



AY 2008 – 2009  
Program Review

Sociology



**MESA STATE COLLEGE**  
**Program Review Self-Study Narrative**  
**B.A. in Sociology**

**I. PROGRAM HISTORY**

The Sociology program has existed in its present structure -- as a B.A. program with concentrations -- since the mid-1990s. Prior to that time, Mesa State College offered a Bachelor of Arts in Social and Behavioral Sciences, an "umbrella degree" with areas of emphasis in several fields including Criminal Justice, Human Services, History, Psychology, and Political Science. As a result of recommendations from the North Central Accreditation and with the support of the faculty, in 1993 Mesa State College began to award B.A. degrees in traditional social science disciplines, including Sociology. With regard to Sociology, students were given two options: earning a B.A. in Sociology without a specific area of concentration; or earning a B.A. in Sociology with a concentration; choices for concentrations were Anthropology, Criminal Justice or Human Services. Thus what had been an Anthropology minor became an area of concentration within Sociology, the Criminal Justice emphasis became the Criminology concentration, and the Human Services emphasis became the Human Services concentration. These program changes were designed to increase the coherence and academic rigor of the Criminal Justice and Human Services concentrations by ensuring that students were exposed to a set of common courses central to the discipline of Sociology, including Theory and Research Methods.

This structure of the discipline and the choice of concentrations continued through 2006. In 2006, however, the concentration in Criminology was replaced with a stand-alone Criminal Justice program which is not affiliated with the Sociology program; thus students may no longer earn a B.A. in Sociology with a concentration in Criminology. Also in 2006, the concentration in Human Services changed slightly to require students in that concentration to take more upper-division Sociology and Anthropology courses in the Restricted Electives category; previously, students could fulfill upper-division course requirements by taking courses in Psychology and Administration of Justice.

Currently, therefore, the possible programs of study in Sociology are as follows: B.A. in Sociology; B.A. in Sociology with a concentration in Human Services; B.A. in Sociology with a concentration in Anthropology; minor in Sociology; minor in Anthropology.

Other than the deletion of the Criminology concentration, the most notable feature of the program since the last review has been a decline in the number of tenure / tenure-track faculty. In 2002-2003, the program had four full-time, tenure / tenure-track sociologists and two full-time, tenure / tenure track anthropologists; over most of the period covered in this review, a total of four tenure / tenure-track faculty members, two sociologists and two anthropologists, were supplemented by full-time and part-time instructors. The implications of this are described and explored in a later section.

It is hoped, however, that the addition of a new faculty member in Sociology, as well as the removal of the concentration in Criminology, will allow the Sociology program to develop in the direction we have envisioned for some time. Several options for developing the major in a new direction are offered later in this document.

## II. PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Broadly speaking, the goals and objectives of the Sociology program stem from three sources: the Mission Statement of Mesa State College, including the philosophy and goals of a baccalaureate education, as described in the MSC Catalog; General Education goals; and the goals articulated in the Assessment Plan for the Sociology degree. Each of these sets of goals and objectives is described in turn below.

### A. The Mission Statement of Mesa State College and the Goals of a Baccalaureate Education.

The mission of Mesa State College, as established by the Colorado Legislature, describes the institution as a “general baccalaureate and specialized graduate institution with moderately selective admissions. Mesa State College shall offer liberal arts and sciences programs and a limited number of professional, technical, and graduate programs. [ . . . ] Mesa State shall also serve as a regional education provider.”<sup>1</sup>

### B. General Education Goals.

The program’s General Education courses and degree-specific offerings help further the nine objectives of a baccalaureate college identified in the MSC Catalog.<sup>2</sup> The following objectives are of particular relevance: effective communication; mathematical skills; an awareness of the enduring moral, ethical, and philosophical questions; knowledge of our own and other cultures; critical thinking skills; and an understanding of the complexities of our social, economic and political environment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.) 23-53-101.

<sup>2</sup> 2007-08 Mesa State Catalog, p. 41.

C. The Sociology Program Assessment Plan.

As a result of the requirements of rigorous and regular program assessment, the Sociology program has adopted, with the guidance of resources provided by the American Sociological Association, three overarching goals for our students. They are as follows.

1. Graduates of the program will demonstrate a solid general understanding of the range of topics, and the content thereof, in the field of sociology.
2. Graduates of the program will have developed critical thinking skills. More specifically, the intended outcome is the ability of sociology graduates to identify, describe, and evaluate the evidence offered in support of an argument.
3. Graduates of the program will have developed the ability to communicate effectively. Specifically, the intended outcome is the ability to express ideas in a clear and coherent manner in written papers and essays and oral presentations.

These goals led, in turn, to the articulation of specific desired student outcomes. All Sociology majors should develop a core knowledge base and set of skills, and students who choose concentrations in Anthropology or Human Services should acquire and develop further knowledge and skills directly relevant to their chosen concentrations. For those students who do internships as a part of their degree requirements, our goal is that students develop job skills which will help them to enter careers in which they can use their degrees. These more specific and extensive goals for student outcomes are delineated in Appendix E, Assessment Plan and Results.

The goals and values of a liberal arts education – writing skills, the ability to think critically, and an understanding of the social context of the important issues of our times – guide the program and its course offerings. These goals stem from the belief that a broad-based liberal arts education is not only the mark of a truly educated person, but also helps students become lifelong learners whose competencies prepare them for productive, interesting, meaningful lives and careers.

III. ANALYSIS OF NEED FOR THE PROGRAM

- A. General Education Support for the College. A total of five courses in sociology and anthropology satisfy General Education requirements in Social and Behavioral Sciences. All five courses have received approval as GT Pathways courses.

- B. Support for the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Other Degree Programs. The Sociology department has, since the inception of separate degree programs within Social and Behavioral Sciences, taught at least three sections per year of Methods of Social Research (SOCI 310). This course is required not only for students majoring in Sociology, but also for those in Political Science and Criminal Justice, and it is also the Methods course of choice for Psychology majors. This is a significant service to the department, especially given our small number of faculty.

Anthropology and Sociology courses also support other programs at Mesa State. Several Anthropology courses are required in the new minor in Archaeology, and World Cultures is one of the options to fulfill a requirement for Education majors. Criminal Justice students are required to take Social Inequality. Both Anthropology and Sociology courses may be used to fulfill requirements for the International Studies program. Finally, either Ethnopsychology or Ethnographic Methods is required for Psychology majors with concentrations in Counseling Psychology. Sociology courses are also listed as electives in several other degree programs as well.

- C. Total Number of Students Served by Sociology and Anthropology Classes. The headcount and credit hour distribution in ANTH and SOCO courses has remained steady over the years 2004-2008 (See Tables 2 and 3 in Appendix A). Total undergraduate registration ranged from a low of 993 to a high of 1134, and credit hours ranged from 2988 to 3414. The five-year change was positive, with an increase of 205 registrations and a 6.48% increase in credit hours.

- D. Number of Majors, Fall Terms, 2003-2007. The number of Sociology majors, including those with concentrations in either Anthropology or Human Services, has remained relatively constant over the period, fluctuating between approximately 80 and 90 majors. The abrupt decline in Sociology-Criminology students between 2006 and 2007 is the result of the deletion of the concentration in Criminology and its replacement with a stand-alone Criminal Justice program. It should be noted that the number of Sociology, Sociology / Anthropology, and Sociology / Human Services majors has risen slightly since 2005, offsetting some of the decline in students in Criminology. See Tables 1A and 1B in Appendix A.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Sociology	36	39	29	30	36
Sociology-Anthropology	9	5	6	8	9
Sociology-Human Services	37	36	30	45	44
Sociology-Criminology	94	98	109	84	27
TOTAL	176	178	174	167	116

- E. Degrees Awarded, 2003-2008. The deletion of the concentration in Criminology is not yet reflected in the number of degrees awarded, though it will be in future years. Degrees awarded in Human Services and Anthropology remained steady over the six-year period shown in the table below, while the number of Sociology degrees awarded rose in 2008 after dropping in the years 2004-07. See Table 4, Degrees Awarded, in Appendix A.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Sociology	9	5	4	5	4	9
Sociology-Anthropology	1	2	2	1	2	1
Sociology-Human Services	9	9	9	3	9	9
Sociology-Criminology	12	16	20	15	12	12
TOTAL	31	32	35	24	27	31

- F. Faculty Workload, 2003-2007. Data on faculty teaching load are provided by Institutional Research in Tables 6 and 7 of Appendix A; these data are available only for years 2005-07, and they contain anomalies which make them difficult to interpret. For example, the course Methods of Social Research, which has always been taught by a sociologist, is not included in Table 7. Holland has been counted as a .8 instructor even in those semesters in which she split her teaching duties between Sociology and either Political Science or History.

Table 6, Faculty by Tenure Status, indicates the extent to which Sociology (excluding Anthropology) relied upon instructors to cover courses. Over the period 2005 to 2008, inclusive, Instructors constituted between 30 and 58% of the total Faculty FTE in Sociology.

Below find a different view of the staffing pattern from the period Spring 2003 through Spring 2008. These data were compiled using course schedules attained through Banner, and show precisely how many courses were taught by what kind of faculty in each of those semesters. Unless otherwise noted by a number in parentheses, the professors were teaching a full load of four courses.

As documented here, we relied heavily upon adjunct and part-time instructors. A total of 69 different course sections were taught by twelve different adjuncts. In terms of tenure / tenure-track faculty, Pat Joffer left for another position after Spring 2003, Starbuck never taught a full load of four courses, and Gerkin was employed only two of the six years shown in the table.

Courses by Faculty Status, Spring 2003 through Spring 2008

	Tenured / Tenure Track Professors	Adjunct / Part-time Instructors
Spring 2003	SOCO: Cummings, Wilhelm, Joffer, Starbuck (2) ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	McCullough (3), Verstraete (2), Taylor (1)
Fall 2003	SOCO: Cummings, Wilhelm ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	Stanley (4), Harmon (2), Verstraete (2), Landman (1)
Spring 2004	SOCO: Cummings, Wilhelm, Starbuck (2) ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	Stanley (4), Verstraete (2)
Fall 2004	SOCO: Wilhelm, Starbuck (3) ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	Landman (2), Verstraete (2), Harmon (1)
Spring 2005	SOCO: Cummings, Wilhelm, Starbuck (2) ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	Landman (2), Verstraete (2)
Fall 2005	SOCO: Cummings, Wilhelm, Gerkin (3), Starbuck (2) ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	Holland (2), Ramaekers-Mattas (2), Verstraete (2)
Spring 2006	SOCO: Cummings, Wilhelm, Gerkin (3) ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	Holland (2), Ramaekers-Mattas (2), Verstraete (2)
Fall 2006	SOCO: Cummings, Wilhelm, Gerkin (3) ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	Holland (3), Landman (1), Schaible (1), Verstraete (1)
Spring 2007	SOCO: Cummings, Wilhelm, Gerkin ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	Holland (2), Verstraete (2), Vigil (1)
Fall 2007	SOCO: Cummings, Wilhelm ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	Holland (3), Verstraete (2), Bell (1), Mize (1), Schaible (1)
Spring 2008	SOCO: Cummings, Wilhelm ANTH: Boulanger, Michrina	Holland (3), Mize (2), Verstraete (2), Staff (1), Vigil (1)

IV. NARRATIVE SUMMARIES OF RESOURCES

A. Unique characteristics of the program influencing the need for resources.

Sociology is a low-cost program requiring resources which are neither unique nor unusual. The courses that satisfy General Education requirements reach hundreds of students per academic year, and the number of students majoring in Sociology, Sociology / Human Services, and Sociology / Anthropology has remained relatively



constant over the years 2003-2007 despite an atmosphere of uncertainty and change.

As documented above, however, Sociology has relied upon part-time and adjunct instructors to teach many of its lower-division courses. This is due to the number of failed searches over the five-year period of this program review. A search for a replacement Sociology / Criminology professor failed in 2003-04; although a later search resulted in a tenure-track hire in 2004-05, that professor (Gerkin) resigned his position at the end of the 2007 academic year. Searches in 2005-06 and 2006-07 to replace Professor Starbuck, who had not taught full-time in the department since 2002 because he oversaw the accreditation process and served as Department Head, also failed.

These failed searches had many repercussions over the five-year period reviewed.

First, as a result, Wilhelm and Cummings carried the double burdens of an increased teaching and advising load and the investment of time and energy in failed faculty searches in every year covered in this program review, as well as the increased assessment requirements for General Education and the program as a whole.

Second, the presence of only two full-time, tenure / tenure-track Sociologists required us to rely upon instructors to help cover our lower-division courses. The quality and dependability of our instructors over the period of this program review is best described as uneven. We would prefer that the majority of our courses be taught by highly qualified and dependable instructors and tenured / tenure-track professors. It is in those lower-division courses that we find majors, prepare them for upper-division coursework in Sociology, and provide a base of common knowledge for upper-division courses.

This is especially important because students rarely come to Mesa State College planning on studying sociology; as a rule, they decide to major in it later in their college careers, many of them after taking a General Education course. Appendix A, Table 1B, Undergraduate Sociology Majors, Fall Terms 2003-2007, demonstrates this. The total number of *freshmen* majoring in Sociology, Sociology / Anthropology, and Human Services over the period was 59. For sophomores, the number had risen to 67; for juniors, 108, and for seniors, 165. Because students discover sociology while in college and then decide to major in it, it is important that students' first encounters with sociology be good ones.

There is another drawback to relying upon instructors. The workload for tasks such as General Education assessment, program assessment, and program reviews has increased over the period of time covered in this review, and instructors do not help

carry that load, nor do they share in advising, course scheduling, faculty searches, and other department service.

Third, the elimination of the Criminology concentration and its replacement with a stand-alone Criminal Justice program resulted in confusion for students in that program and did not immediately release Cummings and Wilhelm from responsibilities in that program area. Both continued to advise students working toward a Sociology degree with a concentration in Criminology, and will continue to do so as those students who were "grandfathered" in finish their coursework in that degree program which is no longer an option.

#### B. Faculty and Staff.

Sociology currently has four full-time, tenured professors: Cummings and Wilhelm in Sociology; and Boulanger and Michrina in Anthropology. A third full-time, tenure-track Assistant Professor of Sociology, Abigail Richardson, joins the department in academic year 2008-09. As noted earlier, the discipline has had fewer full-time, tenured or tenure-track professors than it did over the period of time covered in the previous program review. Full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty employed over the academic years 2003-2007 are as follows.

Clare Boulanger, Professor of Anthropology (Anthropology). B.A., S.U.N.Y. Plattsburg, 1980; M.A., University of Minnesota, 1984; Ph.D., University of Minnesota, 1991.

Adele J. Cummings, Professor of Sociology (Sociology). B.A., Florida State University, 1983; M.S., Florida State University, 1987; Ph.D., Duke University, 1995.

Barry Michrina, Professor of Anthropology (Anthropology). B.S., Chemistry, St. Francis College, 1969; M.S., Organic Chemistry, Colorado State University, 1971; Ph.D., Agronomy, Pennsylvania State University, 1980; Ph.D., Anthropology, S.U.N.Y. Binghamton, 1990.

Brenda Wilhelm, Associate Professor of Sociology (Sociology). B.A., University of Minnesota; M.A., University of Arizona; Ph.D., University of Arizona, 1999.

The Curriculum Vita for these professors are found in Appendix F.

#### C. Physical Facilities.

No physical facilities are unique to Sociology.

D. Instructional Equipment and Technology.

All of the faculty employ some combination of PowerPoint, WebCT, the Internet, statistical packages like SPSS and MicroCase, and other technologies in wide use in academia. The only specific technology need is for a statistics analysis / research methods software package such as MicroCase; Department Head John Redifer succeeded in getting a course-specific fee for the Methods of Social Research approved for the annual purchase and license for MicroCase.

E. Library. Sociology and Anthropology faculty have made good use of our library budget allocation, with particular attention paid to increasing our paper holdings in Race and Ethnicity, Social Movements, and Family. For a summary of library resources, please see Appendix C, the Library Report, as submitted by the Director of Tomlinson Library.

F. DVD and VHS Collection. Our DVD and VHS collection is surprisingly strong, for two reasons. First, because of Sociology's inherently interdisciplinary nature, many videos and DVDs which were purchased for use in Political Science and History courses are appropriate for our courses as well. Second, several faculty members have built extensive personal DVD libraries, which are used to supplement DVDs and videos held by the department and available through Tomlinson library. Both Michrina and Cummings have extensive personal collections which are widely used.

G. Summary. Sociology and Anthropology are low-cost programs that require no unique or unusual resources. The program's greatest strength is its dedicated faculty, and its greatest weakness over the period of time covered in this program review has been the unpredictability of course offerings because faculty searches have failed, the reliance upon adjunct instructors to teach General Education courses, and the uncertainty created by the deletion of Criminology as a concentration area within Sociology. With the addition of a replacement tenure-track Sociologist and the transition of students from Sociology / Criminology to Criminal Justice, the program is currently "right-sized."

V. EFFECTIVENESS IN MEETING OBJECTIVES

This section is organized to mirror the Program Goals and Objectives outlined in Section II above.

A. The Mission Statement of Mesa State College and the Goals of a Baccalaureate Education.

The members of the Sociology faculty are fully committed to teaching relevant, applicable, socially useful skills and ideas within the context of a liberal arts education. The philosophy and goals of a liberal arts education are that “students will emerge with well-developed faculties for critical judgment, analytical thought, and an awareness of the social world. In the college environment, students are expected to embrace some of the great ideas and expressions of creative energy which characterize the human condition.”<sup>3</sup> The program’s assessment goals, high standards for students, extensive writing requirements, and emphasis on critical thinking and analysis all help to further these goals. For evidence of our rigorous course requirements, see the course syllabi provided in Appendix H. It would be surprising if any other degree programs at Mesa State College, with the exception of English and History, require more writing of students.

The program is also helping to achieve the college’s role of regional education provider through the increase in online course offerings, the provision of “paired classes,” the monitoring of the early scholars program course offerings at local high schools, the offering of General Education courses at night and on a “late start” basis, and on the main campus and at the Montrose campus. Through the summer term of 2004, all sociology and anthropology courses were taught on the main campus in a standard classroom format. By Spring 2008, however, the program had 35 Early Scholars registrations, 139 registrations at the Montrose campus, and 67 online registrations. The discipline also offered several paired classes, evening classes, and late-start classes.

B. Contribution to General Education.

Five sociology courses (SOCO 144, Marriage and Families; SOCO 260, General Sociology; SOCO 264, Social Problems; ANTH 201, Cultural Anthropology; and ANTH 222, World Cultures) may be used to satisfy General Education requirements. These courses reach hundreds of students each semester, and contribute significantly to the college and to its institutional role and mission. In AY 2007, for example, a total of 861 students enrolled in lower-division sociology and anthropology courses which meet General Education requirements. All of the lower-division courses in Sociology are designated General Education courses; credit hour production for lower-division courses in AY 2006 and 2007 were 2316 and 2583, respectively. See Appendix A. General Education assessment, while not yet fully institutionalized, suggests that our courses are largely meeting the objectives.

---

<sup>3</sup> Mesa State College, 2007-2008, p. 41.

C. The Sociology Program Assessment Plan.

We collect other assessment data which we use to judge whether our students are achieving the desired outcomes, and specific assignments and rubrics have been developed for our upper-division courses in order to assess student success in critical thinking as well as written and oral communication skills. Students slated to graduate also take the MFAT subject area test in Sociology and fill out exit interviews (see Appendix E) which ask them to judge how well they have met the goals we have set. Finally, our internships are evaluated in two ways: the students who do internships as part of the Human Services concentration assess the value of those internships to their educations; and, in turn, the organizations for whom the students are doing internships evaluate our students (See Appendix E for the internship evaluation forms). Each of these assessment components are addressed in turn below. The section closes with a description of other opportunities offered to Sociology majors.

1. Providing a solid background in Sociology and Anthropology content through program-specific courses. The sociology core courses required of all majors are specifically designed to meet the program goals and objectives and to prepare our students for upper-division courses in Sociology and in their chosen concentrations, should they have one. Similarly, the courses required for a concentration in Anthropology and Human Services directly address the goals identified in Section II.C. above.

One of the means by which we assess our students' understanding of sociology is through the Educational Testing Service Major Field Test in Sociology, which all of our graduating students are required to take. Student scores over the past five years place our institution between the 55<sup>th</sup> and 93<sup>rd</sup> percentile nationwide on Critical Thinking, and between the 66<sup>th</sup> and 96<sup>th</sup> percentile nationwide in knowledge of the Sociology core. A summary of recent institutional scores is as follows. Note: these scores are our institutional ranking, rather than an average test score. In other words, the percentiles reported below reflect the standing of Mesa State College in comparison to the programs at other schools which require their Sociology students to take the Major Field Test.

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE MAJOR FIELD TEST  
SUMMARY RESULTS: 2003-2007

	Sociology Core		Critical Thinking		Total	
	raw score	Percentile*	raw score	Percentile*	raw score	Percentile*
Fall 2007/Spring 2008 (n=21)	55	70%	51	55%	153	60%
Fall 2006/Spring 2007 (n=24)	57	75%	52	60%	155	70%
Fall 2005/Spring 2006 (n=26)	53	66%	54	70%	153	77%
Spring 2005 (n=23)	59	88%	55.3	77%	158	86%
Fall 2004 (n=9)	62	96%	60	90%	161	93%
Spring 2004 (n=9)	59	90%	60.3	93%	161	92%

These scores are noteworthy for several reasons. First, students concentrating in Anthropology and Human Services (and, over the period of this program review those who earned a concentration in Criminology) take relatively few Sociology courses once their core coursework in Sociology is completed. Second, since the discipline is both small and has been understaffed, we are not able to offer courses in important areas of sociology which are tested in the Field Area Test. That our students perform as well as they do suggests that we are providing an excellent general background in the field.

We also use the exit interviews to ask program graduates themselves how well they believe they have mastered the content of Sociology. In the assessment periods 2003-04 through 2007-08, inclusive (the first years in which students filled out exit interviews), every single student reported that s/he had a solid understanding of the basic ideas of sociology and the subject matter with which it deals.

2. Developing the ability to think critically and communicate effectively. Results from Program Assessment, while not yet fully institutionalized, suggest that our students have developed the ability to think critically and communicate effectively; in exit interviews, students agree. The evaluation of this program goal has been structured so that students indicate the extent to which their skills in these areas improved *as a result of particular assignments and particular courses*, a method which both accounts for

value added and allows for continuous assessment. Again, this aspect of program assessment has not been fully institutionalized, but specific assignments and rubrics by which to evaluate them can be found in Appendix E of this document. Additional support for faculty commitment to these goals is evident in our course syllabi offered as supporting documents.

3. Internships. Internships are required of most students with a concentration in either Human Services or Criminology. These internships are an important way to alert students to career opportunities in their chosen fields. Through internships, students gain valuable career experience and make important personal and professional contacts. The internship program also achieves the goal of informing students of career opportunities in their chosen fields. Finally, interns in the Human Services concentration have an active, helpful presence in the community and throughout the state.

Our internship program is evaluated in two ways: the organizations for which the students serve as interns evaluate the students; and the students evaluate their own internships. Over the period 2003 through 2007, every student earned a grade of an A or a B in his / her internship, and the organizations involved all indicated a willingness to recommend interns for similar jobs. Over the same period, every student described their internship experience as either very satisfactory or satisfactory, and more than 90% believed that their internship would help them find employment in their chosen fields.

4. Other opportunities. Students in Sociology have available to them other means of community and academic involvement, as follows.

The Sociology Club has been an important means of creating a voluntary social and academic peer group for particularly motivated students, and the Club regularly performs community service projects. During the past two years, the Sociology Club has also raised money so that members could attend and present papers at an Undergraduate Research Conference offered at Western State College.

Both Sociology and Anthropology faculty regularly offer students the opportunity to conduct independent and structured research.

Professor Barry Michrina serves as the editor of *Vignettes*, a journal in which students edit and publish ethnographic research. Dr. Michrina has also been supervising an ongoing study, begun in August, in which four students, who were trained in the dialogical hermeneutic method have been

conducting interviews with Grand Junction's poor. These students are making certain that voices be heard - men, women, the homeless, single mothers, the elderly, Latinos, the disabled, and veterans. What the team is seeking to understand is the worldview of these people: their values, their hopes, their priorities, their notion of crisis, and more.

5. Other evidence of student success. Sociology students are strong academically, as evidenced by their performance on standardized subject area tests, their grade point averages, and their success at winning Aspinnall scholarships. Over the period of time covered in this review, two Sociology students won the Aspinnall Scholarship (Gorton and Pearson). Because of the academic program and extracurricular activities such as Sociology Club, structured research and internships, graduates are prepared for, and in fact do pursue, a wide variety of endeavors after graduating. Many go on to graduate school or law school (Tupper and Madsen at Northern Arizona University, Laura Schott at the University of Cincinnati, Sarah Kennedy at the University of Memphis, Nikki Torres at the University of Chicago and then at University of Washington, Joe Hamer at Duquesne University, Asheley Seal at Colorado State University, Joshua Bolland at UCLA, Reggie and Tasheka Norman at New Mexico State), and into careers in human services (Linda Gregory at the Homeless Shelter, Catholic Outreach and the United Way, Deb Arnold at the Workforce Center, for example), probation and parole, and law enforcement. Others are in the Peace Corps (Kelley Burns), divinity school (Sally Henry), personnel management (Stephanie Litwiller), environmental advocacy (Kara Johnson), and K-12 education. Still others are currently employed by Mesa State College in a variety of capacities. Kennilyn Marquez Wright (Manager of Student Diversity), Tom Whalen (Assistant Coordinator of Educational Access Services), Mary Barnett (Mesa State College Foundation), and Katherine Pearson (Office of Institutional Research) are particularly noteworthy examples.

## VI. STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM

1. The relationship of the Sociology program to the College's liberal arts mission is clear and direct. The following objectives are of particular relevance: effective communication; mathematical skills; an awareness of the enduring moral, ethical, and philosophical questions; knowledge of our own and other cultures; critical thinking skills; and an understanding of the complexities of our social, economic and political environment.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Mesa State College, *Mesa State Catalog* (2002-03), p. 45.



2. Sociology and Anthropology contribute significantly to the College's General Education offerings. Five different courses, all with significant enrollment and all approved as GT Pathways courses, fulfill Social and Behavioral Science General Education requirements.
3. The core coursework required of all Sociology majors is coherent and rigorous.
4. The coursework specific to the Anthropology concentration is also coherent and rigorous. Moreover, faculty in that concentration maintain high-level research agendas and teach important service courses for the programs in Education, Counseling Psychology, International Studies, and Archaeology.
5. The concentrations currently offered, Anthropology and Human Services, offer students choice and flexibility in pursuing degrees which match their personal and professional goals.
6. The internship program in Human Services provides important links to the community, helps our students get jobs, and provides opportunities for students to apply the knowledge gained in school to real-world situations. The Sociology Club also performs community service every year, providing another important link to the community.
7. The Sociology program's well-trained and dedicated faculty members are committed to the scholar-teacher model. They maintain active research agendas and contribute valuable service to the College and community, in addition to providing a high-quality, intellectually challenging education to its students.

## VII. WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM

1. With the exception of the core faculty of Boulanger, Cummings, Michrina, and Wilhelm, the staffing has been unpredictable and in a state of more or less constant change. Our reliance upon part-time and full-time instructors has made it difficult to monitor the quality of our course offerings, attract majors, spread the load of advising, and oversee the Sociology Club.
2. The relatively small size of the discipline makes it particularly vulnerable to the loss of faculty members. Its small size also means that we have fewer faculty members than other disciplines and departments to oversee General Education assessment, program assessment, program reviews, and other responsibilities.

3. The articulation between our lower-division courses and upper-division courses is weak. The five General Education courses in Sociology and Anthropology also serve as the prerequisites for upper-division courses in Anthropology and Sociology. Since those courses serve students with a wide range of interest and ability, they cannot be taught with the breadth and depth we would like to provide to our majors.
4. Sociology bears the burden of teaching SOCI 310, Methods of Social Research, for virtually the entire Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Social Research Methods is a required course for students majoring not just in Sociology, but in Political Science, Criminal Justice, and Psychology. A sociologist has taught all three sections of Methods per year, an arrangement which satisfies no one; professors and students in each discipline would prefer a Methods course more closely aligned with the specific kind of research undertaken in that particular discipline. Even at three sections per year, the classes are too large to oversee meaningful research projects; and Sociology is teaching a service course for two other disciplines with larger numbers of both students and faculty.
5. Although Sociology's core courses are rigorous and coherent, the Human Services concentration is weak. This concentration requires an upper-division course in Human Services, an introductory psychology course, Social Psychology, a two-course sequence in Counseling Psychology, and an internship. Since its inception in 1993, the concentration in Human Services has never had a faculty member dedicated to it. Over the period 2003-2007, four different people have overseen the internship program. An adjunct instructor teaches Introduction to Human Services. Its course requirements lean more toward Psychology than Sociology. And our search for an applied sociologist was unsuccessful.

Students in that concentration share our concerns. Exit interviews conducted between 2003 and 2007 indicate that between one-third and one-half of our students working toward a degree with a concentration were "underwhelmed" with the course offerings and unique opportunities in the concentration. Some of these students were working on a concentration in Criminology, and they are no longer a concern to Sociology, but we would like to offer our Human Services students more.

## VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

With the hiring of a third full-time, tenure-track sociologist beginning 2008-2009

and the deletion / removal of the concentration in Criminology, the Sociology program is in a position to do more than tread water. The following are recommendations and options for strengthening the major.

1. Institutionalize the General Education and program assessment processes and procedures. Further develop and employ curriculum mapping as a guide to program assessment.
2. Explore alternatives to teaching Social Research Methods. Options might include: allowing or requiring each discipline to develop and teach its own Methods course; allowing some disciplines to delete the Methods requirement; and allowing students to fulfill the Methods requirement by taking either Methods of Social Research (SOC 310), which focuses on quantitative research methods or Ethnographic Methods (ANTH 310), which emphasizes qualitative research methods. A department committee, chaired by Cummings, has been formed to explore these options.
3. Develop a 200-level "bridge course" for Sociology majors with material specifically designed to prepare them for upper-division coursework in Sociology over and above that provided in General Education courses. Cummings was granted a Strategic Planning Grant in 2007 to begin to develop such a curriculum.
4. Strengthen the Human Services concentration. Options include:
  - a. Restructure the concentration with existing faculty. Develop new academic courses in, e.g., History and Philosophy of Social Welfare (Cummings, contingent upon a decrease in the number of sections of Research Methods) and Gerontology (Richardson, the new Sociology hire), and add courses to the concentration that are already regularly offered (e.g., Applied Anthropology and Medical Anthropology).
  - b. Create a new line and hire a tenure-track Sociologist or, perhaps, a highly-qualified full-time instructor, to develop and teach courses specific to Human Services and / or Applied Sociology. Our difficulties in hiring an Applied Sociologist, for which we advertised in 2005-06, make this a less likely option, and in any event we would be reluctant to radically restructure the concentration around a single faculty member. Moreover, declining enrollments in Sociology because of the removal of the concentration in Criminology make it unlikely that a new line in Sociology would receive priority.

- c. Create a full-fledged, stand-alone program in Social Work, separate from the Sociology program. This option would require extensive resources, since accreditation is an issue. According to the Council on Social Work Education, only three institutions in Colorado have accredited Social Work programs: Metropolitan State College and Colorado State University offer baccalaureate degrees in Social Work, and Colorado State University and Denver University have M.S.W. programs. At Colorado State University in Fort Collins, the Social Work website lists twelve tenured or tenure-track faculty, and as many research associates and field directors; even CSU-Pueblo has four full-time, tenured / tenure-track faculty members dedicated to its B.S.W. program.

# Appendix A

## Program Statistics



**Table 1A. Undergraduate Enrollment by Major Code, Fall Terms 2003-2007**  
**Mesa State College**

Level	Major Code	Program Name						
			2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
<b>Baccalaureate</b>								
	3708	Sociology - Criminology						
		New Majors	45	46	46	20	0	
		Continuing Majors	49	52	63	64	27	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>94</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>27</b>	
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology						
		New Majors	1	1	4	3	2	
		Continuing Majors	8	4	2	5	7	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	
	3710	Sociology - Human Services						
		New Majors	14	13	13	14	14	
		Continuing Majors	23	23	17	31	30	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>37</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>44</b>	
	3728	Sociology						
		New Majors	13	14	14	15	14	
		Continuing Majors	23	25	15	15	22	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>36</b>	
	<b>All Sociology</b>							
		New Majors	73	74	77	52	30	
		Continuing Majors	103	104	97	115	86	
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>176</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>116</b>	

**Table 1A. Undergraduate Enrollment by Major Code, Spring Terms 2003-2007**  
**Mesa State College**

Level	Major Code	Program Name						
			2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
<b>Baccalaureate</b>								
	3708	Sociology - Criminology						
		New Majors	6	18	14	0	0	
		Continuing Majors	72	76	87	60	22	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>78</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>22</b>	
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology						
		New Majors	0	2	2	4	0	
		Continuing Majors	8	3	6	6	9	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	
	3710	Sociology - Human Services						
		New Majors	6	5	17	5	9	
		Continuing Majors	30	33	24	36	34	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>43</b>	
	3728	Sociology						
		New Majors	8	1	6	10	8	
		Continuing Majors	30	26	21	21	24	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>38</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>32</b>	
	<b>All Sociology</b>							
		New Majors	<b>20</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>	
		Continuing Majors	<b>140</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>89</b>	
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>160</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>106</b>	



**Table 1A. Undergraduate Enrollment by Major Code, Summer Terms 2003-2007**  
**Mesa State College**

Level	Major Code	Program Name						
			2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
<b>Baccalaureate</b>								
	3708	Sociology - Criminology						
		New Majors	1	3	0	1	0	
		Continuing Majors	13	16	12	17	14	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology						
		New Majors	0	0	0	0	0	
		Continuing Majors	1	0	0	0	3	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	
	3710	Sociology - Human Services						
		New Majors	1	1	0	1	0	
		Continuing Majors	10	8	4	14	9	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	
	3728	Sociology						
		New Majors	2	3	4	0	1	
		Continuing Majors	7	9	5	5	6	
	<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	
	<b>All Sociology</b>							
		New Majors	4	7	4	2	1	
		Continuing Majors	31	33	21	36	32	
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>35</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>	

Table 1B. Undergraduate Sociology Majors, Fall Terms 2003-2007  
Mesa State College

Level	Major Code	Program Name					
			2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>Freshman</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	25	37	34	16	0
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	1	1	2	0	2
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	4	3	3	4	5
	3728	Sociology	10	7	6	4	7
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Sophomore</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	25	18	27	17	3
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	1	0	1	3	1
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	7	6	3	3	7
	3728	Sociology	3	8	8	8	8
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Junior</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	14	17	24	26	7
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	1	0	0	2	3
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	11	10	12	13	13
	3728	Sociology	9	8	7	9	10
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Senior</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	30	26	24	25	17
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	6	4	3	3	3
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	15	17	12	25	19
	3728	Sociology	14	16	8	9	11
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>ALL CLASSES</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	94	98	109	84	27
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	9	5	6	8	9
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	37	36	30	45	44
	3728	Sociology	36	39	29	30	36
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>176</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>116</b>

Table 1B. Undergraduate Sociology Majors, Spring Terms 2004-2008  
Mesa State College

Level	Major Code	Program Name					
			2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Freshman</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	7	29	23	6	0
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	0	1	1	1	0
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	0	3	1	5	4
	3728	Sociology	9	2	6	4	4
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>16</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Sophomore</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	19	20	28	10	1
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	1	0	2	3	3
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	9	4	9	5	7
	3728	Sociology	5	7	5	9	6
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>34</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Junior</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	21	18	22	15	1
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	1	0	1	1	2
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	13	8	16	5	9
	3728	Sociology	10	5	8	8	8
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>45</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Senior</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	31	27	28	29	20
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	6	4	4	5	4
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	14	23	15	26	23
	3728	Sociology	14	13	8	10	14
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>65</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>ALL CLASSES</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	78	94	101	60	22
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	8	5	8	10	9
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	36	38	41	41	43
	3728	Sociology	38	27	27	31	32
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>160</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>106</b>

Table 1B. Undergraduate Sociology Majors, Summer Terms 2003-2007  
Mesa State College

Level	Major Code	Program Name					
			2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>Freshman</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	2	4	2	2	0
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	0	0	0	0	0
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	0	1	0	1	0
	3728	Sociology	0	2	2	0	1
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Sophomore</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	1	3	1	5	2
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	0	0	0	0	1
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	2	1	0	1	0
	3728	Sociology	1	1	1	0	1
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Junior</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	4	4	3	5	4
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	1	0	0	0	0
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	4	3	1	7	1
	3728	Sociology	2	2	3	1	2
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Senior</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	7	8	6	6	8
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	0	0	0	0	2
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	5	4	3	6	8
	3728	Sociology	6	7	3	4	3
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>ALL CLASSES</b>							
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	14	19	12	18	14
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	1	0	0	0	3
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	11	9	4	15	9
	3728	Sociology	9	12	9	5	7
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>35</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>

Tables 2 and 3. Sociology Registrations and Credit Hours by Academic Year - AY 2004 - AY2008

	AY 2004		AY 2005		AY 2006		AY 2007		AY 2008		5 Year Change - Credit Hours	
	Registrations	Credit Hours	Registrations	Credit Hours	Registrations	Credit Hours	Registrations	Credit Hours	Registrations	Credit Hours	#	%
Lower - 100	450	1350	356	1068	300	900	314	942	274	822	-528	-39.11%
Lower - 200	313	939	386	1158	472	1416	547	1641	601	1803	864	92.01%
Upper - 300	178	534	170	510	151	453	200	600	198	594	60	11.24%
Upper - 400	112	342	81	252	89	271	73	231	49	151	-191	-55.85%
Total Undergraduate	1053	3165	993	2988	1012	3040	1134	3414	1122	3370	205	6.48%
Total FTE		105.50		99.60		101.33		113.80		112.33	6.93	6.48%

**Table 4. Degrees Awarded by Major Code, Academic Years 2003 - 2007**  
**Mesa State College**

Level	Major Code	Program Name	Degree Attainment				
			2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>Baccalaureate</b>							
BA	3708	Sociology - Criminology	12	16	20	15	12
BA	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	1	2	2	1	2
BA	3710	Sociology - Human Services	9	9	9	3	9
BA	3728	Sociology	9	5	4	5	4
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>31</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>27</b>

**Table 5A. ONE-YEAR RETENTION RATE FOR FIRST-TIME STUDENTS 2002 - 2006**  
**Mesa State College**

Level	Major Code	Program Name	Retained or Graduated Subsequent Fall		Not Retained Subsequent Fall		Total	
			#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Baccalaureate</b>								
	3708	Sociology - Criminology	55	53.4%	48	46.6%	103	100.0%
	3709	Sociology - Anthropology	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	6	100.0%
	3710	Sociology - Human Services	7	58.3%	5	41.7%	12	100.0%
	3728	Sociology	10	47.6%	11	52.4%	21	100.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>74</b>	<b>52.1%</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>47.9%</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 5B. Headcount and Average Cumulative Credit Hours to Degree for Sociology Majors  
Graduating AY 2003 - 2007**

Type of Entry into MSC	Headcount		Average Cumulative
<b>Baccalaureate</b>			
<b>Student Type</b>			
Began at MSC	85	57.0%	137.3
Transferred in to MSC	64	43.0%	136.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>137.1</b>
		<b>Subtotal</b>	



**Table 6. Faculty by Tenure Status, 2005-2007**  
Mesa State College

		Sociology		2005-2006 FTE		2006-2007 FTE		2007-2008 FTE	
Status		FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
	Tenure	1.4	42.4%	1.6	39.0%	2.3	53.5%		
	Tenure-Track	0.0	0.0%	1.3	31.7%	0.0	0.0%		
<b>Total Tenure</b>		<b>1.4</b>	<b>42.4%</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>70.7%</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>53.5%</b>		
	FT Instructor	0.8	24.2%	0.6	14.6%	0.8	18.6%		
	PT Instructor	1.1	33.3%	0.6	14.6%	1.2	27.9%		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>3.3</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		

**Table 6. Faculty by Tenure Status, 2005-2007**  
Mesa State College

		Anthropology		2005-2006 FTE		2006-2007 FTE		2007-2008 FTE	
Status		FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
	Tenure	1.4	42.4%	2.6	63.4%	2.3	53.5%		
	Tenure-Track	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%		
<b>Total Tenure</b>		<b>1.4</b>	<b>42.4%</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>63.4%</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>53.5%</b>		
	FT Instructor	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%		
	PT Instructor	0.1	3.0%	0.4	9.8%	0.5	11.6%		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1.5</b>	<b>45.5%</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>73.2%</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>65.1%</b>		

Table 7. Aggregate Faculty Workload by Appointment Status, 2007 - 08

Rank	Course	Instructor	Track	Enrollments	Course CH	Student CH	FTEF	FTES	FTEF/FTEF
1 - T/TT	SOCO 330	Bell	A	34	3,000	102			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 260	Cummings, Adele	A	58	3,000	174			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 260	Cummings, Adele	A	56	3,000	168			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 300	Cummings, Adele	A	13	3,000	39			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 305	Cummings, Adele	A	13	3,000	39			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 410	Cummings, Adele	A	22	3,000	66			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 260	Cummings, Adele	A	57	3,000	171			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 260	Cummings, Adele	A	61	3,000	183			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 310	Cummings, Adele	A	29	3,000	87			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 400	Wilhelm, Brenda	A	23	3,000	69			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 316	Wilhelm, Brenda	A	22	3,000	66			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 144	Wilhelm, Brenda	A	46	3,000	138			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 144	Wilhelm, Brenda	A	42	3,000	126			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 144	Wilhelm, Brenda	A	31	3,000	93			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 264	Wilhelm, Brenda	A	58	3,000	174			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 264	Wilhelm, Brenda	A	52	3,000	156			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 340	Wilhelm, Brenda	A	20	3,000	60			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 312	Wilhelm, Brenda	A	15	3,000	45			
1 - T/TT	SOCO 144	Wilhelm, Brenda	A	36	3,000	108			
<b>1 - T/TT Total</b>			<b>A Total</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>57,000</b>	<b>2064</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>68.80</b>	<b>28.97</b>
3 - FT Temp	SOCO 260	Holland, Constance	A	57	3,000	171			
3 - FT Temp	SOCO 264	Holland, Constance	A	57	3,000	171			
3 - FT Temp	SOCO 264	Holland, Constance	A	34	3,000	102			
3 - FT Temp	SOCO 144	Holland, Constance	A	59	3,000	177			
3 - FT Temp	SOCO.144	Holland, Constance	A	60	3,000	180			
3 - FT Temp	SOCO 264	Holland, Constance	A	28	3,000	84			
<b>3 - FT Temp Total</b>			<b>A Total</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>18,000</b>	<b>885</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>29.50</b>	<b>39.33</b>
				<b>295</b>	<b>18,000</b>	<b>885</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>29.50</b>	<b>39.33</b>

Table 7. Aggregate Faculty Workload by Appointment Status, 2007 - 08

Rank	Course	Instructor	Track	Enrollments	Course CH	Student CH	FTEF	FTEs	FTEs/FTEF
6 - PT	SOCO 264	Schaible, Sonia	A	27	3,000	81			
6 - PT	SOCO 264	Schaible, Sonia	A	33	3,000	99			
6 - PT	SOCO 301	Verstraete, Patricia	A	29	3,000	87			
6 - PT	SOCI 122	Verstraete, Patricia	A	3	3,000	9			
6 - PT	SOCO 301	Verstraete, Patricia	A	9	3,000	27			
6 - PT	SOCI 121	Verstraete, Patricia	A	2	3,000	6			
6 - PT	SOCO 301	Verstraete, Patricia	A	14	3,000	42			
6 - PT	SOCO 260	Vigil, Patricia	A	17	3,000	51			
			<b>A Total</b>	134	24,000	402	1.00	13.40	13.40
6 - PT	SOCO 499	Verstraete, Patricia	B	1	4,000	4			
6 - PT	SOCO 499	Verstraete, Patricia	B	3	4,000	12			
			<b>B Total</b>	4	8,000	16	0.33	0.53	1.60
6 - PT Total				138	32,000	418	1.33	13.93	10.45
<b>Grand Total</b>				1,121	107,000	3367	4.46	112.23	25.17

Table 9. SOCIOLOGY COURSES BY COURSE LEVEL BY TERM AY 2008

Level/Course Level	Summer Courses	Fall Courses	Spring Courses	Total Courses
<b>Undergraduate</b>				
Remedial - 000	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Lower - 100	0 0.0%	3 18.8%	3 17.6%	6 16.7%
Lower - 200	1 33.3%	6 37.5%	7 41.2%	14 38.9%
Upper - 300	0 0.0%	5 31.3%	5 29.4%	10 27.8%
Upper - 400	2 66.7%	2 12.5%	2 11.8%	6 16.7%
Subtotal Undergraduates	3 100.0%	16 100.0%	17 100.0%	36 100.0%
<b>Graduate</b>				
Graduate - 500	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Subtotal Graduates	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 100.0%</b>	<b>16 100.0%</b>	<b>17 100.0%</b>	<b>36 100.0%</b>

Table 9. ANTHROPOLOGY COURSES BY COURSE LEVEL BY TERM AY 2008

Level/Course Level	Summer Courses	Fall Courses	Spring Courses	Total Courses
<b>Undergraduate</b>				
Remedial - 000	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Lower - 100	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Lower - 200	1 33.3%	7 43.8%	5 29.4%	13 36.1%
Upper - 300	0 0.0%	3 18.8%	6 35.3%	9 25.0%
Upper - 400	0 0.0%	1 6.3%	0 0.0%	1 2.8%
Subtotal Undergraduates	1 33.3%	11 68.8%	11 64.7%	23 63.9%
<b>Graduate</b>				
Graduate - 500	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Subtotal Graduates	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 33.3%</b>	<b>11 68.8%</b>	<b>11 64.7%</b>	<b>23 63.9%</b>

Table 10. Number of Registrations by Campus by Term for Selected Courses

	Summer 2003	Fall 2003	Spring 2004	Summer 2004	Fall 2004	Spring 2005	Summer 2005	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Summer 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Summer 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	
<b>Main Campus</b>																
SOCO 144	16	266	184	28	246	110	18	180	120	0	199	115	0	88	119	
SOCO 260	28	122	0	0	121	67	0	118	131	15	177	122	17	171	118	
SOCO 264	0	81	110	0	88	110	16	103	110	0	124	115	0	124	165	
ANTH 201	0	150	165	0	140	156	0	150	164	21	160	149	13	157	140	
ANTH 222	0	68	0	0	57	0	0	58	0	0	38	0	0	55	0	
SOCI 310	0	31	56	0	30	64	0	34	46	0	33	63	0	36	58	
<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>682</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>731</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>631</b>	<b>600</b>	
<b>Early Scholars</b>																
ANTH 201					11			18								6
SOCO 260																6
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Montrose Campus</b>																
ANTH 201					24			19			19	18		11	12	
SOCO 260						10						9			17	
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>29</b>	
<b>Online Courses</b>																
SOCO 144														31	36	
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>36</b>	



# Appendix B

## Finance and Budget





Dept/Subj	BANNER	CH Total	FO3	S04	Faculty Comp	Class Comp	Dept Head Comp	Admin Comp	Academic Support	Stud Svcs Alloc
FY 04	ANTH	LOWER	1,149.0		87,982	1,505	196		14,954	21,543
		UPPER	340.0		27,056	445	58		4,425	6,375
	SOC	LOWER	2,324.0		101,593	3,043	395		30,247	43,574
		UPPER	1,304.0		131,674	1,708	222		16,971	24,449

FY 05	CAMPUS/DEPT	ORG	DISC	LEVEL	CH'S	Fac FTE	FAC COMP DIR	FAC COMP ALLOC
	MAIN	1280 ANTH	DIVISION	Lower Division	1,059	0.046506521	61398.14	173,3019015
	MAIN	1280 ANTH	DIVISION	Upper Division	375	0.016468315	58964.82	61,36752887
	MAIN	1280 SOCI	DIVISION	Lower Division	27	0.001185719	19700.26	4,418462079
	MAIN	1280 SOCI	DIVISION	Upper Division	343	0.015063019	61851.5	56,13083308
	MAIN	1280 SOCO	DIVISION	Lower Division	2,226	0.097755918	71997.27	364,2776514
	MAIN	1280 SOCO	DIVISION	Upper Division	762	0.033463616	68357.99	124,6988187

FY 06	Program	Division	Credit Hrs	Fac FTE	Faculty	Alloc	Grad alloc	Total Fac Compt/Variable	VAR/CH
	ANTH	Lower	1,116	0	59,966		359	60,325	54
	ANTH	Upper	315	0	62,097		101	62,198	197
	SOCI	Lower	27	0	10,246		9	10,255	380
	SOCI	Upper	324	0	67,706		104	67,810	209
	SOCO	Lower	2,286	0	62,329		735	63,064	28
	SOCO	Upper	724	0	77,521		233	77,754	107

Instif Supp Alloc	Plant Alloc	OCE	TOTAL COSTS	TOTAL COSTS/CH
19,685	26,621	9,200	181,685	158
5,825	7,877	2,722	54,783	161
39,815	53,845	18,608	291,119	125
22,340	30,212	10,441	238,017	183

TL_FAC_COMP/VAR	VAR/CH	DEPT HEAD	EXEMPT	SUPP STAFF	TL_OTH COMP	OTH EXP	CFEES	TL_OCE EXP	OTH INSTRUCT
61,571	58	330.6404396	0	1453.965935	1784.606374	1,694	-	1,694	3,754
59,026	157	117.0823086	0	514.8604585	631.9427671	600	-	600	1,329
19,705	730	8.429926222	0	37.06995301	45.49987923	43	-	43	96
61,908	180	107.091285	0	470.9256994	578.0169843	549	-	549	1,216
72,362	33	695.0005841	0	3056.211682	3751.212266	3,562	-	3,562	7,891
68,483	90	237.9112512	0	1046.196452	1284.107703	1,219	-	1,219	2,701

Classified	Oth Costs	Course Fees	grad costs	TL Oth Costs	Oth Instruction	AS spec	AS alloc	SS alloc	IS alloc
1,647	1,718			1,718	3,557	-	11,097	21,592	24,648
465	485			485	1,004	-	3,132	6,095	6,957
40	42			42	86	-	268	522	596
478	499			499	1,033	-	3,222	6,269	7,156
3,374	3,518			3,518	7,285	-	22,730	44,230	50,489
1,068	1,114			1,114	2,307	-	7,199	14,008	15,990

<u>ACADEMIC SUPPORT</u>	<u>STUDENT SERVICES</u>	<u>INSTIT SUPP + SCHOLAR</u>	<u>PLANT</u>	<u>TOTAL FIXED</u>	<u>FIXED/CH</u>	<u>TOTAL COSTS</u>	<u>BY DEPT TL/CH</u>	<u>LOWER TL/CH</u>
11,193	19,489	15,087	21,330	74,932	71	136,503	129	
3,963	6,901	5,342	7,766	26,534	71	85,560	228	
285	497	385	559	1,910	71	21,615	801	
3,625	6,312	4,887	7,103	24,270	71	86,177	251	
23,527	40,965	31,713	46,997	157,505	71	229,857	103	
8,054	14,023	10,856	15,780	53,917	71	122,400	161	

  

<u>POM_spec</u>	<u>POM alloc</u>	<u>Tuit Support</u>	<u>Depreciation</u>	<u>Total Fixed</u>	<u>Fixed/CH</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>TL COSTS/CH</u>	<u>TL/CH</u>
-	24,553	12,452	17,756	119,020	107	179,345	161	
-	6,930	3,515	5,012	33,594	107	95,792	304	
-	594	301	430	2,880	107	13,134	486	
-	7,128	3,615	5,155	34,554	107	102,364	316	
-	50,295	25,507	36,371	243,798	107	306,862	134	
-	15,929	8,078	11,519	77,213	107	154,967	214	

UPPER TL/CH   GRAD TL/CH   BY DISC TL/CH

155

291

118

TL/CH   TL/CH   TL/CH   TL/CH

192

329

153

# Appendix C

## Library Assessment



**Library Program Assessment  
John U. Tomlinson Library  
Mesa State College**

Date of Assessment: July 31, 2008

Purpose of Assessment: Analysis of Library Resources

Program under review: Sociology

Program Level/s: B. A. with 3 concentrations and 2 minors

Liaison Signature: Assessment done by Paul Rolland

**I. Collection Assessment**

This program generally has 100-150 majors at any given time. An average of 37 students graduate with the Bachelors degree each year. The program offers 3 concentrations for the B.A.: Sociology, Human Services, and Anthropology, as well as a Sociology and an Anthropology minor. In addition, the College offers both an A.A. and a B.A. in Social Science with students in these programs required to take Sociology courses. The Department is also a popular provider of electives for students in other disciplines. Library resources for this program would include materials on the subjects of sociology, social problems, human services, social movements, population, social inequality, racial and ethnic relations, crime and delinquency, sex and gender, death and dying, classical and contemporary social theory, social modeling, social research, cultural anthropology, applied anthropology, world cultures and prehistory, the North American Indian, ethnography, religion and culture, language and culture, gender and culture, and globalization.

**a. Reference Support**

The Library has approximately 54 print Reference titles in sociology-related subjects. About 1/3 of these are 10 years old or newer. In addition, there are 24 print Reference titles in the subject discipline of anthropology with 9 of these published in the last 10 years. There are also 8 Reference print titles on human services/social work subjects. 5 of these are 10 years old or newer.

**b. Monographic Sources**

The circulating book collection has adequate coverage for the Sociology programs. A subject search of the Library's collection on the term "sociology" results in 761 items, 120 or 15.8% are 10 years old or less. A "sociology" keyword search of the Library's catalog returns 1154 results, 174

or 15.1% are 10 years old or less. A subject search of the Library's collection on the term "human services" results in 67 items, 35 or 52.2% are 10 years old or less. A "human services" keyword search of the Library's government documents returns 1594 results, 333 or 20.9% are 10 years old or less. This high number is due to the many documents that pertain to the U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services. A subject search of the Library's collection on the term "anthropology" results in 313 items, 88 or 28.1% are 10 years old or less. An "anthropology" keyword search of the Library's catalog returns 810 results, 295 or 36.4% are 10 years old or less.

#### c. Periodicals

The Library has 7 open print subscriptions and 4 closed print subscriptions to sociology journals. The Library has 5 open print subscriptions and 3 closed print subscriptions to anthropology journals. Online access to periodicals in these subjects is substantial. There are 331 online sociological journals listed in the Library's Journal Finder, all have indexing and 166 are available in full text. There are 112 online anthropological journals listed in the Journal Finder, all have indexing and 71 are available in full text.

#### d. Electronic Resources

The Library's electronic resources provide excellent coverage in both the sociology and the anthropology fields. A subscription to SocIndex was started in January, 2006 and is currently maintained. This is a major index to literature in the field dating back to 1895. The Library's general subject databases contain substantial information on the main subject areas of this program. For example, a subject search on "sociology" in Academic Search Premier returns 18,243 citations, 17,079 of which are for academic journal articles and 5,560 are available in full text. A subject search on "anthropology" in the same database returns 7,241 citations, 6,264 of which are for academic journal articles and 4,490 are available in full text. Other online databases the Library licenses that pertain to sociology and anthropology include: OmniFile Select, PsycInfo, Project Muse, JSTOR, Contemporary Women's Issues, and Science Direct. All databases licensed by the Library are available to faculty, staff, and students 24/7 from any Internet computer. InterLibrary Loan service is also available for citations not found in full text via the Library's resources; ILL ordering and delivery can be conducted online 24/7.

## 2. Evaluation of the total collection

### a. Strengths

The Library provides excellent electronic resources in the subject areas



relevant to this degree program, especially for an institution of its size and type. One of the Anthropology faculty members is a heavy user of the Library Reserves, a system where academic materials are cataloged, maintained, and dispensed to students in specific classes. Department faculty also take a strong interest in recommending new materials for the Library to acquire for its collection.

b. Weaknesses

Although the print collections in Sociology are sufficient for current needs, a high percentage of these materials are older than ten years.

3. Recommendations

Library print materials in the subject areas relevant to this program should continue to be upgraded with allotted budget monies. Department faculty should continue to work with their assigned Library liaison to insure that the collection is enhanced in ways that best support the curriculum and Department needs. The current high level of electronic resources should be maintained.

Library Director: Elizabeth W. Brodak



# Appendix D

## Most Recent Program Review Summary



## SYNOPSIS OF MOST RECENT PROGRAM REVIEW, 2002-2006

The most recent program review, covering the period 2002-2006, identified the following weaknesses.

First, the consolidation of enrollment gains made in the mid-1990s and slight growth since 1996-97 was both a curse and a blessing. The number of students majoring in Sociology without a concentration and with a concentration in Criminology had grown, as has the number of advisees per faculty member. The internship programs, while providing valuable opportunities for students and service to the community, were time-consuming to administer. In short, the program was straining the limits of its human resources.

Second, because the Sociology department had six faculty members and oversaw four different programs (Sociology without a concentration and three concentrations), it was a program that tended to be "spread thin." Sociology was vulnerable to the loss of faculty members. With the loss of one department faculty member to another institution and a second faculty member to administrative duties, the department was reduced to two sociologists and two anthropologists, none of which had ever supervised an internship program. The timing of the loss of these faculty members (in the spring, when it is hard to recruit for positions beginning in the fall of the same calendar year), low salaries and budget uncertainties made it difficult to replace those faculty members with people of the same caliber.

The recommendations that resulted from the 2002-06 program review were as follows.

First, it was recommended that the Sociology program be supported at present levels and expanded as resources became available.

Second, high on the list of priorities was deciding whether to continue offering Criminology as a concentration under Sociology or to create a separate four-year Criminal Justice degree; whichever direction was decided upon, it was recommended that a top-notch faculty member be recruited to teach courses and supervise the internships for both Criminology and Human Services.

In terms of staffing, it was recommended that the program resist the temptation to staff its lower division and General Education classes with temporary or adjunct faculty. Because few high schools offer more than a single general course in Sociology, college students do not typically choose sociology as a major until they are exposed to the discipline in lower division courses. Moreover, the goals of a baccalaureate education are best served by ensuring that the introductory courses are taught by qualified, dedicated, experienced teachers.

Finally, we recognized that limited funds threatened the program's ability to support current faculty and recruit new faculty. Tomlinson Library was forced to cancel

its subscription to Sociofile in December 2002, and the department has been unable to build its stock of teaching and video materials. Cuts in department funds designed to enable faculty members gather data and conduct research (rather than to present papers at professional conferences) restricted the research agendas of current faculty.

# Appendix E

## Assessment Plan and Results





## Sociology – 2007-08 Year-end Report

### SOCO 144: Marriage and Families

**Goal 1:** Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment.

**Assessment:** Ten multiple-choice questions were administered to all students.

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 70%. The average score was 69%, and the median score was 75%.

**Use of Results:** Although we are reaching the more capable students in our classes with this material, we will be working on reaching the lower-performing students in the future. Methods that have been particularly effective will be shared between instructors of the course.

**Second Means of Assessing Goal 1:** Students will be asked to answer a battery of questions on their own assessment of their knowledge on the sociological perspective and sociological theory as it pertains to social problems, as well as on the specific set of content areas covered in the course.

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 70%. The students were relatively confident in their own knowledge of sociological perspectives. The mean for the general sociological perspective was 97%, for conflict theory was 88%, for structural functionalism was 84%, for symbolic interactionism was 73%, for exchange theory was 80% and for feminist theory was 81%.

**Use of Results:** Our students generally feel confident but there are certain theories that they feel less confident about. We will work collaboratively on improving our teaching of those particular theories.

**Goal 2:** Be able to think critically and creatively.

**Assessment:** Students will complete an assignment asking them to describe the argument made by the author of an assigned text as well as how the author supported that argument.

**Results:** Our objective is an average score of three on a five-point scale laid out in the evaluation rubric. There was some confusion on the rubric to be used for this objective, but of the sections reporting, the mean score for description of conclusions was 3.3 and the mean score for describing the author's support for conclusions was 3.

**Use of Results:** While we did reach our goals here, there is certainly room for improvement. We will continue to work collaboratively to improve the critical thinking abilities of our students by sharing strategies that seem to work particularly well.

**Second Means of Assessing Goal 2:** Students will be asked to assess their own ability to recognize arguments made in written texts as well as the extent to which they feel that this course has improved that ability.

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 70%. The means show that most students rate their ability to recognize an argument as good, very good, or excellent (83%). The corresponding percentage for the ability to describe an author's primary conclusions was 78% and to describe the author's support for his/her conclusions was 82%. Perhaps more importantly, the vast majority of our students (section means of 97-98%) reported that their abilities to do these things improved as a result of this particular course.

**Use of Results:** While we would like our students to improve their critical thinking abilities further, especially as their assessment of their own abilities is higher than our assessment of their abilities, we are heartened to see that so many of them feel that their abilities have improved as a result of taking this course. We continue to work on developing these abilities in our students.

---

## **SOCO 260: General Sociology**

**Goal 1:** Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment.

**Assessment:** Twenty matching questions were administered to all students.

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 70%. The class average was 65%, and 75% of the students scored at or above 70% correct in the two sections taught.

**Use of Results:** We have discussed ways to improve student learning and re-examined the battery of questions adopted to ensure that the content and structure of our General Education courses emphasizes these basic terms and concepts.

**Second Means of Assessing Goal 1:** Students will be asked to answer a battery of questions on their own assessment of their knowledge on the sociological perspective and sociological theory.

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 70%. 80% of students rated their understanding of the application of theory as good, very good, or excellent.

**Use of Results:** We will continue to use this questionnaire and to pay particular attention to the match between the professor's assessment of abilities and the students' own assessments.

**Goal 2:** Be able to think critically and creatively.

**Assessment:** The same rubric was used in all courses to evaluate a theories and applications essay question appropriate to the course.

**Results:** The distribution of scores for the 77 students writing the essay is as follows:

A (4 points):	5
B (3 points):	11
C (2 points):	27
D (1 point):	16
F (0 points):	18

**Use of Results:** Part of the problem encountered in testing for application of theory and critical thinking is that the means of assessment we chose requires our students to write well enough to demonstrate their understanding. Some of the students who did poorly on this means of assessment may have done so because they did not write well enough to demonstrate the understanding which they did have. This is a problem which cannot be addressed easily, but perhaps it would help if the students had more opportunities to write essays in which they apply theory, and if some basic instruction on how to structure essays were provided in class.

**Second Means of Assessing Goal 2:** Students will also be asked to assess their own ability to essay calling for comprehension of theory and critical thinking.

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 70%. Of the 77 students who answered the questionnaire at the end of the course, approximately 80% rated their understanding of the application of theory as good, very good, or excellent.

**Use of Results:** We will continue to use this questionnaire and to pay particular attention to the match between the professor's assessment of abilities and the students' own assessments.

---

## **SOCO 264: Social Problems**

**Goal 1:** Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment.

**Assessment:** Ten multiple-choice questions were administered to all students.

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 70%. The average score on this battery of questions for the sections reporting was a 78%.

**Use of Results:** We are pleased with these results and feel confident that our students are learning the general sociological perspective, as well as specific theoretical perspectives. There is, of course, room for improvement and we will work collaboratively toward developing teaching methods that will further improve this score.

**Second Means of Assessing Goal 1:** Students will be asked to answer a battery of questions on their own assessment of their knowledge on the sociological perspective and sociological theory.

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 70%. 80% of students rated their understanding of the application of theory as good, very good, or excellent.

**Use of Results:** These results support the objective findings reported above. We will continue working on these goals in the future.

**Goal 2:** Be able to think critically and creatively.

**Assessment:** Students will complete an assignment asking them to discuss the argument made by the author of an assigned text, including both the author's conclusions as well as how the author supports those conclusions.

**Results:** Success is defined as an average score of three on a five-point scale laid out in the evaluation rubric. The mean score for description of conclusions was 3.45 and the mean score for describing the support for the conclusions was 3.37

**Use of Results:** These scores reflect our goals, but of course, there is always room for improvement. We will work collaboratively on strategies to improve the critical thinking skills of our students.

**Second Means of Assessing Goal 2:** Students will be asked to assess their own ability to recognize arguments made in written texts as well as the extent to which they feel that this course has improved that ability.

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 70%. Averaging the sections, most of our students (87-88%) rate their critical thinking abilities as good, very good, or excellent. Approximately 94% say that their critical thinking abilities have improved as a result of this course

**Use of Results:** While we would like our students' critical thinking to improve further, as their own assessment of their abilities is higher than our assessment of their abilities, we are heartened to see that so many of them feel that their abilities have improved as a result of taking this course. We will continue to work on developing these skills in our students.

Sociology – 2007-08

Class	Goal	Assessment	Results
<b>SOCO 144: Marriage and Families</b>	Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment.	Ten multiple-choice questions were administered to all students.  Students were asked to assess their own knowledge of sociological perspective and theory.	The average score 69%.  Scores in the various content areas ranged from 80-97%.
	Be able to think critically and recognize issues across a broad spectrum of subjects.	Students will complete an assignment asking them to describe the argument made by the author of an assigned text.  Students were asked to assess their own ability to recognize and argument and if they believe the course improved their ability to do this.	The average score was 3 (5 point scale).  The average score ranged from 78-98%.
<b>SOCO 260: General Sociology</b>	Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment	Twenty matching questions were administered to all students.  Students were asked to assess their own knowledge of sociological perspective and theory.	The class average was 65%, and 75% of the students scored at or above 70% correct in the two sections taught.  80% of students tagged their understanding as good, very good, or excellent.
	Be able to think critically and recognize issues across a broad spectrum of subjects.	The same rubric was used in all courses to evaluate a theories and applications essay question appropriate to the course.  Students were asked to assess their own ability to evaluate and essay.	The distribution of scores for students writing the essay is as follows: A (4 points): 5 B (3 points): 11 C (2 points): 27 D (1 points): 16 F (0 points): 18  80% of students tagged their understanding as good, very good, or excellent.

<b>SOCO 264: Social Problems</b>	Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment	<p>Ten multiple-choice questions were administered to all students.</p> <p>Students were asked to assess their own knowledge of sociological perspective and theory.</p>	<p>The average score was 76.8%.</p> <p>80% of students tagged their understanding as good, very good, or excellent.</p>
	Be able to think critically and recognize issues across a broad spectrum of subjects	<p>Students will complete an assignment asking them to discuss the argument made by the author of an assigned text.</p> <p>Students were asked to assess their own ability to recognize and argument and if they believe the course improved their ability to do this.</p>	<p>Scores ranged from 3.37-3.45 (5 point scale).</p> <p>The average score ranged from 87-94%.</p>

## Sociology – 2006-07 Year-end Report

### SOCO 144: Marriage and Families

**Goal 1:** Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment.

**Assessment:** Ten multiple-choice questions were administered to all students

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 75%. The average score for students in section 1 of this course was 60.3%, and the median score was 70%. For section 2 of Marriage and Families, the average score was 69.8% and the median score was 70%.

**Use of Results:** As a department, we have discussed ways to improve student learning and re-examined the battery of questions adopted to ensure that the content and structure of our General Education courses emphasizes these basic terms and concepts.

Several different strategies have been identified to improve student understanding of basic sociological theories. One professor has adopted a new textbook that comes packaged with student access to an Online Learning Center which includes modules specific to the description and application of theory. Another has redesigned his course to include class discussion of the *basic tenets* of theory with respect to topics discussed in the course (e.g., crime, mental illness, work, social problems, etc.). Given that the results indicate that we are basically meeting our goal, no major changes to our courses is indicated.

**Goal 2:** Be able to think critically and recognize issues across a broad spectrum of subjects.

**Assessment:** The same rubric was used in all courses to evaluate a theories and applications essay question appropriate to the course.

**Results:** The essays were evaluated on both Comprehension of Theory and Application of Theory. For the 54 students in section 1 of Marriage and Families, the mean score of the question testing Comprehension of Theory was 2.3, while the mean score of the question testing Critical Thinking / Application of Theory was 2.8. These scores indicate an overall score of a middling “C,” a considerable improvement over last year’s scores. The 44 students in section 2 scored an average 2.5 on Comprehension and 2.4 on Critical Thinking.

**Use of Results:** Overall, we in the department are pleased with both the scores of our students on critical thinking and comprehension of theory, and on the improvement shown in this area since the previous assessment. We will continue to bring theory to more of the substantive areas and use in-class exercises to have students apply theories in small-group situations using concrete examples.

---

### SOCO 260: General Sociology

**Goal 1:** Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment.

**Assessment:** Ten multiple-choice questions were administered to all students

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 75%. The class average was 80%, and 83% of the students scored at or above 70% correct in the two sections taught.

**Use of Results:** As a department, we have discussed ways to improve student learning and re-examined the battery of questions adopted to ensure that the content and structure of our General Education courses emphasizes these basic terms and concepts.

Several different strategies have been identified to improve student understanding of basic sociological theories. One professor has adopted a new textbook that comes packaged with student access to an Online Learning Center which includes modules specific to the description and application of theory. Another has redesigned his course to include class discussion of the *basic tenets* of theory with respect to topics discussed in the course (e.g., crime, mental illness, work, social problems, etc.). Given that the results indicate that we are basically meeting our goal, no major changes to our General Sociology courses are indicated.

**Goal 2:** Be able to think critically and recognize issues across a broad spectrum of subjects.

**Assessment:** The same rubric was used in all courses to evaluate a theories and applications essay question appropriate to the course.

**Results:** The distribution of scores for the 99 students writing the essay is as follows:

A (4 points):	7
B (3 points):	14
C (2 points):	22
D (1 point):	22
F (0 points):	34

**Use of Results:** Overall, we in the department are displeased with both the scores of our students on critical thinking and comprehension of theory in this particular course. In a personal conversation with me, the professor of the two General Sociology courses described in this report was extremely disappointed with the writing abilities of the students, and suggested that their comprehension may well have been better than their scores indicated.

---

## **SOCO 264: Social Problems**

**Goal 1:** Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment.

**Assessment:** Ten multiple-choice questions were administered to all students

**Results:** Success was defined as an average score of 75%. The mean and median scores for the 36 students in section 1 were 76.7% and 80%, respectively; for the 39 students in section 2, the mean and median scores were 73.4% and 70%, respectively.

**Use of Results:** As a department, we have discussed ways to improve student learning and re-examined the battery of questions adopted to ensure that the content and structure of our General Education courses emphasizes these basic terms and concepts.

Several different strategies have been identified to improve student understanding of basic sociological theories. A strategy with promise is to include in the course an ongoing class discussion of the *basic tenets* of theory with respect to topics discussed in the course (e.g., crime, mental illness, work, social problems, etc.). Given that the results indicate that we are basically meeting our goal, however, no major changes to our Social Problems courses are indicated.

**Goal 2:** Be able to think critically and recognize issues across a broad spectrum of subjects.

**Assessment:** The same rubric was used in all courses to evaluate a theories and applications essay question appropriate to the course.

**Results:**

	Comprehension	Application
Section 1		
Mean	2.0	1.2
Median	2.0	2.0
Section 2		
Mean	2.2	2.2
Median	2.0	2.0

**Use of Results:** Overall, we in the department are not entirely pleased with the scores of our students on critical thinking and comprehension of theory in this and our other General Education courses. We continue to worry that our students write so poorly that they have a difficult time expressing their understanding of the content and making a good argument based on critical thinking.

---



Sociology – 2006-07			
Class	Goal	Assessment	Results
<b>SOCO 144: Marriage and Families</b>	Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment.	Ten multiple-choice questions were administered to all students	The average score for students ranged from this course was 60%-70%.
	Be able to think critically and recognize issues across a broad spectrum of subjects.	The same rubric was used in all courses to evaluate a theories and applications essay question appropriate to the course.	Scores ranged from 2.4-2.8.
<b>SOCO 260: General Sociology</b>	Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment	Ten multiple-choice questions were administered to all students	The class average was 80%, and 83% of the students scored at or above 70% correct in the two sections taught.
	Be able to think critically and recognize issues across a broad spectrum of subjects.	The same rubric was used in all courses to evaluate a theories and applications essay question appropriate to the course.	The distribution of scores for the 99 students writing the essay is as follows: A (4 points): 7 B (3 points): 14 C (2 points): 22 D (1 points): 22 F (0 points): 34
<b>SOCO 264: Social Problems</b>	Understand the complexities of our social, political and economic environment	Ten multiple-choice questions were administered to all students	The average score for students in section 1 was 76.7% and 73.4% for the students in section 2.
	Be able to think critically and recognize issues across a broad spectrum of subjects	The same rubric was used in all courses to evaluate a theories and applications essay question appropriate to the course	Scores ranged from 1.2-2.2.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

Assessment Record for :

Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period: 2005 2006  
Date Submitted: 18-Oct-06

Includes Assessment reports for those  
Instructional Programs listed below:

<u>Title of Instructional Degree Program</u>	<u>Degree Level</u> (Associate, Bachelors, Masters, etc.)
Undergraduate Sociology Program	B.A.



Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair or Faculty Assessment Representative

**Mesa State College  
Assessment Report**

**Degree Program:**

**Undergraduate Sociology Program**

Assessment Period Covered: 2005 to 2006

Date Submitted: 18-Oct-06

**Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose Linkage:**

**Institutional Mission Reference:**

A principal focus of Mesa State College's curricular program is undergraduate education in the liberal arts and sciences... (p. 5 of catalog).

**College/University Goal(s) Supported:**

...all graduates of baccalaureate level will have developed a depth of understanding in their major field.

**Intended Education (Student) Outcomes:**

1. Graduates of the program will demonstrate a solid general understanding of the range of topics in Sociology.

2. Graduates demonstrate an ability to carry out all stages of a research project, including data collection and analysis, application of theory and presentation of results.

3. Students will leave internships with job skills enabling them to enter careers in which they can use their degree. Because the internships vary, the specific job skills learned are dependent upon the internship itself.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period Covered: 2005 to 2006

Date Submitted: 18-Oct-06

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

1. Graduates of the program will demonstrate a solid general understanding of the range of topics in Sociology.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

Ia. The average score of the graduates of the BA program in Sociology on the MFAT will be above 70% (140 points). All graduating students will take the exam.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

The mean overall score was 153 (77%).

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

While this is a satisfactory score, we would like to improve it. We plan to engage in a curriculum mapping project aimed at better coordination of our courses in the hopes of improving these scores. However, because students know that MFAT scores don't impact graduation, we realize that motivating them to do their best on this test is a challenge.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

Ib. In an exit interview, at least 80% of graduating students of the BA program in Sociology will report having a solid understanding of topics with which sociology deals and, where appropriate, a solid understanding of their concentration. All graduating students will fill out an exit interview. See attached interview form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

A total of 10 exit interviews were completed. All 10 students reported a solid understanding of Sociology. Of the 6 students graduating with a concentration in Human Services or Criminology, 3 expressed reservations about the quality and extent of coursework in their concentrations.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We had hoped to build the Human Services concentration with a new hire last year, but unfortunately, the search was failed in the spring. We are currently conducting another search for a Sociologist specializing in Applied Sociology and/or Human Services. As the new Criminal Justice program has replaced the Sociology-Criminology concentration, we have little control over future coursework in that area.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period Covered: 2005 to 2006

Date Submitted: 18-Oct-06

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

2. Graduates demonstrate an ability to carry out all stages of a research project, including data collection and analysis, application of theory and presentation of results.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

2a. Students with an anthropology concentration will produce an ethnographic project in the mandatory Ethnographic Methods course. These projects will be evaluated by anthropology faculty. 80% of them will be judged as demonstrating competence in the field of cultural anthropology. See attached evaluation form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

Unfortunately, the only Sociology-Anthropology graduate this year took the course many years ago.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We think that the best use of "results" in this case is to work on promoting the Anthropology concentration. We are developing an informational session to be held during registration each spring and fall, aimed at introducing students to the program and encouraging them to consider Sociology as their major or minor.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

2b. Students will write a final paper applying classical theory to current topics in the classical theory course. A random sample of graduating students' papers (10-12 papers) will be evaluated by sociology faculty. 80% of these papers will be judged as demonstrating acceptable skill, as defined by the sociology faculty, in applying classical theory to contemporary topics. See attached evaluation form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

Papers from 17 students were assessed. 94% demonstrated both adequate comprehension of theory and adequate application of theory to a contemporary topic. The mean score for comprehension was 3.9 and for application was 3.7 (on a 5-point scale).

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

These results indicate that students who go on to graduate have a solid knowledge of theory and ability to apply theory to contemporary topics. Revisions of the assignment include more information on critical thinking and more opportunities to write drafts in order to improve the ultimate application.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period Covered: 2005 to 2006

Date Submitted: 18-Oct-06

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

3. Students will leave internships with job skills enabling them to enter careers in which they can use their degree. Because the internships vary, the specific job skills learned are dependent upon the internship itself.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

3a. Supervisors will provide a written assessment of their interns. At least 75% of supervisors will grade their interns with B or above. At least half of supervisors will state a willingness to recommend their interns for a similar job. See attached form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

Ten students completed internships. 80% received an A and 10% received a B from their supervisors. 90% of interns were recommended for a similar job, and in fact, one student was hired where she interned.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

While we are satisfied with these results, a new advisor has taken over the supervision of the internships. He plans to change the pre-internship screening process to ensure that students are prepared to enter their specific internships.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

3b. Students will provide a written assessment of their internship experience. At least 75% of students doing internships will rate their experience as satisfactory or very satisfactory. At least half of students doing internships will report that their internship experience will help in their search for employment. See attached form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

Of the 10 students who completed internships, 50% rated their internships very satisfactory with another 40% rating their internships satisfactory. 90% of the interns felt that the internship experience would help them in their search for employment.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We are proud of these results, but hope to continue improving outcomes through the pre-internship screening process mentioned above.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

Assessment Record for :

Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period: September-04 September-05  
Date Submitted: 10-Oct-05

Includes Assessment reports for those  
Instructional Programs listed below:

<u>Title of Instructional Degree Program</u>	<u>Degree Level</u> (Associate, Bachelors, Masters, etc.)
Undergraduate Sociology Program	B.A.



Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair or Faculty Assessment Representative

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

**Degree Program:**

**Undergraduate Sociology Program**

Assessment Period Covered: September-04 to September-05

Date Submitted: 10-Oct-05

**Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose Linkage:**

**Institutional Mission Reference:**

A principal focus of Mesa State College's curricular program is undergraduate education in the liberal arts and sciences... (p. 5 of catalog).

**College/University Goal(s) Supported:**

...all graduates of baccalaureate level will have developed a depth of understanding in their major field.

**Intended Education (Student) Outcomes:**

1. Graduates of the program will demonstrate a solid general understanding of the range of topics in Sociology.

2. Graduates demonstrate an ability to carry out all stages of a research project, including data collection and analysis, application of theory and presentation of results.

3. Students will develop job skills in internships which will help them to enter careers in which they can use their degree. Because the internships vary, the specific job skills learned are dependent upon the internship itself.



Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

**Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program**

Assessment Period Covered: September-04 to September-05  
Date Submitted: 10-Oct-05

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

1. Graduates of the program will demonstrate a solid general understanding of the range of topics in Sociology.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

1a. The average score of the graduates of the BA program in Sociology on the MFAT will be above the 70%. All graduating students will take the exam.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

The average score on the total test was 158.3 (79%). Scores ranged from high of 92% to a low of 67%.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We are pleased with this result and will continue to work at providing students with a solid background in Sociology.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

1b. In an exit interview, at least 80% of graduating students of the BA program in Sociology will report having a solid understanding of topics with which sociology deals and, where appropriate, a solid understanding of their concentration. All graduating students will fill out an exit interview. See attached interview form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

100% of majors reported a solid understanding of sociology but only 60% reported a solid understanding of their concentrations. The negative comments on concentrations had to do with lack of courses and faculty in Human Services and Criminology, and the lack of a major in Anthropology.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

While we are happy with the outcomes regarding sociology as a whole, we are concerned about the concentrations. We were able to hire a sociologist specializing in criminology beginning in Fall 2005, which should address some of these needs. We will be doing a search for a sociologist with an applied background this year.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period Covered: September-04 to September-05  
Date Submitted: 10-Oct-05

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

2. Graduates demonstrate an ability to carry out all stages of a research project, including data collection and analysis, application of theory and presentation of results.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

2a. Students with an anthropology concentration will produce an ethnographic project in the mandatory Ethnographic Methods course. These projects will be evaluated by anthropology faculty. 80% of them will be judged as demonstrating competence in the field of cultural anthropology. See attached evaluation form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

Due to a bureaucratic error, this will get under way next academic year.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

2b. Students will write a final paper applying classical theory to current topics in the classical theory course. A random sample of graduating students' papers (10-12 papers) will be evaluated by sociology faculty. 80% of these papers will be judged as demonstrating acceptable skill, as defined by the sociology faculty, in applying classical theory to contemporary topics. See attached evaluation form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

83% of papers were judged acceptable in their comprehension of theory (average of 3.42 out of 5) and 83% were judged acceptable in their analysis of the issue from a theoretical perspective (average of 3.17 out of 5).

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We are satisfied with these results as they show that our graduates are able to understand and apply classical theoretical concepts to contemporary issues. We would like to see improvement on the quality of the papers and the paper assignment has been amended in hopes of accomplishing this goal.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period Covered: September-04 to September-05  
Date Submitted: 10-Oct-05

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

3. Students will develop job skills in internships which will help them to enter careers in which they can use their degree. Because the internships vary, the specific job skills learned are dependent upon the internship itself.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

3a. Supervisors will provide a written assessment of their interns. At least 75% of supervisors will grade their interns with an A or B. At least half of supervisors will state a willingness to recommend their interns for a similar job. See attached form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

23 students completed internships. 87% of the interns received an 'A' and 13% received a 'B.' All interns were recommended for a similar job.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We are very satisfied with these results and will work to maintain the quality of the internship program.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

3b. Students will provide a written assessment of their internship experience. At least 75% of students doing internships will rate their experience as satisfactory or very satisfactory. At least half of students doing internships will report that their internship experience will help in their search for employment. See attached form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

86% of the interns rates their experience as very satisfactory with the remaining 14% rating the internship as satisfactory. All the interns said that the internship experience would help in their search for employment.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We are very satisfied with these results and will work to maintain the quality of the internship program.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

Assessment Record for :

Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period: September-03 September-04  
Date Submitted: 4-Oct-04

Includes Assessment reports for those  
Instructional Programs listed below:

<u>Title of Instructional Degree Program</u>	<u>Degree Level</u> (Associate, Bachelors, Masters, etc.)
Undergraduate Sociology Program	B.A.



Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair or Faculty Assessment Representative

**Mesa State College  
Assessment Report**

**Degree Program:**

**Undergraduate Sociology Program**

Assessment Period Covered: September-03 to September-04

Date Submitted: 4-Oct-04

**Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose Linkage:**

**Institutional Mission Reference:**

A principal focus of Mesa State College's curricular program is undergraduate education in the liberal arts and sciences... (p. 5 of catalog).

**College/University Goal(s) Supported:**

...all graduates of baccalaureate level will have developed a depth of understanding in their major field.

**Intended Education (Student) Outcomes:**

1. Graduates of the program will demonstrate a solid general understanding of the range of topics in Sociology.

2. Graduates demonstrate an ability to carry out all stages of a sociological research project, including data collection and analysis, application of theory and presentation of results.

3. Students will develop job skills in internships which will help them to enter careers in which they can use their degree.

**Mesa State College  
Assessment Report**

**Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program**

Assessment Period Covered: September-03 to September-04  
Date Submitted: 04-Oct-04

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

1. Graduates of the program will demonstrate a solid general understanding of the range of topics in Sociology.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

1a. The average score of the graduates of the BA program in Sociology on the MFAT will be above the 50th percentile compared to national results. All graduating students will take the exam.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

Due to a bureaucratic error, sociology majors with an emphasis in criminology did not take the correct MFAT. For the remaining students, the average MFAT score was in the 93rd percentile. Our students were in the 90th percentile for core sociology and the 92nd percentile for critical thinking. The subject area scores ranged from the 69th percentile to the 98th

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We believe these results show that we are providing a high quality education to our students. We also believe that the replacement of our full-time criminologist will further increase our lowest subscore.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

1b. In an exit interview, at least 75% of graduating students of the BA program in Sociology will report having a solid understanding of topics with which sociology deals and, where appropriate, a solid understanding of their concentration. All graduating students will fill out an exit interview. See attached interview form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

Eighteen of the 25 graduates in 2003-04 completed an exit interview. All 18 reported a solid understanding of the core concepts of sociology. Of the 14 students for whom the question was applicable, eight believed they had received a solid understanding of their concentrations.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

Our students concur that they are receiving a solid education in sociology. Concerns over the concentration in Criminology were expressed, and the hope is that the new hire in the Administration of Justice position will address those students' legitimate concerns.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period Covered: September-03 to September-04  
Date Submitted: 04-Oct-04

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

2. Graduates demonstrate an ability to carry out all stages of a sociological research project, including data collection and analysis, application of theory and presentation of results.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

2a. Students will write a final paper in the research methods course that gauges their ability to apply social science methods to a research topic. A random sample of graduating students' papers (10-12 papers) will be evaluated by sociology faculty and 75% of them will be judged as demonstrating acceptable skill, as defined by the sociology faculty. See attached rubric.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

A research proposal is currently required only for the Methods courses taught in the spring. Of the five graduating seniors enrolled in those courses, all five submitted acceptable research proposals.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

In the future, we will require final papers of students in all three Methods courses so that all graduating seniors may be judged on this criterion.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

2b. Students will write a final paper applying classical theory to current topics in the classical theory course. A random sample of graduating students' papers (10-12 papers) will be evaluated by sociology faculty. 75% of these papers will be judged as demonstrating acceptable skill, as defined by the sociology faculty, in applying classical theory to contemporary topics. See attached rubric.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

All of the graduating students were judged to have demonstrated acceptable skill at applying classical theory to contemporary topics. However, there were sometimes problems in the presentation of arguments.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We will continue to work with students on the application of theory and will emphasize the clear written communication of that application.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

**Degree Program:** Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period Covered: September-03 to September-04  
Date Submitted: 04-Oct-04

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

3. Students will develop job skills in internships which will help them to enter careers in which they can use their degree.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

3a. Supervisors will provide a written assessment of their interns. At least half of supervisors will grade their interns with an A or B. At least half of supervisors will state a willingness to recommend their interns for a similar job. See attached form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

All internship supervisors graded their interns with an A or a B. All supervisors said that they would recommend their interns for a similar job.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We are proud of these results and will work to maintain them in the future.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

3b. Students will provide a written assessment of their internship experience. At least 75% of students doing internships will rate their experience as satisfactory or very satisfactory. At least half of students doing internships will report that their internship experience will help in their search for employment. See attached form.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

All of the students doing internships rated their experiences as satisfactory or very satisfactory. All of the students also reported the opinion that their internship would help with their job search. (Note: Some students filled out an old form without

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

We are proud of these results and will work to maintain them in the future.



**Mesa State College  
Assessment Report**

Assessment Record for :

Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period: September-02 September-03  
Date Submitted: 26-Mar-03

Includes Assessment reports for those  
Instructional Programs listed below:

<u>Title of Instructional Degree Program</u>	<u>Degree Level</u> (Associate, Bachelors, Masters, etc.)
Undergraduate Sociology Program	B.A.



Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair or Faculty Assessment Representative

**Mesa State College  
Assessment Report**

**Degree Program:**

**Undergraduate Sociology Program**

Assessment Period Covered: September-02 to September-03  
Date Submitted: 26-Mar-03

**Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose Linkage:**

**Institutional Mission Reference:**

A principal focus of Mesa State College's curricular program is undergraduate education in the liberal arts and science (p. 5 of catalog).

**College/University Goal(s) Supported:**

...all graduates of baccalaureate level will have developed a depth of understanding in their major field.

**Intended Education (Student) Outcomes:**

1. Graduates of the program will demonstrate a solid general understanding of the range of topics with which Sociology deals.

2. Graduates demonstrate an ability to carry out all stages of a research project, including data collection and analysis, application of theory and presentation of results.

3. Students will use their degrees outside of the classroom in internships that provide them with useful employment experience.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program

Assessment Period Covered: September-02 to September-03  
Date Submitted: 26-Mar-03

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

1. Graduates of the program will demonstrate a solid general understanding of the range of topics with which Sociology deals.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

1a. The average score of the graduates of the BA program in Sociology on the MFAT will be above the 50th percentile compared to national results.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

1a. As a group, recent graduates have consistently scored in the top 1/3 of comparable graduates. Individuals have scored as high as the 99th percentile. However, some subfields show relative weaknesses.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

1a. Faculty will continue to focus upon our subfield strengths and will develop new courses and revise current courses in order to address the weaknesses, to the extent that resources allow.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

1b. In an exit interview, most graduating students of the BA program in Sociology will report feeling confident in their knowledge of the field.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

1b. Exit interviews are currently being developed and will be pretested in Spring 2003.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

1b. Sociology faculty will make adjustments to the program where needed, as resources allow.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

**Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program**

Assessment Period Covered: September-02 to September-03  
Date Submitted: 26-Mar-03

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

2. Graduates demonstrate an ability to carry out all stages of a research project, including data collection and analysis, application of theory and presentation of results.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

2a. Students will write a final paper in the research methods course that gauges their ability to apply social science methods to a research topic. A random sample of these papers will be evaluated by sociology faculty and 75% of them will be judged as demonstrating acceptable skill, as defined by the sociology faculty.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

2a. This will be implemented in the 2003-2004 academic year.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

2a. Adjustments will be made according to the results.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

2b. Students will write a final paper applying classical theory to current topics in the classical theory course. A random sample of these papers will be evaluated by sociology faculty. 75% of these papers will be judged as demonstrating acceptable skill, as defined by the sociology faculty, in applying classical theory to contemporary topics.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

2b. This will be implemented in the 2003-2004 academic year.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

2b. Adjustments will be made according to the results.

Mesa State College  
Assessment Report

**Degree Program: Undergraduate Sociology Program**

Assessment Period Covered: September-02 to September-03  
Date Submitted: 26-Mar-03

**Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

NOTE: There should be one form C for each intended outcome on form B. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

3. Students will use their degrees outside of the classroom in internships that provide them with useful employment experience.

**First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

3a. Supervisors provide a written assessment of their interns. At least half of supervisors will state a willingness to recommend their interns for a similar job.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

3a. Supervisor assessments indicate a range of experiences. The majority of supervisors wish to remain a part of the internship program, which indicates a generally positive experience.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

3a. Modifications and improvements in the internship programs are an ongoing process.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**Means of Program Assessment and Criteria for Success:**

3b. Students provide a written assessment of their internship experience. At least 75% of students doing internships will rate their experience as satisfactory or very satisfactory.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

3b. Quantitative questions will be added to the internship evaluation forms. Qualitative answers indicate a range of experiences.

**Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program**

3b. Faculty have used and will continue to use these results to improve the internship program.

### Summary of Exit Interviews, Spring 2006

A total of 10 exit interviews were returned, with the following breakdown by major:

Sociology, no concentration:	3
Social Science	1
Sociology, Criminology	5
Sociology, Human Services	1

All 10 respondents indicated that they felt they would graduate with a solid understanding of the topics with which sociology deals.

Of the six students earning concentrations in either Criminology or Human Services, however, three expressed reservations about the quality and extent of the coursework specific to those concentrations. The deletion of the concentration in Criminology means, in effect, that program development and staffing is now the responsibility of those involved in the new Criminal Justice degree program. We in the Sociology department certainly hope that our students majoring in Sociology with a concentration in Criminology will "graduate with a solid understanding" of the field, but there is little we can do at this point to ensure that outcome.

As noted above, the respondent graduating with a concentration in Human Services registered a similar concern. This student complained that only one class dealt specifically with the area of Human Services. Our search for a sociologist in the area of Human Services was failed in the spring, and we hope to remedy the problem with a successful hire this year. Without a faculty member to develop that program and offer new courses, however, the substance of that concentration will languish.

As to whether or not the courses met students' needs and prepared them for their personal and professional goals, the answer provided by these students is a qualified "yes." Of the five students graduating with a concentration in Criminology, three answered (literally) "yes and no," being slightly disappointed with the offerings in Criminology but well prepared in Sociology. The students graduating with degrees in Sociology, Social Science, and Sociology with a concentration in Human Services responded that they felt very well prepared.

Finally, eight of the ten students reported seeing an academic advisor and being happy with the advice they got; they remaining two students did not feel the need of academic advising and planned their programs on their own.

## Sociology Exit Interview

As a part of the process of assessing the sociology major, we would like to obtain information on your experience as a sociology major. Participation is completely voluntary but we would appreciate your input as the information will be used to assess and improve the program. Your answers are not anonymous but they are confidential and will be used only within the discipline.

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability and return the form to Cathy Rickley in the SBS office when you are finished. If you would like to discuss your experiences further, please feel free to make an appointment with any of the sociology faculty.

1. What is your name?
2. What is your expected date of graduation?
3. Contact information:
4. Are you graduating with a straight sociology degree, a concentration in human services, a concentration in anthropology, or a concentration in criminology?
5. Why did you decide on this major/concentration?
6. Do you feel that you will graduate with a solid understanding of the topics with which sociology deals? Please explain your answer.  
 Yes       No
7. If you have a concentration, do you feel that you will graduate with a solid understanding of that concentration? Please explain your answer.  
 Yes       No

8. Do you feel that the courses offered met your needs? Are there additional courses you would like to see offered? Please explain your answer.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      \_\_\_\_\_ No

9. As you near graduation, do you feel prepared for your personal and professional goals? Please explain your answer.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      \_\_\_\_\_ No

10. During your tenure here at Mesa State, did you seek out advising? If so, what was the quality of that advising? Please explain your answer.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      \_\_\_\_\_ No

11. What words of advice would you give to someone just starting out in the sociology program?



**Mesa State College  
Assessment Report (Student Internships)**

Internships completed:  
10

Grade received:  
A – 8  
B – 1  
C – 1

Student rating of internship experience  
Very satisfactory – 5  
Satisfactory – 4  
Not satisfied – 1

9 out of 10 students felt that their internship experience would help them in their search for employment.

Mesa State College

Subject: Rating Scales for Internship

In order to properly arrive at a grade for the student, it is necessary for the immediate supervisor to evaluate the work accomplished.

Please rate the student on a scale of 10 to 1, (10) ranking highest, and (1) lowest. Circle the appropriate answer.

You are encouraged to make the appropriate comments in the space provided at the end of the rating categories.

Student's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

1. Attendance (Absence and punctuality) 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Number of times absent

2. Initiative (Does the student seek responsibility) 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

3. Attitude (From your personal observation, rank the interest exhibited by the student toward assigned duties) 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

4. Cooperation (Was the student cooperative or reluctant to assume new or additional assignments?) 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

5. Progress and performance (Rate the student on overall progress and performance) 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

6. Appearance (In your opinion, did the student's appearance meet with your criteria for the job assignment?) 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

7. Character (Indicate your rating of the student's integrity, honesty, etc.) 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Mesa State College

8. Communication 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  
(Verbal and written. Does the student communicate clearly, concisely, and in an appropriate manner?)

9. Overall Rating Superior (A) \_\_\_\_\_  
Excellent (B) \_\_\_\_\_  
Average (C) \_\_\_\_\_  
Poor (D) \_\_\_\_\_  
(In which of the following categories would you assign a letter grade for the student?)

10. Written Comments:

11. Recommendation Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
(If you were in a position to recommend this student for a position comparable to his or her present assignment, would you?)

12. Duties performed. Specifically, what were the duties required of the student?

Mesa State College

13. Recommendations and comments. In order to properly evaluate the student and the program, please indicate any comments that would be relevant to improving the student's capabilities and/or deficiencies.

Name of Rater \_\_\_\_\_ Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Please return the completed rating scale for this student to Dr. John Redifer, Department of Social Sciences, Mesa State College, 1100 North Ave., Grand Junction, CO 81501

Mesa State College

Subject: Student Evaluation of Internship

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Host Agency \_\_\_\_\_

Agency Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Please address the following questions. Answer in the space provided. Give your responses some thought.

1. How satisfied were you with your internship experience?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Very satisfied  
\_\_\_\_\_ Satisfied  
\_\_\_\_\_ Not satisfied
  
2. What do you consider to be the most important things that you learned during the field experience? Why?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
3. What was your most memorable learning experience during the internship? Why?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
4. What did you like most and what did you like least about the internship? Why?

Mesa State College

5. Do you think your internship experience will help you in your search for employment?

Yes

No

6. Comment on the quality of supervision that you received from the agency supervisor (did your agency supervisor meet or not meet your needs?)

7. What suggestions do you have for improving the quality of this internship?

Grade	CONTENT		PRESENTATION	
	Comprehension	Analysis	Organization	Grammar
A - Excellent 5	24,25 Demonstrates superior comprehension of the topic; arguments supported with sound generalizations and with substantial, specific and relevant details and examples; content never strays from thesis	24, 25 Superior and original thesis; thesis provides a strong response to the question at hand; points of argument clearly defined; presents several points that are not obvious to a reader of the assigned text; all arguments and examples support thesis.	24, 25 Unusually clear plan related to thesis; arguments clearly laid out in introduction; each paragraph starts with clear topic sentence; paragraphs follow in logical order; smooth transition between paragraphs; strong conclusion.	24,25 Sentences skillfully constructed; excellent word choice, precise yet engaging; clarity and effectiveness of expression promoted by good use of punctuation; no or extremely minor spelling mistakes.
B - Good 4	21,22, 23 Demonstrates good comprehension of the topic but perhaps misconstrues some aspects of it in good faith. Provides some details and examples but might be of dubious relevance; content occasionally strays from thesis.	21, 22, 23 Thesis that provides an answer to the question at hand; points of argument clearly defined; presents several points that seem obvious to any reader of the assigned text but nonetheless answer the question; all arguments and examples support the thesis.	21, 22, 23 Introduction generally makes direction of essay clear as it relates to thesis; arguments mentioned in introduction but not always clear as to how author will defend them; topic sentences present but they are sometime not entirely clear; paragraphs follow each other in a logical manner but overall essay could be slightly reorganized; transitions between paragraphs need to be smoother; good conclusion.	21,22,23 Sentences generally well constructed; flow of communication only occasionally hampered by unusual punctuation; minor errors in word form or occasional weakness in word choice; minor spelling mistakes; tone of paper is adequate to topic.
C - Average 3	18, 19, 20 Demonstrates some understanding of the topic but seems unsure, confused or unclear about some elements and it is not clear how much of the reading was comprehended; provides few examples and/or the examples seem irrelevant or extremely general; strays frequently off topic.	Obvious thesis that addresses the question in the most general manner; points of argument very general that any reader of the assigned text would find it obvious; arguments and examples support the overall thesis but sometime seem to contradict the thesis or need more specificity.	18, 19, 20 - Introduction needs direction and reorganization; arguments are presented but not well defined or entirely clear; order of the paper needs improvement as paragraphs seem to jump from topic to topic; paragraphs lack clear topic sentences; transitions between paragraphs are poor and sometimes confuse the reader; fail but obvious conclusion.	18, 19, 20 - Sentences adequate but could use more polish; sentences often wordy; minor errors in sentence mechanics such as tense, subject-verb agreement, pronouns, verbs, etc.; flow of communication often hampered by unusual punctuation; word choice is imprecise or poor; frequent spelling errors; tone of paper seems unusual for topic but does not hinder communication.
D - Poor 2	15, 16, 17 Poor comprehension of topic that suggests failure to read the assigned material and/or attend class; provides minimal examples and detail and these are irrelevant or unrelated; much of essay seems off topic.	15, 16, 17 Essay lacks a thesis; points of argument are difficult to discern; essay indicates lack of comprehension of assigned text; analysis is irrelevant to question or internally inconsistent; no examples to illustrate arguments.	15, 16, 17 - Arguments in support of thesis are not apparent in the introduction; paragraphs lack topic sentences; no logical order to paragraphs and/or sections are redundant; incoherent transitions between paragraphs; poor conclusion.	15, 16, 17 - Sentences poorly constructed and hard to follow; poor word choice that confuses the reader; numerous errors in sentence mechanics; poor punctuation that confuses the reader; numerous spelling mistakes; inconsistent and inappropriate tone.
F - Failing 1	12, 13, 14 Unacceptable, complete lack of comprehension of the topic, no examples or detail; much of essay is unrelated to central thesis of paper	12, 13, 14 Essay has no thesis; fails to address question at hand; provides no examples.	12, 13, 14 - Introduction unclear; arguments not defined in introduction; paragraphs lack topic sentences; essay is disorganized and confusing; incoherent transitions; no conclusion or perfunctory conclusion.	12, 13, 14 - Substandard sentence construction that confuses the reader; substandard word choice and limited vocabulary that confuses the reader; numerous mechanical errors; frequent spelling errors; substandard punctuation that hinders the flow of communication; inconsistent or inappropriate tone.

# Classical Theory + Anthropology Paper Assessment

Paper Title	Comprehension of theory	Analysis of issue	Organization	Grammar
Gender Socialization	4	4	4	4
Sexuo - Economic relationship	4	4	4	3
Georg Simmel	3	3	3	3
Women and Economics	5	5	4	4
Ritualization and Symbolism	5	5	5	4
Three Ideal Types of Authority	3	3	3	3
Gays in the Military	3	3	3	3
Bureaucracy	4	3	3	3
Domestic Violence and Gilman	4	3	3	3
Solidarity Surrounding Terrorism	5	5	5	5
Bureaucracy and American Police Departments	3	3	3	5
Relationships Between Church and State	4	4	4	4
Binge Drinking	5	5	4	4
Violence Against Women	4	3	3	3
An application of Terrorism	2	2	2	2
J.S. Military Suicides in Iraq	4	3	3	5
Same-Xes Marriage	5	5	5	5
Mean	3.94118	3.70588	3.58824	3.70588
Median	4	3	3	4
N=17				



## Upper-Division Sociology Self-Assessment Data

Course/Semester	Communication Skills				Critical Thinking			
	Ability		Improvement		Ability		Improvement	
Religion / Spring 08	Excellent	3	Quite a bit	3	Excellent	2	Quite a bit	5
	Very good	7	Somewhat	8	Very good	6	Somewhat	7
	Good	10	Slightly	6	Good	8	Slightly	4
	Adequate	0	Didn't need	0	Adequate	0	Didn't need	0
	Poor	0	Needed but none	1	Poor	0	Needed but none	0
Political / Fall 07	Excellent	1	Quite a bit	9	Excellent	1	Quite a bit	10
	Very good	14	Somewhat	7	Very good	12	Somewhat	5
	Good	3	Slightly	2	Good	4	Slightly	3
	Adequate	0	Didn't need	0	Adequate	1	Didn't need	0
	Poor	0	Needed but none	0	Poor	0	Needed but none	0
Gender / Spring 08	Excellent	0	Quite a bit	0	Excellent	1	Quite a bit	2
	Very good	1	Somewhat	4	Very good	2	Somewhat	4
	Good	3	Slightly	2	Good	3	Slightly	0
	Adequate	2	Didn't need	0	Adequate	0	Didn't need	0
	Poor	0	Needed but none	0	Poor	0	Needed but none	0
Movements / Spring 08	Excellent	0	Quite a bit	3	Excellent	1	Quite a bit	1
	Very good	5	Somewhat	2	Very good	5	Somewhat	4
	Good	1	Slightly	2	Good	1	Slightly	2
	Adequate	1	Didn't need	0	Adequate	0	Didn't need	0
	Poor	0	Needed but none	0	Poor	0	Needed but none	0
Inequality / Fall 07	Excellent	1	Quite a bit	1	Excellent	1	Quite a bit	3
	Very good	3	Somewhat	4	Very good	1	Somewhat	1
	Good	1	Slightly	0	Good	3	Slightly	1
	Adequate	0	Didn't need	0	Adequate	0	Didn't need	0
	Poor	0	Needed but none	0	Poor	0	Needed but none	0
Classical / Fall 07	Excellent	1	Quite a bit	6	Excellent	3	Quite a bit	8
	Very good	10	Somewhat	4	Very good	8	Somewhat	5
	Good	4	Slightly	6	Good	2	Slightly	0
	Adequate	2	Didn't need	0	Adequate	0	Didn't need	0
	Poor	0	Needed but none	1	Poor	0	Needed but none	0
Overall (number)	Excellent	6	Quite a bit	22	Excellent	9	Quite a bit	29
	Very good	40	Somewhat	29	Very good	34	Somewhat	26
	Good	22	Slightly	18	Good	21	Slightly	10
	Adequate	5	Didn't need	0	Adequate	1	Didn't need	0
	Poor	0	Needed but none	2	Poor	0	Needed but none	0
Overall (percent)	Excellent	8.2	Quite a bit	31	Excellent	14	Quite a bit	45
	Very good	55	Somewhat	41	Very good	52	Somewhat	40
	Good	30	Slightly	25	Good	32	Slightly	15
	Adequate	6.8	Didn't need	0	Adequate	1.5	Didn't need	0
	Poor	0	Needed but none	2.8	Poor	0	Needed but none	0

## Upper-Division Sociology Self-Assessment Data

Course/Semester	Communication Skills				Critical Thinking			
	Ability		Improvement		Ability		Improvement	
Overall (number)	Excellent	6	Quite a bit	22	Excellent	9	Quite a bit	29
	Very good	40	Somewhat	29	Very good	34	Somewhat	26
	Good	22	Slightly	18	Good	21	Slightly	10
	Adequate	5	Didn't need	0	Adequate	1	Didn't need	0
	Poor	0	Needed but none	2	Poor	0	Needed but none	0
Overall (percent)	Excellent	8.2	Quite a bit	31	Excellent	14	Quite a bit	45
	Very good	55	Somewhat	41	Very good	52	Somewhat	40
	Good	30	Slightly	25	Good	32	Slightly	15
	Adequate	6.8	Didn't need	0	Adequate	1.5	Didn't need	0
	Poor	0	Needed but none	2.8	Poor	0	Needed but none	0

# Appendix F

## Faculty Vitae



# CLARE L. BOULANGER

**CURRENT ADDRESS:** Social and Behavioral Sciences  
Mesa State College  
1100 North Avenue  
Grand Junction, CO 81501-3122  
*Phone:* (970) 248-1886 (office)  
(970) 243-4998 (home)  
*Email:* [boulange@mesastate.edu](mailto:boulange@mesastate.edu)

## EDUCATION:

**Ph.D., Social/Cultural Anthropology, University of Minnesota, June 1991.** Dissertation title: "Workers are one race': constructive relations in the West Malaysian workforce."

**M.A., Social/Cultural Anthropology, University of Minnesota, June 1984.** Concentration in U.S. Studies.

**B.A. with majors in both Anthropology and Studio Art, State University of New York at Plattsburgh, May 1980.**

## TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

1993-present **Professor of Anthropology, Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Mesa State College (Associate Professor from 1997-2004, Assistant Professor from 1993-1997)**

Courses taught include Cultural Anthropology (lower-division), World Prehistory (lower-division), U.S. as a Foreign Culture, Regional Study: Southeast Asia, Gender & Culture, Applied Anthropology, Language & Culture, World Ethnicity & Nationalism, Medical Anthropology, and Globalization & Culture Change. Responsible for course design, text selection, testing, and grading.

1990-91 **Logan Teaching Fellow, Department of Anthropology, Beloit College**  
Taught two sections of Society & Culture, Fall 1990; one section of Society & Culture, plus Woman, Culture, & Society, Spring 1991. Responsible for course design, text selection, testing, and grading.

1981-84 **Teaching Assistant, Department of Anthropology, University of Minnesota**  
Led discussion sections for Introduction to Social/Cultural Anthropology, devised and graded tests and assignments. Served one quarter as Teaching Assistant for upper-division Method & Theory class.

## AWARDS/HONORS:

2002 Tun Jugah Fellow at the University of Hull, UK.

**AWARDS/HONORS** (*cont'd*):

- 2002            Granted funds from Center for Southeast Asian Studies Academic Share Program to carry out library research at the University of Michigan on urban ethnicity in Sarawak, Malaysian Borneo.
- 1998            Western Alliance to Expand Student Opportunities (WAESO) stipend won on behalf of student assistant who helped complete research project on urban ethnicity in Sarawak.
- 1997            Mesa State College Council of Chairs Student/Faculty grant, to finance flight expenses for student assistant mentioned above.
- 1996            Mesa State College Foundation grant to begin research project in Sarawak.
- 1989            University of Minnesota Graduate School Dissertation Writing Fellowship.
- 1988            I.I.E.-Fulbright Study Abroad grant for dissertation fieldwork in Malaysia.
- 1987            U.S. Department of Education funds to attend COTI (Consortium of Teachers of Indonesian) intensive Indonesian-language program, Malang, East Java.
- 1986-87        Foreign Language Area Scholarship from the US Department of Education to attend FALCON (Full-Year Asian Language Concentration)-Indonesian course, Cornell University
- 1985-86        Traveling scholar at University of Wisconsin-Madison (CIC Big Ten exchange program). Studied the Indonesian (Malay) language.
- 1980            B.A. awarded *summa cum laude* from the State University of New York at Plattsburgh. Received Redcay Award for Excellence of Scholarship in the Behavioral Sciences.

**PRESENTATIONS** (*selected list*):

- 2007            Organized session, "What's the matter with the United States? views from here and abroad," at the 106<sup>th</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 28-December 2, Washington, DC; read paper, "We thought you deserved it: Malaysia and the U.S. in the post-9/11 era," at session.
- 2006            Read paper, "Revisiting class in (yet) an(other) era of globalization: a Dayak example," at a seminar, "Consequences of the changing world economy for class relations, ideology, and culture," held at the Ho Chi Minh National Political Academy, January 9-11, Ha Noi, Viet Nam.
- 2005            Chaired and participated in session, "Small anthropology programs: how many anthropologists does it take to...?" at the 104<sup>th</sup> Annual American Anthropological Association (AAA) Meeting, November 30-December 4, Washington, DC.

PRESENTATIONS (*cont'd*):

- 2004 Read paper, "*American Pie*: good to eat, good to think?" for a session at the 103<sup>rd</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, December 15-19, Atlanta, GA.
- 2003 Read paper, "The United States and the power of myth," for an invited session at the 102<sup>nd</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 19-23, Chicago, IL. Also served as discussant for a session on Borneo.
- 2001 Read paper, "'Lost, forever, completely': attitudes toward Islamic conversion among non-Muslim Dayaks in Sarawak," at the 100<sup>th</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 28-December 2, Washington, DC.
- 2001 Read paper, "The modern Melanau: power and risk in the ethnic margins of Sarawak," at the 3<sup>rd</sup> International Malaysian Studies Conference, August 6-8, Bangi, Malaysia.
- 2000 Delivered presentation on Dayak ethnic classification in Sarawak, at the 6<sup>th</sup> Biennial Borneo Research Conference, July 10-14, Kuching, Malaysia.
- 1999 Read paper, "Repenting for the sin of headhunting: time and its discontents in urban Sarawak," at the 98<sup>th</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 17-21, Chicago, IL.
- 1998 Read paper, "Inventing tradition, inventing modernity: Dayak identity in urban Sarawak," for a session honoring Vinson H. Sutlive, Jr., at the 97<sup>th</sup> Annual AAA Meetings, December 2-6, Philadelphia, PA.
- Delivered public talk, "Ethnic identity in urban Sarawak," July 27, Sarawak Museum, Kuching, Malaysia.
- 1996 Chaired session, "Global and local forces in development," at the 95<sup>th</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 20-24, San Francisco, CA; read paper, "When the Third World comes in first: the place of anthropology in a changing world order," at session.
- 1995 Read paper, "Imagining the anti-community: the demonization of the homosexual in Colorado," at the 94<sup>th</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 15-19, Washington, DC.
- 1994 Read paper, "Who is the human in human rights? dissent from Asia," at the 93<sup>rd</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 30-December 4, Atlanta, GA.
- 1993 Read paper, "Sexual harassment in the field," at the 92<sup>nd</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 17-21, Washington, DC.
- 1992 Read paper, "Class at the center of cultural analysis: the West Malaysian case," at the 91<sup>st</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, December 2-6, San Francisco, CA.
- 1991 Chaired session, "Ethnicity and the mobilization of labor," at the 90<sup>th</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 20-24, Chicago, IL; read paper, "Ethnic order and working-class strategies in West Malaysia," at session.

**PUBLISHED WORKS** (*selected list*):

- 2008      *A Sleeping Tiger: Ethnicity, Class, and New Dayak Dreams in Urban Sarawak*.  
Forthcoming through University Press of America, Lanham, MD.
- “Repenting for the sin of headhunting: modernity, anxiety, and time as experienced by urban Dayaks in Sarawak,” in Zawawi Ibrahim, ed., *Representation, Identity, and Multiculturalism in Sarawak*, forthcoming anthology to be published in the ATMA Borneo Series, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- 2007      Edited volume, *Reflecting on America: Anthropological Views of U.S. Culture*. Boston: Pearson Education (Allyn & Bacon). Wrote two introductory pieces for the anthology, 3-8, 9-11; plus article, “Paradise is for pussies: *Star Trek* and the Myth of the Bad Mother,” 55-63.
- 2004      “The modern Melanau: power and risk in the ethnic margins of Sarawak,” 85-98, in Mohd Hazim Shah and Phua Kai-Lit, eds., *Public Policy, Culture and the Impact of Globalisation in Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Persatuan Sains Sosial Malaysia.
- 2002      “Inventing tradition, inventing modernity: Dayak identity in urban Sarawak,” *Asian Ethnicity* 3, 2: 221-231.
- 2000      “On Dayak, Orang Ulu, Bidayuh, and other imperfect ethnic categories in Sarawak,” 44-65, in Michael Leigh, ed., *Borneo 2000: Proceedings of the Sixth Biennial Borneo Research Conference (Ethnicity, Culture, & Society)*. Kuching, Sarawak: Institute of East Asian Studies, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.
- 1999      “Making modern Malaysians in Sarawak,” *Sarawak Museum Journal* 54, 75: 93-104.
- “The amazing adventures of an American anthropologist in the urban jungles of Borneo,” *Sarawak Gazette* 126, 1540: 71-73.
- 1997      “When the Third World comes in first: the place of anthropology in a changing world order,” *High Plains Applied Anthropologist* 17, 1: 98-102.
- 1996      “Ethnicity and practice in Malaysian unions,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 19, 3: 660-679.
- 1993      “Government and press in Malaysia,” *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 28, 1-2: 54-66.
- 1992      “Ethnic order and working-class strategies in West Malaysia,” *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 22, 3: 322-339.

**PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:**

American Anthropological Association, General Anthropology Division



**PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS** (*cont'd*):

**Federation of Small Anthropology Programs**

2006 Co-organized and chaired invited session, "Speaking as the anthropologist...": representing our discipline on (and off) campuses with small anthropology programs," at the 105<sup>th</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 15-19, San Jose, CA.

**Borneo Research Council**

2000 Organized session, "Fertility, forest fires, and a phonebook: what everyone should know about Borneo studies," at the 99<sup>th</sup> Annual AAA Meeting, November 15-19, San Francisco, CA.

**High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology**

2005-08 Newsletter Editor.

2005-07 Served as Past President; duties included organizing annual Fall Retreat.

2003-05 Assumed Presidency. Presided over Board of Directors and continuation of Society's conference schedule and publication of its journal.

2001 Elected to position of President-Elect/Membership Chair.  
Co-organized Spring Conference, April 20-22, Estes Park, CO.

**Adele J. Cummings**  
*Curriculum Vitae*  
September 2008

Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
Mesa State College  
Grand Junction, CO 81502  
970/248-1022

2455 ½ Broadway  
Grand Junction, CO 81507  
acumming@mesastate.edu

**CURRENT POSITION:**

Professor of Sociology, Mesa State College

**EDUCATION:**

Ph.D.Sociology, Duke University, December 1995

M.S. Educational Foundations and Policy Studies, Florida State University, 1987

B.A. Psychology, Minor in English Literature, Florida State University, 1983

**COURSES TAUGHT:**

Contemporary Social Theory, Social Research Methods, Political Sociology, Environmental Sociology,  
Sociology of Religion, General Sociology, Marriage and the Family.

**RESEARCH AND TEACHING INTERESTS:**

Political Sociology, Contemporary Theory, Comparative Historical Sociology, Environmental/Natural  
Resource Sociology, Sociology of Religion.

**DISSERTATION:**

“Governing the Economy: The Process and Politics of Federal Involvement in the Railroads of 19th-  
Century Canada and the United States.”

**Committee:** Joel Smith (chair), Thomas E. Janoski, Angela M. O’Rand, Allan M. Parnell (Sociology,  
Duke University); John Herd Thompson (History, Duke University).

## PAPERS, PRESENTATIONS, and CURRENT PROJECTS:

Cummings, Adele J. "The Sociodemographic Bases of Environmentalism in Canada and the United States: A Reexamination." Literature on the sociodemographic bases of environmental attitudes identifies age, sex, social class, education and other variables as significant correlates of environmental attitudes. Other research indicates that the different ways in which environmental issues may be framed in questionnaire items (e.g., support for spending to protect the environment, environmental activism, trade-offs between the economy and the environment, perception of threat to the environment, etc.) affect the results. This paper extends the literature described above in three ways. First, using data from the World Values Survey, the social bases of environmental attitudes in Canada and the United States are compared. Second, the question of the meaning of "environmentalism" in the two countries is examined. Third, using General Social Survey data from 1985 to 2004, the *reliability over time* of these social bases of environmentalism in the United States is examined. Presented at the 2007 Western Social Science Association, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Cummings, Adele J. "La Muerte es la Corona de la Vida: The Cemeteries and Gravestones of the San Luis Valley." The cemeteries and gravestones of Colorado's San Luis Valley offer insight into the lives of Hispanic Coloradans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The first non-Indian settlers in the region were farmer-peones granted land by the Spanish colony of New Mexico. They united in small settlements in the isolated high desert valley in south-central Colorado for their mutual protection. These communities were characterized by social and economic cohesion and relative equality, communal responsibility and sometimes ownership of land and water, a direct relationship with the plants and animals which supported them, and a devout Catholicism. The cemeteries and gravestones of the Valley serve as memorials to the settlers' "voluntary reliance upon the geography" of the area. Simple markers of locally available materials -- fieldstone, wood, tin and concrete -- were created by family members and local artisans. Evident are the materials and skills that people already had found useful in the course of daily life: welding and soldering; cabinetmaking and simple carpentry; poured concrete; etc. The gravestones and cemeteries are testimonials to a way of life which proved to be short-lived, however, as the Hispanic settlers were displaced by Anglo mining and railroad interests and large-scale agriculturalists between the Civil War and the Depression. Presented at the 2003 Association for Gravestone Studies Conference held in Poultney, Vermont.

Cummings, Adele J. and Jessica Gorrano. "The Sociodemographic Bases of Environmentalism: A Reexamination." Literature on the sociodemographic bases of environmental attitudes identify age, sex, social class, education and other variables as significant correlates of environmental attitudes. Other research indicates that the different ways in which environmental issues may be framed in questionnaire items (e.g., environmental attitudes, environmental activism, trade-offs between the economy and the environment, perception of threat to the environment) affect the results. This paper reexamines the effect of sex on environmental attitudes using data from the General Social Survey. Results indicate that some independent variables are more reliable than others in predicting environmental attitudes, and that the operationalization of environmental attitudes can indeed lead to inconsistent findings regarding the relationship between certain demographic predictors and environmentalism. Presented at the 2002 Western Social Science Association in

Albuquerque, New Mexico.

- Cummings, Adele J. "The Social Construction of Environmental Justice: Rhetorical Claims to Water Rights in Urban and Rural Nevada." Population growth and urbanization in the Southwest make problematic the current distribution of water rights, which is weighted in favor of agricultural rather than municipal, industrial and recreational uses. The social justice literature suggests that notions of different kinds of justice imply different goals, decision criteria, and distribution outcomes. Using as a case Las Vegas's recent efforts to obtain more water allocated to ranchers and farmers north of the city and from the Colorado River, the public positions of relevant stakeholders are examined to see if the structure of their arguments and the assumptions on which they are based correspond with the different ways in which people feel they are getting what they deserve. Discourse analysis indicates a weak correspondence between notions of fairness and the structure of arguments, suggesting instead that the disputes stem from more fundamental ideological differences over the causes, consequences, and desirability of urban economic growth. Paper accepted for presentation to the 2001 Western Social Science Association in Reno, Nevada.
- Cummings, Adele J. "The New Water Wars in the American West: Will Any Allocation Satisfy Social Justice?" This paper examines the distribution of water rights in eight Western states, which is currently heavily weighted in favor of agricultural rather than municipal, industrial and recreational uses. Conflicts over water rights are intractable because water is both a private and a public resource, but allocations which are generally perceived as fair differ dependent on the allocation process.
- Cummings, Adele J. "Was the United States a 'Minimal' State? The Policy and Process of Government Involvement in Railroad Construction, 1850-72." This paper uses data from my dissertation to evaluate the thesis that the U.S. government was reluctant to become involved in the economy. Results indicate that an active role for the federal government in economic enterprise, though controversial, was considered legitimate and desirable under certain conditions; *laissez-faire* attitudes did not become prevalent until after the Civil War. Presented at the 1994 American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Los Angeles.
- Cummings, Adele J. and Stephen T. Russell. "Comparative Analysis of Women's Legislative Representation: Challenging Theories of Development." Even in developed countries of the world, the participation rates of women in national democratic assemblies varies greatly, suggesting that there are intermediate factors that affect women's legislative participation. Most studies of the issue include countries that differ along so many dimensions that it is difficult to determine the most salient factors that influence women's representation. We examine twenty-three OECD countries and find that nations with multi-party systems, early dates of women's suffrage (variables that characterize the political system), and high rates of female labor force participation (a characteristic of female populations) have significantly higher rates of legislative representation by women in national legislatures. We conclude that models of development, which have dominated this area of study, are insufficient for explaining the vast variation in rates of legislative representation by women in developed nations. Presented at the 1993 Southern Sociological Society Annual Meeting, Chattanooga.
- Bickel, Robert, Adele Cummings and Sande Milton. "Technocratic Assumptions and Centralized Control: The Florida State Comprehensive Plan." *Journal of Educational Policy* (vol. 3 no. 1 (1989): 67-77. This paper suggests that a centralized planning strategy required by law in

Florida is ambitious but flawed. The planning approach reinforced the idea that social problems have technocratic solutions, a belief which is not supported by social scientific research or by real-world experience. The statutory requirement that state agencies participate in the Comprehensive Plan compelled agency heads to public endorse a particular vision of economic development and social change; the most notable result was the centralization of decisionmaking power in the Office of Planning and Budgeting.

#### GRANTS AND AWARDS:

- 2007 Strategic Planning Grant to research poor student performance in Methods of Social Research and to develop strategies to improve performance and retention.
- 2007 Travel grant to attend WSSA in Calgary, Alberta.
- 2005 Sabbatical award granted for the fall 2005 semester.
- 2003-04 Library Services and Technology Act grant, program evaluation component.
- 2001 Civic Forum grant, to develop and administer an environmental survey in Mesa County.
- 2001-02 Faculty development grant to attend WSSA in Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- 2000-01 Faculty development grant to attend WSSA in Reno, Nevada.
- 99-2000 Office of State Colleges and department funds to support research trip to the San Luis and Rio Grande Valleys to photograph cemeteries.
- 1998- Multi-year, \$25,000 grant to evaluate the effects of welfare reform, a project on which I served as co-principal investigator.
- 1996-98 Faculty development, travel, and research grants to support research at the University of Colorado Boulder, present findings at professional conferences, and develop new courses.
- 1993-95 Duke University, United States Department of Education Foreign Language and Area Studies Grant, to support writing the dissertation and attending a French immersion course at the University of Quebec at Troes-Rivieres. First awarded 1993-94, grant renewed for 1994-95.
- 1993-94 Duke University, Graduate School Conference Travel Grants, to present papers at professional meetings in Chattanooga and Los Angeles.
- 1991-92 Duke University, Canadian Studies Center Clearly Canadian Research Fellowship, to support data collection at the National Library and Archives in Ottawa.
- 1987-88 Florida Legislative Internship, to support half-time graduate study and full-time work at the Florida House of Representatives.

1986-87 Teaching Fellowship (1986-87) and University Fellowship (1987), Florida State University, to support full-time graduate study.

**MEMBERSHIPS:**

American Sociological Association  
Western Social Science Association

**REFERENCES:**

Steve Schulte            Professor of History  
                              Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
                              Mesa State College  
                              Grand Junction, CO 81502  
                              Telephone 970/248-1418, e-mail [schulte@mesastate.colorado.edu](mailto:schulte@mesastate.colorado.edu)

John Redifer            Department Head and Professor of Political Science  
                              Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
                              Mesa State College  
                              Grand Junction, CO 81502  
                              Telephone 970/248-1117, e-mail [jredifer@mesastate.edu](mailto:jredifer@mesastate.edu)

Helen Levine            Policy and Communications Advisor  
                              Office of the President  
                              University of South Florida  
                              4202 E. Fowler Avenue, ADM 247  
                              Tampa, FL 33620  
                              Telephone 813/974-1678

Stephen T. Russell      Professor and Fitch Nesbitt Endowed Chair  
                              Norton School of Family and Consumer Sciences  
                              University of Arizona  
                              650 N. Park Avenue, P.O. Box 210078  
                              Tucson, AZ 85721  
                              Telephone 520/621-1231, e-mail [strussell@arizona.edu](mailto:strussell@arizona.edu)

# Barry P. Michrina

Department of Social Sciences  
Mesa State College  
1100 North Ave.  
Grand Junction, CO 81501

## EDUCATION

Institution	Major	Dates	Degree	QPA
SUNY at Binghamton	Anthropology	9/86 to 5/91	Ph.D.	4.0/4.0
SUNY at Cortland	Anthropology	9/84 to 5/85		3.8/4.0
Pennsylvania State University	Agronomy	9/77 to 2/81	Ph.D.	4.0/4.0
Colorado State University	Chemistry	9/69 to 9/71	M.S.	3.6/4.0
Saint Francis College	Chemistry	9/65 to 5/69	B.S.	3.8/4.0

## RESEARCH, TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

- 2008      Research director for Hermeneutic Study of Grand Junction Poor
- 2000-2002      Board of Directors, Society for Humanistic Anthropology
- 2000 & 2001      Chair, Victor Turner Prize Committee
- 1998-present      Editor of *Vignettes, A Journal of Undergraduate Student Ethnography*
- 1995-1997      Editor of *Anthropology of Consciousness*
- 1996-present      Professor, Department of Social Sciences, Mesa State College
- 1994-1996      Associate Professor, Department of Social Sciences, Mesa State College
- 1990-1994      Assistant Professor, Department of Social Sciences Mesa State College; teaching Cultural Anthropology, Religion and Culture, Native North Americans, Ethnographic Research Methods, World Cultures, and Ethnopsychology
- Revised the curriculum, chaired a search committee for a second anthropologist, carried out extensive committee work, chaired a community committee, advised three student organizations, and conducted research with the Ute Indians.

- 1990 Instructor, Department of Sociology/Anthropology Indiana University of Pennsylvania; taught introductory courses in Cultural Anthropology and Principles of Sociology.
- 1986-1987 Teaching Assistant, Anthropology Department SUNY at Binghamton; conducted two sections of discussion for Introductory Linguistics, three semesters.
- 1983 Instructor, Learning Skills Center Cornell University; taught course in Organic Chemistry Problem Solving.
- 1981-1983 Research Fellow, Agronomy Department Cornell University; conducted research on zinc availability in soils.
- 1978-1979 Teaching Assistant, Agronomy Department Pennsylvania State University conducted two laboratory sections for Soil Fertility course, three semesters; research that produced three publications.
- 1971-1977 Research Chemist, Eastman Kodak Company; conducted research on photographic developers and other reducing agents, produced two publications and eight company reports.

#### VOLUNTEER WORK

- 1994-1995 Chair, Norms Committee of Community Against Substance Abuse, Grand Junction, Colorado.
- 1988 G.E.D. Instructor, Cambria County, Ebensburg, PA.
- 1984 Phone Counselor, Suicide Prevention and Counseling Service, Ithaca, NY.
- 1983 G.E.D. Instructor, Alpha House Substance Abuse Center, Ithaca NY.

#### AREAS OF EXPERTISE

United States Culture, Classes, and Subculture; Labor Ethnography; Ute Religion.

Dialogical Hermeneutics; Philosophical Anthropology; Methods in Fieldwork and Writing; Emotions and Ethnopsychology.

#### PUBLICATIONS

*Report to the Community: A Hermeneutic Study of Grand Junction's Poor.* In progress.



Mining History: Small Town Histories and Celebrations Among the Nacirema In *Reflecting on America* (Clare Boulanger, ed.) 2008, Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Standing Thirsty: The Ute Sun Dance. *Pathways*. 2004, 2(1)4-11.

Book Review: The Female Circumcision Controversy (Ellen Gruenbaum) *Anthropology and Humanism*. 2002, 27(2)208-209.

*Mines, Memories and More*. Rembrandt Club, May, 2002.

Book Review: Reflexive Ethnography (Charlotte Aull Davies) and Decolonizing Methodologies (Linda Tuhiwai Smith). *American Ethnologist* 2000, 27(1)212-214.

Book Review: Healing Makes Our Hearts Happy (Richard Katz, Megan Biesele) *Anthropology of Consciousness* 1998, 9(4).

*Pennsylvania Mining Families: The Search for Dignity in the Coalfields*. University Press of Kentucky, November, 1993.

*Person to Person: Fieldwork, Dialogue, and the Hermeneutic Method*. S.U.N.Y. Press, March, 1996.

The Challenge of Teaching Ethnopsychology. *Anthropology of Consciousness* 1996, 7(1):4-9.

Soft Coal's Soft-spoken Diplomat. *Pennsylvania Heritage* 1997, XXIII (2): 4-9.

The Boundaries between Science and Humanism. *Anthopology Newsletter*, 37(3):10, 1996.

Effects of Temperature and Time of Storage of Dry Soil Samples on a Chemical Index of N-Availability. *Plant and Soil* 1982, 66(1):81-89.

Chemical Characterization of Two Extracts Used in the Determination Available Soil-Nitrogen. *Plant and Soil* 1982, 64(3):331-341.

A Comparison of Laboratory, Greenhouse, and Field Indicators of Nitrogen Availability. *Communication in Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*. 1981, 12(6):519-535.

Studies of the Delayed Luminescence of Silver Halides. *Photographic Science and Engineering*. 1974, 18(5):512-517.

Effects of Moisture on Photographic Sensitivity. *Photographic Science and Engineering*. 1973, 17(4):373-381.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED AT ANNUAL MEETINGS

*Miracles in Magdalena Mexico: Experiencing the St. Francis Milagros*. Annual Conference for the Society for the Anthropology of Consciousness, March 2001.

*Sun Dance Visions and the Ute Community.* Annual Conference for the Society for the Anthropology of Consciousness, March, 1999.

*The Ute Elder, Witchcraft, and the Avatar: A Sundancer's Explanations and Expectations.* Invited Session, Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, November, 1997.

*The Ute Elder, The White Woman and the Avatar: Complexities in Fieldwork Ethics and Method.* Annual Conference for the Society for the Anthropology of Consciousness, March, 1997.

*Emotions and the Shift in Consciousness in Fieldwork.* Annual Conference for the Society for the Anthropology of Consciousness, March, 1996.

*The Challenge of Teaching Ethnopsychology.* Annual Conference for the Society for the Anthropology of Consciousness, April, 1995.

*Dialogical Hermeneutics: Negotiation as a Method in the Study of Consciousness.* Invited session for the Annual meeting of the American Anthropology Association, December, 1994.

*Dialogical Hermeneutics and the Validation of Reality.* Annual Conference for the Society for the Anthropology of Consciousness, April, 1994.

*The Dialogical Hermeneutic Method of Analysis.* Annual Conference of the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology, April, 1994.

*Hidden Aspects of Force in Pennsylvania Coal Mines.* Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Anthropology Association, March, 1990.

*Mine Foremen as "Union Men": A Unique Class of Employee in Central Pennsylvania Bituminous Coal Field, 1940-1980.* National Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, December, 1989.

#### AWARD PRESENTATION SPEECHES AND WORKSHOPS

Writing Workshop: Writing for the General Public. American Anthropological Association November, 2002.

Victor Turner Prize for Ethnographic Writing. American Anthropological Association Meeting, November, 2001.

Writing Workshop: Writing for the General Public. American Anthropological Association Meeting, November, 2001.

Victor Turner Prize for Ethnographic Writing. American Anthropological Association Meeting, November, 2000.

Workshop: Teaching Native Americans. Tenth Annual Multicultural Conference, State of Colorado, June, 1998.

## SPEAKERS BROUGHT TO CAMPUS

Nancy Scheper-Hughes, University of California, Berkeley. Author of *Death Without Weeping* and winner of the 2001 Staley Prize for Social Science Research.

Richard Katz, Saskatchewan Federated Indian College. Author of *Boiling Energy* and *The Straight Path*.

Dennis Banks, Former Leader of the American Indian Movement.

John Trudell, Former Leader of the American Indian Movement.

David Wilkins, University of Minnesota. Author of *Tribes Treaties and Constitutional Tribulations* and *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law*.

Barney Old Coyote, Crow Elder. Framer of the 1977 Native American Religious Freedom Act.

Red Ute (Edward Box, Sr.), Ute Elder and former Sun Dance Chief.

## HONORS AND AWARDS

1999 & 2000	Certificate of Merit, Academic Services, Mesa State College
1997	Mesa State College Foundation Award
1997	Distinguished Faculty Award, Mesa State College
1997	Mesa State College Sabbatical Study Award
1988-1989	State University of N.Y. Graduate Fellowship.
1981-1983	Cornell University Research Fellow.
1969-1971	NDEA Fellowship.
1969	Phi Kappa Phi National Honor Society.
1965-1969	Fr. John Sullivan Memorial Scholarship.
1966	CRC Science Award.

## Curriculum Vitae

### Brenda Wilhelm

Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
Mesa State College  
1100 North Avenue  
Grand Junction, CO 81501

970-248-1429  
bwilhelm@mesastate.edu

### Employment

- 2005-present Associate Professor, Mesa State College, Grand Junction, Colorado  
2000-2005 Assistant Professor, Mesa State College, Grand Junction, Colorado  
1999-2000 Postdoctoral Fellow, Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina

### Education

- Ph.D. University of Arizona, Sociology, 1999  
"Entry Into Marriage and Cohabitation: Effects of Family Structure in a Changing World"  
Advisors: Doug McAdam and James Shockey
- M.A. University of Arizona, Sociology, 1995  
"Changes in Cohabitation Across Cohorts: The Influence of Political Activism"  
Advisor: Doug McAdam
- B.A. University of Minnesota, Sociology and Mass Communications, 1993  
Summa Cum Laude

### Teaching and Research Interests

Family, Life Course, Gender, Race and Ethnicity, Social Movements, Inequality,  
Social Problems

### Courses Taught

Life Course Sociology	Racial and Ethnic Relations
Population	Sociology of Marriage and Families
Collective Behavior/Social Movements	Social Problems
Classical Social Theory	Introduction to Sociology
Sex and Gender	Social Inequality

## Brenda Wilhelm

### Publications

Mueller, Margaret M., Brenda Wilhelm and Glen H. Elder, Jr. 2002. "Variations in Grandparent-Grandchild Relationships." *Journal of Research on Aging* 24(3):360-388.

Wilhelm, Brenda. 1998. "Changes in Cohabitation Across Cohorts: The Influence of Political Activism." *Social Forces* 77(1):289-310

Van Dyke, Nella, Doug McAdam and Brenda Wilhelm. 2000. "Gendered Outcomes: Gender Differences in the Biographical Consequences of Activism." *Mobilization* 5 (2): 161-177.

### Published Reviews

2003 review of Cynthia Levine-Rasky's *Working Through Whiteness: International Perspectives*, in *Comparative Sociology* 2 (3): 562-564.

2004 review of Ronald Fernandez's *Mappers of Society: The Lives, Times and Legacies of Great Sociologists*, in *Teaching Sociology* 32 (2): 250-251.

2007 review of Marilyn and Chuck Braverman's *A Revolving Door* (DVD), in *Teaching Sociology* 35 (4): 393-394.

### Pre-Publication Book Reviews

2005 pre-publication review of Mooney, Knox and Schachts's *Understanding Social Problems*, for Wadsworth Publishing Company.

2006 pre-publication review of Joel M. Charon and Lee Garth Vigilant's *Social Problems: Readings with Four Questions*, for Wadsworth Publishing Company.

### Presentations (selected)

Discussant for Undergraduate Sociology Conference, Western State College, Gunnison, Colorado, 2007.

"White Privelege in the College Classroom: Toward Pedagogical Strategies," with Sarah Swedberg and Melissa Shea. American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Montreal, 2006.

Workshop on "Sneaking Research Into Your Teaching." Conference on Undergraduate Research, Kearney, NE, 2005 and Council on Undergraduate Research Annual Meeting, Greencastle, IN, 2006.

**Brenda Wilhelm**

"Sneaking Research Into Your Teaching." Council on Undergraduate Research National Conference, La Crosse, WI, 2004.

"Race and Ethnicity in the Classroom: Student Attitudes and Experiences," with Sarah Swedberg and Melissa Schuessler. Western Social Science Association Annual Conference, Salt Lake City, 2004.

"Teaching Race in a Resistant Environment," with Sarah Swedberg. Western Social Science Association Annual Conference, Las Vegas, 2003.

"Consequences of Family Structure While Growing Up: The Timing of Co-Residential Unions." Western Social Science Association Annual Conference, Albuquerque, 2002.

"Variations in Styles of Grandparenting." Population Association of America Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., 2001.

"Relationship Formation Patterns of Children From Single Parent Families: Marriage and Cohabitation." American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, 1999.

"Adult Life Course Transitions of Children From Single Parent Families: Effects of Family Structure in a Changing World." American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 1998.

"Sequencing the Life Course: Heterogeneity and Change in Sequencing Norms," with James Shockey. American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 1998.

"Divorce Reform: Is Rolling Back No-Fault a Solution?" Pacific Sociological Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 1998.

"Gendered Outcomes: Gender Differences in the Biographical Consequences of Activism," with Nella Van Dyke. American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, 1997.

"Changes in Cohabitation Across Cohorts: The Influence of Political Activism." American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, New York, 1996.

"The Declining Association of the New Left with the Sixties Counterculture," with James Shockey and Michele Companion. American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, New York, 1996.

"Differential Effects of Social Movement Participation on the Subsequent Lifecourse Histories of Men and Women," with Nella Van Dyke. Pacific Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, 1996.

## **Brenda Wilhelm**

### **Service**

Social and Behavioral Science Senator, Faculty Senate, Mesa State College, 2007-present.

Sociology General Education Assessment Co-Coordinator, Mesa State College, 2006-present.

Sociology Program Assessment Co-Coordinator, Mesa State College, 2003-present.

Sociology Club Advisor, Mesa State College, 2003-present.

Sociology Search Committee Chair, Mesa State College, 2006.

Sociology Search Committees, Mesa State College, 2005 and 2007.

Human Resources/Affirmative Action Representative, Mesa State College, 2005-2006.

Administration of Justice Search Committee Member, Mesa State College, 2004 and 2005.

Councilor, Council of Undergraduate Research, 2003-2006.

Curriculum Committee, Mesa State College, 2001-2004.

Executive Committee, Department of Sociology, University of Arizona, 1998-99.

Undergraduate Studies Committee, Department of Sociology, University of Arizona, 1995-96.

Graduate Studies Committee, Department of Sociology, University of Arizona, 1994-95.

### **Grants And Honors**

Summer Fellowship Grant, Mesa State College, 2006 and 2007.

Professional Presentation Fund Travel Grant, Mesa State College, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006.

Graduate Instructor Teaching Award Finalist, Department of Sociology, University of Arizona, 1998 and 1999.

Graduate Student Teaching Award Finalist, Department of Sociology, University of Arizona, 1997

**Brenda Wilhelm**

Graduate and Professional Student Association Travel Fund Grant, University of Arizona, 1995, 1996, 1998.

Women's Studies Advisory Council (WOSAC) Stipend, University of Arizona, 1998.

Honors Pass, Social Movements Preliminary Exam, Department of Sociology, University of Arizona, 1996

Graduate Assistantship, Department of Sociology, University of Arizona, 1993-99

Undergraduate Teaching Assistantship, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, 1992-93.



**External Review of the  
SOCIOLOGY PROGRAM**

**Within the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences**

**MESA STATE COLLEGE  
Grand Junction, CO**

**May 2009**

**Margaret Weigers Vitullo, PhD  
Director of Academic and Professional Affairs  
American Sociological Association  
Washington DC**

**Jerry Shepperd, PhD  
Chair of the Behavioral Sciences Department and Professor of Sociology  
Austin Community College  
Austin Texas**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE: Introduction.....	1
SECTION TWO: Major Themes from the Program Review.....	4
SECTION THREE: Overview and Brief History of the Program.....	5
SECTION FOUR: Program Goals and Objectives.....	6
SECTION FIVE: Curriculum.....	10
SECTION SIX: Students and Student Satisfaction.....	14
SECTION SEVEN: Faculty.....	16
SECTION EIGHT: Resources/Institutional Support.....	17
SECTION NINE: Conclusions.....	18
REFERENCES.....	20
APPENDIX I: NATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE UNDERGRADUATE SOCIOLOGY MAJOR.....	21
APPENDIX II: SAMPLE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES FOCUSING ON RESEARCH TRAINING.....	23

## EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAM Mesa State College

### SECTION ONE: Introduction

#### The Reviewers and Their Activities:

The current review of the undergraduate program in Sociology at Mesa State College is based on a campus visit Jerry Shepperd, Department Chair and Professor at Austin Community College that took place on October 22-23, 2008. During that site visit Dr. Shepperd met with Sociology program faculty and the Head of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Department, Dr. John Redifer. He also met with President Foster, and Vice-President for Academic Affairs Futhey, as well as Faculty Senate President Werman. He also met with the IT Director, Jeremy Brown and Library Director Betsy Brodak, as well as the IR Director Brandon and the Assessment Coordinator, Jessica Herrick. Dr. Shepperd also met with students and alumni from the Sociology Program.

Information Dr. Shepperd's site visit was then supplemented by an additional seven hours of interviews with each of the Sociology and Anthropology faculty by Margaret Weigers Vitullo, Director of Academic and Professional Affairs at the American Sociological Association. These interviews were conducted between May 4-6, 2009.

Dr. Shepperd is a long-term member of the Department Resources Group (DRG) of the American Sociological Association and Dr. Vitullo is the Director of the DRG. Members of the Department Resources Group are selected for their expertise in teaching particular courses or using particular techniques, curriculum building, assessment, and other important topics in higher education. They receive training at each ASA annual meeting and are in regular communication about trends, data, and resources on topics relating to building strong departments. All DRG consultants operate under the same guiding principles for doing effective reviews and reports.

Both reviewers carefully examined the extensive and well prepared documents provided by the Sociology Program:

- A detailed self-study. Includes descriptions of the program history, goals and objectives, analysis of need, summary of resources, analysis of effectiveness in meetings goals, strengths and weaknesses of the

- program, and recommendations.
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research
- Data from the Budget Office
- Library Assessment
- Summary of Previous Program Review
- Program Assessment Plan and Results
- Assessment forms. Includes exit interview, internship evaluation, sample assignments and grading rubrics.
- Faculty Curriculum Vita
- Sociology and Anthropology syllabi
- Sociology and Anthropology program sheets

In addition, Dr. Vitullo reviewed the Mesa State College 2008-2009 Catalog, including the General Policy Statement, Diversity Statement, and Student Bill of Rights. She also reviewed the Mesa State College web page, including President Foster's Welcome message and the college's statement of Core Values, as well as the web page for the Social and Behavioral Science Departments and the Sociology major.

#### Criteria for Program Review and National Guidelines for the Undergraduate Sociology Major

With any form of assessment, establishing clear and public goals and outcomes is an essential first step. This is as true for program review as it is for a single assignment in an undergraduate class. In general, external program reviews are designed to identify areas of strength as well as to provide suggestions for further improving programs at an institution. This report thus focuses upon both the areas of strength and achievement in the undergraduate program in Sociology and Anthropology at Mesa State College, as well as areas in which the program may strengthen what it offers to the liberal arts education at the College.

Both Anthropology and Sociology, as separate disciplines, are central to a liberal arts education. The ultimate purpose of an external review is to strengthen those disciplines and the program, so that they continue to make significant contributions both to the general education program and to the individual educational experiences of students at Mesa State College.

In 1989 the Association of American Colleges (now called the AAC&U) worked with a dozen national professional organizations in reviewing undergraduate majors in the arts and sciences. Each discipline produced a separate in-depth report on their major. The report in Sociology (Eberts, *et al.* 1990) produced a set of national guidelines for

the undergraduate major in Sociology. This report was subsequently updated and expanded in *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated: Meeting the Challenge of Teaching Sociology in the Twenty-First Century* (McKinney, et al. 2004). As noted earlier, the American Sociological Association (ASA) trains a set of consultants from colleges and universities nationwide to use these guidelines in doing program reviews. As members of the ASA Department Resources Group, our evaluation uses these national guidelines for the undergraduate major in Sociology (McKinney, et al. 2004) as one lens for assessing the program. The full set of national recommendations is included in Appendix 1 of this report.

Anthropology was not one of the disciplines that produced a report of this type with the AAC. Sociology and Anthropology, however, are often found in combined departments. Indeed, slightly over half of all Sociology undergraduate programs in the United States are located within some type of combined unit, and Anthropology is by far the most common pairing, found in slightly over one-fifth of the undergraduate Sociology programs in the United States (Spalter-Roth and Erskine, 2003; Kain, 2006, 2007).

Many of the ASA Guidelines do apply to Anthropology, but generally Anthropology has a more holistic emphasis than Sociology, addressing a variety of human issues, including human evolution, linguistics, and archaeology as well as cultural anthropology, and is deeply and fundamentally grounded in field research. As such, the ASA guidelines are a useful tool for assessing a program that includes both Sociology and Anthropology, as long as the foundational tenets of holism and field work necessary to the practice of Anthropology are acknowledged as points for assessment as well.

In addition, in 2006 a task force of the American Sociological Association produced a report entitled *Models and Best Practices for Joint Sociology-Anthropology Departments*. The task force report is available as a PDF download at the ASA website. It describes the ways in which Sociology and Anthropology programs may co-exist in departments, ranging from “parallel play” to “complete cross-listing with no distinctions between disciplines.” The task force report also offers a series of recommendations for departments that include both sociology and anthropology, regardless of the manner of their co-existence.

### Structure of the Report

This report is divided into nine sections. The first section is comprised of this

introduction. The second section lists several major themes that emerged from our interviews and review of the materials on the program in Sociology. Sections 3-8 address each of the six topic areas identified in the Mesa State “Instructions for External Reviewers.” Those are: history of the program; goals and objectives; curriculum; students and student satisfaction; faculty; and resources and institutional support. Section 9 provides a brief conclusion for the whole report.

**Throughout the report, suggestions based upon our program review are indicated in bold type.** Since many of the suggestions for the undergraduate program in Sociology are organized around the national guidelines, those guidelines will be referenced along with each program review suggestion. These suggestions include some that are directed at the institution, and others that apply to the Sociology program. In most cases, these suggestions would be implemented by individual faculty members working as a team with their colleagues

## **SECTION TWO: Major Themes from the Program Review**

Throughout the on-campus site visit, the subsequent phone interviews, and in reviewing all of the printed and web materials and documents, at least 5 major themes emerged. These themes related both to strengths in the department and program, and to challenges faced by Sociology and Anthropology.

1. The Sociology and Anthropology faculty are committed to the best ideals of a liberal arts education and its enactment through the disciplines of Sociology and Anthropology. They understand the value of a liberal arts education as a path to gaining broad conceptual understandings as well as specific practical skills that employers value and students can use to embark on successful careers in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
2. The Sociology and Anthropology faculty are noteworthy for their dedication, creativity, and student-centered approach. They have excellent academic training and demonstrate expertise in a wide variety of areas. Even when faced with significant challenges in terms of reduced numbers of faculty and limited resources they have worked to make sure that the quality of education offered to students was not compromised.
3. Both Sociology and Anthropology faculty are clearly and actively motivated to find ways to strengthen the synergy between the Sociology and Anthropology components of the program. This interest has been long standing, but has become more acute in the wake of the administration’s recent request for a plan

that would increase enrollment in Anthropology courses within two years.

4. The Sociology and Anthropology faculty are deeply committed to promoting undergraduate research through faculty-student collaborations. In the course of the interviews Dr. Vitullo conducted it became apparent that in the past few years, every faculty member—including the Head of the Social and Behavioral Science Department and all Sociology and Anthropology faculty—had undertaken some sort of faculty-student research collaboration. These collaborations resulted in positive outcomes for the Grand Junction community, the students, and the faculty themselves. The remarkable synchronicity of interest in faculty-student research collaborations suggests a significant organizational opportunity for the program which will be addressed in several of the suggestions outlined in the sections below.
5. The Sociology program, including the Anthropology offerings within it, makes strong contributions to the general education program at Mesa State. Five courses taught in the program satisfy general education requirements, including: ANTH 201, ANTH 222, SOCO 144, SOCO 260, and SOCO 264. Each semester SOCO 260 and ANTH 201 regularly enroll over 100 students, and frequently as many as 150-170 students. SOCO 144 and ANTH 222 are also well enrolled each semester. More broadly, the core principles and topics found at the heart of both Sociology and Anthropology foster the mission of Mesa State and its strong Diversity Statement as well as its commitment to helping students succeed in the complex global context of our society today.

These five themes are expanded upon in the remaining sections. They help shape many of the suggestions that we offer.

### **SECTION THREE: Overview and Brief History of the Program**

Mesa State is a comprehensive regional public higher education institution. According to the college's web site, its broad mission includes "offering liberal arts, professional and technical programs at the master's, bachelor's, associate, and certificate levels."

The Sociology program at Mesa State took its current shape in the mid-1990s. Prior to that time, only a Bachelor of Arts in Social and Behavioral Sciences was offered, with options to concentrate in a variety of disciplinary areas including Criminal Justice, Human Services, History, Psychology, and Political Science. At that time Anthropology was offered as a minor. According to the program's 2003-2007 self-study, "As a result of recommendations from the North Central [Association] and the support of the faculty, in 1993 Mesa State began to award B.A. degrees in traditional social science

disciplines, including Sociology.” Then in 2006 a four year program in Criminal Justice was established which organizationally separate from the Sociology program.

At this time, the following programs of study related to Sociology and Anthropology are housed within the Department of Behavioral and Social Sciences:

- Major in Sociology without a concentration
- Major in Sociology with a concentration in Anthropology
- Major in Sociology with a concentration in Human Services
- Minor in Sociology
- Minor in Anthropology

In addition to the significant organizational changes that have taken place in these programs over the past 15 years, the program has also lost a full-time tenure track/tenured faculty position. At the time of the previous program review there were four full time Sociologists and two full time Anthropologists. There are now three Sociologists and two Anthropologists.

#### **SECTION FOUR: Program Goals and Objectives**

Significant work has taken place to develop an effective assessment plan for the program. The faculty clearly understands the fundamentals of assessment, and has worked to establish program goals and objectives, as well as assessment measures to determine the degree of program success in reaching those goals. A combination of standardized nationally benchmarked assessment tools and subjective self-report measures are used. Best practices in assessment call for using multiple methods and multiple measures, and the department is to be commended for their efforts to do so. However, the program’s goals and objectives are not yet fully formed and articulated. The 2003-2007 self-study report lists three overarching goals for students; however Appendix E of the report includes Assessment Reports from 2005-2006 that articulate another set of goals and measures that are inconsistent with those described in the Self-Study. The department chair and faculty members are aware of this situation, and have been working for some time to create a coherent and complete set of program goals.

One factor that may be creating a stumbling block for the faculty’s efforts to develop a clear set of program goals and measures is the lack of clarity about the structural and organizational relationship between the Sociology and Anthropology portions of the program, as well as the Human Services component. Currently 40 percent of the faculty



members teaching in the program are Anthropologists, yet the program is called the Sociology Program, and the goals and assessment measures rarely, if ever, mention Anthropology. The goals for the Human Services concentration within the Sociology major are also not fully articulated, nor is there clarity about the concentration's relationship to the other parts of the program.

The first recommendation in *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated* is that "Departments should develop a mission statement, goals, and learning objectives for their Sociology program and make them public, especially to students." The first two suggestions in this report suggest taking steps toward defining a clear mission statement for the program based on a clearer and more intentional relationship between its various parts.

**Suggestion 1:** Sociology and Anthropology faculty should carefully read the document *Models and Best Practices for Joint Sociology-Anthropology Departments* (Kain, Wagenaar and Howery 2006) and have a series of meetings that include all Sociology and Anthropology faculty, as well as the faculty member who teaches Human Services, to discuss the implications of the report for the program at Mesa State.

**Suggestion 2:** Consider the possibility of creating a joint program in Sociology and Anthropology that offers a single interdisciplinary major in Sociology and Anthropology.

A 2005 study of departments that offered both Sociology and Anthropology examined the range of options for majors, minors, and concentrations within those departments. The most common option was to offer only a combined sociology/anthropology major, with or without additional options for minors (Kain, Wagenaar, and Howery 2006). Carlton College offers one example of this arrangement. Another example is seen at Alma College, which has a single mission statement encompassing both of the disciplines represented in its major:

Sociology and Anthropology investigate basic processes, structures, culture and change in social reality and what it means to be human in that complex reality. This investigation encompasses: (1) method and theory — the logic of inquiry; (2) vocation — the ethically self-conscious examination of actions; and (3) the intended and unintended consequences of social action. While this investigation entails challenge and intellectual risk, it also promotes intellectual and ethical development in the best traditions of liberal education.

Alma's Sociology and Anthropology graduates successfully pursue graduate education in many fields as well as careers in sociology and social work, business and personnel administration, law, ministry, museum curatorship, corrections, government and many other areas. It is our hope that one can have a life as well as a living; liberal education can lead to both. ( [www.alma.edu](http://www.alma.edu) )

Creating a combined program also helps respond to Recommendation 10 from *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major* (McKinney et al. 2005), which states "Departments should structure the curriculum to recognize explicitly the intellectual connections between Sociology and other fields by designing activities to help students integrate their educational experiences across disciplines."

**Suggestion Three:** Regardless of final decisions about the relationships between the various parts of the program and the program name, a clear mission statement for the overall program and program goals should be established and published widely in order to guide both faculty and student understandings of the program and its purpose. The next step would be for the program to reframe its goals in terms of measurable student learning outcomes for each level in the curriculum. Finally, the program should establish a 5 year cycle for assessment that defines a sub-set of goals to be evaluated each year.

As mentioned earlier, the first recommendation in the national guidelines for the sociology undergraduate major addresses creating a clear mission statement with goals and objectives. The last recommendation, number 16, states that "*Departments should assess the sociology program on a regular basis using multiple sources of data, including data on student learning.*" As mentioned earlier, the Sociology faculty members are already engaged with this task, and have planned to create a cycle of assessment--as evidenced in Appendix E of the Self-Study in their memo to Mrya Heinrich, Chair of the Assessment Committee. The suggestion here is to enlarge that process to include both the Sociology and Anthropology faculty in working toward agreed upon program goals.

A variety of examples of mission statements, assessment plans, and forms of measurement can be found in Lowery et. al. (2005), *Creating an Effective Assessment Plan for the Sociology Major*, which can be downloaded as a PDF from the American Sociological Association web site for free. In addition, numerous examples of assessment tools from Sociology departments (some of which are combined

departments) from around the country can be found on line at:

<http://www.lib.cmich.edu/bibliographers/ruiwang/collection.htm>. This web site was created by Mary Senter, at Central Michigan University, with the assistance of the librarians there.

An essential part of establishing an effective assessment plan is for faculty members to come to an agreement about what student learning outcomes are appropriate for each course level. This leads to the next suggestion:

**Suggestion Four: Student learning outcomes of increasing complexity should be attached to each level in the developmental curriculum, and should be listed in the course syllabi. Among the student learning outcomes should be those related to information literacy in Sociology and Anthropology.**

This recommendation focuses on thinking about the curriculum in terms of cumulative student learning outcomes. For instance, by the end of an introductory course in Anthropology/Sociology, students should be able to read a professional research article and identify the research question, theoretical perspective, methods used, and basic research findings.

Department faculty should also develop a set of shared learning outcomes for the other required courses in the program. No matter who teaches any particular course in the required sequence, students should have developed the same skills and knowledge base in preparation for later coursework. Once the shared learning outcomes are developed for courses at all levels of the curriculum, they should systematically be included in syllabi and published on the department web page. Appendix II includes one sample of student learning outcomes that are cumulative and linked to four levels in the curriculum. We are not suggesting that these be adopted; we are simply giving them as one example. Faculty in the program(s) can work as a group to determine the appropriate student learning outcomes for each level of courses in the curriculum.

It is productive to have continued discussions about the shared vision for the program. The starting point is the question "What do we want our students to have at the end of the program that they don't have at the beginning?" You can then ask "Where in the curriculum do they receive the training/experience/activities that develop these outcomes?"

When student learning outcomes are integrated into syllabi, it is useful for them to take the form of: "By the end of this course, students should be able to. . ." Current syllabi in the department typically do not include a clear statement of course objectives. It

would be fruitful if all syllabi moved in the direction of listing student learning outcomes, linked to four levels in a cumulative curriculum, that have been decided upon within the program.

As faculty discuss their student learning outcomes, they should continually keep in mind the national recommendations for the major and how these may be useful in shaping their decisions.

## SECTION FIVE: Curriculum

With good reason the Sociology and Anthropology faculty are proud of the rigor of their courses. They require extensive writing from their students, critical thinking is emphasized throughout, and based on evidence from the Sociology Major Field Test that all graduating seniors take, students become well-versed in the major theoretical perspectives of the discipline of Sociology through their studies. As stated at the beginning of this report, the Sociology and Anthropology faculty are committed to the best ideals of a liberal arts education and its enactment through the disciplines of Sociology and Anthropology.

The program faculty members understand the value of a liberal arts education as a path to gaining broad conceptual understandings as well as specific practical skills that employers value and students can use to embark on successful careers in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. However, they are also aware that it is important to help students learn how to translate the employable skills gained through a Sociology or Anthropology major to potential employers.

The majority of the 16 recommendations from *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major* relate to curriculum, and 8 of those are particularly relevant to the suggestions in this section of the report. Those 8 are briefly summarized below:

- The curriculum should require Introduction to Sociology and a Capstone course, as well as theory, methods and statistics for the sociology major. (#3)
- The curriculum should be infused with the empirical base of sociology such that students are engaged with data and research processes at each level of their studies (#4)
- The curriculum should have four levels defined by increasing difficulty and complexity. (#5)
- The curriculum should underscore the centrality of race, class, and gender in society and in sociological analysis. (#8)

- The curriculum should be designed to increase students' exposure to multicultural, cross-cultural, and cross-national content. (#9)
- The department should encourage... active learning experiences. (#11)
- The department should offer community and class-room based learning experiences...to prepare [students] for lives of civic engagement. (#12)

The Sociology faculty members in the program currently face two challenges regarding curriculum. First, they teach research methods to all students in the Social and Behavioral Sciences Department (including students in Political Science and Psychology, etc.) which translates into offering three sections of Research Methods every year, and they are not able to tailor that course to the research approaches most frequently used within their discipline(s). Similarly, they are not currently able to offer a statistics course tailored to their students' needs. There seems to be some movement on these two issues, and the next two suggestions essentially reflect and offer support for changes that are currently in process. In addition, these suggestions emphasize the use of an active-learning approach that engages students in empirical data collection and analysis:

**Suggestion Five:** The Sociology and Anthropology program(s) will be well-served by having a research methods course that is tailored to their specific program. The fact that the various disciplines within the Social and Behavioral Sciences department are currently working on this change represents an opportunity for the Sociology and Anthropology program(s) to develop a research methods course that gives students hands-on experience in posing sociological and anthropological questions, developing theory-driven hypotheses, and using data to test them.

**Suggestion Six:** Students in the program will benefit enormously from a course in statistics that is tailored for their major. The current plan to have a faculty member from the Math Department "assigned" to teaching a course for the program may well be a highly creative solution that does not require adding an additional faculty line. However, it will be essential for the Math faculty person to work closely with faculty in the program to design a course that engages students in hands-on analysis of social data.

As efforts to develop a program-specific research methods course and statistics course are in process, it might be useful to examine two rich resources for locating teaching modules and easy-to-use data sources for use in undergraduate classrooms. Those resources are the Social Science Data Analysis Network ([www.ssdan.net/datacounts](http://www.ssdan.net/datacounts)) and the Survey Documentation and Analysis site at Berkeley (<http://sda.berkeley.edu/index.htm>). The SSDAN web site includes many data modules that

were created through a collaboration with the ASA that was funded by the National Science Foundation. A special edition of *Teaching Sociology* (2006, 34: 1) also includes useful information on this collaboration.

Creating program-specific methods and statistics courses will greatly enhance the curriculum, and strengthen the empirical foundation of the program. However the students do not currently have the opportunity to bring all of the skills they learn during their studies together into a summary learning experience. Currently the Sociology major, with or without a concentration in Anthropology—requires students to take two social theory courses: SOC 400: Classical Social Theory and SOC 410: Contemporary Social Theory. In addition, majors are not required to take a Capstone course, nor is one offered. There are many ways to organize a Capstone course. However, given the tremendous interest in conducting research with students among Sociology and Anthropology faculty, and the strong interest at Mesa State in general and this program in particular, in helping students learn to translate the knowledge they gain through their studies into skills in the job market, it may be particularly useful to consider organizing a Capstone course in Applied Social Research.

**Suggestion Seven: Reduce the number of required theory courses to 1, and establish a two-semester Capstone course in Applied Social Research that engages students in a year-long research project to answer a question of interest to a local community organization—either a non-profit, a social service agency, or a government office. The course could be team-taught by a Sociologist and an Anthropologist and could emphasize the use of both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The faculty for the Capstone course would rotate, so that a different community organization would benefit from the course each year, a different research topic would be addressed each year, and a different team of faculty would have the opportunity to conduct a scholarly research project that could result in professional publications.**

Since the previous program review, the Sociology and Anthropology faculty have all, to a person, been involved in research collaborations with students. To give just two examples, Dr. Machrina (Anthropology) recently worked with students to help a local social service organization study residents of Grand Junction who were in poverty. Dr. Cummings (Sociology) is currently developing a two-semester project with the Public Defenders Office where her students will be collecting data and writing pre-sentencing reports. The remarkable synchronicity of interest in faculty-student research collaborations suggests a significant organizational opportunity for the program. These projects provide models for how an Applied Social Research Capstone Course could function. Creating a Capstone course of this kind would respond to the National Guidelines for the major that call for including Capstone courses in Sociology majors; it

would result in positive outcomes for the Grand Junction community and bolster the relationship between the community and Mesa State; it would infuse the curriculum with the empirical basis of both Sociology and Anthropology, as well as give students the opportunity to learn how to apply their academic skills to the world of work; and it could also help faculty remain engaged in disciplinary scholarship and publication.

Creating a two-semester Capstone should be possible without increasing faculty workload if the Sociologists no longer are required to cover three sections of Research Methods each year, and the two semesters of theory are combined into one course.

Another curriculum issue that has been debated in the program regards the requirement that all students majoring in Sociology take STAT 200: Probability and Statistics. Students who concentrate in Anthropology are then also required to take ANTH 310: Ethnographic methods. The Anthropologists have been concerned that students who might otherwise be interested in Anthropology shy away from the program because of this additional research requirement. If, however, a single interdisciplinary major in Sociology and Anthropology were established, it would be in the best interests of the students to have familiarity and basic competence in both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

**Suggestion Eight: If the department decides to create an Interdisciplinary Major in Sociology and Anthropology, continue to require statistics for all students – albeit an applied course that clearly links statistical concepts to the analysis of relevant data on current social issues of interest to both disciplines. In addition, bring Ethnographic methods into the shared curriculum through a research methods course designed for the program, as well as the Capstone course.**

Nationally, about half of Sociology programs offer statistics in the department, and about half require a course taught outside of the department (typically in the mathematics department). Schools of Mesa State's size do not typically offer it inside the department. It is common (though not universal) for statistics to be a pre-requisite to the required methods course in Sociology. If there is a first-year math requirement, or if statistics fulfills a general education requirement, then the catalog and departmental webpage should encourage those who think they might want to major in Sociology to take statistics to fulfill this requirement. All students in a liberal arts setting need to have basic quantitative literacy, including a sense of how statistics can be applied in a variety of situations. Students who major in Sociology need statistics to provide them with a solid foundation for the research methods course and for graduate work. This background in statistics is also important for advanced courses in the discipline, where they would need to be able to read the sociological literature, which includes

quantitative research employing a variety of types of statistics. Moreover, a recent survey of employers conducted by the American Association of Colleges and Universities indicates that employers are looking for applicants who have strong quantitative reasoning skills. They are also looking for applicants who have knowledge of human cultures and the ability to work in teams with diverse groups (AAC&U 2008). In short, employers are looking for the kinds of skills and competencies that would come out of a combined Sociology and Anthropology program that engages students in both quantitative and qualitative methods.

## **SECTION SIX: Students and Student Satisfaction**

In 2007 there were 116 majors in the Sociology program. That total was composed of 27 students who were grandfathered into the Criminology concentration (which is being phased out since the establishment of the stand-alone Criminal Justice Program), 9 concentrating in Anthropology, 44 concentrating in Human Services, and 36 majoring in Sociology without a concentration.

Recommendation 2 in *Liberal Learning* is that “*Departments should gauge the needs and interests of their students, and department goals and practices should, in part, reflect and respond to these needs and interests as well as to the mission of the institution.*” The overall number of majors, combined with information from the program’s Self-Study and Dr. Shepperd’s meetings with students and alumni all reflect considerable student satisfaction. In spite of the creation of a stand-alone Criminal Justice program, which diverted many students away from the Sociology program, there has been a 6.48 percent increase in total student credit hours over a five-year period.

Both in the exit interviews included in the program’s Self-Study, and in their conversations with Dr. Shepperd, students spoke highly of the faculty and their engagement with students. As the summary of major themes listed in Section Two of this report made clear, the faculty members are very student-centered in their approach. Because they work so closely with their students, they have a good sense of their needs and interests.

Additionally, graduates of the program have been quite successful. They have gone on to get jobs in human services, probation and parole and law enforcement, Peace Corps, personnel management, and environmental advocacy and K-12 education. Majors interested in graduate school have had great success, gaining admission to prestigious programs at the University of Chicago, University of Washington, University of Cincinnati, and the University of California—Los Angeles, to name just a few.



That said, with only three Sociology faculty and two Anthropology faculty, it has been difficult to offer many of the upper level courses that the students are interested in taking. Moreover, the small number of students concentrating in Anthropology suggests that the current arrangement is not fully satisfying those students needs. One idea that has been discussed in the program is establishing an Anthropology major, over and above the current concentration in Anthropology. However, with no increase in faculty numbers it seems quite unlikely that a stand-alone Anthropology major could be successful and fully respond to student interests and needs—especially within the two year period proposed by the administration. In contrast, if an Interdisciplinary Sociology and Anthropology major were established, then the faculty in the program could work as a single five-person team, rather than two teams. This could increase the program's ability to respond to student interests and needs.

**Suggestion Nine: If an Interdisciplinary Sociology and Anthropology major is established, distribute responsibility for advising evenly across the program faculty. This will result in a net increase in the amount of time and attention faculty could offer to advisees. Also consider cross-listing courses in Sociology and Anthropology to create more upper-level course options for majors.**

Several other opportunities for responding to students' needs and interests and increasing student satisfaction came up through the program review. At this time there is a small and very active Sociology Club that, quite remarkably, raised enough money to cover 50 percent of the costs of 8 students traveling to the Pacific Sociological Society meetings this year. This club could be expanded to include Anthropology students, which would help create a greater sense of program identity for all students, regardless of the final decision regarding the structural arrangement of the two disciplines. In addition, outstanding students could benefit from the opportunity to become members in the international honor society for Sociology, Alpha Kappa Delta. This will give student members an honor to list on their resumes and also automatically give them a starting-salary increase should they get a job with any agency of the federal government. In addition, departments can help their majors succeed in a competitive job market by creating prizes for an outstanding paper or thesis, or special service to the department. Additional information on establishing a Department Prize can be found on the ASA web site.

**Suggestion Ten: Change the Sociology Club to the Sociology and Anthropology Club and include Anthropology Faculty in the organization and sponsorship of the club.**

**Suggestion Eleven: Establish a chapter of Alpha Kappa Delta on campus. In**

**addition, consider establishing a Department Award (or awards) that can be given to deserving students each year.**

Having a clear sense of student interests and needs can be extremely valuable for any program. While the current exit interview for majors provides some useful information, it might be worthwhile to consider involving students in collecting data on this topic.

**Suggestion Twelve: The department should consider ways of involving Anthropology and Sociology students in research aimed at collecting data on the needs and interests of students in the program. Students could also collect data about alumni and post it on the departmental web page. With permission from those alumni, they could also build an alumni contact list that could be made available to majors so that current students could network with graduates.**

Students in the required Research Methods course could develop surveys and in-depth interviews that collect data about current students as well as alumni. Not only would students build their skills in interviewing, survey design, data collection, data analysis, and report writing, but they would provide the department with valuable data that could be used in assessment and planning. An added benefit is that this project will encourage linkages between current students and Mesa State alumni. In different years the survey could have a different focus. One year could involve an alumni survey, the next a survey of current majors, the next a survey of people taking Anthropology and Sociology as general education courses, etc.

One question on the alumni survey could ask if the graduates would be willing to have their name and job title included on a list of program alumni available to all majors to facilitate networking with current students. The department could then develop a list of alumni who represent a broad range of occupations, careers, and experiences.

Alternatively, if developing this type of survey is not feasible within the structure of the research methods course, perhaps an advanced major (or majors) could do a project like this as an independent study.

## **SECTION SEVEN: Faculty**

The Sociology program currently has five full-time faculty — three in Sociology and two in Anthropology. The quality and commitment of the faculty in this program are its greatest strength. As stated in Section One of this report, they are committed to the best ideals of a liberal arts education and its enactment through the disciplines of Sociology

and Anthropology. They understand the value of a liberal arts education as a path to gaining broad conceptual understandings as well as specific practical skills that employers value and students can use to embark on successful careers in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They have excellent academic training and demonstrate expertise in a wide variety of areas. Even when faced with significant challenges in terms of reduced numbers of faculty due to several failed searches for sociologists, they have worked to make sure that the quality of education offered to students was not compromised. Another strength of the faculty is their openness and genuine interest in finding ways to strengthen their program and work together effectively.

Recommendation 14 in *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated* is that “Departments should promote faculty development and an institutional culture that rewards scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning.” The faculty in the program are committed to scholarship, and to engaging students in the research process. As mentioned earlier, since the previous program review, every faculty member—including the Head of the Social and Behavioral Science Department and all Sociology and Anthropology faculty—had undertaken some sort of faculty-student research collaboration. However, it has been difficult for the Sociology faculty to publish the results of these collaborations, perhaps due in part to the pressure of advising large numbers of students and teaching large sections.

Enacting several of the suggestions in this report could positive impact the faculty and their professional development. If the program decides to enact Suggestions 7 and faculty-student collaboration becomes part of the structure of the program through an Applied Research Capstone, it will support faculty in their professional development and scholarship. Additionally, if Suggestions 2 and 9 are accepted and an Interdisciplinary Major in Sociology and Anthropology is established and advising loads are distributed more evenly across the Sociology and Anthropology faculty, this could also create a net increase in scholarship among the group.

## **SECTION EIGHT: Resources/Institutional Support**

The Resources and Institutional Support for the Sociology program has areas of strength as well as weakness. The library resources are strong, and include access to Sociology and Anthropology journals in both paper form and through electronic databases. The department also has a strong DVD and VHS collection. Access to technology and technology support both are quite strong as well.

One area of significant limitation regards student access to data analysis programs.

Currently there is a course-specific fee for the Methods of Social Research course to allow for the purchase of licenses for MicroCase. However if applied research skills are to be infused throughout the curriculum, it will be important for students to have access to data analysis programs in more than one course.

**Suggestion 13: Explore options for expanding students' access to data analysis software and make the investment necessary so students will be able to work with data in multiple courses within the program.**

Additionally, the Sociology and Anthropology faculty and the program could benefit from additional support for participating in professional conferences. Presenting at professional conferences is a key part of scholarly engagement and renewal.

**Suggestion 14: When resources allow, make it a priority to increase the level of support available for faculty to travel to professional conferences from the current level of \$600 to a level that encourages faculty to submit scholarly work for presentation at their disciplinary meetings and facilitates their attendance.**

## **SECTION NINE: Conclusions**

Both Sociology and Anthropology are core disciplines in a strong liberal arts curriculum that can help students prepare for the rapidly changing, increasingly global and technology-driven 21<sup>st</sup> century labor market. The skills that will lead to success in the 21<sup>st</sup> century include: creativity, innovation, critical thinking, analytic problem-solving, communication, collaboration, multi-cultural and global understandings, strong math and science skills, and excellent written expression. These are the skills that are taught in Sociology and Anthropology courses at Mesa State.

The strong faculty in these programs, their collegiality and openness to new ideas, the synchronicity of their interest in student-faculty research collaborations, and the transition of criminology out of the program and into a free-standing Criminal Justice program together has created an opportunity for the Sociology and Anthropology faculty to come together to build a vibrant combined program. It will be important to give the program time to develop a detailed and intentional plan with a coherent mission statement, learning goals, and assessment processes, as well as time to implement that plan. This process will take at least four years, and probably five. The final suggestion in this report reflects that reality.

**Suggestion 14: In the Spring of 2009 the Anthropology faculty were asked to create a plan for increasing their course enrollments and number of majors within two years. If the Sociology and Anthropology faculty decide to undertake the establishment of an Interdisciplinary Major in Sociology and Anthropology, we suggest that they be given a full five year cycle to establish the new program and begin its assessment.**

In closing, we would like to thank the Sociology and Anthropology faculty at Mesa State for their excellent organization of Dr. Shepperd's campus visit and their full cooperation and readiness for the program review, including the late addition of telephone interviews with Dr. Vitullo as part of the program review process. The faculty members' candor and sincerity in discussions with both of the authors of this report was greatly appreciated. We also appreciate the preparation and contributions of their colleagues across the campus in the Office of Institutional Research, the library, and the Budget Office. We hope that the recommendations in this review will help both the institution and the program to continue to strengthen Anthropology and Sociology at Mesa State College.

## REFERENCES

- American Association of Colleges and Universities. 2008. *College Learning for a New Global Century*. Washington D.C.
- Eberts, Paul, Carla B. Howery, Catherine White Berheide, Kathleen Crittenden, Robert Davis, Zelda Gamson, and Theodore Wagenaar. 1990. *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Kain, Edward L. 2007. "The Structure of the Sociology Major at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States." *Teaching Sociology* 35(1): 31-47.
- Kain, Edward L., Theodore C. Wagenaar, and Carla B. Howery. 2006. *Models and Best Practices for Joint Sociology-Anthropology Departments*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Lowry, Janet Huber, Carla B. Howery, John P. Myers, Harry Perlstadt, Caroline Hodges Persell, Diane Pike, Charles H. Powers, Shirley A. Scritchfield, Cynthia M. Siemsen, Barbara Trepagnier, Judith Ann Warner, and Gregory L. Weiss. 2005 *Creating an Effective Assessment Plan for the Sociology Major*. American Sociological Association.
- McKinney, Kathleen, Carla B. Howery, Kerry J. Strand, Edward L. Kain, and Catherine White Berheide. 2004. *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated: Meeting the Challenge of Teaching Sociology in the Twenty-First Century*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Nichols, James O. (Ed.). 1995. *A Practitioner's Handbook for Institutional Effectiveness and Student Outcomes Assessment Implementation* (3rd ed.). New York: Agathon.
- Spalter-Roth, Roberta M., and William B. Erskine. 2003. *How Does Your Department Compare? A Peer Analysis from the AY 2001-2002 Survey of Baccalaureate and Graduate Programs in Sociology*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Teaching Sociology. 2006. Special Issue on Cultivating Quantitative Literacy. January, 2006.

## APPENDIX I: NATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE UNDERGRADUATE SOCIOLOGY MAJOR

These recommendations are from Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated: Meeting the Challenge of Teaching Sociology in the Twenty-First Century by Kathleen McKinney, Carla B. Howery, Kerry J. Strand, Edward L. Kain, and Catherine White Berheide. This Report of the ASA Task Force on the Undergraduate Major was published in 2004. An earlier report (1990) included 13 recommendations. Most of these were retained; some have been combined within broader recommendations. The recommendations are:

**“Recommendation 1:** Departments should develop a mission statement, goals, and learning objectives for their Sociology program and make them public, especially to students.

**Recommendation 2:** Departments should gauge the needs and interests of their students, and department goals and practices should, in part, reflect and respond to these needs and interests as well as to the mission of the institution.

**Recommendation 3:** Departments should require introductory Sociology and a capstone course in Sociology as well as coursework in sociological theory, research methods, and statistics for the Sociology major.

**Recommendation 4:** Departments should infuse the empirical base of Sociology throughout the curriculum, giving students exposure to research opportunities across several methodological traditions, providing repeated experiences in posing sociological questions, developing theoretical explanations, and bringing data to bear on them.

**Recommendation 5:** Departments should structure the curriculum of required major courses and substantive elective courses to have at least four levels with appropriate prerequisites. At each succeeding level, courses should increase in both depth and integration in the major while providing multiple opportunities for students to develop higher order thinking skills and to improve their written and oral communication skills.

**Recommendation 6:** Within the four-level model, departments should also structure the curriculum to include one (or more) content area or substantive sequences which

cut across two or more levels of the curriculum. Departments should design sequences to develop students' skills in empirical and theoretical analysis along with their knowledge about one or more specialty areas within Sociology.

**Recommendation 7:** Departments should structure the curriculum to develop students' sociological literacy by ensuring that they take substantive courses at the heart of the discipline as well as across the breadth of the field.

**Recommendation 8:** Departments should structure the curriculum to underscore the centrality of race, class, and gender in society and in sociological analysis.

**Recommendation 9:** Departments should structure the curriculum to increase students' exposure to multicultural, cross-cultural, and cross-national content relevant to Sociology.

**Recommendation 10:** Departments should structure the curriculum to recognize explicitly the intellectual connections between Sociology and other fields by designing activities to help students integrate their educational experiences across disciplines.

**Recommendation 11:** Departments should encourage diverse pedagogies, including active learning experiences, to increase student engagement in the discipline.

**Recommendation 12:** Departments should offer community and classroom-based learning experiences that develop students' critical thinking skills and prepare them for lives of civic engagement.

**Recommendation 13:** Departments should offer and encourage student involvement in out-of-class (co- and extra-curricular) learning opportunities.

**Recommendation 14:** Departments should develop effective advising and mentoring programs for majors.

**Recommendation 15:** Departments should promote faculty development and an institutional culture that rewards scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

**Recommendation 16:** Departments should assess the Sociology program on a regular basis using multiple sources of data, including data on student learning."



## APPENDIX II: SAMPLE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES FOCUSING ON RESEARCH TRAINING

(Appendix 9 from Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated)

*The Sociology Department at Southwestern University, Georgetown, TX, has designed its curriculum with a set of research competencies in mind. For a full discussion, see Kain (1999). The learning goals are linked to different levels in the Sociology curriculum.*

The Sociology curriculum is designed to develop a series of skills in students. These skills are cumulative and begin with those developed in the introductory courses. The skills are developed and expanded in second- and third-level courses and culminate in the capstone experience of a seminar course and the senior oral examination.

### *Introductory Courses in Sociology*

By the end of an introductory Sociology course, students should be able to:

1. have a working familiarity with the list of concepts and terms in the Department Handbook, found online at <http://ww.southwestern.edu/academic/depts/socanthro/>
2. identify and find Sociology journals in the library and on the Web;
3. conduct an electronic search of the journals on a topic of interest;
4. evaluate and critique a published article; decipher the important material in a research article—purpose/methods/findings, beginning to distinguish between anecdotal information and sociological research as ways of knowing;
5. identify the major paradigms in Sociology;
6. demonstrate critical-thinking skills in which they formulate their own understanding of American society, how it works, and how it is shaped by issues of power and privilege;
7. develop an appreciation for the impact of race, class, and gender upon social life;
8. demonstrate skills in finding sociological resources on the Web; and
9. Illustrate their understanding and appreciation of the sociological imagination and demonstrate skills in asking sociological questions.

### *Second-level Courses*

Second-level courses, as listed in the college catalog, include two types of courses. The first set includes those that are required of all majors—Research Methods and Sociological Theory. The second set (Conformity, Deviance and Identity, Gender Relations and Sexuality, Families in Society, Sociology of Sport, and Chicago: 1893 to 1933—Studies in Urban Sociology) includes courses that tend to serve a broad audience of both majors and non-majors. These courses develop the following skills:

1. producing and evaluating a literature on a particular subject;
2. developing oral presentations on sociological research that some of the students in the class have not read (i.e., developing skills in communicating basic research materials);
3. formulating a hypothesis and proposing a method for testing it;
4. honing skills in asking sociological questions;
5. applying the concepts and the major paradigms of Sociology to a specific area of a specific field;
6. learning more specific concepts relevant to sub areas (methods, theory, conformity/deviance/ identity, gender relations and sexuality, family, and Sociology of sport);
7. movement toward synthesis of terms/concepts/theories; and
8. exploring the impact of race, class, and gender upon specific areas of social life; developing awareness of the intersections of race, class, and gender.

### *Third-level Courses*

Third-level courses in the Sociology curriculum are primarily for majors or minors or other students who have particular interest in the discipline. As noted in the college catalog, in general, students should have taken at least two other courses in Sociology and Anthropology before enrolling in these courses. Some of them may require the skills acquired in Research Methods and the Methods lab.

In these third-level courses, students will:

1. continue to develop the ability to collect and analyze data on sociological topics, with the ultimate goal of having the ability to use SPSS on the GSS to do simple analyses in different topic areas;
2. develop a more sophisticated ability to do a literature review and connect it to research;

3. develop oral presentations, including their own research; and
4. continue to apply theory and develop a more sophisticated understanding of the role of the fundamental sociological variables of gender, race, and class—developing an expanded vision of how societal structures operate and shape lives.

### *Capstone*

The final level of skill development in the Sociology curriculum comes with the capstone course. In this course, students each work on their own individual projects and develop skills that allow them to:

1. devise and carry out an individual research project;
2. report the results of that research in relation to the existing body of knowledge;
3. listen to reports of others and provide constructive criticism in a community of scholars;
4. cultivate an ability to reflect upon their experiences and synthesize the material from all of their Sociology courses, including the central importance of the intersecting impact of race, class, and gender; and
5. hone their skills at writing up their research in a final report.

Note: At a curriculum meeting on July 19, 1995, Dr. Dan Hilliard, Dr. Edward L. Kain, and Dr. Maria Lowe formulated this set of cumulative skills. It was modified and expanded at a department retreat on August 12, 1998. These learning outcomes are used in the annual assessment of the program. The department now has an annual retreat, during which the learning outcomes are regularly reviewed.



