still in development and therefore in defacto pilot mode) includes: appreciative inquiry, critical pedagogy, interdisciplinary, and intercultural classical education framings (e.g. liberal arts models) of process & outcome assessment of learning in the study of politics utilizing the personal grounding futures consciousness framework and a global assessment of functioning index for determination of degrees of student success.

Definition of programmatic success is defined as the extent to which there is a pattern of achievement of overall "college level performance" on "observed performance patterns" which are consistent with program learning outcomes – as assessed utilizing a Global Assessment of Functioning Scale (0 to 100) – such that:

- 25% of students will achieve an overall GAF of 80 or above;
- 70% of students will achieve an overall GAF of 70 or above; and
- Only 30% (or less) of students will achieve and overall GAF of 69 or below.

³ This effort has been short circuited by the lack of support from the Staff Development Committee to give us the time we need to finish the curricular framework. We hope this might be addressed by a more competent committee in 2015. Refer to the Lumina Foundation (accessed: 10-10-2014); **The degree qualifications profile**; http://www.luminafoundation.org/1_no_parent_nav_bar_fix/publications/special_reports/degree_profile/

We assess all three PLOs/SLOs each year for holistic assessment (See figure below). Our Fall 2016 to Spring 2016 data analysis years of SLO achievement; shows we meet our goals. (Due to the evaluation paradox – e.g. completing reports - we may have problematic completion of data entry into the

TaskStream system and are addressing this by the end of the Fall Semester.) We collect data on three different levels for every student in all courses and then do an overall assessment of this data compared to the GAF standard.

Assessment results and reflection has led to a higher integration of learning outcome constructs throughout the course and driven the learning process relative to

- mastery of foundational knowledge in the field;
- proficiency in critical political thinking, and
- An enhanced capacity for personal political efficacy as a person, worker, and citizen.

2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	SLOs
SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	3
SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	3
SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	3
SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	3
SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	3
SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	3
SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	3
SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	3
SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	SLO 1,2 & 3	3

Data we have thus far collected; shows a high degree of success in meeting our learning outcome goals; with almost 75% of our students achieving “Success” - defined as “course (or program) completion” with a grade “C” or better.

We have tracked Learning Outcomes with a Learning Matrix EFF Learning Outcome protocol which has yielded some interesting data. *According to students own learning objectives on a holistic EFF measure (EFF Learning Matrix: knowledge mastery, critical thinking proficiency, and capacity for personal efficacy; as citizens, workers, and persons); and sampled each week over the semester, in all classes; the students assessed their understanding of the material for class each week with Likert Scale scores (high – 1 to low - 1). The cumulative data from Fall 2014 through Spring 2016 the students assessed their learning goals in the following proportions:*

EFF Observations of POSCI Students 2014 to 2016			
N = 1470 (individual observations)			
	Score	Resp	%
High	10	206	14%
--	9	313	21%
--	8	459	31%
--	7	297	20%
--	6	122	8%
--	5	44	3%
--	4	15	>1%
--	3	9	<1%
--	2	3	<1%
Low	1	2	<1%

VII. Program Learning Outcomes and Assessment 2015/2016

- 3 degrees and certificates
 - 2 A.A. and an A.A.-T in Political Science
 - 1 Certificate of Proficiency in Violence Prevention
- 3 with Program Learning Outcomes
- 2 In process of assessment (AA and COP);

Methodological Approach to assessment: The political science department has actively participated in the design of an alternative Learning Outcomes assessment model that is a narrative contextual systems approach to assessment – totally integrated into teaching – is the approach of this department to outcomes of learning assessment. This includes: appreciative inquiry, critical pedagogy, interdisciplinary and intercultural classical education framings (e.g. liberal arts models) of process & outcome assessment of learning in the study of politics utilizing the personal grounding futures consciousness framework and a global assessment of functioning index for determination of degrees of student success.

Definition of programmatic success is defined as the extent to which there is a pattern of achievement of overall “college level performance” on “observed performance patterns” which are consistent with program learning outcomes – as assessed utilizing a Global Assessment of Functioning Scale (0 to 100) – such that:

- 25% of students will achieve an overall GAF of 80 or above;
- 70% of students will achieve an overall GAF of 70 or above; and
- Only 30% (or less) of students will achieve and overall GAF of 69 or below.

Refer to Appendix C for general description of methods of assessment of PLOs and SLOs. Also refer the document:

Brem, RJ (2011). An Appreciative Inquiry and Classical Liberal Arts Model of Process & Outcome Assessment & Evaluation of Learning in the Study of Politics, Unpublished manuscript Departments of “Politics” and Psychology; College of Alameda.

Our ongoing development of Certificates and Degrees in Public Administration, Law, and Change Studies – as well as our development to of an Area of Emphasis in Social Justice Studies AA-T - are being guided by our Learning Outcomes Protocol. **Ongoing program improvements have been driven by feedback from students on the course and program learning outcomes via our “EFF” instruments.**

Our overall analysis of the program – from our selected sample of all courses in 2015-16 - utilizing the retrospective post-test / pre-test EFF 3 Model; reveals that 72% of our students achieved their learning goals as self-assessed in their EFF 1 instruments on the first week of coursework.

This overall score is a result of three SLOs (PLOs) in nine categories of learning goals: knowledge, critical thinking, and life skills in each of three sectors – public, private, and social. We exceeded our goals and show proof of concept on the BLM-EFF in assessing program effectiveness. **See Results below**

Programmatic EFF 3 Summary Data

N=50

Level of Understanding comparing day one to last day of class

	High Level Change							Low Level Change				
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/R	
Public Sector – “Citizen”												
knowledge	7	4	12	7	6	3	2				4	45
thinking	9	4	14	8	6			2	1		4	48
efficacy	8	5	16	4	2	4			1	1	5	46
Summary	24	13	42	19	14	7	2	2	2	1	13	
Private Sector – “Worker”												
knowledge	9	4	10	11	3	4	2				5	48
thinking	6	7	11	10	3	2			2		4	45
efficacy	9	10	6	5	4	4	4		1		5	48
Summary	24	21	27	26	10	10	6	0	3	0	14	
Social Sector – “Person”												
knowledge	12	10	11	7	3	1	2				4	50
thinking	9	9	12	3	3	3	2	1		1	4	47
efficacy	15	9	6	4	2	2		1		1	4	44
Summary	36	28	29	14	8	6	4	2	0	2	12	
Overall Summary	84	62	98	59	32	23	12	4	5	3	39	421
Overall Self-Rating – To what extent on the last day compared to the first, how well did students meet their learning goals?												
	11	12	9	5	4	2	1	0	0	0	6	50

VIII Prioritized Resource Request Summary

Human Resources:

- 1) **Faculty:** Based upon our productivity, our vision and mission planning and implementation efforts; and having a .6 f/t contract faculty member, and the requisites of success for our CCUL efforts; the Department has a demonstrated need for an addition of a 1.0 f/t faculty member; who would be dedicated to Department and CCUL initiatives; to ground our efforts at success. With only a mostly part time faculty dedicated to such a project, program collapse is a higher probable risk with any future loss of key personnel.
- 2) **Staff:** CCUL could use a full time operations coordinator for CCUL with a full time staff assistant to make the CCUL program and the political science rise to its true level of superior functioning as evidenced by what we have been able to do with a shoestring budget and minimal institutional capacities and part time and unstable staff.
- 3) **Student Workers:** We continue to need and fully utilize our student assistants – *we have thus far received this support from the office of financial aid work study.*
- 4) Division II **Classified support** has been insufficient to CCUL needs needs; thus refer to #2 above; either way we need a staff to help meet our administrative needs.

Technology & Equipment:

- 5) **Equipment Needs:** The aged department computer crashed in summer 2015 and was replaced by the IT department with an older refurbished unit from one of the classrooms is aging out.

- **A new office system** would be good. This would serve our plans for expansion of an online presence for the department. Multimedia work is also a need and we wish to convert older films to digital for use in the 21st Century Class environment.
- We still need a **50 page feeder equipped PDF scanner Printer** (with copy function) to replace the 15 year old printer we currently use and which shows signs of becoming dysfunctional. CCUL utilizes a lot of materials which need to be fed in and create PDFs and using the copy center is difficult.
- **Adobe Professional** is crucial. We have strived for 10 years to get this and still have not been able to procure this. This is needed for the creation of program support materials. (We note that other departments have equipment they hold in locked spaces *that does not conform to sufficient utilization nor availability standards*.)
- “**Dragon Speak**” and **Video camera and filming equipment** to use in creating outreach materials.
 - Our budget is too small and we need money for equipment.
- Other program needs not otherwise specified until need becomes apparent in delivery of CCUL and departmental programming..

Supplies:

- 6) **Supply Needs:** Our needs are insufficiently met via an ever diminishing office supply budget. From 2012/13 thru 2013/14 we sustained 50% cut from previous years; and sustained a further 20% reduction in 2014/15. For current year we saw funding increased to 2012 levels. This impedes our efforts to have sufficient supplies in the upcoming year. **WE REQUEST and increase in supply budget to \$1,000.**

Facilities:

- 7) **Facilities Needs:** CCUL has sought out an office and resource center for six years and has yet to receive these. We were awarded the law school pathway grant for ten years. We have been approached by Alameda Point Collaborative to revitalize our Service Learning Initiative from 2005-2008 and a space to support this would be useful. Interns from the MPA program could work with our students in such a space. An office and resource center is still a valid request.

Professional Development:

- 8) **Professional Development:** We have requested release time for 21st Century curriculum framework development which would integrate multiple threads of innovative programmatic design work from Lumina, NIF, EFF, accelerated contextualized curriculum, and learning community work. We had requested a full semester release through Staff Development and delivered a comprehensive proposal and plan and had the request summarily rejected without explanation. We would find such release time to engage in training and development and program completion useful; and most likely will not be able to do the work otherwise.

<h2>IX Alignment of Goals: Department to College and District</h2>

- A] **District Strategic Goals & Institutional Objectives** - (The following are the Peralta Community College District’s Strategic Goals and Institutional Objectives as of 2015-16.):

Strategic Focus for 2015-2016: Our focus this year will be on student success in the core educational areas of basic skills/ESOL (English for speakers of other languages), transfer, and CTE (career technical education) by encouraging accountability, outcomes assessment, innovation and collaboration while spending within an established budget.

❖ **How the POSCI/CCUL Department meets the Strategic Goals & 2015-2016 Institutional Objectives**

<p>A: Advance Student Access, Equity, and Success</p> <p><u>COA – POSCI/CCUL meets this goal with:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Innovative Learning Outcomes and Basic Skills integration efforts (appendix B); 2) Expansion of program and courses offerings (including a unique CTE-POSCI series of stackable certificates; and a law program aimed at traditionally underserved populations). 	<p>A.1 Student Access: Increase enrollment for programs and course offerings in the essential areas of basic skills/ESOL, CTE and transfer to achieve the District target of 19,355 RES FTES.</p> <p>A.2 Student Success: Increase students' participation in SSSP eligible activities by 50%, with specific emphasis on expanding orientations, assessments, academic advising and student educational plans.</p> <p>A.3 Student Success: Using baseline data, increase student engagement in activities such as student governance, student life activities, Student leadership development, service learning programs, learning communities, student employment, etc.</p> <p>A.4 Student Equity Planning: Address the achievement gap through fully developing and implementing the student success and equity plans at each campus.</p>
<p>B: Engage and Leverage Partners</p> <p><u>COA – POSCI/CCUL meets this goal with:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) our Innovative partnerships efforts with CSU East Bay, APC, WISR, and Alameda County; 2) Our outreach efforts towards Alameda High Schools for recruitment; 3) Outreach and partnerships with East Bay Community Based Organizations. 	<p>B.1 Partnerships: Develop a District-wide database that represents our current strategic partnerships and relationships.</p> <p>B.2. Partnerships: Expand partnerships with K-12 institutions, community based organizations, four-year institutions, local government, and regional industries and businesses.</p>
<p>C: Build Programs of Distinction</p> <p><u>COA – POSCI/CCUL meets this goal with:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Community Change and Urban Leadership Initiative (Appendix A) is in itself a potentially world class program – <u>if it were to receive sufficient support.</u> 	<p>C.1 Student Success: Develop a District-wide first year experience/student success program.</p> <p>C.2 Student Success: Develop an innovative student success program at each college.</p>
<p>D: Strengthen Accountability, Innovation and Collaboration</p> <p><u>COA – POSCI/CCUL meets this goal with:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The departmental engagement with Student Government on a mentoring basis, and the creation of student leadership courses and trainings. 2) Our WISR and Alameda County partnerships offer this opportunity. 3) Alameda Point Collaborative Service Learning initiative 	<p>D.1 Service Leadership: Provide professional development opportunities for faculty, staff and administrators that lead to better service to our students and colleagues.</p> <p>D.2 Institutional Leadership and Governance: Evaluate and update policies and administrative procedures and the PBIM participatory governance structure.</p>

B] Relevance of COA “Politics” Program Plans to the College of Alameda Strategic Plan

Where the COA POSCI “Politics” Department aligns with overall COA – Peralta Strategic Plan Goals COA:

- ✓ **The Mission of College of Alameda** to serve the educational needs of its diverse community by providing comprehensive and flexible programs and resources that empower students to achieve their goals.
- ✓ **The Vision of College of Alameda** is that we are a diverse, supportive, empowering learning community for seekers of knowledge. We are committed to providing a creative, ethical and inclusive environment in which students develop their abilities as thinkers, workers and citizens of the world.

✓ **The COA Values** – “The COA ABCs” -- are derived from our vision to choreograph into three central themes for “learning excellence” and services to students.

- ❖ Academic Excellence
- ❖ Budgetary Competence
- ❖ Community Engagement

These emphasize crucial success indicators for our students in achieving an enhanced capacity to pursue their dreams!

<u>The Following Strategic Plan Goals Apply</u>	<u>Describe how goal applies to your program.</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Advance Student Access, Success & Equity ✓ Engage our Communities & Partners ✓ Build Programs of Distinction ✓ Create a Culture of Innovation & Collaboration ✓ Develop Resources to Advance & Sustain Mission 	<p>In addition to our two Degrees – AA and AA-T - we have a certificate. We are also developing “stackable certificates” and towards two new degrees in Public Administration and Change Studies and in Society and Street Law.</p> <p><u>We have been engaging in discussions with:</u> 1) Alameda County Training Center to explore the creation of Programming for Alameda County and Associated Governments Employees; 2) CSU East Bay to explore a 2+ 2+2+2 AA to MPA program; 3) Western Institute for Social Research (WISR) to explore degree completion programs. 3) We are exploring some conjoint program ideas under the rubric of Areas of Emphasis – Social Justice Studies. 4) Reinvigorating our old <u>Service Learning Initiative with Alameda Point Collaborative.</u></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>New programs under development</u> – “stackable certificates” towards two new degrees in Public Administration and Change Studies and in Society and Street Law; Social Justice Studies Area of emphasis AA-T Development underway.. ✓ <u>CCUL Program is integral to COA overall strategy</u> ✓ Our CCUL 2+2+2 tracks are all potentially <u>essential for transfer</u> – certainly that fact that POSCI-1 (and POSCI-26 suffices for) is required for “American Institutions Requirement” is <u>essential for transfer</u> ✓ CCUL Program clearly serves community needs – Politics Department also prepares students to be effective citizens

X Appendices

Appendix	Title	Page
A	Community Change and Urban Leadership	23
B	Student Success Basic Skills Standards as applied in the POSCI Department	30
C	POSCI Department SLO/PLO ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL	31
D	21st Century Curriculum Image	35
E	Law School Brochure	36
F	Summer 2008 to Spring 2015 - Comparative Enrollment Data of POSCI Courses in Peralta By POSCI 1,2,3,4 6 by time of day	38
G	2015-2016 Department Productivity Data from previous APU	42
H	POSCI Continuing Action Plan	45
I	COA ILOs Map to COA POSCI PLOs	50

Appendices In Revision: Available upon request