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1) Introduction and Program Overview

a) Program description
The sociology program at Colorado Mesa University (CMU) currently offers a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in sociology. The sociology program also offers a sociology minor, which serves as an excellent complement to a wide variety of majors across the CMU curriculum.

The B.A. prepares students for a variety of careers in the public and private sectors and/or for graduate work in a variety of disciplines. Sociology majors complete a rigorous core in which they build a foundation in sociological perspectives, theories, and methods, along with "bridge" course during which they complete preparation for upper-division sociology along with professional development activities. While there are no concentrations in the major, students choose from a variety of sociology electives covering different subfields of sociology as well as a selection of courses from complementary disciplines to develop an individualized path within the major.

The sociology program is housed in the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS), which offers degrees in criminal justice, history, political science, psychology, and social work. For Academic Year 2018-19, there are 28 tenured and tenure-track full-time faculty in the department, three of whom are in the sociology program, plus four full-time instructors.

b) History of the program
The sociology program at CMU has existed since 1993 when, as the result of recommendations from North Central Accreditation, Mesa State College (now CMU) began offering degrees in traditional social science disciplines rather than an "umbrella degree" containing within it emphases in several disciplines. From 1993 to 2006, sociology students could choose a sociology major with no concentration or could choose a concentration in anthropology, human services, or criminology; the sociology program was staffed with four tenure or tenure-track sociology faculty and two tenured or tenure-track anthropology faculty.

The first of several major changes to the structure of the sociology program took place in 2006, when the concentration in criminology was phased out and replaced by a stand-alone Criminal Justice program not formally affiliated with the Sociology program. At the time of the last program review in 2008-09, the structure of the sociology major included the option of "straight" sociology with no concentration or a concentration in either anthropology or human services. At that time, the sociology program was staffed by four full-time, tenured or tenure-track professors, two in sociology and two in anthropology, and had recently hired a third sociology faculty member to begin the following academic year.

The second major change was the phasing out of the anthropology concentration and all associated courses in 2011, along with the anthropology faculty positions. The third and final major change to the structure of the sociology program took place in 2012-2013, when the human services concentration was phased out and replaced first with a social work minor and then with a stand-alone social work program not formally associated with the sociology program. When the programs were phased out, students already in those concentrations were permitted to complete their coursework. For all intents and purposes, both concentrations had been taught out by 2013-14.
vi) **Create a statistics course tailored for the major.** At the time of the 2008-09 program review, SBS was working with the Math Department to create a course tailored to SBS majors, and the external reviewer emphasized that sociology faculty would need to work closely with the mathematics faculty “to design a course that engages student in hands-on analysis of social data.” This course has been created with the input of sociology and other SBS faculty and does include a hands-on SPSS component. Sociology faculty have maintained ties with the math faculty teaching that course.

vii) **Reduce the number of required theory courses to one and establish a two-semester Capstone course in applied social research.** This is really two recommendations and we will address each in turn.

1. The sociology faculty considered reducing the theory courses to one but decided against it for two primary reasons. First, students have said that the theory sequence is where they truly begin to feel like sociologists and alumni have said that thinking theoretically is one of the skills that has been particularly beneficial to them. Because of the year-long theory sequence, sociology majors at CMU go into graduate school and the job market having had significant practice in problem-solving by applying abstract concepts and theoretical propositions to concrete realities. Students who have gone on to graduate school in sociology have reported that they are more prepared for graduate level study than their peers and students who have gone straight into careers have reported that their ability to think theoretically has been very beneficial in their careers. We believe that the year-long theory sequence is an experience that makes our students unique in their ability to provide abstract explanations for concrete social realities. Second, the theory sequence is when our students develop a cohort-mentality; because we hope to encourage post-graduation career networks among our students, we want to encourage that cohort-mentality. That said, the American Sociological Association recommends that theory come earlier in the program, so we will be considering the location of the sequence in the program.

2. Establishing a capstone sequence in applied social science has been beyond our ability given recent staffing changes. However, we do plan to create a capstone course, the specifics of which have not yet been decided (see Part 6 on Future Plans). The external reviewer provided recommendations as to the format of the capstone course, which we will carefully consider. We agree that an applied component – be it through research, internship, or active learning – is important.

viii) **Establish a chapter of Alpha Kappa Delta on campus and consider a department award for deserving students.** We established a chapter of Alpha Kappa Delta in 2010 and initiate an average of seven students each year. We have not yet established a department award but will consider that possibility as we move forward.

ix) **Consider ways of involving students in the collection of data on the needs of students in the program and the creation of an alumni contact list.** This is something we will consider implementing in the future.

x) **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.** At the time of the last program review, students were using MicroCase. Currently, students use SPSS in both STAT 215 and SOCO 303.

xi) **Make it a priority to increase the level of support available to faculty to travel from the current level of $600.** The travel allowance has not changed; however, there has been increased funding for all-campus competitive professional development grants. It remains
Beyond the classroom, the sociology faculty have made significant contributions to the campus community through service on Faculty Senate, the Board of Trustees, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and many other important committees. Contributions faculty have made to the community include a variety of talks given to community groups at the public library, through the New Dimensions senior education program, etc. The sociology faculty have also contributed to their disciplines through scholarly publications and presentations, along with service work in professional organizations.

**e) Support of other majors, minors, and general education (Essential Learning) requirements**

Sociology offers three Essential Learning courses: SOCO 144 Marriage and Families, SOCO 260 General Sociology, and SOCO 264 Social Problems. Approximately 9 sections of these courses (combined) are offered each semester and typically one is offered in the summer as well. All but one per semester are taught by full-time tenure/tenure-track faculty. All courses are approved by the Colorado Department of Higher Education for statewide guaranteed transfer.

In addition to the sociology minor, which combines well with a wide variety of majors, the sociology program’s service to other academic programs includes:

- **Criminal Justice BA and BAS Restricted Electives**: SOCO 316 (Social Inequality), SOCO 325 (Race and Ethnicity), and SOCO 400 (Classical Social Theory)
- **Criminal Justice BA and BAS Recommended Essential Learning**: SOCO 260 (General Sociology) and SOCO 264 (Social Problems)
- **Criminal Justice AAS Essential Learning Core or Degree Selection**: SOCO 264 (Social Problems)
- **Liberal Arts (Social Sciences) AA Electives**: all sociology courses may be used toward this degree
- **Political Science BA Restricted Electives**: SOCO 300 (Political Sociology), SOCO 305 (Environmental Sociology), SOCO 310 (Sociology of Religion), SOCO 312 (Social Movements and Political Activism), SOCO 314 (Population), SOCO 316 (Social Inequality), and SOCO 325 (Race and Ethnic Relations)
- **Social Work BSW Recommended General Electives**: SOCO 264 (Social Problems), SOCO 310 (Sociology of Religion), SOCO 316 (Social Inequality), SOCO 320 (Life Course Sociology), and SOCO 325 (Race and Ethnic Relations)
- **Women’s and Gender Studies Minor Electives**: SOCO 340 (Sociology of Gender), SOCO 345 (Sociology of Sexuality), and SOCO 351 (21st Century Families)

**f) Locational/comparative advantage**

Colorado Mesa University is the largest university in Western Colorado and serves a 14-county region. According to CMU’s strategic plan, CMU embraces “the philosophy that as the institution adapts to its changing world, it does so with the overarching goal of supporting the residents of Western Colorado to achieve a higher degree of educational attainment by preparing students to function successfully in the future.” Because sociology provides knowledge and a skill set that is relevant to a wide variety of career paths, a thriving sociology program is an important part of CMU’s ability to meet that strategic goal for students across the Western Slope of Colorado. Students who graduate from with a sociology degree from CMU have a competitive
and illness, life course and aging, self and society, race and ethnic relations, gender, sexuality, and contemporary families. These electives fall into three broad categories – social institutions, social inequalities, and micro-macro linkages (although most courses touch on all of these areas in some way). Sociology majors choose six of these electives for their program, and sociology minors choose five. We advise both majors and minors to think carefully about the constellation of electives they choose but recognize that they are limited by how often courses can be offered. We also recognize that we cannot offer regular courses in every subfield of sociology with only three full-time faculty members, but we allow motivated students to do independent study courses in other areas of sociology.

Finally, we believe that sociology majors are well served by developing a base of knowledge in related or complementary disciplines. Our majors choose three courses from a wide variety of restricted electives in criminal justice, philosophy, psychology, social work, political science, and history. Students are encouraged to pursue a minor in one of these fields.

b) Program currency and changes since the last program review

In part, program currency is a matter of the faculty keeping current in the literature. All of the sociology faculty take that demand seriously and continuously update our classes with the latest research. All the faculty attend conferences regularly and spend time reading articles and books not just in our own specialty areas but also in the broader areas relevant to what we teach.

As noted in the history section of this document, the program has undergone significant changes since the last program review, including the deletion of both the anthropology and the human services concentrations in 2011 and 2012 respectively. Until 2013-2014, sociology majors were required to take a course in cultural anthropology and could choose from several anthropology courses to take as electives or restricted electives; after that point, all anthropology courses were deleted from the CMU course catalog and thus from the sociology program sheet as well.

Since the last program review, several changes have been made to the sociology core, which currently consists of 19 semester hours including general sociology, the statistics and methods sequence, and the capstone theory sequence.

- In 2010-2011, CMU developed a new category of courses called “foundation courses.” This category was created to assist students transferring from community colleges so that they could move into their major during their third year and finish within four years total. At that time, the sociology faculty moved Social Problems and Cultural Anthropology from the “sociology core” to the “foundation courses” section of the program sheets. Later, Cultural Anthropology was replaced with Human Geography as a way of continuing to include an international focus. We considered including General Sociology in the foundation but ultimately kept it in the core so as to encourage students to take this important prerequisite class at CMU so that they could get to know at least one faculty member before moving on to upper-division classes.

- Another important change to the core was the development of STAT 215 (Statistics for SBS), which was offered for the first time in 2010-11. Faculty from multiple SBS majors worked with the statistics faculty to develop this four-credit course that covers basic statistics in a way that is relevant to SBS majors and includes a lab component where students learned to use SPSS. Sociology faculty continue to work with the faculty teaching that course to ensure that it remains useful to sociology majors.

- As the result of many discussions amongst the sociology faculty about how we could better prepare students for upper-division coursework, a new class – SOCO 202 (Introduction to
3) **Analysis of Student Demand and Success**

a. *Number of majors and minors*

In 2013-2014, we were in the process of “teaching out” the concentrations, particularly the Human Services concentration which had recently been redeveloped into a Social Work major (with the input and assistance of sociology faculty). Sociology now offers a major, without available concentrations, along with a sociology minor. The total number of majors in the program has decreased since 2013, despite growth in the student body of CMU. Declines have been seen in other Social and Behavioral Sciences as well, but we suspect that the changes in the major combined with faculty turnover have made it difficult to recruit and retain students. Sociology also tends to be top heavy; by this we mean that a large proportion of our students are juniors and seniors. We find that relatively few freshman majoring in sociology and that instead students come to sociology through lower-division courses; students get attached not only to the subject matter of sociology but also to the professors who teach their lower-division courses. We are hopeful that stability in the program, plus potential curricular changes, will allow us to focus on efforts to recruiting students earlier in the college careers and retaining students as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Major</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1st Major</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1st Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology-Provisional Baccalaureate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology-Criminology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology-Anthropology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology-Human Services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. *Student credit hours by student level*

Table 2 shows the number of students enrolled in sociology classes by level as well as the total number of student credit hours (SCH) that students earned each year in sociology classes. Not surprisingly, more students have enrolled in courses during their freshman and sophomore years, when they are most likely to take lower division courses that have higher enrollment caps.
Table 3: Registrations and Student Credit Hours Per Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociology Course</th>
<th>2013-14 Sect</th>
<th>Enroll</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>2014-15 Sect</th>
<th>Enroll</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>2015-16 Sect</th>
<th>Enroll</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>2016-17 Sect</th>
<th>Enroll</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>2017-18 Sect</th>
<th>Enroll</th>
<th>SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and Families 144</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro to Soc Inquiry 202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Sociology 260</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems 264</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division Subtotal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>2580</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>2670</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>2388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Sociology 300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods 303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sociology 305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Religion 310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Movements 312</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inequality 316</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Health and Illness 318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Course Sociology 320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial and Ethnic Relations 325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Aging 331</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex and Gender 340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics 396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Social Theory 400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our students also have a good track record in terms of student research. Students regularly present research at the Pacific Sociological Association annual meetings, at the Western Colorado Undergraduate Sociology Conference, and the Colorado Mesa Student Showcase. Of note, when we compare our students' research to that presented by students attending other Western Slope colleges and universities, it becomes clear that CMU sociology students are being trained in higher-level research methodologies and have a stronger theoretical background.

Each year, an undergraduate institution in Western Colorado hosts the Western Undergraduate Sociology Conference. In the spring of 2019, our program will host this event for the third time. We have secured a grant from Alpha Kappa Delta to support the costs of hosting the conference; this will give our students an opportunity to gain leadership and practical experience through conference organization and also an opportunity to present at a conference. Our students are currently doing excellent research in their sociology courses and will be prepared to present their work in the spring.

Data from alumni surveys will be presented later in this self-study, but anecdotal evidence indicates that our students are successful in the job market and in graduate school. We have had students go on to top Ph.D. programs in sociology, to applied master’s programs in sociology, and to a wide variety of other master’s programs (e.g. public health, social work, gender studies, education, and instructional technology). Sociology students often are interested in volunteering their time and we have had a number of students go on to the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps, and other service organizations. In terms of employment, our students often choose social service career paths. We have alumni working for Mesa County in the Department of Human Services, Community Corrections, and the Department of Health; we have alumni working for Montrose county in similar positions. We have alumni working for Ariel Clinical Services, for the Commons at Hilltop, the Western Slope Center for Children, Mesa Developmental Services, and Caprock Behavioral Services. Some of our students have gone into education; for instance, we have alumni working for District 51 and for the Strive Prep SMART High School (in Denver). One of the joys of being a faculty member is having students come visit or email to share their success stories.

f. Other information

In the last program evaluation nine years ago, one of the concerns that the faculty raised was the number of course taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty compared with part-time faculty. While qualified adjuncts have remained an important part of the program, changes in the past few years have resulted in more classes taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty (see Table 5). Currently, only one course per semester is taught by a non-tenure-track faculty member, while all other courses are taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty. We believe that this is beneficial for our students, particularly as we encourage students in lower-division courses to consider a sociology major or minor.
During the five-year period being reviewed, total student credit hour production has fluctuated but remained near the five-year average. The share of student credit hours taught by tenured/tenure-track faculty has steadily risen in the past five years, from a low of 51% (2013-2014) to a high of 92% (2017-2018). This is due to a decrease in the number of part-time and non-TT faculty and a steadying of the number tenured/tenure-track faculty.

Figure 2: Credit Hours Taught by Faculty Type

(3) Faculty successes/quality/recognitions
In addition to the high productivity in teaching and impressive breadth of course offerings for a small program, sociology faculty are productive outside the classroom as well. Current faculty are accomplished in scholarship, as evidenced by a total of a combined career total of 19 sole- or co-authored articles in peer-reviewed journals. Faculty members have also authored book chapters, academic encyclopedia articles, published book reviews, and served as anonymous reviewers for books and numerous journal articles. They also regularly attend and present at major academic conferences. Committed to the teacher-scholar model, sociology faculty also regularly supervise student research. Students have gone on to present their work at the CMU Student Showcase as well as regional academic conferences. As part of her qualitative methodology course, Dr. Henley supervised seven undergraduate research projects in 2018 alone, all of which were presented at the Student Showcase. Faculty engagement with mentoring and student academic achievement is also evident in Dr. Wilhelm serving as faculty representative for the CMU chapter of Alpha Kappa Delta, the sociology honor society.

The sociology faculty are very active in departmental and university service, plus significant service to the discipline. Dr. Wilhelm recently served as chair of the Senate Working Group on Tenure and Promotion, which overhauled the Tenure and Promotion Portfolio instructions and recommended changes to the Tenure and Promotion Process in the Professional Personnel Employment Handbook; she also served as Faculty Trustee from 2011-2013. Currently, in addition to serving as Program Coordinator, Dr. Wilhelm is serving once again on the all campus Tenure and Promotion Committee and a variety of other committees. Dr. Merino currently serves as webmaster for the Social and Behavioral Sciences department, working with departmental faculty to update and improve the department website. He also serves as the SBS representative to the Essential Learning Committee and serves at the department level on the Scholarship Committee. Dr. Henley currently serves as the department representative on the Distance Learning Committee and the Academic Policies Committee, and she serves at the department level on the Tutorial Services Advising Committee and on the Department Cohesion Initiative Committee.
Although some subjects may seem to have limited monographs available, use of Prospector to quickly obtain books from strong research collections such as the University of Wyoming, the University of Colorado, and Colorado State University ameliorates the shortage of materials. Further searching in the catalog with keyword searching may reveal more monographs in these areas. The liaison would be happy to help with more detailed bibliographies and additional materials can be purchased if necessary.

c. Electronic Resources

Indexes/Databases

Several full text databases are available to support research needs in sociology, including SocIndex, Social Sciences Full Text, Wiley Online, and Sage Journals Online. Subject searches (where available) on the major themes of sociology indicate the strength of the library holdings. Results indicate the number of full-text articles retrieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6 (continued)</th>
<th>Print</th>
<th>Electronic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marriage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - present</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-2003</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - present</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2012</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-2003</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Problems (Keyword)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - present</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2012</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-2003</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Inequality (Keyword)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - present</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2012</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-2003</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - present</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-2003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - present</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-2003</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Theory (Keyword)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - present</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2012</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-2003</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
range of courses offered but since the majority of need is for journal articles, the scope of full text databases available compensates for the smaller monograph collection. Strong use has been made of these resources. SocIndex, for example, was accessed for 12,243 articles during the 2017/18 academic year.

b. Weaknesses
With the limited budget available for monographs, it will be important for faculty to continue to request relevant material and participate in the collection development process. In the past few years, purchases of monographs have been directed toward filling gaps in the collection in areas such as gender studies and domestic violence as well as topic areas frequently researched by students. The budget should be sufficient to fill any gaps in coverage that may occur.

3. Recommendations
With continued partnership between the Library and the faculty, Sociology students should continue to receive excellent service and have their research needs met.

d) Physical facilities
Sociology requires no additional physical facilities beyond classroom and office space.

e) Instructional technology and equipment
The sociology program is well served by existing campus instructional technology and equipment.

f) Efficiencies in program operation
As stated above in Part B, sociology is a very cost-effective program. With expenses limited to normal classroom and office space, instructional technology and equipment, and a small number of faculty, the program is already operating very efficiently.

5) Student Learning Outcomes and Assessments

a) Student learning outcomes
In 2012, Colorado Mesa University instituted changes in the procedures for assessment based on the Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications profile. During AY 2012/13, the sociology faculty worked to develop SLOs that both fit the requirements of that profile and were consistent with the recommendations of the American Sociological Association at that time. Information reported here are based on program assessment for AY 2013/14 to AY 2017/18. Our current curriculum map is included in the appendix.

The Sociology Program Student Learning Objectives are:
1. Articulate the reciprocal relationship between individuals and society (specialized knowledge)
2. Interpret published statistical findings on social problems or issues (quantitative knowledge).
3. Frame and answer complex questions about social issues using theoretical perspectives and the scholarship from the field of Sociology (specialized knowledge).
on assignments that measure the five SLOs, although we would like to see more improvement especially in SLOs #2, 4, and 5. We are also satisfied that student performance on each of the SLOs improves from the lower-division assessment point to the upper-division assessment point. In the most recent assessment year for each SLO, the results for students in the relevant upper-division course scored as follows:

- SLO #1: 60% advanced and 20% developing
- SLO #2: 25% advanced and 50% developing, however this was a group of only 8 students. The year before, 22% scored at advanced and 67% at developing.
- SLO #3: 71% advanced and 24% developing (Due to a data collection error related to faculty turnover, data in the relevant upper-division course was not collected during the most recent assessment year.)
- SLO #4: 33% advanced and 40% developing
- SLO #5: 38% advanced and 46% developing

(2) Alumni survey results
The 23 students who returned the alumni survey indicated a high degree of satisfaction with their undergraduate education, with 95% indicating at least general satisfaction. Of the alumni who said that they were satisfied, 55% said very satisfied and 45% said generally satisfied. None of the alumni indicated that they were dissatisfied, although one was “ambivalent.” More specific to sociology, 87% said that they were at least generally satisfied with their degree program. Of those, 60% said that they had a very high degree of satisfaction and another 40% said they had a high degree of satisfaction. The remainder (three students) said that their degree of satisfaction was “average.” A full 75% said that they would definitely recommend CMU to a current high school student and another 17% said that they would probably recommend CMU. When asked specifically about the Student Learning Objects, the alumni reported the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articulate the relationship between the individual and society (or use your sociological imagination).</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>More than Adequately</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Less than Adequately</th>
<th>Very Poorly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 65.2%</td>
<td>6 26.1%</td>
<td>2 8.7%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understand the social world around you (especially based on theories and research from the discipline of sociology).</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>More than Adequately</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Less than Adequately</th>
<th>Very Poorly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 60.9%</td>
<td>7 30.4%</td>
<td>2 8.7%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understand and interpret statistical findings about social problems and issues.</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>More than Adequately</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Less than Adequately</th>
<th>Very Poorly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 30.4%</td>
<td>10 43.5%</td>
<td>5 21.7%</td>
<td>1 4.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Make clear, well-reasoned, empirically-supported arguments about social problems and issues.</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>More than Adequately</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Less than Adequately</th>
<th>Very Poorly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 56.5%</td>
<td>8 34.8%</td>
<td>1 4.3%</td>
<td>1 4.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apply sociological theories and research to real-world organizational or clinical settings.</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>More than Adequately</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Less than Adequately</th>
<th>Very Poorly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 50.0%</td>
<td>8 36.4%</td>
<td>1 4.5%</td>
<td>2 9.1%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Future Program Plans

a) Vision for the program
We feel that we are in a very exciting time for the sociology program. We have three highly qualified tenured/tenure-track professors who are dedicated to a period of rebuilding for the program. We plan the use American Sociological Association resources to restructure the curriculum and assessment plan, and then focus our attention on recruiting students and providing the best undergraduate sociology education that we can. We would like to grow the major without sacrificing the quality of instruction.

b) Strengths and challenges (including discipline trends and use of the program review process)
Since the last program review, despite the high level of faculty turnover, we have developed a strong stand-alone sociology program and we are very proud of the students in and graduates of that program. As noted earlier in this self-study, we were able to implement some but not all of the prior program reviewer's recommendations. We believe that the process of program review in 2009 helped us create a stronger program and have high hopes for this one as well. Looking back at the past nine years, with a focus on the past five, has been a useful exercise especially for our two new assistant professors. They now have a good sense of program history and are looking forward to the external reviewer's recommendations for the future of the program. Since the last program review, the American Sociological Association has developed a clear set of recommendations for the undergraduate sociology major, and we believe that the program review process will provide us the opportunity to use them to improve our major.

One of the greatest strengths of our program is the quality of instruction at the lower as well as upper division levels. Both anecdotal and systematic data indicate that our students feel that they are getting an excellent education. Our lower-division sociology courses are challenging, as we expect students to not only memorize information but to also develop skills in critical thinking, research, and the development of written arguments. Even in 50-student classes, we expect our students to demonstrate in writing comprehension of the material and relevant skills. We have been very fortunate to keep most of our upper-division courses to 20 students or fewer, which means that we can run seminar-style classes with high expectations for daily preparation, a lot of discussion, and significant one-on-one attention for students. While we would like to grow the program, we do not want to lose this strength as we believe it is crucial to providing an excellent undergraduate education that will serve our students well both during college and after graduation.

Another strength of the sociology program at CMU are the methods and theory sequences. Our students complete a three-course methods sequence, including a statistics course taught in another department and a sociology course in which they learn basic methods and write a research proposal. They finish the sequences with an advanced class where they reach the level of doing

---

Appendix I

List of Tables and Figures
### List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Majors and Minors .................................................................................... 9  
Table 2: Student Credit Hours by Student Level ............................................................ 10  
Table 3: Registrations and Student Credit Hours Per Course ............................................. 11  
Table 4: Number of Graduates .................................................................................... 12  
Table 5: Credit Hours by Faculty Type .................................................................. 14  
Figure 1: Faculty Efficiency (FTES/FTEF and Number of Faculty) ...................................... 14  
Figure 2: Credit Hours Taught by Faculty Type ............................................................ 15  
Table 6: Library Collection .................................................................................... 16  
Table 7: Electronic Resources ................................................................................. 18  
Table 8: Alumni Survey Results ............................................................................... 21  
Table 9: Curriculum Map ....................................................................................... 62
Appendix II

Faculty Curriculum Vitae
Curriculum Vitae

Brenda Wilhelm

Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences  bwilhelm@coloradomesa.edu
Colorado Mesa University  970-248-1429
Grand Junction, CO 81501

Employment

2010-present  Professor, Colorado Mesa University (formerly MSC), Grand Junction, Colorado
2005-2010  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

Primary Teaching and Research Interests

Family, Life Course, Gender, Inequality, Demography
Current Project: Not a Stepmonster: Joys and Challenges of Stepmothering (with Jessica Peterson)

Courses Taught

On a regular rotation: 21st Century Families, Population, Life Course and Aging, Social Movements and Political Activism, Classical Social Theory, Sociology of Gender, Social Problems, Marriage and Families (classroom and online)

On demand: Social Inequality, General Sociology, Race and Ethnicity


**Undergraduate Student Research Supervision**


**Conference participation**

**Academic Conference Presentations**


“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.


Professional Development Workshops
“Professional Development Workshops
“A Leadership Strengths Inventory” with Kristen Hague
“Tenure, Promotion, and the Boyers Teacher-Scholar Model” with Kristen Hague

New Dimensions (a senior education program) Courses
Women’s Movements: From Seneca Falls to #MeToo, with Erika Jackson, Fall 2017
Gender in the 20th and 21st Century: What’s Changed, What Hasn’t?, Spring 2017
Generational Change in the Transition to Adulthood, Fall 2016

Panel Discussion, “The Culture of Masculinity and Sexual Assault,” Association of Feminists, Colorado Mesa University, 2016.

Mesa County One Book.
Panel Discussion of Can’t We Talk About Something More Pleasant. 2015.
Panel Discussion of Tale for the Time Being. 2014.
Panel Discussion of The Geography of Bliss. 2010.

CMU Assessment Workshop. Presentation of Sociology Program Assessment. 2011.

Service
SBS Committee to Improve Junior Faculty Mentoring, Chair, 2018.
External Program Reviewer, Sociology, Western State University, 2018.
Colorado Mesa University Student Showcase, Judge, 2017 and 2018.
Women’s and Gender Studies Faculty Advisor, Colorado Mesa University, 2013-present.
Alpha Kappa Delta (international sociology honor society) Advisor, 2013-present.
Michrina Lecture Series Committee, 2012-present.
Sociology Program Coordinator, Faculty Mentor, and Faculty Advisor, Colorado Mesa University, 2011-present.
Sociology Assessment Coordinator, Colorado Mesa University, 2003-present.
Orientation and Recruitment Events Advisor for SBS, Colorado Mesa University, 2008-present.
Chair, Senate Working Group on Tenure and Promotion, 2017-2018.

Research Sabbatical, Colorado Mesa University, 2016.

Distinguished Faculty Nominee, Colorado Mesa University, 2013 and 2016.

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


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


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

Honors Pass, Social Movements Prelim 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.

References

Available upon request
  - Reported on by CNN and *The Salt Lake Tribune*


**Other articles**


TEACHING EXPERIENCE

2016- (CMU) Courses taught:
2016- (CMU) General Sociology (Fall 2016, Fall 2017, Sum 2017, Fall 2018)
2016- (CMU) Social Inequality (Fall 2016, Fall 2017, Fall 2018)
2016- (CMU) Race and Ethnic Relations (Fall 2016, Fall 2018)
2016- (CMU) Sociology of Religion (Fall 2016)
2016- (CMU) Sociological Research Methods (Sp 2017, Sp 2018)
2016- (CMU) Social Problems (Sp 2017, Sp 2018)
2016- (CMU) Environmental Sociology (Fall 2017)
2016- (CMU) Self and Society (Sp 2018)

2012-2016 (UTPA/ UTRGV) Courses taught:
2012-2016 (UTPA/ UTRGV) Sociology of Religion (Fall 2012, Fall 2013, Fall 2014, Fall 2015)
2012-2016 (UTPA/ UTRGV) Social Psychology (Fall 2012, Fall 2013, Fall 2014, Sum 2015, Fall 2015, Sp 2016)

2010-2011 (Penn State) Courses taught:
2010-2011 (Penn State) Race and Ethnic Relations (Sum 2011)
2010-2011 (Penn State) Introductory Sociology (Sum 2010)
2017  Member, Anonymous Committee for Distinguished Faculty Award, CMU
2016-  Advisor, CMU Sociology Club
2015-2016  Sociology Program Representative, UTRGV Faculty Senate
2014-2016  Co-Advisor, UTPA/UTRGV Sociology Club
2013-2016  Co-Advisor, UTPA/UTRGV chapter of Alpha Kappa Delta Sociology Honor Society
2014-2015  Sociology Undergraduate Student Advisor, UTPA
2014-2015  Member, Faculty Development Council, UTPA
2011-2012  Student Representative, Sociology Graduate Admissions Committee, Penn State University
2011  Member, Planning Committee for the 2011 Penn State Stratification and Social Change Conference
2010  Moderator, Ronald E. McNair Scholars Program Annual Summer Research Conference, Penn State University

_Profession_

2011-2012  Student Representative, American Sociological Association Section on Sociology of Religion Council

_Ad Hoc_  

_Memberships_  
Alpha Kappa Delta (Sociology Honor Society), Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Association for the Sociology of Religion, Religion Research Association
Megan M. Henley  
Curriculum Vitae  
September 2018

Social and Behavioral Sciences Department  mhenley@coloradomesa.edu  
Colorado Mesa University  970-248-1435  
1100 North Avenue  
Grand Junction, CO 81501

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

2016-present  Assistant Professor of Sociology, Colorado Mesa University

EDUCATION

2016  Ph.D. University of Arizona (Sociology)  
Dissertation Title: “Science and Service: Doula Work and the Legitimacy of Alternative Knowledge Systems”  
Committee: Louise Marie Roth (chair), Erin Leahey, Terrence D. Hill

2013  Certificate of College Teaching, Office of Instruction and Assessment  
University of Arizona

2010  M.A. University of Arizona (Sociology)

2007  B.A. University of California, Irvine (Sociology, Honors)

TEACHING AND RESEARCH AREAS

Medical Sociology, Gender, Knowledge, Reproduction, Families

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

At Colorado Mesa University: Sociology of Marriage and Families, Sociological Inquiry, Sociology of Health and Illness, General Sociology, Sociology of Sexuality, Contemporary Social Theory, Qualitative Methods (all in-person)

At University of Arizona: Reproduction and Society, Health Disparities, Families and Society, Gender, Identities, Interactions, and Relationships (all web-based); Health and Society, Introduction to Sociology (taught both in-person and as web-based); Medical Sociology, Sociology of Gender (in-person only).
Other Publications


Manuscripts in Preparation

Henley, Megan M. Millennial Mothers and the Digital Divide in Healthcare Knowledge: The Case of Doula Support.

Henley, Megan M. “The Goddess of the Room”: Birth as a Feminist Issue among Doulas and Mothers.


UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH SUPERVISION


Alma De Lara, “Men’s versus Women’s Success with College Math,” Presented at CMU Student Showcase, Grand Junction.

Nicholas Mynes, “Family Pressure in Collegiate Football” Presented at CMU Student Showcase, Grand Junction.


Amy Schuster, “Portrayals of Women in Magazine Advertisements” Presented at CMU Student Showcase, Grand Junction.

Gary Reece-Scott, “Rap Music’s Influence on Young African Americans” Presented at CMU Student Showcase, Grand Junction.


2011  “‘Everybody Loved Him!’: Men in Early Childhood Education.” Gender and the Workplace Session. Southwest Social Science Conference in Las Vegas, NV.


SERVICE

Professional

Ad hoc reviewer for Sociological Inquiry; Higher Education; Social Science Quarterly; Social Currents; Social Problems
ASA Session Organizer: Body and Embodiment Section

Departmental and University

Department Service
Tutorial Services Advisory Committee
Departmental Cohesion Initiative Facilitator

University Service
Distance Learning Committee Department Representative
Academic Policy Committee Department Representative
Social Responsibility Committee (Ad Hoc)
Colorado Mesa University Student Showcase Facilitator

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American Sociological Association
   Section Memberships: Medical Sociology; Sex and Gender; Body and Embodiment; Science, Knowledge, and Technology
Lamaze International
Pacific Sociological Association
Southern Sociological Association
Sociologists for Women in Society
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Current Program Sheets
About This Major . . .

Sociology is the scientific study of social life, social change, social organization, and the complex social causes and consequences of human behavior. Since all human behavior is social, the subject matter of sociology covers a broad array of topics, including family, religion, crime, politics, life course, race, gender, and social class. Sociology provides many distinctive perspectives on the social world, as well as a range of research methodologies that can be applied to virtually any aspect of social life, from corporate downsizing to problems of peace and war to the expression of emotion and beyond. Because sociology addresses the most challenging issues of our time, it is an expanding field increasingly tapped by those who craft policies and create social programs. For more information on the subject matter of sociology, go to www.asanet.org/topics.

Sociology majors gain important skills in critical thinking, research methods and responsible citizenship. Sociology majors are prepared for future graduate work in sociology and related disciplines, as well as for a wide variety of careers in such sectors as business, the health professions, the criminal justice system, social services, human resources and government.

For more information on what you can do with this major, go to http://www.coloradomesa.edu/career/whatmajor.html and www.asanet.org/career-center/careers-sociology

Advising Process and DegreeWorks

This document is intended for informational purposes to help determine what courses and associated requirements are needed to earn a degree. The suggested course sequencing outlines how students could finish degree requirements. Some courses are critical to complete in specific semesters, while others may be moved around. Meeting with an academic advisor is essential in planning courses and altering the suggested course sequencing. It is ultimately the student’s responsibility to understand and fulfill the requirements for her/his intended degree(s).

DegreeWorks is an online degree audit tool available in MAVzone. It is the official record used by the Registrar’s Office to evaluate progress towards a degree and determine eligibility for graduation. Students are responsible for reviewing their DegreeWorks audit on a regular basis and should discuss questions or concerns with their advisor or academic department head. Discrepancies in requirements should be reported to the Registrar’s Office.
ESSENTIAL LEARNING REQUIREMENTS (31 semester hours)
See the current catalog for a list of courses that fulfill the requirements below. If a course is an Essential Learning option and a requirement for your major, you must use it to fulfill the major requirement and make a different selection for the Essential Learning requirement.

English (6 semester hours, must receive a grade of “C” or better and must be completed by the time the student has 60 semester hours.)

- ENGL 111 - English Composition (3)
- ENGL 112 - English Composition (3)

Mathematics (3 semester hours, must receive a grade of “C” or better, must be completed by the time the student has 60 semester hours.)

- MATH 110 - College Mathematics (3) or higher

Humanities (3 semester hours)

- Select one Humanities course (3)

Social and Behavioral Sciences (6 semester hours)

- Select one Social and Behavioral Sciences course (3)
- Select one Social and Behavioral Sciences course (3)

Natural Sciences (7 semester hours, one course must include a lab)

- Select one Natural Sciences course (3)
- Select one Natural Sciences course with a lab (4)

History (3 semester hours)

- Select one History course (3)

Fine Arts (3 semester hours)

- Select one Fine Arts course (3)

OTHER LOWER-DIVISION REQUIREMENTS

Wellness Requirement (2 semester hours)

- KINE 100 - Health and Wellness (1)
- Select one Activity course (1)

Essential Learning Capstone (4 semester hours)

Essential Learning Capstone must be taken after completion of the Essential Learning English and Mathematics requirements, and when a student has earned between 45 and 75 hours.

- ESSL 290 - Maverick Milestone (3)
- ESSL 200 - Essential Speech (1)

FOUNDATION COURSES (12 semester hours)

- GEOG 102 - Human Geography (3)
- SOCO 264 - Social Problems (3)

Two consecutive classes in the same foreign language. FLAS 114 & 115 will NOT fulfill this requirement.

-

-
About This Minor...
Sociology is the study of social life, social change, social organization, and the social causes and consequences of human behavior. Sociologists investigate the structure of groups, organizations, and societies, as well as how people interact within these contexts. Since all human behavior is social, the subject matter of sociology ranges widely from intimate families to hostile mobs; from organized crime to religious cults; and from the divisions of race, class and gender to the common beliefs in a culture. Sociology provides many distinctive perspectives on the social world, as well as a range of research methodologies that can be applied to virtually any aspect of social life, from corporate downsizing to problems of peace and war to the expression of emotion and beyond. Because sociology addresses the most challenging issues of our time, it is an expanding field whose potential is increasingly tapped by those who craft policies and create social programs.

Sociology majors gain important skills in critical thinking, research methods, and responsible citizenship. Students who minor in sociology develop an understanding of social behavior and social organization that is useful in any career path they choose.

Advising Process and DegreeWorks
This document is intended for informational purposes to help determine what courses and associated requirements are needed to earn a minor. Meeting with an academic advisor is essential in planning courses and developing a suggested course sequencing. It is ultimately the student's responsibility to understand and fulfill the requirements for her/his intended minor.

DegreeWorks is an online degree audit tool available in MAVzone. It is the official record used by the Registrar's Office to evaluate progress towards a minor. Students are responsible for reviewing their DegreeWorks audit on a regular basis and should discuss questions or concerns with their advisor or academic department head for the minor. Discrepancies in requirements should be reported to the Registrar's Office.

Graduation Process
A minor cannot be awarded by itself. It must be combined with a baccalaureate degree outside the major field of study. Students should follow the graduation process outlined for the baccalaureate degree and list their majors and minors on the "Intent to Graduate" form.

If a student's petition for graduation is denied, it will be her/his responsibility to consult the Registrar's Office regarding next steps.
Appendix IV

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment
Current Student Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Map

The Sociology Program Student Learning Objectives are:
1. Articulate the reciprocal relationship between individuals and society (specialized knowledge).
2. Interpret published statistical findings on social problems or issues (quantitative knowledge).
3. Frame and answer complex questions about social issues using theoretical perspectives and
   the scholarship from the field of Sociology (specialized knowledge).
4. Write a fully developed and empirically supported research paper in standard American
   Sociological Association format (communication fluency).
5. Describe ways in which theories and research from the discipline of sociology are applied in
   real-world organization and clinical settings (applied learning).

Table 9: Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>200-level ES</th>
<th>SOC 202</th>
<th>300-level</th>
<th>SOC 303/400/410</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Articulate individual/society relationship</td>
<td>Beginning level</td>
<td>Developing level</td>
<td>Developing level</td>
<td>Advanced level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpret statistical findings</td>
<td>Beginning level</td>
<td>Developing level</td>
<td>Developing level</td>
<td>Advanced level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Frame and answer complex questions</td>
<td>Beginning level</td>
<td>Developing level</td>
<td>Developing level</td>
<td>Advanced level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Write research paper</td>
<td>Beginning level</td>
<td>Developing level</td>
<td>Developing level</td>
<td>Advanced level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Describe real-world applications</td>
<td>Beginning level</td>
<td>Developing level</td>
<td>Developing level</td>
<td>Advanced level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Outcome 2</td>
<td>Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)</td>
<td>Assessment Method(s)</td>
<td>Semester of Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret published statistical findings on social problems or issues (quantitative knowledge)</td>
<td>SOCO 202, SOCO 303</td>
<td>The specific methods vary from course to course and semester to semester but there is always a writing assignment in which students are asked to demonstrate this ability; the complexity and depth expected increases they progress through the program. Students are rated as beginning (B), developed (D), or advanced (A).</td>
<td>2015-2016, 2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Results (Include numbers of students)</th>
<th>Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>202(13) - 62%B,23%D,8%A&lt;br&gt;303(18) - 17%B,67%D,22%A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>202 (19) = 42%B, 53%D, 5%A&lt;br&gt;303 (8) = 25%B, 50%D, 25%A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions Taken**

Many more students are achieving a high level of competence in their quantitative fluency in the upper-level course (both taught by the same professor). While we'd like to see more student achieve an advanced level of competence by the end of 303, we're happy with the general trend we are seeing. Due to faculty turnover, there will be some changes made to both classes. Especially in 303, we will work toward getting more students to an advanced level.

Due to faculty turnover, both courses were taught in 2016-17 by faculty new to CMU as new preparations. These realities, plus a very small N for SOCO 303, make it difficult to interpret changes between the two years of assessment. Taken at face value, it seems that students are getting to a more advanced point in SOCO 202 but not in SOCO 303. However, we suspect that this is an artifact of the above issues.
Program Outcome 4
Write a fully developed and empirically supported research paper in standard American Sociological Association format (communication fluency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses/Educational Strategies Used (from Curriculum Map)</th>
<th>Assessment Method(s)</th>
<th>Semester of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCO 202, SOCO 410 (AY 13/14), SOCO 303 (AY 17/18)</td>
<td>The specific methods vary from course to course and semester to semester but there is always a writing assignment in which students are asked to demonstrate this ability; the complexity and depth expected increases they progress through the program. Students are rated as beginning (B), developed (D), or advanced (A).</td>
<td>2013-2014 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Results (Include numbers of students)</th>
<th>Target or Benchmark (If Applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2013-2014| 202 – 58%B, 21%D, 21%A  
410 – 14%B, 38%D, 48%A |                                    |
| 2017-2018| 202 (19) – 37%B, 26%D, 37%A  
303 (15) – 27%B, 40%D, 33%A |                                    |

Actions Taken:

The overall performance of students in the courses improved over time. The seniors were much more advanced than the sophomores/juniors. Between the two assessment years, a lot changed, including the course that we are using to assess the upper-division students. SOCO 202 has changed to include an introductory research methods component that is explicitly connected with SOCO 303, which is the primary research methods course. We’d like to see more improvement between SOCO 202 and 303 in the percentage of students who score out at the advanced level. This is something that we will be discussing as we talk about curricular changes after the 2018-19 program review. We also wonder if following individual students from one course to the next might provide more useful data.
External Reviewer’s Report

Submitted:

By: Dr. Anne Cross
Professor, Metropolitan State University, St. Paul, MN

For

Program Review AY 2018/2019

At

Colorado Mesa University
Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Sociology Program

Visit Date: April 30, 2019

Program Description

Bachelor of Arts: Sociology
I. NARRATIVE

This report was prepared with the help of the department’s self-study and an April 30, 2019, visit to campus. My knowledge and training as a consultant and longtime program reviewer for the American Sociological Association (ASA) informs this review. I appreciate all those who made this process efficient and outcome-oriented. Specifically, I extend my thanks to Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs (AVPAA) for Student and Faculty Success, Dr. Aparna Palmer; Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Kurt Haas; Department Head of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Dr. Jessica Herrick; The Director of the Library, Ms. Sylvia Rael, AVPAA for Assessment and Accreditation, Dr. Morgan Bridge; Vice President of Information Technology, Mr. Jeremy Brown; the Sociology program faculty; and the current Sociology program students.

The narrative and findings contained in this report are made in consideration of the context of the university’s and department’s expressed mission and goals. All evaluations and recommendations align with discipline norms and best practices within the field of sociology. The report’s specific findings regarding the program are mine alone and do not represent any other entity.

Introduction

Colorado Mesa University’s (CMU) institutional mission statement provides a context for departmental program reviews:

Committed to a personal approach, Colorado Mesa University is a dynamic learning environment that offers abundant opportunities for students and the larger community to grow intellectually, professionally, and personally. By celebrating exceptional teaching, academic excellence, scholarly and creative activities, and by encouraging diversity, critical thinking, and social responsibility, CMU advances the common good of Colorado and beyond (CMU-1 2018).

The content of the self-study and observations made on campus confirm that CMU’s Sociology program is committed to the university’s collective goals and makes strong contributions to all aspects of this mission.

The Sociology Curriculum

The current Sociology curriculum at CMU is sound. Required and elective courses include essential sociological concepts and competencies and support broader 21st-century learning goals, including data analysis, critical thinking, research, and writing. The curriculum reflects current disciplinary standards and is in keeping with recent endeavors within the discipline to
Sociology provides courses required for graduation to students across all majors. Whether being taken as electives, Essential Learning Requirements, or as part of a variety of majors and minors, CMU Sociology courses provide critical curricular infrastructure for the university.

In addition to serving sociology majors and offering in-major content for programs such as social work and criminology, the CMU Sociology curriculum plays a mission-critical role in the university’s broader curricular infrastructure, due to Sociology’s strong role on the list of approved Essential Learning Requirements in the Social and Behavioral Sciences. CMU Sociology is home to three of the twenty available options.

On several points, the program and its contents are truly exceptional. The curriculum is delivered by an exceptionally talented, motivated, dedicated, charismatic, and well-prepared (though small and perhaps overworked) faculty. Curricular materials, including syllabi, lectures, electronic course content, curated links, and supplemental material, are exceptionally well-developed and innovative. Students offer exceptionally positive feedback about the program faculty and curriculum. Through the club and other department initiatives, students are offered opportunities to engage in research and other sociology-related activities outside the classroom, including participation in conferences, campus activities, and viewing and discussing sociology-related films. Alumni report broad satisfaction with the program and the preparation they received.

The Sociology B.A. and the courses contained within it provide students with a foundation in conceptual and methodological knowledge of the social world. Each course offered by CMU Sociology builds competencies in research, critical thinking, and data analysis. The program provides solid preparation for meaningful employment, civic engagement, and intellectual (and more general) thriving in today’s dynamic environment. The program, as currently delivered, provides an excellent foundation for advanced study in a variety of fields.

**Depth and Breadth of the Curriculum:** On paper, the number and variety of sociology courses currently in the CMU catalogue represents a robust curriculum of adequate depth and breadth. In practice, however, the depth and breadth of the curriculum are significantly constrained by the small size of the faculty. Currently, the faculty regularly teaches in an overload capacity to cover even the basic needs of majors and other CMU students who rely on sociology courses in their degree plans. Many CMU Sociology courses are offered infrequently because of staffing shortages. Other courses on the books are not within the current faculty members’ areas of expertise. The current CMU Sociology curriculum is deeper and broader than can be delivered given current resources and lacks sufficient depth and breadth.
time. The department lacks the faculty bandwidth required to support and facilitate internships, career pipelines, professional networking, and mentoring, and to harness alumni and other stakeholders toward serving the learning and career objectives of the department and its students.

**Capacity for Careful and Personalized Mentoring:** Although a significant amount of fully appropriate and valuable service is being done by CMU Sociology, opportunities exist to strengthen formal and informal advising and mentoring processes within the department that would directly serve the student population. Additional faculty resources would help ensure that the program has the capacity and time required to actively engage students in academic and career planning and offer guidance on further study in sociology and related fields.

**Program Goals and Mission:** Although a general set of goals can be reverse engineered from the department’s assessment program, to my knowledge, the program has not yet articulated a distinct or collectively crafted mission that is relevant for the department’s present configuration. Assessment protocols within the department do not fully measure the program’s progress toward its goals and the overall university mission. The program is aware of this shortcoming and has plans to address it.

**Use of Data in Assessing Teaching Effectiveness and Program Goals:** Data collected in a department’s assessment program are currently underutilized as a means to improve the curriculum and better understand students’ strengths and needs. The faculty currently has access to Qualtrics software through the department, which would be helpful in managing and using data.

**University Context**

The ASA emphasizes the importance of taking stock of the institutional context in which the Sociology curriculum is offered. Institutional and cultural factors, although outside the scope of any single program review, are overwhelmingly determinate in any program’s success and quality. Broader CMU context is outside the scope of this report, but several positive aspects of the university climate were apparent during the campus visit, including innovative administrative structures, exceptional collegiality, and a strong commitment to student success. These elements of university life undergird CMU Sociology’s quality and productivity.

In the self-study report, the Sociology program is described as “very cost-effective,” presumably within the context of the overall university budget. University trustees, administrative leaders, and faculty are advised to take a more nuanced and equity-informed look at funding and staffing levels that support Sociology at CMU.
## II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Table 1: Executive Summary for External Reviewer’s Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review Element</th>
<th>Check the appropriate option</th>
<th>Provide explanation if you do not agree with an element and/or why you are unable to evaluate it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Do Not Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program’s self-study is a realistic and accurate appraisal of the program.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program’s mission and its contributions are consistent with the institution’s role and mission and its strategic goals.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program’s goals are being met.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum is appropriate to the breadth, depth, and level of discipline.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum is current, follows best practices, and/or adheres to the professional standards of the discipline.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current library resources meet the program’s needs.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning outcomes are appropriate to the discipline, clearly stated, measurable, and assessed.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program faculty members are involved in ongoing assessment efforts.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program faculty members analyze student learning outcome data and program effectiveness to foster continuous improvement.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program’s articulation of its strengths and challenges is accurate/appropriate and integral to its future planning.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which assessment is being used to productively manage pedagogical and curricular adjustments within programs and across the department is unclear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Recommendations and Commendations

Recommendations for Program Improvement: several of these points have been identified in the narrative of this report. For clarity, they are organized as specific action items.
Recommendation 4: Secure resources to design and launch an internship and/or service learning program.

Recommendation 5: Develop a strategy and ensure sufficient resources to support effective online education in sociology. Introduce more online offerings in sociology (faculty resource permitting).

Recommendation 6: Strengthen formal and informal advising and mentoring processes within the department.

6a. Ensure that the faculty has the capacity and time required to provide personal attention to students and proactively engage with students on the topics of academic and career planning.

6b. Secure appropriate faculty resources to support and facilitate internships, career pipelines, professional networking, and mentoring, and to harness alumni cohesion and loyalty for serving the learning and career objectives of the department and its students.

Recommendation 7: Develop a pathway for junior faculty to gradually take on more responsibility for decision-making within the discipline and curriculum as they gain seniority.

Recommendation 8: Develop an effective social media presence to facilitate connection with students, alumni, and other stakeholders.

8a. Review examples across CMU (if available) and from other sociology programs. (See the University of Illinois at Chicago’s Facebook page for an example at https://www.facebook.com/uicsoc/.)

8b. Make the creation, shaping, and maintenance of CMU’s social media presence the collective responsibility of the sociology program rather than assigning the task to one person.

8c. Make sure that social media messages reflect authentic content and support the university’s mission and complement the university’s overall brand management strategies.

8d. Get students involved in creating authentic social media content.
This program chose not to prepare a rejoinder because factual errors were not present in the external review.