

**SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY DEPARTMENT**

**PROGRAM REVIEW**

**SIX-YEAR REPORT**

**September 2017**

Thomas Jayawardene, Full Professor of Sociology & Interim Department Chair (2017-2018)

Sarah Jirek, Associate Professor of Sociology

Serah Shani, Assistant Professor of Anthropology

Felicia Song, Associate Professor of Sociology & Department Chair (2014-2017)

Meredith Whitnah, Assistant Professor of Sociology

## 1.0. INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

### 1.1 Current Status

Since 2010, the year of the previous Six-year Report, the Sociology & Anthropology Department has undergone a sea change. Namely, over the course of a four-year period, we have successfully completed *four* job searches to fill tenure-track positions made open from two retirements (one in sociology and one in social work), a previous sociology vacancy that had been temporarily filled with a series of full-time instructors, and a line in Anthropology (that Tito Paredes had graciously filled on a multi-year short-term appointment). The new faculty members consist of:

- Felicia Song, hired as Associate Professor of Sociology and Department Chair, having previously taught at Louisiana State University's Manship School of Mass Communication for seven years, and researched online communities and women in social media;
- Sarah Jirek, hired as Assistant Professor of Sociology, having previously taught at University of Tampa after earning a joint PhD in Sociology and Social Work from the University of Michigan, with expertise in gender, violence, interpersonal practice, and trauma recovery;
- Meredith Whitnah, hired as Assistant Professor of Sociology, a recent PhD graduate of Notre Dame's Department of Sociology, specializing in religion and gender in cross-cultural perspective;
- Serah Shani, hired as Assistant Professor of Anthropology, having served as Visiting Professor at Eastern University after earning a PhD in Anthropology from Columbia University, with expertise in African education, and immigration.

With so many hires occurring in a short period of time, we are grateful for the investment and support of all those who helped make the transition possible, not only our colleagues who have since left the department, but also the external committee members and the Provost's Office.

Despite the high degree of transition in personnel, the department has been able to organize well-attended events such as the Fall Department Retreat, Department Chapel, and Senior Lunch, while also managing to cover all our necessary course offerings and introducing new ones as well. With new faculty come updated or new courses that reflect the growing fields of research in the discipline. Some new courses include Sociology of Sport, Internet and Society, and Anthropology of Education. We have also experimented with new events and programming for faculty and students such as the Ice-Cream Social kick-off, a Research Brownbag Lunch Series, Workshops on Professionalization, a bi-weekly email newsletter to our majors, and participation in the Westmont Research Symposium.

We are hopeful for the department's future when we consider how we and our students have performed in this time of intense transition within the broader Westmont community: three of our incoming faculty have given campus-wide public lectures—including the Phi Kappa Phi lecture—one of our faculty was named 2017 Teacher of the Year, and our department has managed to receive awards in 2015 and 2016 for exemplary Annual Assessment Update Reports. More importantly, we have been extremely proud to have among our majors: three inductees into the Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society; the recipient of the Dean's Award for being the outstanding female student-athlete in 2016; the recipient of the 2014 David K. Winter

Servant Leader Award; and both the 2016 and the 2017 Dave Dolan Award recipients for campus leadership.

Our most significant and ongoing work remaining is the revision of the department's curriculum. We have been able to make significant progress in revising our major requirements in research methods and the senior capstone experience. With this first step completed and with all of our department's lines filled, we are now poised to begin discussion on how the existing three tracks might be improved to reflect the aims and goals of our new faculty.

## **1.2 Values and Vision**

In the past few years, the wider world has been changing as dramatically as the department has, and in particular ways that arguably increase the relevance of sociology and anthropology as disciplines necessary to the equipping of our students as informed citizens of a changing world:

- After a series of high-profile police shootings of unarmed black people and the cultural emergence of the Black Lives Matter movement, the quandaries of race and social class have returned to the center of public and political discourse after a time when many assumed that America had become post-racial;
- Changing norms concerning sexuality have solidified through the 2015 federal legalization of same-sex unions and similar watershed legislative battles over the status of transgender individuals, further throwing into question how our society negotiates the gendered nature of our institutions and practices.
- The double-edges of globalization have manifested internationally in increasing conflict, violence, and a humanitarian refugee crisis, and domestically within nation-states as elections display growing rifts between those who have felt threatened and those who have gained from the transnational forces of cultural exchange.

In light of these macro-level developments, our department's Mission Statement remains:

*...to develop our major's capacities as social scientists to think critically and globally about human experience. The department offers students the richness of a multi-disciplinary study of the ways in which culture and society influence human behavior. We provide students a foundation in the concepts, theories, and methods of sociology and/or anthropology. Students also have the opportunity to take courses related to social work. ...Along with a strong academic background in sociology and anthropology, we want our students' interests in these disciplines to be grounded within the Christian faith. We place emphasis upon not only the acquisition of knowledge and skills but also the ability to use them to serve others and to further the building of Christ's Kingdom.*

In this report, we wish to affirm the core of our mission statement by highlighting the ways that our disciplines have the potential to motivate a type of moral awakening that is particular to one's social situatedness. For most Westmont students, a moral awakening would mean gaining consciousness of their privilege—whether it be in their social class, race, or gender—and then being offered opportunities to practice genuine empathy and realize their need to identify how to appropriately wield the cultural assets they possess in their social identity for the greater good. For those students who come from comparatively disadvantaged backgrounds, their moral awakening can emerge out of a realization of how larger forces

have profoundly shaped the course of their life. Upon grasping those forces to be malleable and upheld by human institutions and ideologies, students have the potential to experience their disadvantage as a strategic position from which to articulate and enact resistance that communicates truth about how things can be otherwise, just as our Lord Jesus Christ did.

For either student, our department's hope is that such an awakening would help form an attitude of epistemological humility that comes with recognizing the limitations of one's social location and cultural 'inhabitation'. In our current cultural climate, where voices are often shrill and patience lacking, this humility is essential and a testament to the task of peacemaking that we are called to as Christians. In this way, our department is animated by both philosopher Nicholas Wolterstorff and Ugandan theologian Emmanuel Katongole's twin calling to the Church to pursue Shalom or Biblical human flourishing:

*"We are to pray and struggle for the release of the captives, and we are to pray and struggle for the release of the enriching potentials of God's creation. We live under both a liberation mandate and a cultural mandate. And the vision comes to us as a two-part invitation: we are invited to celebrate such manifestations of shalom as appear in our world, and invited to mourn Shalom's shortfall."*  
(Wolterstorff 2004: 23)

Because so much of teaching sociology and anthropology involves addressing the many inequalities, cultural conflicts, and distressing problems of our world, we are aligned with Katongole's claim: "To learn to lament is to become people who stay near to the wounds of the world, singing over them and washing them, allowing the unsettling cry of pain to be heard" (Katongole & Rice 2008: 94)

Accepting that "Justice is the ground floor of shalom..." We aim to "not just...teach *about* justice—though we must...we [also] teach *for* justice. The graduate whom we seek to produce must be one who practices justice" (Wolterstorff, p. 23, 24) for our department firmly believes that "We do not flee the world, but rather carve out wild spaces within it. We are a people who can imagine new possibilities because we worship One who took on flesh and joined us where we were" (Katongole 2009: 143).

Undoubtedly, there are many steps between learning to lament and becoming a person inclined towards practicing justice and imagining new possibilities. Our hope is that the Sociology and Anthropology Department can become a critical component of the College's broader capacity to help all of its students discover how to take these steps towards practicing justice, and would continue to equip our majors to have the capacity to model and lead in the pursuit of Shalom in their future spheres of influence.

## 2.0 FINDINGS

## 2.1 STUDENT LEARNING

Since our last 6-year report, the Department of Sociology & Anthropology streamlined its Program Learning Outcomes, identifying four central PLOs:

- 1) Core Knowledge Competence: Students will apply sociological, anthropological, or social work concepts to social, cultural and global situations.
- 2) Research and Methods Competence: Students will apply qualitative and quantitative methods according to the disciplinary standards of sociology, anthropology or social work.
- 3) Integration of Faith and Learning: Students will be able to explain the integration of Biblical principles with sociological, anthropological or social work issues.
- 4) Oral and Written Communication: Students will be able to effectively communicate their ideas, research, and arguments in public presentations and reports.

Overall, our students performed satisfactorily on each of these Program Learning Outcomes. In addition to collating data from our annual assessments of each of these PLOs, we also conducted a focus group with current students in order to get more in-depth perspective on some of the questions & issues raised from our regular assessment work. In many cases, our alumni survey also shed light on how well we are executing these PLOs. Where relevant, data from these multiple sources are summarized below. While we do not currently have established Benchmarks to evaluate, we have discussed how we could work to articulate specific Benchmarks. We will continue these conversations in our next sequences of annual assessments and in department meetings.

### **2.1.1 Core Knowledge Competence:**

*Method.* Final papers from one section of SOC 001 were assessed using a scoring rubric on competence on core knowledge developed this year. Each paper was scored on a scale from Excellent (score=4) to Poor (score=1) in two areas: knowledge and application of social identities. The instructor purposively sampled 5 low-, 5 middle-, and 5 high-achieving students so that the sample would represent the full range of students in the class.

*Findings.* The overall average for competence in Knowledge was 2.563 (where 4=excellent and 1=poor) and Application was 2.597. Disaggregating this overall average, we found that the “high-achieving” students exhibited a well-developed to masterful understanding of both knowledge and application of concepts, while the “low-achieving” students demonstrated a very weak or under-developed understanding of both knowledge and application. Interestingly, the “middle-achieving” students showed a slightly greater capacity to apply concepts than articulate and explain concepts.

*Interpretation.* For some students, this assignment and course may function as motivating their “eureka moment.” In that light, these papers show good learning. We can see benefit to making at least one of the primary goals of this course to be to facilitate an environment where that can happen. Learning some basic

sociological facts (e.g., that social inequality is real, that the U.S. is not actually a level playing field, etc.) is an important first-level step in learning (which all, or nearly all, students reached). The next step, of being able to see how it plays out in their lives (and, for many, acknowledging the role that privilege has played in their lives) is the next step – a harder step – and one that a good number of students did satisfactorily.

*Action.* We decided it would be valuable to **modify the language of the current PLO** to include explicit mention of “knowledge,” since this is related to but distinct from “application.” The new language will be: “Students will demonstrate understanding of and apply sociological, anthropological, or social work concepts to social, cultural and global situations.” We also found it helpful to continue our discussions of curriculum revision and move in the direction of **scaffolding at least some of our courses**. If the goal for SOC001 is for students to comprehend the existence of a social hierarchy, the department needs to identify what the next step is for 2<sup>nd</sup> tier (and subsequent) courses in the scaffolding, so that we can determine levels of progress.

### **2.1.2 Research and Methods Competence:**

*Method.* SOC 195 Senior Seminar Research Papers were assessed using a scoring rubric on research methods which required each paper to be scored on a scale from Excellent (score=4) to Poor (score=1). Ten papers were purposively sampled from the 18 paper submissions to reflect the work of 3 under-achieving, 4 mid-level achieving, and 3 high-achieving students.

*Findings.* In general, it was observed that there was great variance between student papers that demonstrated excellent understanding and great thoughtfulness in conducting research, and other papers which contained significant holes and lacked basic research competence. Out of a possible 20 points, the average overall score was 13.08. This finding is reinforced by the alumni survey, where it was notable that, compared to higher scores on our other PLOs, 41% of our alumni from the last 15 years indicated that their ability to apply and achieve competency in qualitative and quantitative methods is only “average.” Some alumni also specifically noted that this was a weakness in the curriculum during their time here.

*Interpretation.* While students generally seemed to be most able to articulate their method choice rationale, their execution of the respective methods varied greatly in skill. Small sample sizes, convenience sampling methods, and weak explanations of coding schemes raised concerns about how much time and guidance students receive in developing independent research projects. We discussed the institutional history that had resulted in the decision to *not* have qualitative/quantitative methods as two separate courses -- and found that we agree that, while well-intentioned, this likely negatively impacted our students.

*Action.* The evaluation of student papers raised many questions about the adequacy of the existing SOC106/107 research sequence, and the degree to which upper-division courses successfully strengthen students’ research skills and lead up to the competence level expected of seniors in SOC/AN195. As a

result, beginning in AY 2016-2017, we changed the old SOC 106/107 sequenced courses to be **two non-sequenced courses**: SOC 108 (Quantitative Research Methods) and SOC 109 (Qualitative Research Methods). All of the students who participated in the focus group named this change as a positive one, and, in particular, appreciate that the methods courses are no longer required to be sequenced.

We need to have qualified faculty to teach quantitative methods. Given that our present faculty all have much more expertise in a range of qualitative methods, and that our alumni indicated that this was an area of comparative weakness, it is essential to prioritize this in future hires. To help fulfill this need, we would like to **hire an adjunct** specifically to teach the Quantitative Methods course for us.

We have also been requiring our students to **give oral presentations of their research** at the Westmont research symposium. This has raised the bar for the SOC 195 projects, and has generally been a positive experience. We are in ongoing conversations about how to continue to have high expectations for the senior-level research, and build up students' competence as we go along.

### **2.1.3 Integration of Faith and Learning:**

*Method.* As part of the final research paper for SOC195, students were asked to consider their research topic in light of biblical and doctrinal standards. Students were given a faith-learning rubric as a guide for the assignment, which was included as an appendix to their papers. Eleven of these essays were collected from the SOC 195 students.

*Findings.* The appendices yielded mixed evaluations as some appendices indicated thoughtful application of Biblical themes and doctrinal commitments on students' research topics, while the majority of essays demonstrated a lack of critical and appropriately contextual use of Scripture and sources. Concern about students' tendency to only consider and assert one perspective on issues about which Christians have a rich diversity of viewpoints was shared. However, students in the focus group articulated that they sense this is a priority of the faculty, and that they have been asked to work on integrating faith & learning in a variety of smaller-level assignments, depending on the course.

*Interpretation.* The gaps in students' ability to critically engage different Christian perspectives on particular social issues and concepts by the time they are working on their senior projects seem to indicate points in which the faith-learning goals need to be more intentionally introduced and exercised in earlier courses. Finding ways to systematically help students learn how engage social problems and issues in light of biblical and doctrinal standards and employ resources within appropriate historical and cultural contexts is the next step.

*Action.* The department has created a new assignment, **a faith-learning appendix**, that requires senior students to reflect on the role of faith learning—drawing from theological and Biblical resources—*specifically* in relationship to their Senior Research Project. As we continue to develop our curriculum to reflect the changes in our senior capstone experience, we will also continue to deliberately incorporate

reflections on vocation, calling, integration of faith in life in the senior capstone year (through both SOC 195 & 197).

We also intend to continue to integrate this PLO **across our curriculum**, and, now that we have a fully functioning faculty, we will have conversations in our department meetings about how to ensure that our students are building the momentum they need to be able to reflect on their senior capstone experience with appropriate depth and breadth.

#### **2.1.4 Oral and Written Communication:**

*Method.* This PLO was not assessed on its own in this period (it was due for its own assessment in AY 2016-2017), so we are relying on data from an assessment of senior seminar research papers that include information about written communication, as well as data collected in the focus group and alumni survey.

*Findings.* Assessments from senior seminar research papers in 2011-2012 scored the papers' use of Evidence-Based Argumentation at an average of 3.2; the Structure was an average of 3.4; and the Logic and Argumentation was an average of 3.3 out of a possible 4 points. This suggests that students did a reasonably good job of expressing their ideas in writing overall.

Students in the focus group asserted that this was a definite feature of the program, and that the requirements across different courses that include both oral presentations and written papers have provided opportunities for significant growth in their communication skills. Students did note that this could, at times, be uneven across different courses/instructors.

Finally, the vast majority of our alumni rated this PLO as "very important" for their career, and most of them also said they either agreed or strongly agreed that they have successfully achieved this outcome in their work.

*Interpretation.* We are hesitant to draw strong conclusions from the past assessment of the senior seminar papers, but these findings do suggest that our students are learning how to enhance their writing skills, in particular. We are more confident in interpreting results from the focus group and alumni survey: students and alumni perceive this to be one of the most important skills they develop in college, one that is very important for their careers, and we are encouraged that students find this to be an area of strength for the department.

*Action.* Given that we did not have a focused assessment of this PLO during this period, our first action step will be to **conduct an in-depth assessment of this PLO next year**. We also want to ensure that our expectations are clear, reasonable, and consistent. We will have ongoing discussions about what we are each expecting of our students, and also have further conversation, especially among those of us who teach courses that satisfy the Writing-Intensive General Education requirement, to try to maximize our department's potential to contribute to students' overall growth in their writing and oral communication skills.

### **2.1.5. Assessment Methodology**

We have three main conclusions on the assessment process: First, we think we are moving in a positive direction in terms of the effectiveness of our assessment methodology. Streamlining our PLOs to four and assessing one per year made the process more manageable. In addition, the assessment process has not only provided valuable data for us to interpret the effectiveness of our program; it has also provided us with the opportunity to have important conversations about the future of our program. Given that so many of us are new to the department, this has been invaluable.

Second, we also have found it very helpful to fine-tune our methodology in terms of both the selection of assignments and the rubrics we use to evaluate them. We think the strategy of purposively selecting high/middle/low performances is very valuable. We will continue to develop our rubrics and assignments to give us the best sense of student learning.

Third, moving forward, we would like to be more strategic about which courses we are using to evaluate certain PLOs. For instance, we have found it very helpful to introduce a wider range of courses than our senior capstone course. This could allow us to see how students are learning and improving as they move throughout our program. We also want to continue to intentionally develop assignments within courses that can also serve the purpose of being our assessment tool. For example, our discussions regarding SOC 001 helped us to think about designing an assignment that might be given in all sections of the course, giving us a helpful starting benchmark for student learning.

## **3.0 ALUMNI SURVEY AND REFLECTIONS**

**3.1. Procedures.** We created an alumni survey using SurveyMonkey, based upon a template provided by the Dean of Educational Effectiveness as well the alumni survey created by the Communication Studies Department two years ago (see Appendix 7 for a copy of our survey). Using email addresses for all Sociology and Anthropology alumni, as provided by the Alumni and Parent Relations Office, we emailed the survey link to all of our 684 alumni in late March 2017, with a reminder email sent out in early April 2017. Sixty-three emails “bounced back” as being invalid email addresses. The survey was anonymous. We requested honest feedback about both what our Department is doing well, as well as areas in which we can improve. One hundred and sixty-eight alumni began the survey, although twenty did not fully complete it. Taking into account the invalid email addresses and only counting the completed surveys, our response rate was 24% (i.e., 148 completed surveys out of 621 valid email addresses).

**3.2. Respondents.** One hundred and forty-eight alumni completed the survey. Women comprised 77% of the sample. Seventy-nine percent of the sample is non-Hispanic white. While we had 11 respondents (7%) who graduated in the 1950s and 1960s (with the earliest graduation year being 1951), most respondents, understandably, graduated more recently. Seventeen percent of respondents graduated in the 1970s, 16% in the 1980s, 14% in the 1990s, 27% in the 2000s, and 19% between 2010-2016. Sixty percent of respondents completed the Sociology General track, 21% completed the Sociology Human Services track, 15% completed the Sociology Cross-Cultural track, and 5% completed an Anthropology major.

**3.3. Findings.** Overall, the alumni survey results were very encouraging, although a handful of responses also reflect the frustration that some students experienced during a relatively recent period of faculty member turnover in the department. Below, we highlight some of the patterns we found particularly noteworthy in the dataset. Please refer to Appendices 21-22 for complete results, percentages for every item, and all responses to the open-ended questions.

***Eighty-nine percent*** of the alumni were *satisfied or very satisfied with their Sociology or Anthropology degree*. In fact, only eight individuals (5%) were not satisfied with the program. Approximately three-quarters (76%) of the alumni rated the **teaching** in the department to be *outstanding or strong*.

Sixty-three percent of the alumni completed an **internship** as a part of their Sociology or Anthropology degree. In an open-ended question, the majority of these alumni describe important learning, opportunities, or practical benefits (e.g., a job offer) that resulted from their internship. Seventy-one percent participated in an off-campus or study abroad program.

When reflecting upon their post-Westmont years, alumni continue to rate the Sociology and Anthropology Department highly. The majority of alumni indicated that our program prepared them *moderately* (47%) or *very well* (31%) for life after college. Ninety-six alumni (65%) attended an advanced degree program (so far) and 77% of them believe that the Sociology / Anthropology Department **prepared them well or very well for their advanced degree program**. Even more importantly, 92% of the alumni self-identify as a Christian or follower of Jesus Christ, and many of them describe (in an open-ended question) specific ways in which being a Sociology or Anthropology major or graduate has had a positive impact on their faith journey.

Regarding their current employment status, 61% of alumni are working full-time outside of the home, 11% are retired, 11% are working part-time outside of the home, and 4% are homemakers; the remaining 13% fall into an “other” category (usually because they fit into multiple categories). When asked to reflect upon their Sociology or Anthropology degree and their current (or most recent) employment, the vast majority of alumni indicated that their learning from the degree is being used *moderately* (31%) or *very much* (41%) in the workplace.

Regarding our four departmental **Program Learning Outcomes** (PLOs), we asked alumni to evaluate how important these PLOs are to their current (or most recent) work, as well as how successfully they have achieved these outcomes in their work. It is important to note that we divided two of our PLOs into two survey items each (i.e., we separated quantitative and qualitative research methods, and we separated oral and written communication abilities). To see the full results, please refer to the first Table in Appendix 7. Our alumni were confident regarding both the importance of and their actual success in applying core disciplinary knowledge, their ability to communicate orally, and their ability to communicate in writing with regard to their work. The alumni rated both quantitative and qualitative

research methods as somewhat less important in their work, and they most often evaluated their achievement in these areas as *average*.

We also asked alumni how important three key emphases within the Sociology or Anthropology curriculum have been in their personal formation (e.g., as an engaged citizen of society, as a Christian, as the kind of person they strive to be), as well as in their professional career or vocation. To see the full results, please refer to the second Table in Appendix 7. The majority of our alumni found each of these curricular emphases to be important in both their personal formation and their professional career or vocation.

These results from (primarily) the closed-ended items reflect the comments in the open-ended items. In two of our open-ended survey questions, we asked alumni to reflect back upon the best aspects of the Sociology / Anthropology program, as well as the improvements that they would suggest for the program. It is important to note that for the qualitative analyses of these responses, we limited the data to graduates from the past 15 years (i.e., the graduating classes of 2002-2016). This subset included 60 alumni, which is 41% of our total respondents. We chose to limit these analyses to graduates from the past 15 years because of the vast amount of change that our department and major has undergone over the past decades, as well as the relatively high percentage of respondents who graduated in the twentieth century (e.g., 54% of the sample graduated prior to the year 2000). We believe that our department can gain the most insight regarding current areas of strength and potential areas in need of improvement from our more recent graduates.

When identifying the **best aspects** of the Sociology / Anthropology program, the alumni discussed five prominent themes. First, the most frequent response revolved around having **good professors and good classes** (38 of 60, 63%, wrote about this without prompting). Alumni mentioned the mentoring they received from faculty members, having easy access to professors, feeling challenged in beneficial ways by their professors, and feeling that the faculty members cared about them. Second, the alumni noted that their worldview was shaped by the program as they **learned to think critically** about social structures, inequality, culture, and/or global issues (16 of the 60 mentioned something in these areas). Third, many alumni appreciated the **small class sizes**, the small cohort of Sociology / Anthropology majors, and the **peer friendships** that our department fostered (14 of 60 mentioned this). Fourth, eight alumni (13%) noted that they valued the numerous **in-class discussions** and open dialogue in our courses. And finally, eight alumni (13%) stated that they appreciated their **internship experiences**, classes that required **community engagement**, and/or classes that emphasized **the application of academic knowledge** to real-world settings or issues.

When identifying what improvements they would suggest for the Sociology / Anthropology program, the alumni discussed five prominent themes. First, the most frequent response regarding **improvements** revolved around having **improved teaching, mentoring, and advising** from the faculty, as well as **greater stability within the department** (19 of 60, 32%, wrote about this without prompting). Several alumni expressed frustration with older, dispassionate faculty members having outdated materials and not

connecting well with their students. We regret that some alumni had these types of experiences! However, we also believe that, after making four new faculty hires in the past five years, we have addressed most of these alums' concerns regarding teaching, mentoring, advising, and departmental stability. The second most prominent theme was the desire to receive **more information regarding their career options**—and how to get there—with a degree in Sociology or Anthropology (11 of 60 mentioned this). Third, nine alumni (15%) recommended either **requiring an internship for every Sociology or Anthropology major** or creating more ways for students to acquire hands-on learning in the community. Fourth, nine alumni (15%) suggested that the department **increase the variety of its course offerings** and/or they suggested specific types of course additions (e.g., grant-writing, non-profit management). And finally, a handful of alumni (5 of 60) urged the department to **increase discussions on current social issues** (e.g., racism, sexuality) and/or how to think about these issues through the lens of faith.

**3.4. Interpretations.** Overall, it was affirming and encouraging for us to see such positive responses from our alumni! The vast majority of alumni are satisfied with their Sociology or Anthropology degree. The alumni survey data show that, while there is always room for improvement, faculty members are generally doing well in teaching, in fostering a supportive learning community, and in preparing students for success in graduate school, their careers / vocations, and their ongoing Christian faith journey. Our PLOs and curricular emphases are generally validated as important to alumni's personal formation and professional careers / vocation. In the past three years or so, we have begun to address some of the most common critiques that relatively recent alumni had of our program. In short, as a department, we are doing good, important work, and we are moving in a positive direction!

**3.5. Action Steps.** Beginning in AY 2016-2017, we changed the old SOC 106/107 sequenced courses to be two non-sequenced courses: SOC 108 (Quantitative Research Methods) and SOC 109 (Qualitative Research Methods). We have also recently revised our curriculum such that SOC197 (Senior Research Capstone) is a course dedicated solely to the completion and public presentation of a research project. We believe that these recent curricular changes will strengthen our graduates' ability to use both quantitative and qualitative research methods in their work.

To further promote our graduates' increased quantitative abilities, we would like to hire an adjunct faculty member specifically to teach the Quantitative Research Methods course, as well as to prioritize quantitative research skills in our next tenure-track hire.

Regarding course variety, we will continue to examine our curriculum and course offerings. Having made four tenure-track hires in recent years, we will continue to develop new courses that build upon our new faculty members' teaching and research interests.

Finally, we will continue to discuss, as a department, how to best educate our students regarding the myriad career options available to them with a Sociology or Anthropology degree, as well as how to best prepare our students to succeed in their post-college career paths. We anticipate that the recently-created

2-credit SOC195 (Senior Seminar) course will assist us in this process. We will also continue to discuss, as a department, if we should require all of our majors to complete an internship.

#### **4.0. CURRICULUM REVIEW.**

In the past four years, each incoming faculty joined the department knowing that curriculum revision was going to be one of the primary tasks in the coming years. Our discussions on curriculum revision have been framed by three realities: (1) The curriculum needs to adequately reflect the disciplines of sociology and cultural anthropology of today; (2) The curriculum needs to pragmatically prepare students for their next steps in schooling or work, and (3) The curriculum needs to be sustainable for a 5-person faculty that is spread across 3 disciplines (sociology, social work, and anthropology). We are also cognizant of the need to maintain adequate course enrollment for each faculty's load and fresh attempts to recruit new majors.

One of the earliest tasks completed in 2013 was a review of the curriculum from peer institutions (See Appendix 5) . This comparison among peer institutions has served as a reference point and source of ideas in our ongoing discussions about the curriculum. One of the discoveries we made in the review was that **no other department offers programs of study that straddle Anthropology, Social Work and Sociology.** (Typically, departments only pair Sociology/Anthropology OR Sociology/Social Work.) With each job search and hire that the department has made since 2013, we have chosen to affirm and retain our multidisciplinary status (rather than separating out or removing altogether as other institutions have), believing that the combination offers a unique and relevant curriculum to students living in today's world.

We firmly believe in the enormous potential that lies in these philosophical and disciplinary synergies, however finding a way to create a curriculum structure that enables these synergies to manifest themselves and flourish is the challenge. While we have taken some preliminary steps in alleviating some of the obvious "hot-spots" in the existing curriculum that were creating strains in our department's ability to meet our PLO goals and also yielding both faculty and student dissatisfaction, the greater work that lies before us is the task of envisioning a sustainable curriculum structure that can sufficiently feed life into each discipline and nourish the points of fruitful interdisciplinary investigation.

#### **4.1. WORK ALREADY COMPLETED.**

##### **4.1.1. Re-Evaluation of Core Courses**

From the review of peer institutions we found that our required courses match that of almost all other peer departments: Introduction to Sociology, Theory, Methods, and Senior Seminar. In 2015-2016, we applied for and were awarded the Innovative Edges Grant offered by the Provost's Office in order to carry out substantive changes in the required courses of the major:

- *4.1.1.1. Research Sequence:* The Department replaced the former research methods sequence of "Social Research Methods" and "Qualitative & Quantitative Data Analysis" with two stand-alone courses that are defined by either the Quantitative or Qualitative methodological approach. While

both courses lay the foundational elements of social scientific research design, SOC108: Quantitative Research Methods covers the methods of survey and content analysis, with special attention paid to questionnaire construction, statistical analysis and interpretation and SOC109 Qualitative Research Methods covers participant observation and interviewing, and the unique considerations of the researcher's role and ethics.

- *4.1.1.2. Senior Capstone Experience:* From the 2015 Assessment, it was clear that the Senior Seminar course had become unsustainable—attempting to cover not only independent research and faith-learning integration, but also discussions on professionalization and post-graduate life. While we remain committed to all of these elements in our seniors' experiences, we recognized the need to disaggregate these elements into two separate courses: SOC197 Senior Research Capstone (4-credit), a course dedicated solely to the completion and public presentation of a research project that enables seniors to synthesize knowledge gained during their major studies; and SOC195 Senior Seminar (2-credit) that addresses faith-learning integration and the broader post-graduate life considerations such as vocation, community, work-life balance, etc., professionalization skills and preparation. Note: The new 2-credit SOC195 is replacing SOC192 Extracurricular Activities which was closed after a 2014 attempt to improve its effectiveness, and an assessment process that revealed how the change had increased dissatisfaction among both faculty and students.
- *4.1.1.3. Introduction to Sociology Course:* While the above changes only impact our department's majors, we also made one adjustment to the way that we distribute the 4 sections of Introduction to Sociology that are taught annually as not only the starting point to the major, but also our department's primary GE offering. Namely, we have moved away from the former model that expected one member of the department to carry the burden of all of these sections, and towards a new model where each member teaches at least one Introductory section a year. With this change, each faculty member is annually reflective about the goals of our discipline and how our department can serve the larger Westmont community. Also, by staffing these Introductory courses with the full diversity of perspectives, training, and experiences represented by our department's faculty, we enable our student body to become acquainted with our department in its entirety and can maximize opportunities of recruiting new majors.

#### **4.1.2. Curriculum Sequencing / Scaffolding.**

In an effort to create a more intentionally sequenced and heavily scaffolded curriculum that helps both faculty and students have consistent expectations about the required level of preparation and engagement in each course, a preliminary discussion in Spring 2016 produced a first draft of an initial attempt to communicate greater delineation and/or recommendation on the course's degree of difficulty by imagining the ideal year of a student's program for courses to be taken. This draft needs to be further refined and then approved by the entire department.

#### **4.1.3. QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IN UPCOMING REVISION OF CURRICULUM.**

- What do students who are committed to pursuing a career in social services need in the curriculum in order to be adequately prepared for applying for a Masters of Social Work graduate program? Are there courses outside the department that should be recommended as part of their program of study?
- What is the place of Anthropology as a distinct area in this department and in the college? How is Anthropology related and distinct from Global Studies?
- What would it take to pursue the official approval of a BA in Anthropology (rather than continuing with the existing template available through the Registrar's office)? Are there courses outside the department that should be recommended as part of such a program of study?
- What is the role of our department in the ongoing developments of the Global Fellows program and the Global Studies minor?
- How can the curriculum be structured so that majors gain an increased chance of truly engaging in a multi-disciplinary education through our department?
- Would the structure of Wheaton's curriculum be a possible model to draw from (it consists of required core courses, required core electives, and then electives)?
- How might our sociology and anthropology course offerings serve other majors or departments? Can they be integrated as major electives, cross-listed courses, or part of new initiatives such as "certificates" that equip students in applied sociological or anthropological concepts and skills?
- How might a required internship for majors be designed? What criteria would we use to determine if students completed an internship outside the department?

As we engage these questions, we recognize that there are both philosophical and pragmatic concerns to weigh as we move forward. While we are hopeful about how our curriculum might be structured to adequately profile each of our three disciplines as distinctive from each other, we are equally excited about how they can strengthen each other when brought in conversation with each other in students' programs of study. In order to deliver on the promises of what these respective disciplines can offer to our majors and the larger student body, we are likely to need help making our curriculum and its revision sustainable through the request of adjunct instructors to support some teaching needs, and institutional support in time and resources to maintain new course creation and the management of significant restructuring of particular curricula.

## **5. PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY & FACULTY QUALITY**

### **5.1. Thesis 1: A Department in Change: Historical Context to the Legacy and the Promise!**

The prime experience of this six year cycle is the pace of change of the almost the entire cadre of department faculty that have been the face of the Program and of the College itself for many decades. As the proverb reminds us all 'those who discount history are condemned to repeat it'. Here is the epitaph of the department that has passed away.

*Evidence 1:* In its own indomitable way it is this sociology/anthropology department that has a noteworthy identity within the history of all departments at Westmont College. Firstly, Westmont's premier campus

outside of Santa Barbara was founded by the Sociology Department in 1968. Then it was called the Urban Program administered by the Sociology Department Faculty. Now it has blossomed into a fully fledged Multi-disciplinary campus of Westmont. Secondly, in 1991, the department pioneered the first international study program in Asia to Sri Lanka & Singapore, sometimes including the Middle East countries of Jordan and Israel. Thirdly, In the fall of 2004, Westmont in Mexico was set up jointly by the Sociology and Spanish Departments. This is now a regular program. Fourthly, this Department is singularly instrumental in spearheading the Gender Diversification of Faculty at Westmont, the Annual Department Retreat beginning in the early 1990s. It was and still is one of the academic departments that has the most diversity. This is also a rare department that is the home for three disciplines: Sociology, Anthropology and Human Services. It is in recognition of providing a home for three disciplines represented by the three tracks of General Sociology, Human Services and Cross Cultural Studies that five (5) faculty are dedicated to this department. Similar social science departments at Westmont housed next to each other have less faculty even when some of them graduate more majors -since they do not envelop such multiple disciplines. For example, Economics and Business well as Political Science Departments have each four full time faculty. The Department's last six year report envisaged an additional anthropologist. This however did not materialize.

#### *Evidence II: Fresh Faces, Renewed Spirits for New Times*

The period of the last six years has been a period of momentous change in the cadre of department faculty. In 2011 after twenty one years (21) Laura Montgomery, Department's sole anthropologist left to join Wheaton College as Dean of Global Studies. Ron Enroth specialist in sociology of religion retired in 2012 after 40 years, the longest campus wide tenure in the history of the College. Also in 2012 Xuefeng Zhang, a quantitative studies specialist left after a stint of five years. Judy Alexandre directed the human services program, retired in 2014 after twenty years. Tito Paredes an anthropologist who temporarily replaced Laura Montgomery completed his tenure in 2016. There were other part time faculty who were enlisted as temporary faculty.

The new faculty recruitments did not begin until 2013. Table F-1 show vacant positions filled by temporary faculty relevant to the period of this report. The first replacement (for Xuefeng Zhang) is Felicia Song, a specialist in Social Media and Digital Technology plus Sociology of Culture appointed in 2013. Sarah Jirek (for Judy Alexandre) a specialist in Human Services and Sociology of Violence assumed her appointment in 2014. In 2015 Meredith Whitnah, (for Ron Enroth) a specialist in Sociology of religion, Gender and Cultural Sociology joined the department. Finally, in 2016, Serah Shani became the department's new anthropologist (for Laura Montgomery) a Specialist in Transnational Migrations, African Diaspora & Anthropology of Education. Thomas Jayawardene is a possible 'bridge faculty' remaining from past dispensations. He joined in 1988 as a specialist in comparative societies and religions and of global development. *Table F-1 summarizes the described turnover.*

**TABLE 1**  
**Faculty Turnover in the Department.**

Discipline	Faculty #	Faculty Turnover 2011-16
Anthropology	1	1
Human Services	1	1
Sociology	3	2

**5.2. Thesis 2: Faculty Diversity Plus Global Expertise: A Foundational Asset Of The New Cadre Of Faculty**

*Evidence:* One of the important characteristics of faculty demographics in the departments is its gender, ethnic and international quality. Four or 80% of the department faculty including the Chair are female. Three or 60% are minority faculty. 40% of the faculty are international faculty. Three of the present five member department have expertise in one or more geographic regions of the World. All members of the faculty have lived abroad : Some department faculty are involved in regular overseas research/book and journal publications and conference presentations. They have also been keynote and commencement speakers at universities abroad.

**CHART 1. International Competencies of the Department**

<b>Country Expertise:</b> South Africa, Kenya, Ghana, Uganda, Nigeria, Tanzania, Singapore, Israel, India, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Bangla Desh, Italy, Britain, France, & Germany
<b>International Language Competence:</b> German, Italian, Spanish, French, Latin, Greek. Pali, Sanskrit. Swahili, Maasai, Kisii , Kikuyu, Tamil, Sinhalese and English
<b>Global/Regional Research Publications and Research:</b> South Africa, East Africa, South Asia. <b>Department Led Student/Faculty Teaching and Service Programs:</b> Singapore, Sri lanka, Israel, Jordan, Mexico Programs. (some prior to present cycle)
<b>Quality of Qualifying Universities:</b> Yale, UVirginia, Harvard, UMichigan, UNotre Dame, UColumbia, USurrey (Britain), UDaystar (Kenya), UColombo (Sri Lanka), Goethe (Germany), LUISS (Rome)

New Faculty have published articles in Harvard Education Review, Gender & Society, Contexts, Society for International Education, Journal of the American Academy of Religions and book chapters at Columbia University and Cambridge Scholars Presses. Nationally and Internationally reputed traditions of the academic heritage have been the intellectual pastures of the department faculty in places such as Yale, UVirginia, Harvard, UMichigan, UNotre Dame, UColumbia, USurrey (Britain), UDaystar (Kenya), UColombo (Sri Lanka), Goethe (Germany), LUISS (Rome).

*Conclusion:* In summary, this is a department that has a solid past with even better prospects for the future. The faculty celebrate multiple asset types. If supported they would provide benefits to the department, students, faculty, College and to the larger Global Village.

**5.3. Thesis 3. Gaps in Faculty Loads and Student Credit Hours Due to Comings and Goings of Faculty**

*Evidence I:* There are many gaps in all areas of faculty load data. These as shown above is due to the departure of faculty and vacant positions substituted by adjunct faculty. These obviously resulted in fewer course offerings or adjunct faculty offerings. As shown below 2016-17 is the first year when the department operated with the fully-staffed faculty since 2011.

**CHART 2. Department Faculty by Year: Arrivals and Departures**

2011-2012	ThomasJ	XuefengZ	JudyA	LauraM	
2012-2013	ThomasJ	XuefengZ	JudyA	TitoP	
2013-14	ThomasJ	FeliciaS	JudyA	TitoP	
2014-15	ThomasJ	FeliciaS	SarahJ	TitoP	
2015-16	ThomasJ	FeliciaS	SarahJ	MeredithW	
2016-17	ThomasJ	FeliciaS	SarahJ	MeredithW	Serah Shani

*Evidence II:* The teaching load ( Credit Hours) of department faculty members show the gaps in faculty departures and arrivals. Each faculty member teaches a total of six (6) courses equivalent to 24 credit hours per year which is 12 credit hours per semester. Sometimes there are adjustments of 4 credit hour course reduction during the first semester teaching and the department chair is eligible for one (4 unit) course reduction. Sometimes an overload is carried to fill a position that is vacant or absent or on sabbatical. The student credit hours calculates the frequency of enrollments in different courses.

*Conclusion:* Since there was so much of flux, it is difficult to make definitive assessment of the figures given below. (For more details, see Appendices.)

**TABLE 2.  
Distribution of Faculty Load and Student Credit Hours (2012-2017)**

Faculty	'12-'13		'13-'14		'14-'15		'15-'16	
	Load	CRS	Load	CRS	Load	CRS	Load	CRS
RP(Tito)	24	324	20	284	24	392	*12	*168
TJ	12**	272	12**	260	24	580	12**	**192
FS	-	-	16	220	22	288	25	321
SJ	-	-	-	-	24	230	24	224
MW	-	-	-	-	12	144	20	352
SS	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	248

**5.4 Thesis 4. Introductory courses in sociology, anthropology and human services are distributed among all department faculty**

*Evidence:* Distribution of Core courses among departmental faculty is given in F- 3 table. (TBC) The core courses are taught in such a manner that students both majors and non majors are exposed to the whole faculty cadre and to different perspectives in the department. There has also been new course preps for all department faculty. Some are due to new courses that are being experimented while others follow from exchange of courses among faculty. For examples among the new courses are: Soc 177 Interpersonal Violence, Soc 050 Sociology of Sports, Soc 196 Non Profit Leadership, Anth 115 Peoples and Cultures of Africa. Soc 160 Internet and Society, etc.

**Thesis 5.5. FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY:** Department Faculty have excellent credentials in professional pursuits in scholarly activity: First, there are substantial lists of publications, & award winning teaching. Secondly, there is faculty leadership in the new intellectual, political and social ethos pervading the campus. Thirdly, there is an activating ‘elan’ from head to heart learning enlivened by deliberate coupling of encounters with persons of those “Others” ( Muslims/Other Religions, Immigrants, Poor children, Homeless, Mentally Ill) etc. who are marginal and invisible to Montecito College Life. The details of the above could be found in the current **curricula vitae** of the faculty in the Appendices.

*Evidence:* The following are a ‘Few’ of the examples: Felicia Song, Department Chair was selected for the **Best Teacher** Of the Year in Social Sciences for 2016-17. In fact, for a young Department it already has two (FeliciaS & ThomasJ) Best Teacher awardees. Additionally, Meredith Whitnah, Serah Shani, Sarah Jirek and Felicia Song are current or very recent recipients of **Professional Grant Awards** from Westmont and elsewhere. All Department Faculty hold **Scholarly Publications**. The newer faculty have published both before and after arriving at Westmont.

Please refer to the Curricula Vitae for details of **Journal Publications**: To name a few they include Harvard Educational Review, Contexts, Journal of the American Academy of Religion, Qualitative Social Work. Furthermore, there is a prolific output of peer reviewed research presentations at **Professional Conferences**, seminars and workshops nationally and internationally. In Pedagogical Advancement, Faculty are using **Electronic Pedagogical Tools** in teaching and learning. **Instilling in Heart Learning** above and beyond Head learning is taking effect. Advancement, is made in raising awareness of equality in gender, ethnicity and sexual orientation, in caring for the mentally ill, the hungry and the homeless. Department faculty engage in teach-ins seminars, liturgies etc. Students openly professed the benefits of their discovery of **the ‘Other’** in tutoring poor school kids after school, in working at homeless shelters, in dialoguing with Muslim, Hindus and Buddhists.

With the new faculty have come **New Expertise**: Digital Media, Internet and Society are new areas of teaching and learning :African societies and transnational movements/diaspora cultures: Interpersonal Violence and Trauma: Race and Gender Studies are all enriching a lively resourcefulness all around our ethos in the department.

**5.6. Thesis 6. STUDENT ADVISING:** The Sociology/Anthropology Department Faculty have done very well in advising students. We advise students on their entire ‘undergraduate course planning’. See table below and for more details, see Appendix 9.

**Table 3. Distribution of Advisees among Faculty by Academic Year**

<i>Adviser</i>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>
<b>MW</b>	NA	NA	NA	9
<b>FS</b>	4	17	15	22
<b>SJ</b>	NA	8	11	20
<b>TJ</b>	11	9	11	7

Students are advised in the nuts and bolts of both GE and Major course selection that meets their interests and requirements for graduation. Beyond this help is provide to students who need special care to better their grades and follow ups to support their progress in sometimes young adult mishaps. There is also assistance to students in connecting with the counseling center or disability services program. There is a special program to direct students especially Seniors and Juniors to Career Counseling, Internships, Alumni etc. Faculty write recommendations to job interviews and postgraduate programs on behalf of advisees. Students have reiterated publicly and privately how much they appreciate lounging in the homely hospitality of welcoming faculty homes.

**5.7. Final Conclusion:** The above theses are evidenced by the findings that department is ending a time of flux with a full department able to teach the courses required by the program. The findings also show that although the changing of the guard happened without a due period of transition the new faculty are bravely facing the transition. Once the dust settles there is abundant talent and promise among the faculty to accomplish their best on behalf of the students, the community and the society.

## **6.0 ADDITIONAL ANALYSES**

### **6.1. FINANCES**

We are very grateful for the college's allotted budget to our department and its faithful steadfastness in our years of transition. In the past seven years, we have been, at times, under-spending our budget because of our periods of low or transitional staffing and programming. (See 2014-2017 budget summaries in Appendices.) Now that all of our lines are filled, and as we move towards a more concrete vision of a newly revised curriculum, we expect that we will be more fully utilizing the resources that have been allocated to our department. In particular, we see two discretionary line items--professional development and system software--to potentially increase as each new junior faculty member becomes better acquainted with various opportunities that are available in training or workshops that would enhance their teaching and/or leadership at the college. Also, as our methods courses solidify in both quantitative and qualitative methods, our needs in the software necessary for data analysis will become better defined and we anticipate putting in a college-level request in the years to come. Finally, as mentioned in earlier sections of this report, in our hopes to build a department and curriculum that offers a truly multidisciplinary approach to the study of (and service to) societies and cultures, we anticipate the need to request adjunct instruction to sustain particular parts of this curriculum. Given that our department's staffing transitions have replaced faculty at full professor status with junior-level faculty, and because we are a five-person department supporting three distinct disciplines, we believe that the resources needed to support adjunct instruction will be minimal when compared to the remarkable impact such instruction will have in the sustainability of our anticipated curriculum and programs.

### **6.2. ADVISING.**

Drawing from data gathered from the Alumni Survey and Current Student Focus Group, most students are very pleased with the advising they have received from their SOC/AN professors. 41.7% of alumni from the past 15 years reported being "Extremely satisfied" and 30% were "Satisfied." A smaller minority (10.4%) reported being extremely dissatisfied or dissatisfied. These results are reflected in comments from current students. Current students note the high accessibility of the majority of professors. Students report valuing faculty advisors for course planning, as well as discussions about graduate school and career paths. The less frequent points of dissatisfaction concerned the extremes of either feeling that some advisers unnecessarily demanded too much time in meetings OR were not available enough. Overall, however, the greater majority of our faculty advising seems to be serving our students effectively.

### **6.3. INTERNSHIP SUPERVISORS / INTERNSHIP REPORT.**

*What we are doing well.* Our internship course is highly effective. Students who complete an internship have learned to apply a sociological perspective to a workplace setting, increased self-awareness and self-confidence, gained concrete and marketable "hard" and "soft" skills, gained a clearer vision regarding career paths of interest, and grappled with how to live out their faith within the workplace. The "employers," or internship supervisors, have also confirmed that our interns have been successful. Supervisors complete a mid-semester and final evaluation for every intern. Their evaluations of interns are highly positive. The vast majority of our interns over the past five semesters have received either

*exceptional* (the highest rating) or *commendable* (the second highest rating) on 33 survey items that assess their ability to learn, communication skills, creative thinking and problem solving skills, professional and career development skills, interpersonal and teamwork skills, organizational effectiveness skills, and basic work habits / character attributes. In addition, in response to a survey item assessing student intern's' overall performance at their internship, supervisors have rated 67% of students as *outstanding* and the remaining 33% of students as *good*—the highest and second-highest of five categories.

Please refer to the Table, in Appendix 15 to view a summary of internship supervisors' final evaluations of our 15 Sociology interns over the past five semesters. (Due to turnover in the internship coordinator position, we do not have comparison data prior to Fall 2014.)

*What we can improve.* Our alumni survey results suggest that we should consider requiring an internship for every Sociology and Anthropology major, rather than merely for students in the Human Services track. Our department has had several discussions on this topic during the past three years and we are considering various ways in which to implement an internship and/or internship portfolio requirement.

The main obstacle for some students is that dedicating six to twelve hours per week for a two- or four-credit internship does not easily fit into their other academic / co-curricular schedules. The two-fold challenge for our department is, if we implement a required internship: a) How to provide the internship course (SOC 190) frequently enough to meet the increased student need, without compromising the breadth of our other course offerings; and b) How to provide an internship course that is relevant for students across the three tracks within the Sociology major and for Anthropology students.

#### **6.4. LIBRARY SERVICES**

In the last four years of our hiring transitions, our department library liaison Diane Ziliotto has patiently been introducing each faculty member to the Westmont library collection and holdings, actively suggesting books, journals and visual media for purchasing consideration, and reminded us of purchasing budgets and deadlines. While steady attention to cultivating the resources available through our library has admittedly not been on the top of our department priorities at the moment (given the other significant areas outlined in other parts of this report), we are excited in the coming years to expand the college's collection through our department's new areas of expertise: gender-based violence, trauma recovery, African societies and cultures, and digital media and technology.

With each new hire, the college's generous offering for individual and departmental purchases in the areas of our study have kept a steady rate of growth in the library's books collection as seen in the Library Collection Development table in the Appendices. Similarly, in journal acquisitions and access, we are grateful for Diane Ziliotto's initiative in helping our department expand its access to several new journals in 2013 when the department began its road to rebuilding. As the department strengthens its trajectory of encouraging and improving the level of student research, we will need to commit some time to more fully assessing the needs of journal access for both student and faculty research.

During these transition years, the library has probably played the strongest role in providing instruction for our department when we teach Research Methods and instruct students in building a

literature review. Both in the methods courses (SOC106/108) and also the Senior Research capstone (SOC195/197) from 2012 through 2017, we are so grateful to have Diane as a partner-instructor who has not only taught class sessions in effective academic searches, but also greatly aided students in identifying and narrowing feasible topics for research. Please see Appendix 14 for data on journal access and instruction.

Finally, the library's computer lab has also proven essential to our instruction of Research Methods as it is the only space on campus where quantitative statistical software (SPSS) is installed on enough computers to accommodate our teaching needs. We are grateful for the availability and ease to which it is to reserve the lab for instructional use. In the coming years, one of the acquisitions our department would like to request of the college is the purchase of qualitative analytical software such as NVivo. Now that we have a course that is wholly dedicated to qualitative research methods, our teaching needs in this software have increased and we are also aware of several other department's faculty members whose research requires this software and therefore, would make steady use of it, were it available in campus facilities.

### **6.5. GE. (General Education).**

The department participated in the 2014-2015 assessment of the Understanding Society GE. We assessed one assignment from a section of "Introduction to Sociology" and used the opportunity to open a discussion about our respective approaches to this course. Given the fact that the MCAT exam now requires pre-med students to have sociological knowledge, the assessment motivated us to consider preliminary ways of setting benchmarks of knowledge that could unify the 4 sections of the course. We also discussed the shared challenges of finding introductory-level readings that could help student reflect on their newly acquired knowledge from a Christian perspective. While the progress made in these discussions can be easily carried out internally within our department, one of the larger institutional issues that we identified was a growing concern that, while the Sociology/Anthropology department is in a unique position to contribute to the heart and soul of the Understanding Society GE, perhaps due to the years our department has been in transition, there is more work to do in making our disciplines' contribution more central to this GE. We recognize that in today's world the content of this GE is imperative to our students and college graduates, and we are concerned that our contribution to this knowledge not be diminished.

## **7.0 LOOKING FORWARD: CHANGES AND QUESTIONS**

Having completed this review process, the Sociology & Anthropology Department is ready to identify what we have done and what we intend to do. Note that some of our proposed changes will require additional funding.

### **7.1. Changes Made**

- o Filled four faculty lines between 2013-2016: 2 in Sociology, 1 in Social Work and 1 in Anthropology.

- o From the 2015 Assessment of the Research Methods PLO, we changed the old SOC106/107 sequenced courses to be two non-sequenced courses: SOC 108 (Quantitative Research Methods) and SOC 109 (Qualitative Research Methods).
- o From the 2014 Assessment of the faith-integration PLO, a new assignment, a faith-learning appendix, was created to require senior students to reflect on the role of faith learning—drawing from theological and Biblical resources— specifically in relationship to their Senior Research Project.
- o The Senior Capstone experience was expanded from 4-credits to 6-credits in order to cover all the desired goals including an independent research project. The 2 extra credits came from closing SOC192 Extracurricular Activities as a course offering.
- o Re-distributed teaching of Introduction to Sociology so that all faculty members are teaching this GE offering and starting point for majors.

### **7.3. Changes Proposed**

- o Modify the language of the current PLO #1 to include explicit mention of “understanding,” since this is related to but distinct from “application.” (Student Learning)
- o Continue to discuss how to better integrate PLO development across the curriculum. (Student Learning)
- o Discuss how to define benchmarks for each PLOs when we assess each year. (Student Learning)
- o Discuss how to integrate professionalization of majors earlier and more thoroughly into student experience, by emphasizing range of and paths towards various career options and inviting guest speakers (such as alumni) to share on vocation. (Student Learning—Alumni Survey)
- o Hire adjunct with appropriate expertise to teach Quantitative Research Methods. (Student Learning).
- o Pragmatic plan to support student (and joint faculty-student) research with the goal of scholarly presentations, publications, exhibits etc. Set up financial support to attend conferences, summer research labs etc (former precedent in department supported by Provosts office).
- o Look into building partnerships with other departments to both grow course enrollments and sustain curricula, and also serve college needs such as the MCAT requirements. (Curriculum / Program sustainability)
- o Continue discussions regarding an internship requirement for all majors. (Student learning—Alumni Survey, Internship Report).

### **7.4. Possible Key Questions**

- How do we create curriculum that is sustainable for each faculty member in their commitment to the college, their scholarship, and their lives?
- What is necessary within a Human Services track/emphasis, to equip students for work or graduate school in the helping professions? With only one full-time faculty member, how do we make this track / emphasis sustainable?
- What is the place of Anthropology as a distinct discipline? How is it distinct and related to global studies? What resources would be needed to sustain a viable Anthropology major? What should be the relation between the current Cross Cultural track/emphasis and Anthropology?
- How do we continue to foster our department’s commitment and unique position to engage issues of diversity and global engagement?

## 8.0. APPENDICES

1. [Program mission, vision, goals, and PLO for the current six-year cycle .](#)
2. [Summary of assessment results for every PLO](#)
3. Rubrics and instruments for every PLO: [Core Knowledge](#), [Methods](#), [Faith1](#), [Faith2](#),
4. [Reports on closing the loop activities for every PLO](#)
5. [Relevant syllabi for major changes in curriculum](#)
6. [Curriculum Map + PLO Alignment Chart](#)
7. [Sociology and Anthropology Alumni Survey 2017--Instrument](#)
8. [Peer institution comparison](#)
9. [Core faculty instructional and advising load](#)
10. Faculty CVs ([FS](#), [SJ](#), [MW](#), [SS](#), [TJ](#))
11. [Faculty race/ethnicity and gender breakdown](#)
12. [2016 Sociology-Anthropology Report](#)
13. [Student race/ethnicity & gender breakdown](#)
14. Review of library holdings: [Instruction](#), [Journals](#), [Collection](#)
15. [Internship Supervisors' Survey Table](#)
16. [2010 Six Year Report Sociology-Anthropology Report](#)
17. [Budget Summary](#)
18. [Inventory of Education Effectiveness Indicators](#)
19. [Multi-Year Assessment Plan form](#)
20. [External Reviewer Request & Authorization Form](#)
21. [Alumni Survey Results--Complete Surveys Only](#)
22. [Alumni Survey Results Tables](#)