

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Self-Study

Spring 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	<u>Program Introduction/History</u>	1
	A. Mission and Goals	2-3
	B. Effectiveness of Changes	4-13
	C. State and National Trends	13
2.	<u>Academic Programs</u>	
	A. Learning Expectations.	
	1. Expectations for:	
	a. The discipline	13-16
	b. Writing and Reading in the Major	16
	c. Computer /Information Competence in the Major	17
	2. Basis for Expectations	17
	3. Communication of Expectations to Students	17
	B. Curriculum Structure	17-24
	C. Teaching Strategies	24-25
	D. Distance and Distributed Education Courses	25
	E. Assessment Plan	25-26
	F. Effectiveness of Program	26-30
	G. Consistency in Multiple Sections	30
	H. Changes to Enhance Effectiveness of Program Outcomes	30
	I. General Education and/or Service Learning	30-32
	J. Program Response to Diversity of Students	32
	K. Contribution of the Minor	32
3.	<u>Students</u>	
	A. Student profile	33-34
	B. Student Academic Performance	34-35
	C. Student Academic Support	35-36
	D. Student Professional Development	36-37
4.	<u>Faculty</u>	
	A. Faculty Profile	37-38
	B. Assessment of Faculty Profile	38
	C. Faculty as Teachers	38-39
	D. Faculty as Scholars	39-40
	E. Faculty Service to the University and Community	40-41

5.	Governance Process	
	A. Faculty involvement	41
	B. Student involvement	41
	C. College and University Relationships	41
6.	Institutional Support/Resources	
	A. Library	42
	B. Computer/Technology	42
	C. Student Support Services	42
	D. Faculty Support Services	42-43
	E. Physical Facilities and Equipment	43
	F. Financial Resources	44

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 (Revised Internship Program)	45
Appendix 2 (Library Resources Report)	51
Appendix 3 (ASA Document: Liberal Learning....)	55
Appendix 4 (Learning Matrix)	60
Appendix 5 (Entering Sociology Major Questionnaire)	61
Appendix 6 (Sociology Graduate Exit Survey)	67
Appendix 7 (Alumni Survey –Quantitative Results)	80
Appendix 7A (Alumni Survey-Qualitative Results)	84
Appendix 8 (Annual Assessment Reports 2000-2004)	91
Appendix 9 (Student Needs and Priorities Survey)	103

1. PROGRAM INTRODUCTION/HISTORY

INTRODUCTION/HISTORY:

The Department of Sociology was formed as an independent department in 1964 after separation from the Department of Social Work. Between 1964 and 1970 enrollment increased dramatically and was associated with a concomitant increase in full-time faculty. By 1970 the department consisted of 21 full-time tenure track faculty serving a student population equivalent to 575 FTE. From that point on, national trends were mirrored in the department's experience, and by 1982 enrollments had fallen as low as 216 FTE. This precipitous decline was, in turn, associated with a hiring drought that lasted for 27 years from 1970 to 1997. Fortunately, enrollments in sociology (again as part of a nationwide trend) commenced recovery in the early 1990s, and have accelerated rapidly with almost every passing year. In the Fall of 2003, for the first time, we exceeded the previous record of 575 FTE placing us among the largest departments within the College of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Studies.. This recent robust growth has resulted in a dramatic increase of faculty with 14 new tenure track hires between 1997 and 2004. Of the original 1970 faculty cohort only two remain in full-time status and three more are currently in the Faculty Early Retirement Program.

This brief history will assist the Program Review Team in understanding the dramatic changes--particularly in the area of curricular development--that have occurred in the last 7 years.

A: PROGRAM MISSION AND GOALS:

Mission: To provide our students with the theoretical and substantive knowledge to participate as skilled professionals within the institutions and organizations that shape our region.

The mission of the Sociology Department involves three functions.

1. General Education - We offer a series of courses that illustrate to the student how to use the sociological perspective and tools for critical analysis to analyze both specific social issues (crime, race and ethnicity, for example), and general perspectives on society (introductory sociology, social problems). This is a significant function for us - 40 of 61 sections for Fall 2004 have G.E. status.
2. Sociology Major - We offer what might be viewed as a traditional major which requires 2 lower division prerequisites, 7 core courses (in methods, social stratification, social psychology and theory), and 5 electives in sociology. The major is designed to illustrate the sociological perspective, to help students develop skills in critical thinking, and to introduce and explain the tools of sociology. These skills will be beneficial for those who may seek jobs in sociology, and also for those who seek employment in human and social service occupations in the Sacramento region.
3. Graduate Program - We offer an MA degree in Sociology. Our intent is to introduce and explain higher level skills in theory, research, social psychology, and urban, family, social organization, and social stratification. Advanced research skills and knowledge of the discipline would prepare for a further advanced degree, higher level research positions, or teaching or employment in a variety of educational and human and social service organizations in the Sacramento region or elsewhere.

The sociology curriculum should contribute to the following **Learning Goals** for the typical student who receives a baccalaureate degree in sociology at CSUS:

1. Help students understand the sources of racial, ethnic, cultural, religious, and gender diversity in an increasingly pluralistic California and to appreciate and respect the opportunities and consequences of that diversity. Our students should be able to demonstrate the relevance of race, class, and gender in understanding human groups and human behavior and the influence of these characteristics on the functioning of organizations they work in. They should also, for example, be able to know how to generalize and/or resist generalization across gender, race, and ethnic groups.
2. Assist students in developing the knowledge and tools to understand and respond to rapid changes in the social, political, technological, and economic spheres of life. Students should be able to know how factors such as urbanization and population, for example, affect social structures and individuals and how global trends are affecting the local community they live in.
3. Promote students' understanding of human interaction, institutions, and trends so that the sociological perspective will help them comprehend and react to the complexities around them. Our students should be able to carry with them the sociological perspective, apply it to the organizations they work in, to their community and

neighborhood, and to their role as citizens in a democratic society.

4. Guide the development of critical thinking skills and appreciation for the social scientific method as a tool for understanding social problems and providing solutions to those problems. Our students should understand arguments about social problems and solutions to those problems, and the role that scientific research plays in constructing knowledge about these problems. They should be able to identify basic premises in arguments about social concerns and to present alternative and opposing viewpoints and hypothesis on various issues that confront them both in their world of work and in their life as citizens.
5. Encourage our students to develop their own interdisciplinary vision for the future of this region by becoming involved as citizens and employees in the quest to address the problems we face in the Sacramento Valley and in Northern California. Sociology is a liberal arts major. It helps prepare our students for a variety of careers, for life-long learning, and for their role as active and involved citizens in their communities.

B: EFFECTIVENESS OF CHANGES:

Recommendations of the Program Review Team, 2001.

- 1. Reconsider the mission of the Department and make a frank and realistic assessment about the courses that should be offered in its curriculum to maintain the integrity and coherence of the program.**

The department found this recommendation to be confusing, mainly because the Program Review Team (PRT) failed to include any textual discussion of our mission statement, and hence no indication of what its shortcomings might be, and therefore no suggestions as to the kinds of changes that would be appropriate (see the relevant opening section of the PRT report). In our view, our mission statement is entirely appropriate.

Regarding the recommendation to realistically assess the courses that should be offered to maintain the integrity and coherence of the program that, of course, is an ongoing and vital part of any professional department. In fact, the Sociology Department has been actively engaged in revising its curriculum at both the undergraduate and graduate levels for several years and this is reflected in the observable changes in every catalogue since 1996-98 (i.e. since commencement of the latest round of faculty hires). Moreover, during the Spring semester 2005 this process continued with additional, highly significant, changes to the undergraduate major. This reflects intense departmental discussion over the last year in the context of the newly developed proposals (2004) for the major published by the American Sociological Association. These changes are discussed in more detail elsewhere in this report and will be included in the 2006-2008 catalogues.

- 2. Review each semester's class schedule to ensure that key courses designed to help students fulfill the program's goals and learning expectations are offered regularly.**

Like all departments, the Sociology Department always bears keenly in mind the need to distribute resources in a manner that maximizes multiple values. Among these, attainment of learning goals and progress towards graduation are paramount. The limiting factors are, as always, resources in the form of budgetary constraints and availability of qualified faculty. Since the last program review the department has continued to expand its full-time tenure track base with the addition of new faculty with diverse specializations which has enabled us to broaden our offerings. This process has been greatly aided by rapidly expanding FTES with the result that the number of sections offered each semester has increased from 44 sections in the Fall 2000 to 61 sections in the Fall 2004. These two factors in conjunction have enabled us to maximize service to our students through increased offerings. These are detailed in other parts of this report (see response to recommendations 5 and 6 below).

3. Schedule a variety of course offerings more frequently to ensure real choices for students in all four areas of study offered by the program.

The response to this recommendation is the same as to recommendation #2 above. The department has always sought to maximize student choice, but constraints in the form of availability of faculty with appropriate specializations, and the number of sections that could be supported by the allocation of limited resources within the school, have constrained our capacity to serve our students as ideally as we would wish. This problem has been largely overcome in the last 5 years for reasons elaborated in #2 above. In addition, the most recent changes in the curriculum, to be included in the 2006-08 catalogue, restructure the major in ways designed to alleviate this problem(see Section 2B “Curriculum Structure”).

4. Encourage new faculty members to regularly offer courses that have recently been neglected in the department curriculum.

Revitalization of the curriculum by new faculty has been one of the department’s highest priorities since the recent expansion of the faculty began in 1997. This has meant encouragement of new faculty to teach courses that had lain fallow due to retirement of colleagues with appropriate specializations, as well as the development of new courses to reflect new directions in the discipline. Once again, the availability of increased resources has permitted us to successfully meet this challenge. (For example, of the 7 courses identified by the 2001 PRT as having been infrequently offered between 1995 and 1999--during which time the department was seeking to recover from the 27 year hiring drought--5 have been offered in 2004/2005 alone.)

5. Provide more flexibility in the scheduling of classes by offering more evening classes and multiple sections of classes for the undergraduate program.

Implementation of this recommendation is, of course, largely a reflection of resources made available by the Dean. The department has been particularly fortunate in this respect and considers itself well-supported by the Dean in the allocation of resources. As noted above, we have expanded our section offerings by almost 40% in the last five years. As a result, we report the following for Fall 2004:

Course	N of UG sections
1	12
3	3
8	4
101	3
102a	2
102b	3
1	7

1	3
157	2
162	2
192	2

(There were, of course, additional course offerings that were single sectioned but we don't address them here since the PRT recommendation spoke only of multiple sections.)

In the same semester (Fall 2004) we offered nine sections (undergraduate) in the evening time slots.

6. Explore the possibility of cross-listing courses with other programs and departments to provide more course options that the department is currently not able to offer, such as courses in gender, race and ethnicity.

As with most of our responses above, increased resources in the form of faculty hires and increased funding from the Dean has allowed us to address this issue from within the department and obviated the necessity to look outside for courses in these key areas of gender and race/ethnicity. New colleagues, with full encouragement and support from the department, have developed the following new undergraduate courses in the department related to Gender and Race/Ethnicity:

Black Studies in Sociology
Sociology of Gender
Men, Masculinities, and Society
Labor Migration and Trans-Nationalism in the Modern World

In the same vein, this is an appropriate point to underline that a major priority for the department has been expansion of the curriculum consistent with new disciplinary trends. In addition to the courses identified above new colleagues have also developed the following undergraduate courses:

Sociology of Globalization
Introduction to Environmental Sociology
Sociology of Health and Illness.
Global Perspectives on Sport
Sociology of Deviance
Sociology of Childhood
Sociology of Film
Sociology of Popular Culture
Labor and the American Social Structure

In sum, thirteen new courses have been added to the curriculum to date at the undergraduate level in reflection of developing trends in the discipline. An additional 5 courses have been added at the graduate level (see below) for a total of

18 new course offerings. Curricular development is, therefore, a vital and ongoing process within the department.

For the reasons above, the department has not found it necessary to engage in extensive cross-listing. We have, however, cooperated with the Environmental Studies department in cross-listing a new course entitled Environmental Sociology (Soc 138/ Env. Studies 138). The Labor and American Social Structure course is also cross-listed with the Labor Studies Program.

This is an appropriate point to identify two other activities recently undertaken by the department which have involved, and will continue to involve, extensive cooperation with other departments within and outside SSIS. The Labor Studies Program, traditionally housed in the Economics department, has been transferred to the Sociology department where it will be administered by Professor Varano. In addition, after a year of planning, a new interdisciplinary Social Justice course (ID 196M) is being offered within the College. The sociology department is actively involved in this course which will be taught/administered in the Fall, 2005 by Professor Carrigan. Both of these responsibilities emphasize the mission of SSIS, as frequently articulated by the Dean, to promote interdisciplinary work.

7. Develop the option of an exam or a project for the culminating experience in the graduate program.

As the various catalogues indicate, the department has long offered (since the 1970s) a project as an alternative to the Thesis in completion of the Master's degree. Only rarely do students elect this option. With respect to completion by examination rather than Thesis, the department has strongly rejected this recommendation as a dilution of the rigor of the graduate degree and therefore inconsistent with our mission. In our view, there is no satisfactory intellectual substitute for the challenge of identifying a research question, developing a research plan, collecting and organizing relevant materials (statistical or otherwise), and presenting these in a coherent thesis format under the supervision of a faculty supervisor. Certainly, an exam or project option would be more efficient, more cost effective, and less demanding of the faculty, but we do not consider these considerations to be legitimate (except, perhaps, under considerations of extreme fiscal constraint, which do not currently apply). As we note below such a proposal is also inconsistent with the department's commitment to student writing.

8. Offer some courses at a senior/graduate student level so that more electives would be available for graduate students.

The department experimented with this by offering Sociology 106 (Demography) for joint senior/graduate student enrolment. In the view of the faculty member teaching the course it was not a satisfactory experience in light of the quite disparate levels of preparation between the two groups of students. Fortunately, the basis for this recommendation has been addressed by other means.

Once again, the expansion of the faculty and increased resources provided by the Dean, have enabled us to expand the curriculum at the graduate level to meet the need for a broader set of course offerings.

As with the undergraduate curriculum, new colleagues have been in the forefront of curricular modernization at the graduate level. Since the Fall 2000 we have added the following 5 new courses to the graduate program:

Social Organization
Sociology of Gender
Environmental Sociology
Social Research in Crime and Deviance
Race and Ethnic Relations

In our view, with these additions to the existing program--totaling 14 separate graduate courses--we now provide a sufficiently diverse set of offerings.

9. Hold an advising workshop for faculty members to familiarize everyone with advising information and initiate steps towards fostering stronger advising and mentoring ties between faculty and students.

Undergraduate advising in the Department of Sociology is typically handled by the Department Chair. On a number of occasions the chair has indicated at department meetings his willingness to hold special seminars for faculty wishing to inform themselves of advising procedures, with a view to participating in the advising process. A number of faculty have availed themselves of these opportunities. Graduate advising is conducted in a variety of ways. The graduate coordinator has primary responsibility for overseeing student progress through the procedural requirements of the graduate degree. This is supplemented by the student's thesis advisor. In particular, the department offers a 3 unit two semester sequence (200A/B) which serves as an orientation to the graduate program (1 unit) and a Thesis Prospectus/Project Preparation seminar (2 unit).

10. Establish a link with the campus career center to provide students with updated information about internships, career paths, and possible career fairs in Sociology.

Owing to the press of hiring new faculty and subsequent curricular reform the department has not made this a priority. However, the chair and other faculty have staffed a career desk in the Student Union during Campus Careers day in the Fall semester in each of the last three years. We will discuss this recommendation in the Fall semester 2005.

11. Consider holding a career fair or colloquium in which alumni could be invited to speak to students about their careers and professional experiences.

For the same reason as above the department has not had an opportunity to discuss this recommendation. We will do so in the Fall, 2005.

12. Strengthen the existing internship program and develop more internship opportunities for students.

In the Spring semester 2005, the department reorganized its internship program with a view to more clearly defining goals and expectations and ensuring consistency in the application of standards across faculty. The final document developed by the subcommittee and approved by the department is included as **Appendix 1.**

1. Appoint a committee of faculty and students to revise and update the department student handbook.

In order to reduce costs and facilitate ease of access to information for students, the department no longer maintains a hard copy student handbook. Instead, the department now communicates relevant information to students via the department's web page. We encourage the PRT to review the web page which among other items includes information on:

The structure and expectations associated with the undergraduate and graduate programs;

Individual faculty web pages indicating courses offered, course descriptions, syllabi, expectations etc.;

The revised internship program (description, opportunities available, requirements etc.);

"Sociology Today". This is a department newsletter prepared each semester to inform students of new developments within the discipline, faculty and student activities (research, conference presentations etc.), upcoming professional meetings, new courses, Master's Theses completed, students accepted into doctoral programs, opportunities for student participation in research at the ISR etc.

14. Schedule meetings as necessary between junior faculty and the chair and the personnel committee of the department to review personnel policies, procedures and general expectations for tenure and promotion.

The department of Sociology coordinates its RTP procedures with the College of SSIS in the following manner:

The Dean's office schedules a two hour seminar on RTP procedures and policies within the school for incoming faculty within one month of their appointment.

Within two weeks following the Dean's seminar the Chair of RTP for the department of Sociology schedules a one hour seminar for new faculty in the department to acquaint them with departmental procedures, standards, and expectations and to reinforce the standards communicated in the Dean's seminar.

Upon submission of their prepared RTP files in the first spring semester following their appointment faculty receive feedback from the RTP chair (in writing) and an opportunity to correct errors in the construction of the file.

If significant problems are detected in the candidate's progress towards tenure, the RTP chair schedules a mid-year appointment with the candidate to discuss strategies to correct any difficulties. These strategies are in writing, and indicate in detail actions that could be undertaken--at the candidate's discretion--to correct perceived problems.

Independently, the chair of the department also discusses any difficulties encountered by candidates in any areas of evaluation, and counsels them regarding appropriate steps to be taken to correct problems. The department chair and RTP chair work closely in order to ensure consistency of communication.

1. Establish a part-time Faculty Liaison Committee which meets regularly to improve communication between part-time faculty members and the Department.

The department has a part-time hiring committee which performs this function as required. In addition, departmental procedures provide for attendance (and voting rights) of part-time faculty at all departmental meetings.

16. Encourage all faculty members to become involved in governance issues and general decision-making processes in the department.

This has always been a high priority for the department and all new faculty have been encouraged to participate in all ways possible. For example, the graduate committee is staffed by all faculty who teach in the graduate program. Membership of the curriculum committee is open to all faculty who wish to participate. The chair of these important committees changes periodically to broaden participation. The department has a number of other committees to create possibilities for broad faculty involvement in important issues facing the department. Examples include the Assessment Committee and the Human Subjects Committee.

These examples will suffice, but we encourage the PRT to consult the faculty survey for evidence of faculty satisfaction with the department and its inclusive policies. (We address the faculty survey in more detail later, but for the moment we will simply note that, on a 4.0 scale, the department scored 3.6 in response to the statement "In general, I am satisfied with my opportunities to influence departmental policies and procedures". This compares to a campus-wide average of

3.1. In fact, 100% of faculty agreed with the statement, of whom 60% strongly agreed.)

17. Establish an ISR (Institute for Social Research) Coordinating Committee consisting of the director of the Institute and other Sociology faculty, which would work on pursuing grants and research opportunities through the institute as well as work with the college to promote the institute and make it more visible to the University and the general Sacramento community.

The department has not formed such a committee because we believe it is unnecessary and could not successfully perform this function. Professor Cowles, the new director of ISR keeps the department current and informed on research opportunities and Requests For Proposals from a variety of funding sources. As a result, many faculty are actively involved in research activities through the institute.

The following examples from the current academic year (04/05) will suffice to illustrate this:

Professor Liu conducts, in association with ISR, the Annual Survey of Public Opinion and Life Quality in the Sacramento Region. We are currently in the 4th year of the survey which also provides opportunities for students to learn telephone interviewing techniques. The results of this survey are made available to all major media outlets in the region and have been written up, for example, in the Sacramento Bee.

Professor Wehr is currently involved with two projects through the institute. One of these involves an analysis of recycling patterns in association with the California Department of Conservation. The second is a proposal under submission to the National Science Foundation to examine the impact of water metering in the Sacramento Region.

Professors Ellen Berg and Edward Martinez (Environmental Science) have a proposal under submission to the American River Natural History Association for an American River Parkway Survey.

Professors Kingsnorth and MacIntosh have a \$66,000 proposal under submission to the National Institute of Justice to study the Sacramento County Criminal Justice system response to Stalking Behavior.

Professors Cowles, Liu, and Barajas recently submitted a concept paper to the National Institute of Justice. Though they recently heard that this project will not be funded from that source, Professor Cowles is optimistic that the strengths of the proposal justify the effort of seeking support elsewhere.

In addition to the above, the ISR currently has a number of projects underway which include sociology graduate and undergraduate students as research assistants.

Professor Cowles anticipates that this relationship will strengthen even more in the future as a result of recent news that a major proposal developed with the CSUS College of Continuing Education has been funded, in spite of stiff competition from UC Davis. This project is still in the early development phase, and will result in a Department of Human Services in the Home Social Services Social Worker Training Academy. The CCE will provide the infrastructure and oversee the development and delivery of training. The ISR will provide content expertise, evaluate compliance with the authorizing legislation, evaluate training and impacts of training on social services delivery. This is a large scale, multi-year, multi-million dollar project that will provide plentiful opportunities for involvement of sociology students both graduate and undergraduate.

The above examples are illustrative only and are not intended as an exhaustive assessment of the depth and breadth of the relationship between the department and the Institute for Social Research. The department is extremely positive about both this relationship and also the success of Professor Cowles, the new director of the Institute, in continuing and expanding the ties between the institute and the department.

18. Establish a quantitative task force to ensure that necessary computer software for research is consistently upgraded and supported by the university.

The department has not appointed a task force and sees no need to establish one. Currency of computer software is maintained by faculty who teach the courses in Statistics and Research Methods who confer with each other on an as-needed basis. These are the most competent faculty to make such judgments and, as a result, there are no current problems or deficiencies in the department's software resources.

19. Explore the possibility of hiring additional clerical staff for the department office.

Prior difficulties in this area have been effectively resolved, and the recent history of the department in this area is as follows: In Fall 2004, our longtime secretary Verica Dering retired and, following a search, Sarah Jean Harrison was engaged as her replacement. In March, 2005, as a result of certain personnel changes in the department office, the Dean provided funds to hire an experienced staff person for 20 hours per week in the capacity of an ASA1. It is the judgment of Sarah Jean and Chair Landis that the department's office needs are now fully met.

20. Continue to work with the library to build up reference materials for Sociology, especially in the area of online journals, periodicals, and social science databases.

Professor Berg is the departmental liaison to the library. She has been successful in forwarding departmental requests for new journal subscriptions in

order for faculty to maintain currency in their specialty areas. In addition to Professor Berg, our statistics and methods faculty (Professors Liu and MacIntosh in particular) have worked closely with Kathy Blackmer-Reyes (Library coordinator for Sociology) to facilitate enhanced instruction for students in these classes. Kathy has visited Sociology classes to provide important information to student on library holdings and access. This enhanced level of cooperation with library staff is also part of the department's effort to respond to assessment data suggesting that student's feel the need for more instructions in computer skills. Ms. Blackmer-Reyes' excellent report on the state of library holdings for our discipline is included as **Appendix 2**.

C. Major State and National Trends.

The American Sociological Association has recently (2004) completed its work on recommendations for structuring the major. Those recommendations are included as **Appendix 3** to this document. We are pleased to note that the department of sociology at CSUS is already in substantial compliance with most of those recommendations. During the spring semester 2005 the department curriculum committee developed proposals to modify the major in ways recommended by the ASA. These proposals (approved by the department on March 15, 2005) address, in particular, the ASA recommendation that Race, Class, and Gender be highlighted in the major. This restructuring of the major is covered in more detail below under **Academic Programs**.

II. Academic Programs

A. Learning Expectations.

1a. The Discipline

Learning expectations for the discipline are laid out in detail in the department's web page entitled **Sociology Department Portfolio**. We reproduce this below. The relationship between these expectations and course offerings are covered in **11B** below and displayed in matrix form in **Appendix 4**.

1: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to study, review, and reflect on the discipline of sociology and its role in contributing to our understanding of social reality.

The student should be able to

- describe how sociology differs from and is similar to other social sciences and give examples of these differences; and
- apply sociological imagination, principles, and concepts to her/his own life.

2: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to study, review, and reflect on the role of theory in sociology.

The student should be able to

- define theory and describe its role in building sociological knowledge;
- compare and contrast basic theoretical orientations;
- show how theories reflect the context in which they are developed; and
- describe and apply basic theories or theoretical orientations.

3: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to study, review, and reflect on the role of evidence and quantitative and qualitative research methods in sociology.

The student should be able to

- identify basic methodological approaches and describe the general role of methods in building sociological knowledge;
- compare and contrast basic methodological approaches for gathering data;
- design and complete a research study; and
- critically assess a published research report.
- understand and apply basic statistical tests sociologists often use.

4: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to have basic computer skills necessary to find, communicate, create, and apply sociological knowledge and information.

The student should have the ability

- to use computerized and on-line data bases to find published research;
- to use the internet to communicate to others and to find information; and
- to use standard software packages, such as SPSS, to analyze data.

5: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to study, review, and reflect on basic concepts in sociology and their fundamental theoretical interrelations.

The student should be able to define, give examples, and demonstrate the relevance of culture, socialization, stratification, social structure, institutions, and differentiations by race/ethnicity, gender, age, and social class.

6: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to study, review, and reflect on how social structures operate.

The student should be able to demonstrate

- how institutions interact in their effects on other and on individuals;
- how factors such as population or urbanization affect social structures and individuals; and
- how culture and social structure vary across time and place.

7: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to study, review, and reflect on reciprocal relationships between individuals and society.

The student should be able to explain

- how the self develops sociologically;
- how societal and structural factors influence individual behavior and the self's development;
- how social interaction and the self influences society and social structure; and
- how to distinguish sociological approaches to analyzing the self from psychological, economic, and other approaches.

8: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to study, review, and reflect on the internal diversity of American society.

The student should be able to

- describe the significance of variations by race, class, gender and age; and
- understand appropriately how to generalize or resist generalization across groups.

9: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to study, review, and reflect on the place of American society in the global world and community.

The student should be able to

- understand that local happenings are shaped by events occurring miles away and that their life and the lives of others are to an increasing degree being affected by events and processes everywhere, that they are experiencing an emerging global form of social life;
- understand and critique the Eurocentric-U.S. pattern and conception of globalization and development;
- understand that politics, economy, law, labor, culture, communications, and social movements have become globalized; and
- understand that they live in an interdependent and unequal society and world.

10: The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to think critically.

The student should be able to

- move easily from remembering through analysis and to synthesis and evaluation;
- recognize underlying assumptions in theoretical orientations or arguments;
- identify basic premises in particular arguments; and
- present opposing viewpoints and alternative hypotheses on various issues.

11: The sociology major at CSUS will be expected to have the writing skills necessary to communicate effectively with persons whom they encounter in their work, civil obligation and personal life.

The student should be able to

- write a clear and concise report of the findings from sociological data analysis; and
- write a clear and concise sociological analysis and account of a social event, topic, issue, or problem.

1b. Writing and Reading in the Major.

Students are required to write in most classes. Writing assignments vary. Some are the traditional term paper. Others involve writing a "one minute" paper summarizing what was learned from a particular lecture, or writing drafts of project proposals, field notes from observations, take-home and in-class essays, and small group writing projects.

In addition, as indicated below, many of the department's courses are included in the university's General Education program. As such, whether taken by majors to satisfy major requirements or by non-majors to satisfy GE requirements, all of these courses adhere, (at a minimum) to the writing requirements of the GE program. At the lower division level, the quantity of writing is unspecified, but at the upper division level must total a minimum of 1500 words. Additional requirements include providing feedback to students on their writing problems and offering an opportunity to correct and improve their submissions.

With respect to courses outside the GE program, but required within the major, the department has rigorous writing requirements. For example, the 102A/B sequence is a 6 unit capstone experience whereby students are required to define a research problem, engage in data collection and analysis, and complete a 4,000 word paper.

Similarly, the department requires completion of a Master's thesis as part of the graduate program. Among the several reasons for rejecting an MA by examination (see B7 above) is the department's commitment to the continuing improvement of student writing skills which cannot always be taken for granted at the graduate level. We believe this is best attained by a substantial writing project such as a thesis rather than by examination.

1c. Computer/Information Competence in the Major

Competency is primarily achieved by the 10 unit statistics/research methods sequence. This requires completion of an original research project over two semesters and involves formulating a research question, designing the research project, gathering original data or using an existing database, analyzing and interpreting data, writing the report, and presenting it publicly. This assignment represents the capstone experience for the sociology major. This project is meant to provide the major at the senior level with an opportunity to integrate three key learning expectations: knowledge about sociological theory and the sociological perspective, skills in research methods, and knowledge about a substantive area – crime, education, poverty, religion, race and ethnicity, and so forth.

2. Basis for Expectations

The primary basis for the department's learning expectations is the judgment of the faculty as informed by appropriate disciplinary standards. This question has long been a matter of concern to the American Sociological Association and their judgment has been a primary resource for the department. That judgment is most fully expressed in the following document:

Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major: Meeting the Challenge of Teaching Sociology in the Twenty-First Century. (Updated in January 2005.)

The department's learning expectations identified in **IIA** above are drawn directly from the ASA document which is available online (see page 51).

3. Communication of Expectations to Students.

Most faculty state on the syllabus of each course what the learning goals and expectations are for that course. Knowing the learning expectations of each course and of the sociology program in general helps students to focus on the key ideas, concepts, and knowledge they are expected to learn. Moreover, these expectations are stated on the department's web page.

B: Curriculum Structure

The Sociology major as structured in the current (2004/06) catalogue is as follows:

Current Program (2004-2006 catalogue)

MAJOR REQUIREMENTS BA

Units required for Major: 43

total units required for the BA: 120

Courses in parentheses are prerequisites.

A. Required Lower Division Courses (6 units)

(3) SOC 001 Principles of Sociology

Select one of the following (3):

- SOC 003 Social Problems
- SOC 005 Marriage & Its Alternatives
- SOC 008 Sense & Nonsense in Social Issues and Research
- SOC 010 Issues in Crime & Social Control

B. Area Division Core Courses (22 units)

- (4) SOC 101 Introduction to Statistics for Sociologists
- (4) SOC 102A Research Methods in Sociology (SOC 101)
- (2) SOC 102B Research Methods Lab (SOC 101; SOC 102A)
- (3) SOC 125 Class & Inequality (SOC 001)
- (3) SOC 150 Social Psychology
- (3) SOC 192 Sociological Theory (SOC 001)

Select one of the following (3):

- SOC 130 Political Sociology (SOC 001 or equivalent)
- SOC 140 Sociology of Education (SOC 001 or equivalent)
- SOC 164 Sociology of Globalization
- SOC 166 The Family
- SOC 171 Sociology of Religion
- SOC 175 Workers, Managers, and Bureaucracy

C. Additional Upper Division Requirements (15 units)

Select one of the following areas of study in consultation with a department advisor.

1. Criminology and Deviance

- (3) SOC 155 Criminology
- (3) SOC 156 Delinquency
- (3) SOC 157 Issues in Courts & Prisons

Select two of the following (6):

- SOC 110 Urban Life & Problems
- SOC 135 Sociology of Popular Culture
- SOC 136 Social Movements (SOC 001)
- SOC 158 Sociology of Deviance
- SOC 195* Internship & Fieldwork (Permission of instructor) **OR**
- SOC 199* Independent Study
- CRJ 136 Analysis of Career Criminals
- WOMS 139 Violence Against Women

2. Family and Socialization

- (3) SOC 126 Sociology of Gender
- (3) SOC 140 Sociology of Education
- (3) SOC 166 The Family

Select two of the following 6):

- SOC 106 Demography (SOC 001)
- SOC 127 Men, Masculinity and Society
- SOC 146 Sociology of Aging
- SOC 168 Self & Society (Passing score on WPE)
- SOC 169 Changing American Family
- SOC 190 Sociology of Small Groups (SOC 001 or equivalent)
- SOC 195* Internship & Fieldwork (Permission of instructor) **OR**
- SOC 199* Independent Study
- ETHN 173 Black Family in the US

3. Race and Ethnicity

- (3) SOC 118 Chicano Community
- (3) SOC 120 Ethnic & Race Relations
- (3) SOC 123 Black Studies in Sociology

Select two of the following (6):

- SOC 110 Urban Life & Problems
- SOC 122 Labor migration, Immigration, and Transnationalism in the Modern World
- SOC 136 Social Movements (SOC 001)
- SOC 160 Asian Societies
- SOC 162 Middle Eastern Societies & Culture
- SOC 195* Internship & Fieldwork (Permission of instructor) **OR**
- SOC 199* Independent Study
- ETHN 112 Contemporary Asian American Issues
- ETHN 170 Pan African Studies
- GOVT 163 Introduction to Black Politics in the U.S. (GOVT 001 or equivalent)
- WOMS 137 Women of Color

4. Urban Studies

- (3) SOC 110 Urban Life & Problems
- (3) SOC 120 Ethnic & Race Relations
- (3) SOC 155 Criminology

6) Select two of the following (6):

- SOC 106 Demography (SOC 001)
- SOC 118 Chicano Community
- SOC 133 Global Perspectives on Sport
- SOC 138 Introduction to Environmental Sociology
- SOC 164 Sociology of Globalization
- SOC 175 Workers, Managers, and Bureaucracy
- SOC 195* Internship & Fieldwork (Permission of Instructor) **OR**
- SOC 199* Individual Study Projects
- ANTH 163 Urban Anthropology
- ECON 180 Urban Economics (ECON 001B)
- GOVT 185 Problems of Urbanization (GOVT 001 or equivalent)

General Sociology

Select 15 units of upper division Sociology courses.

* **Note:** SOC 195 or SOC 199 can be taken for 1-3 units of credit. A maximum of 3 units in SOC 195 or SOC 199 may be counted toward the major.

In March 2005, the department curriculum committee recommended, after a year of deliberation, that the major as described above be restructured to recognize the emphasis in the ASA curriculum document (**Appendix 3**) that courses in race, class and gender be highlighted in required classes. Accordingly the following actions were approved by the Sociology department on March 15, 2005:

1. Sociology 125 (Class and Inequality) to be re-titled as Social Inequalities and that the course content be revised to reflect a greater emphasis than currently exists on race and gender. This course is required of all majors.

(In addition to the above change, we underline that the department explicitly discussed and rejected a 9 unit major requirement, consisting of three separate courses in race, class, and gender. This was deemed unrealistic from a staffing perspective, with an additional negative impact on our ability to serve the GE program.)

2. The Social Institutions category be abolished and replaced by a 3 unit category entitled “Advanced Studies in Sociology”. Courses in this category would contain an emphasis on theory, and could be rotated from one semester to another depending on a variety of factors including student demand, faculty availability etc.

3. To accommodate the above changes the existing system of concentrations described in the 2004-06 catalogue has been abolished. There are several reasons for this:

a. Students have complained on a regular basis that their concentration is not recognized on their graduation certificate. The department has pursued this with the University in the past and we have been informed that cost considerations preclude such inclusion.

b. Data provided by OIR at the request of the department indicates that only a minority of sociology majors (27%) select a concentration, with the remainder selecting the General Sociology option.

c. A number of students (as far as we can tell from the data) commence a concentration and then gravitate towards the general option. We believe this is explained primarily by scheduling difficulties. It is impossible to schedule

courses to allow those who wish to concentrate to do so and graduate in a timely way.

d. Abolishing the options in no way constrains a student's program since all the course offered under the concentrations would continue to be available to students with an expressed interest in the areas of concentration.

4. Courses in the major will be organized in the new catalogue around learning goals to facilitate student comprehension of how individual courses fit into the overall pattern of fulfilling the department's mission.

All of the revisions above will be incorporated into the 2006-2008 catalogue and we reproduce here the catalogue copy:

NEW PROGRAM (2006 – 2008 catalogue)

MAJOR REQUIREMENTS BA

Units required for Major: 43

Total units required for the BA: 120

Courses in parentheses are prerequisites.

A. Required Lower Division Courses (6 units)

(3) SOC 001 Principles of Sociology

(3) Select one of the following:

(3) SOC 003 Social Problems

(3) SOC 005 Marriage & Its Alternatives

(3) SOC 008 Sense & Nonsense in Social Issues and Research

(3) SOC 010 Issues in Crime & Social Control

B. Area Division (22 units)

(4) SOC 101 Introduction to Statistics for Sociologists

(4) SOC 102A Research Methods in Sociology (SOC 101)

(2) SOC 102B Research Methods Lab (SOC 101; SOC 102A)

(3) SOC 125 Social Inequalities (SOC 001)

(3) SOC 150 Social Psychology

(3) SOC 192 Sociological Theory (SOC 001)

(3) Select one of the following Advanced Study:

(3) SOC 122 Immigration Studies

(3) SOC 130 Political Sociology

(3) SOC 133 Sport in Global Perspective

(3) SOC 138/ENVS 138 Environmental Sociology

(3) SOC 140 Sociology of Education

(3) SOC 166 The Family

(3) SOC 171 Sociology of Religion

C. Additional Upper Division Requirements (15 units)

Select 15 units of any upper division Sociology courses.

1. Crime and Deviance

- (3) SOC 155 Criminology
- (3) SOC 156 Delinquency
- (3) SOC 157 Courts and Prisons
- (3) SOC 158 Sociology of Deviance

2. Diversity and Inequality

- (3) SOC 118 Chicano Community
- (3) SOC 120 Ethnic & Race Relations
- (3) SOC 123 Black Studies in Sociology
- (3) SOC 124/ID 124 Social Justice in Interdisciplinary Perspective
- (3) SOC 126 Sociology of Gender
- (3) SOC 127 Men, Masculinity and Society
- (3) SOC 160 Asian Societies
- (3) SOC 162 Middle Eastern Societies and Culture

3. Socialization and Interaction

- (3) SOC 128 Sociology of Sexuality
- (3) SOC 134 Sociology of Film
- (3) SOC 135 Sociology of Pop Culture
- (3) SOC 146 Sociology of Aging
- (3) SOC 168 Self and Society
- (3) SOC 170 Sociology of Childhood and Adolescence

4. Globalization and Social Change

- (3) SOC 106 Births, Deaths and Borders
- (3) SOC 110 Urban Life & Problems
- (3) SOC 136 Social Movements
- (3) SOC 144 Health and Illness
- (3) SOC 163 Conflict, Oil, Middle East
- (3) SOC 164 Sociology of Globalization
- (3) SOC 169 Changing American Family
- (3) SOC 175 Work and Occupations
- (3) SOC 176/LBRS 100 Labor and American Social Structure

5. General

- (3) SOC 194 Special Topics
- (1-3) SOC 195 Internship & Fieldwork (permission of instructor)
- (3) SOC 196 Experimental Topics
- (1-3) SOC 199 Individual Study Projects

* **Note:** SOC 195 or SOC 199 can be taken for 1-3 units of credit.

A maximum of 3 units in SOC 195 or SOC 199 may be counted toward the major. Students may take up to 3 units of upper division courses outside the department in consultation with their undergraduate advisor.

The sociology minor is structured as follows and no changes are currently planned:

Requirements □ Minor

Units required for Minor: 21

(3) SOC 001 Principles of Sociology

(3) Select one of the following:

SOC 003 Social Problems

SOC 005 Marriage and Its Alternatives

SOC 008 Sense and Nonsense in Social Issues and Research

SOC 010 Issues in Crime and Social Control

(15) Select 15 units of upper division electives from one of the areas of study above; SOC 125 and SOC 150 may be substituted for any courses in the above areas of study

The sociology Master's degree is structured as follows and no further changes are anticipated at this time:

Requirements □ Master of Arts Degree

Units required for the MA: 30

Minimum required GPA: 3.0

A. Required Core Courses (15 units)

(1) SOC 200A Orientation to Graduate Studies in Sociology

(2) SOC 200B Thesis Prospectus/Project Preparation Seminar (Six hours of graduate study;

SOC 216, or concurrent enrollment, recommended)

(3) SOC 215 Research Methods (SOC 101 or equivalent, or instructor permission)

(3) SOC 216 Data Analysis

(3) SOC 235 Social Psychology

(3) SOC 240 Seminar: Sociological Theory

B. Electives (9 units)

(9) Select 9 units from the following:

SOC 210 Urban Sociology

SOC 220 Seminar: Social Change

SOC 225 Social Stratification

SOC 226 Sociology of Gender

SOC 230 Seminar: Social Organization

SOC 238 Environmental Sociology

SOC 255 Social Research in Crime and Deviance

SOC 260 Contemporary Issues of the Middle East and North Africa

SOC 265 Race and Ethnic Relations

SOC 266 Sociology of the Family
SOC 295* Internship and Fieldwork (Instructor permission)
SOC 299* Special Problems

*No more than 3 units of SOC 295 and SOC 299 may be counted toward the degree.

C. Culminating Experience (6 units)

SOC 500 Thesis or Project

Note: A foreign language is not required for the degree. However, students who plan further graduate study are encouraged to study French, German, or Spanish since proficiency in one of these is sometimes required in doctoral programs.

We draw the PRT's attention to one recent change in the graduate program. In addition to new courses offered in recent years (see responses to Rec. #8 above) the department, on the recommendation of the graduate committee, has now reversed the order of Soc 215 and 216. Research Methods will now precede Data Analysis in the new program.

A detailed matrix showing the relationship between every course (N=38) and the department's learning expectations is provided in **Appendix 4**. This matrix has been updated for the current self-study and includes all courses approved through the Spring semester 2005.

II C. Teaching Strategies:

(Course syllabi contained in **Volume 2** of this report):

- a. Service learning (see 4C below)
- b. Field work: The department recently appointed a committee to examine and revise as necessary the department's longstanding internship program. The committee reported its findings and the department accepted the recommendations of the committee. The newly designed program will be implemented in the Fall semester 2005. The revised program is contained in **Appendix 1**.
- c. Faculty use a variety of techniques depending on the material to be covered and the judgment of the faculty member. For example, one faculty member (Wehr) utilizes the technique of response cards for every class meeting requiring students to respond to the substantive material of the lectures or class discussion covered that day. Professor Hadley asks the students to analyze a set of short fieldnotes from her own fieldwork. They have to do the analytic work and respond to questions professor Hadley poses for them. She reports-"It gets them thinking and analyzing - much more interesting than me just stating my own findings for them."

- d. Many faculty require students to submit writing assignments reflecting on the application of sociological concepts to their own biographies i.e. interpreting their own experiences, attitudes, behaviors etc. in sociological terms (e.g. Barajas, Provenza, Varano, Wu). All these faculty speak positively of student responses to such assignments.
- e. One faculty member (Berg) requires students to create poster presentations for their research papers which cover The Family in a country other than the US. During the scheduled final exam time, Professor Berg books a room in the Union and they present their work in a poster session.

II D Distance and Distributed Education

The department has regularly offered three courses as distance education. Professor Maykovich has frequently offered Sociology 120 (Race/Ethnicity) and Soc 146 (Aging) and Professor Kando has frequently offered Soc 156 also (Delinquency). Professor Maykovich completed her period on FERP status in June 2005 and professor Kando is currently in that status. As yet, the department has not had an opportunity to discuss if, and by whom, we will continue to offer these courses in the future. This will be discussed in the Fall, 2005.

II E Assessment

The Sociology Department relies on a variety of instruments for data collection in the implementation of our assessment plan. These are described in detail in the appendices. Briefly, they include:

1. Entering Sociology Major Questionnaire (see Appendix 5).

This instrument poses 27 questions soliciting (for example) demographic information (age, race/ethnicity/gender) from each student, along with background information concerning parental levels of education, prior levels of educational accomplishment, current academic workload, simultaneous work responsibilities, attitudes towards the major, reasons for selecting sociology as a major, and employment aspirations after graduation.

2. Graduating Senior Assessment Questionnaire (See Appendix 6)

The GSAQ is a 45 item questionnaire that seeks to elicit information indicative (among other things) of the degree to which students believe the department has attained its learning goals/time spent on study, work and recreation/satisfaction with non-instructional components of the department such as advising/campus involvement and out-of-class academic experiences/importance to self and family of academic success/access to faculty/strengths and weaknesses of the program.

3. Alumni Survey. The alumni survey is provided to us by OIR and has both quantitative and qualitative dimensions. The quantitative survey (**Appendix 7**) poses 20 questions designed to elicit alumni views on such topic areas as: why they selected sociology as a major, usefulness of sociology degree, acquisition of skills, knowledge of concepts, relationship of self and society, understanding of social institutions, understanding diversity in contemporary society, integration of courses in the major, satisfaction with the quality of instruction etc. Alumni are also offered an opportunity to supplement their quantitative responses with written comments (**Appendix 7A**).

II F Effectiveness of the Sociology Program

(We emphasize that at this point in the development of our assessment plan the department has focused on student perceptions of the effectiveness of our program as opposed to direct measure of its actual effectiveness. The department is in compliance with measuring actual effectiveness with respect to those courses included in the GE program, and our 5 year assessment plan has been submitted and approved by the GE coordinator. Parallel discussions are currently underway within the department to expand our efforts in the fall semester to include more direct measures of program effectiveness with respect to the major.)

On the basis of the entering and exit surveys identified above, the department files regular assessment reports with the Dean of SSIS and those for years 2000-2003 are reproduced in **Appendix 8**. We offer here a summary of our most recent Assessment Report submitted in 2004.

1. Assessment Activities for the AY 2003-2004.

Our present assessment plan includes entering and exit surveys of undergraduate majors. We continue to introduce new classes and new information into classes to make sure that the learning outcomes of the department are being met, such as the focus on creating Global courses (Soc 122, Soc 133), as well as courses that address diversity in society (Soc 123), interactions (Soc 127) and overall institutional structure and change (Soc 138, 171). All of these courses, which are scheduled to be taught in the upcoming school year, are directly affiliated with learning outcomes for our department, further ensuring that Sociology majors are receiving important and necessary information, while gaining a range of ideas and concepts from a diverse set of courses.

While we have been making changes to better fulfill the departmental learning goals, much of our focus on assessment has been on the development and implementation of the GE assessment. In the past year, there have been numerous changes to the program, and subsequently to our courses that reside in GE.

2. Based on the Assessment of Learning Outcomes, Areas in Which Students Excel

While we are unable to look at the present year, as students are continuing to turn in the exit exams, we can assess the development of the learning outcomes since the previous assessment (2001) until last year (2003). Looking at our past assessment, we see no drop in any of the learning outcomes, with nearly all of our students feeling we attained 4 or 5 on a five point scale across all outcomes. Focusing on the areas that were identified by our students as not having attained as high of levels of knowledge, there were small increases in two of the areas, including computer competence (57% to 59%) and global perspectives (48% to 50%), possibly indicating that as we implement the curriculum changes to better address these issues, there is a small impact on student learning. As we discuss below, we are further addressing these issues. Also in the previous assessment, our students had expressed insufficient knowledge regarding the self in society, which we have changed dramatically, moving from 57% significantly attained in 2000, to 75% in 2003. This change can likely be attributed to the increased emphasis on the individual in society in different courses, including Soc 126 and Soc 158.

We will continue to look at the assessment material over the upcoming summer.

3. Based on the Assessment of Learning Outcomes, Areas of Curriculum or Teaching That Need to be Changed.

While we appear to be achieving our stated departmental learning outcomes, one area that continues to lag behind the others is our coverage of Global issues. Our present areas, while higher than the previous assessment, are still behind where we desire them to be. This is understandable because it has been only within the last few years that we have instituted changes in the curriculum to address such concerns. These affects will likely not be realized for several years, as it will take a few years to disseminate to the students. This will become less of an issue for our newer cohorts, as they will be involved with the major and the courses after the implementation of the changes and thus will be engaging with more global and cross-cultural discussions in courses that previous classes had not.

In order to continue addressing global issues we plan to further enhance attainment of our learning outcomes by offering more courses that utilize, either explicitly or implicitly, a global emphasis. Specifically, Soc 122 (Labor Migration and Trans-nationalism), Soc 164 (Globalization) and Soc 133 (Global Perspectives on Sport) will be offered on a more regular basis. As discussed, we are further implementing global and cross-cultural components into our already established courses, such as Soc 166 (The Family).

Along with this, our students do not feel they are gaining skills in research and statistics to the degree we would wish. This is difficult to interpret since all students in the major must complete a 10 unit capstone sequence emphasizing

statistics and research methods. Moreover faculty evaluations in these courses are very high. Based on the projects our students are producing in these courses, we feel that they are in fact gaining the desired level of methodological and statistical information, but due to the nature and difficulty of the areas, they do not feel significantly well versed in the subject matter. This may be less an issue with departmental focus and more likely due to the difficulty of the topic. Still, this is not to say we are stagnant in our attempts to deepen student understanding in these areas. The recent establishment of the Quality of Life Survey in the Sacramento Region and inclusion of students into the project will help to address this issue in even more detail.

In addition, the project will require students who are affiliated with it to engage with computer programs and applications, which allows us to further address the computer skills learning outcome, which students do not feel have been sufficiently emphasized. Along with this, the recent addition of professors who utilize a greater range of technology in the classroom, including WebCT, which requires the students to engage with computers on a regular basis, will also assist students in gaining and expanding their knowledge about technology. While these programs are important, the true impact of them will not be felt departmentally for several years, when students become more entrenched in the research and affiliated programs.

4. Plans for Next Year's Work on Assessment.

It should first be noted that we are currently in a transition period between assessment coordinators, meaning the new coordinator is still developing an understanding of the focus and meaning of the goals of the assessment program. The change in assessment coordinators will allow our department to further focus on the specifics of our program as the new coordinator will focus solely on the learning outcomes of our program and our assessment of it.

In addition to the entering and exit surveys the department also has at its disposal the results of the alumni survey provided by OIR which we summarize here:

Results of Alumni Survey. (Quantitative--see Appendix 7)

Eighty-eight alumni responded to 20 multiple choice questions and one open-ended question.

Summaries of quantitative responses are as follows:

1. The most important factor leading to a major in sociology is the student's experience with the first course in sociology.
2. The most useful aspects of the degree are familiarity with basic concepts such as stratification and socialization and the ability to think critically about social issues.
3. 87% of former students felt (i.e. 4 or 5 on a 5 point scale) that the core requirements provided integration to the major.

4. 96% of respondents ranked the quality of instruction as 4 or 5.
5. 70% of alumni ranked the quality of advising as 4 or 5. Of the remaining 30% 18% had mixed feeling and 10% ranked advising as poor. We address this below.
6. Almost half (46%) of former students felt the sociology degree was only slightly or not at all important to their current employment.
7. On the provision of knowledge and skills the department ranks high on all items although 14% of students ranked the provision of these as less than adequate or not at all. We address this below.
8. Similar high scores were achieved with respect to mentoring, laboratory facilities and fieldwork experiences when applicable.

The qualitative remarks are, naturally, more difficult to summarize. (For the full document see **Appendix 7A**). Thirty-one alumni chose to provide comments on this portion of the questionnaire. Overwhelmingly, these comments are positive in describing their experiences with our program. Among these respondents 19 indicated explicitly whether they would or would not major in sociology again. 12 of these indicated they would, and 7 that they would not. Without exception, the reasons given among the latter relates to the job market for sociologists. None of these respondents indicated that dissatisfaction with the department's program was a factor shaping their response to this question.

Overall, alumni responses are very gratifying to the department though we note there is room for improvement in areas such as advising and, possibly, skills acquisition. With respect to advising, the department chair has commenced a series of seminars for faculty who wish to increase their level of involvement in this activity. With respect to skills acquisition more information is needed on the particular skills in question, and cross-tabulation of responses is necessary to enhance our understanding of what might be done to improve this situation. Since all majors are required to take 10 units of statistics and methods (typical for sociology programs nationwide) it is not clear what skills students are referring to. Since approximately half of the alumni respondents are working in positions unrelated, or only slightly related, to sociology, they may be referring to skills required in those jobs, which we, obviously, cannot provide.

One additional measure of departmental effectiveness is provided by the OIR in the form of the Student Needs And Priorities Survey (see **Appendix 9**) which offers insights into student perceptions of the Sociology Program and Faculty. The survey solicits sociology student responses to 16 items, and then compares these responses with CSUS students as a whole on a 5 point scale. The results indicate that our students rank us higher than the university as a whole on 12 of these items, equal on another 4, and inferior on none. Particularly high scores were achieved on measures assessing faculty enthusiasm for teaching (4.4), levels of preparedness (4.3) and coursework consistent with stated course objectives (4.3). At the other end of the continuum, the lowest scores were recorded in response to items such as availability of necessary classes (2.95) and

convenience of class scheduling (2.97). While these latter responses are troubling, the department sees little that we can do to remedy this situation, though obviously it is a constant focus of attention when scheduling courses. That the department's scores are typical of the university as a whole (2.90 and 2.96 respectively), clearly indicates this to be a university-wide problem that is best addressed at a university-wide level (where solutions are equally unlikely due to budgetary constraints and limited classroom availability).

Other measures of effectiveness include the fact that all new hires possess the Ph.D, all are active in participating at professional conferences, preparing scholarly papers, developing their pedagogical skills through university sponsored workshops on teaching with technology etc. etc. We suggest the PRT consult the accompanying documents such as faculty CVs and syllabi for further confirmation.

II G Multiple Section Courses.

The issue of consistency across multiple course sections is addressed variously depending on whether or not the course is offered for general education. In the case of those courses in the GE program (e.g. Soc. 1/Soc 120) a coordinator is appointed by the department chair to ensure that all faculty teaching the course are aware of GE criteria as well as department learning expectations for those courses. The department does not impose a common syllabus or required texts across all sections. We regard such impositions as inconsistent with faculty professional autonomy and stifling of faculty initiative and course innovation. Outside the GE program the department relies on informal discussion and cooperation initiated by faculty teaching the course. These discussions are not uncommon (for example Professors Kingsnorth and Cowles convened a working lunch on exactly this point for Sociology 157 in the spring 2005 semester). In addition, some courses are new offerings which are the outcome of faculty collaboration (for example, "Sport in Global Perspective" was jointly developed by Professors Berg and Migliaccio thus ensuring a high degree of consistency across different sections.).

II H Changes Needed to Improve Effectiveness

1. More smart classrooms (see VI below)
2. More large classrooms (" " ")
3. Increased institutional support for scholarly activity (see VI below)
4. Enhance our understanding, by qualitative data, of why a minority of students do not feel the advising process serves them well (see p26 above)

II I General Education and Service Courses

The sociology department offers a range of courses in the General Education program as well as service courses to a variety of programs across campus:

1. General Education

The department offers courses in the following GE areas:

Basic Subjects

A3-Critical Thinking: SOC 8 (Sense and Nonsense in Research)

Arts and Humanities

C1-World Civilizations: SOC 162 (Middle Eastern Societies and Culture)

C4- Further Studies : SOC 135: Sociology of Popular Culture
SOC 160 (Asian Societies).

Foundations in Social and Behavioral Sciences:

D1a: SOC 1 (Introduction to Sociology)
SOC 106 (Demography)

World Cultures

D1b: SOC 163: Conflict, Oil, and Development in the Middle East

Major Social Issues of the Contemporary Era:

D2: SOC 3: Social Problems
SOC 10: Issues Crime and Social Control
SOC 118: Chicano Community
SOC 120: Ethnic and Race Relations
SOC 155: Criminology
SOC 156: Delinquency
SOC 157: Issues In Courts and Prisons
SOC 164: Sociology Of Globalization

Understanding Personal Development

E: SOC 126: Sociology of Gender
SOC 127: Men, Masculinity and Society
SOC 146: Aging
SOC 158: Sociology of Deviance
SOC 168* Self and Society

2. **Service Courses**

The department offers the following courses as service to other programs:

Anthropology: All Anthropology majors are required to complete a statistics course. The Anthropology department list 3 courses of which one is Sociology 101.

Asian Studies: SOC 160 (Asian Societies) is required for the major

Child Development: Pre-credential subject matter program identifies SOC 8 as one of 6 courses among which students can elect to meet their GE Critical Thinking requirement.

Criminal Justice: The CJ department requires all majors to take at least one course from an extensive list of “Supporting Courses”. The Sociology department offers 10 courses on this list which are: SOC 101/SOC 102A/Soc 102B/SOC 130/ SOC 136/Soc 155/SOC 156/SOC 157/ SOC 158/SOC 190.

Gerontology: Soc 102A and 102B are electives in the program.

Liberal Studies: SOC 169 (Changing American Family) is an elective within the Human Development concentration.

Nursing: SOC 1 (Intro) is an elective in “Socio-Cultural Patterns”

Social Science: SOC 1/110/120/125/155/156/160/162 all have elective status in this program.

Women’s Studies: SOC 126 (Sociology of Gender) is an elective.

II J **Student Diversity**

1. Concepts of Race, Class, and Gender are central to the discipline of Sociology and as such are covered in every class we offer. In addition, as noted above, the department has recently (2005) revised its curriculum to comply with new ASA guidelines to give even greater prominence to these concepts in the structure of the major.

2 Because Sociology teaches the impact of race, class, and gender on the life chances of individuals in society, we are consequently sensitive to the role these factors play in shaping the differing levels of educational preparation of students in our classrooms. Faculty regularly discuss student difficulties and many refer needy students to university resources such as the writing center. Several of our faculty are active on committees and in programs such as: EOP (Udayagiri); College Assistance Migrant Program (Barajas); the Multicultural Center (Udayagiri); Cooper-Woodson College Enhancement Program (Monk); Committee on Diversity and Equity (Barajas); committee for diversity awards (Barajas and Monk); CSUS Asian American and Pacific Islander Students Task Force (Liu); and the McNair Scholars program (Barajas).

 In addition, many faculty have participated in university sponsored workshops such as ‘writing across the curriculum’ which enhances their ability to respond to students with writing difficulties (for example).

3. The department effort to impart to students a knowledge of how to live and work effectively in our diverse society is primarily accomplished through implementation of our learning goals (see above goals 5 and 8 in particular).

II K The requirements for the sociology minor are detailed above. The department does not allocate resources uniquely for the minor. We have no data on the number of students who minor in sociology.

III Students

A: Student Profile

1. Enrollment patterns:

Since the Fall 2000 the number of majors (graduate and undergraduate) has increased from 293 to 389 (32%) in the Fall 2004 semester. This increase has been equally manifest at the undergraduate and graduate levels and is dramatically greater than the 11.6% increase in the College and in the university as a whole (8.9%).

2. Gender and Ethnic Composition.

Increases among women (= 43%) over the four years, exceeds that among men (=13% increase). As a proportion, female representation in the major has increased from 65% to over 70%. This is slightly below SSIS (75%), but substantially above the university as a whole (57%).

The **number** of African-American students has remained fairly constant over the last 4 years, though as a **proportion** their representation has fallen from around 15% to 11% (which is substantially above the university average of 6%). This decline largely reflects the surge in Latino students majoring in sociology, increasing from 44 to 78 students (65%) over the 5 year period. The number of white majors has also increased significantly (24%) as has the number of Asian students (from 14 to 32 majors=130%). Reflecting these increases in minority enrollment, white representation in the major has fallen from 43% to 40%.

3. Retention and Graduation Rates

The program profile provided by OIR indicates that the one year continuation rate for incoming freshmen is substantially below that of the College and University as a whole. In the absence of qualitative data we are uncertain as to the meaning of this finding. On the other hand, the 6 year graduation data indicate that a substantially higher proportion of sociology majors graduate within that time frame than is true for the college and university as a whole. Without more information we are unable to interpret these findings. It may reflect the greater inter-major mobility of liberal arts majors compared to professional majors. We note, however, that for transfer students (for whom sufficient numbers are available to permit statistical analysis) retention rates over 1 and 2 year periods for recently entering students (Fall 2001 and 2002) are substantially above those of earlier years. This is, however, too short a period for reliable interpretation.

At the graduate level a similar pattern is noted with sociology graduate students completing their master's degrees at a substantially

higher rate (75%) than the college (60%) and university as a whole (61%) within a 7 year time frame.

4. Part- and Full-Time Enrollments

The increase in enrollments in the last 4 years has been driven primarily by students in full-time rather than part-time status. In fact, at the undergraduate level, the number of part-time majors has fallen recently, whereas the number in full-time status has increased by slightly over 50%. At the graduate level the number of part-time and full-time students has increased for an overall increase of 35% in the last 5 years. The balance of full-time /part-time students in our program closely mirrors the data for SSIS and the University as a whole.

5. Native and Transfer Students:

New transfers in Fall 2004 approximate 20% of sociology majors and this slightly exceeds the college (15%) and university (13%). Undoubtedly this reflects the recent substantial increases in the number of students majoring in sociology.

B. Student Academic Performance.

1. Grading Distribution.

OIR data indicate that departmental grading practices do not, in most instances, depart substantially from overall College norms. Comparisons with university-wide data lack validity given the substantially greater university-wide use of CR/NC than is characteristic of SSIS or the department of sociology (e.g. 11% vs. 2% vs 1% respectively in Fall 2003). Compared to overall SSIS grades the department appears to be slightly more generous in its award of A grades (31% vs. 27%), but we do not consider this to be significant or problematic.

2. GPAs.

OIR data indicate that the GPA of sociology students is remarkably similar to that of the college and university as a whole. This is true at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. (Separation between means of both groups at both levels does not exceed .06)

3. Students on Probation

OIR data indicate that the proportion of sociology students in good standing is very similar to that of the college and university as a whole. This is true at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. (Separation between proportions of both groups at both levels does not exceed 3%)

4. WPE Pass Rates

Native Sociology students pass the WPE at a rate substantially higher than that of the college and university as a whole. The converse is true for transfer students. Without more information regarding the characteristics of students who pass/fail the WPE and how those characteristics might be over and under-represented among native and transfer students, no reliable interpretation of these data is possible.

5. Preparation for Upper Division/Graduate Coursework

A. Upper Division.

The sociology major requires all students to complete at least 6 units at the lower division level as preparation for upper division work including Sociology 1 (Introduction to Sociology), which is a survey course introducing students to the breadth of the discipline. This is very typical of CSU campuses statewide and the department is confident that our students are well prepared for continued studies at the upper division level.

B. Graduate

The core requirements in the major emphasize a solid grounding in Theory and Methods. In particular, the Sociology 101/102 sequence (10units) is a capstone experience designed to lay a foundation of technical and conceptual skills essential for more advanced scholarly work in the discipline. Many of our undergraduate students have gone on to graduate work either in our department or at other universities.

Moreover, many of our graduate students, after completion of the Master's degree with us, have pursued their studies in sociology at the doctoral level in respected programs around the country. Recent examples include the University of Southern California/ SUNY-Albany/ University of Notre Dame/University of Nebraska/University of Arizona/University of Nevada/UC Santa Barbara/University of Utah/UC Davis/Boston College/University of Utah/University of Texas, Austin.

C. Student Academic Support

1. We have indicated elsewhere the advising system in the department. Briefly, this is a responsibility discharged primarily by the chair and supplemented by other faculty as needed. The chair has held advising seminars for other faculty in order to familiarize them with advising norms and procedures. Primary reliance on the chair is explained by a) the preference of the chair for this arrangement and b) the greater assurance of consistency and uniformity of advising when concentrated in the hands of one person. On the other hand the department is far from indifferent to the fact that a minority of students do not feel they have been well advised (see SNAPS, Appendix 9). This is an issue that the department intends to take up in the fall 2005 semester. A primary task

will be to survey students with a view to developing qualitative data which will illuminate the precise nature and source of student dissatisfaction. Once we have a better handle on the reasons for student perceptions, we will be in a better position to put in place corrective measures.

With respect to career advising this has been, is, and always will be, problematic. The sociology degree unlike, for example, the criminal justice degree, is not a professional preparation degree. There is no such job as “sociologist”. Nonetheless, the department makes a number of efforts in this direction:

One area to which we attach particular importance is our internship program. As stated on our web page, the department encourages students to take 3 units of 195 credit for a community work experience supported by academic supervision. In our experience, such internships are an excellent introduction to the world of work, students acquire important skills working with others in an occupational environment and sometimes these positions lead to regular employment with the participating agencies. This program has been recently revamped (see Appendix 1) and we intend to focus more on the possibilities it offers for our students in the future through development of closer relations with an expanded number of agencies in the local area.

In addition, the department works closely with the sociology student’s club (see next section). The club meets monthly and each semester one meeting is scheduled for presentations on entry into graduate school and another on careers in sociology. In the case of the latter, alumni have made presentations on their own work experiences.

2. Additional support for students at the departmental level is left to the professional judgment of the faculty and provided on an individual basis by the faculty to students as needed. Externally, many faculty refer students to the writing center when more intensive support is required. As noted elsewhere (see section below on Faculty), many faculty have participated in university sponsored seminars and workshops designed to enhance their skills in such areas as supervising student writing. These activities enhance our ability to serve students with needs in this area.

DIV. Student Professional Development

A primary method for socialization of students into the discipline is involvement of students in professional conferences and participation in student research conferences. In the case of the former, the Pacific Sociological Association and California Sociological Association are two important active organizations regionally, which strongly encourage

student participation. For many years, both graduate and undergraduates accompanied by faculty have attended these conferences, often presenting papers. At the present time, four faculty (Berg, Carrigan, Migliaccio and Wehr) are involved in organizing four student research panels for the Fall 2005 meeting of the California Sociological Association in Berkeley. Many of our students will participate in presenting their papers at this meeting. These presentations involve both graduates and undergraduates. In addition, the CSU Social Science Research Council sponsors an annual student research conference at which our students frequently present papers. In recent years, many of our students have received awards for their work.

In addition, the sociology department sponsors a local chapter of AKD, the international honors society for sociology undergraduates. This is a lively organization sponsoring talks and social events on a monthly basis. Professors Carrigan and Varano are the faculty advisors to the club and other faculty participate either as guest speakers (Hadley, MacIntosh, and Wehr in the most recent AY) on selected topics (e.g. entry into graduate school, careers in sociology etc.) or in the club's social events.

IV. **Faculty**

A. **Faculty Profile**

1. **Full and Part-Time Faculty**

As currently constituted (Spring 2005) the Department of Sociology consists of 16 Full-Time Tenure-Track faculty, 3 faculty in FERP status, and 5 adjunct faculty.

2. **Gender and Ethnic Composition**

The gender and ethnic composition of the department in the Fall 2005 by Full-Time/FERP/Part-Time status, is as follows:

	Full-time	FERP	Part-time
Gender			
Male	11	3	2
Female	5	0	3
Ethnic			
Arab	1		
African Am	1		1
Asian	3		
Hispanic	2	1	
White	9	2	4

The Tables above are slightly misleading in that they contain generational effects that probably will be corrected for in the near-future by means of retirements etc. The Program review team may wish to know that since 1997 the department has hired 14 new faculty. Of these 5 are female and 9 male. Of the same 14, 7 are white and 7 non-white. Again, of the 14 new hires, 5 are white male with the remaining 9 composed of all other female and non-white categories. The department feels that we have achieved substantial success in attaining the university's goal of diversity in hiring practices.

3. Student-Faculty Ratio/Class Size.

Student-Faculty Ratios in Sociology are higher (28.3) than the average for SSIS (25.2) and the university as a whole (21.0). Unsurprisingly, this is paralleled by a higher average class size (45.4) than either of the two comparison groups (35.4 and 28.2 respectively).

B. Assessment of Faculty Profile;

As noted above, the department has hired 14 new faculty in the last 8 years. We have also indicated the substantial changes in the major and number and type of course offerings which have been introduced during that period. As a result the department finds itself in a strong position vis-à-vis the curriculum and our ability to support the program and achieve learning goals. All 14 recent hires have the Ph.D in relevant specialty areas and the department feels we have adequately covered the major substantive areas of the curriculum. In addition to possession of the Ph.D, the CVs of the faculty indicate that all are engaged in significant scholarly work in the form of publications, conference presentations, reviews of manuscripts for journals, membership of professional committees, etc.

C. Faculty as Teachers:

1. As noted in the historical introduction, the Sociology department has hired 14 new faculty in the last 8 years which has largely redressed what was an increasingly critical imbalance between the curriculum and the faculty's ability to deliver. Today (2005), the situation is quite different. Our faculty are at the beginning rather than the end of their careers, and are highly energized and motivated to restructure the curriculum to reflect contemporary disciplinary trends (see above). As a group the faculty are highly appreciated by our students who rank us--on average--at 4.6 on a 5 point scale across all classes offered (Fall semester, 2004 data). This level of evaluation is highly consistent from semester to semester. Student written comments on their evaluation forms amply support these high quantitative scores.

In addition:

- A number of faculty have involved themselves in such activities as developing service learning components to their courses, (e.g. Berg, Carrigan, Migliaccio, and Wehr)
- Several faculty have participated in CSUS workshops such as “Writing Across the Curriculum” (e.g. Carrigan, Wehr), “Teaching With Technology” (Migliaccio, Udayagiri) and Web CT (Berg, Wehr).
- Faculty are frequently presenting papers/organizing roundtables at professional conferences such as the PSA meeting in Portland April 2005, focused upon teaching methods and strategies (e.g. Curiel, Hadley, Migliaccio, Wehr).
- The sociology department contributed 2 (Berg, Liu) of 5 panelists at an Office of Community Collaboration Service Learning Workshop.
- Professor Berg is a member of the Pacific Sociological Association Committee on Teaching.
- In AY 2002/03 Professor Liu received the Outstanding Teacher Award for the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies.

D. Faculty as Scholars:

The sociology department ranks scholarly activity second after teaching effectiveness in its evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion purposes. The specific weightings are: Teaching=70%; Scholarly activity=15%; Institutional Service=10%; and Community Service=5%.

A glance at the Faculty CVs provided in volume 2 of this report will reveal a very active faculty (both tenured and untenured), fully engaged in scholarly work. The following examples are intended as no more than a brief summary of the level of scholarly work undertaken by our faculty in the last 2 academic years:

- Barajas:** Presented 3 papers at professional conferences and signed one book contract.
- Berg:** Presented 3 papers at professional conferences.
- Carrigan:** Presented 3 papers at professional conferences and authored 2 research reports.
- Curiel:** One article published, and two conference presentations
- Hadley:** Co-authored 2 publications and one conference presentation.
- Kingsnorth:** Co-authored one article published and three more under submission and one conference presentation.
- Liu:** One article published and six research reports.
- MacIntosh:** Co-authored one published article.

- Migliaccio:** Two articles published and two more under submission.
Monk: Presented one paper at a professional conference.
Udayagiri: One article published, a second under submission,
Varano: One article published, one book review, one paper presented.
Wehr: One book published, two book reviews, and one co-authored article.
Wu: Grant recipient from National Institute of Justice, one article published, one research report, two conference presentations.

As noted above, we encourage the review team to consult the CVs in Volume 2 for more detail on faculty scholarship.

A. Faculty Service:

As with faculty scholarship, we encourage the PRT to consult Faculty Vitas included in volume 2 of this report for a more complete view of faculty service. The following is intended to provide no more than a suggestion of faculty service to CSUS (and does not include service to professional organizations such as the American Sociological Association, Pacific and California Sociological Associations.)

- Barajas:** Faculty Advisor CSUS Academic Advising Center/
Advisor for McNair Scholars/ Member-Curriculum Policies
Committee.
- Berg:** Chair, Department Committee for Protection of Human
Subjects/ Department Library Liaison/ Member department
Curriculum and Graduate Committees.
- Carrigan:** General Education Committee member/ Chair PRT for
Special Minors, Majors and Master's programs/ Member
PRT Foreign Languages.
- Curiel:** Member CSUS Faculty Senate, Department Graduate
Committee.
- Hadley:** Member RCA Award Evaluation Subcommittee/ Member,
Soc. Dept. Human Subjects Committee/ Curriculum
Committee
- Kingsnorth:** Chair Sociology Department RTP committee.
- Landis:** Chair, Department of Sociology 1973-present
- Liu:** Chair, CSUS Faculty Policies Committee/ Member,
Executive Committee Faculty Senate/ Member CSUS CUP
- MacIntosh:** Graduate Coordinator Department of Sociology/ Member
Pedagogy Enhancement Review Committee
- Migliaccio:** Chair Department of Soc. Assessment Committee/ member,
Alumni Relations Committee/ RCA Award subcommittee
member.

- Monk:** Mentor, Cooper-Woodson College Enhancement Program.
Member, Diversity Awards Committee.
- Udayagiri:** Chair, Soc. Dept. Curriculum Committee/Member, RCA
Awards sub-committee/ Member, Advisory Board Multi-
Cultural Center.
- Varano:** Chair SSIS Curriculum Committee/Director, Labor Studies
Program CSUS.
- Wehr:** Member, RCA Award Evaluation Subcommittee/member
Soc. Dept. Human Subjects Committee.
- Wu:** RCA Award Evaluation Subcommittee.

V. Governance.

A. Faculty Involvement in Department Governance.

The governance structure of the department consists of the department Chair supported by the Chairs of a number of Standing Committees.

These are:

Graduate Committee:	Chair-Professor MacIntosh
Curriculum Committee:	Chair-Professor Udayagiri
Human Subjects Committee:	Chair-Professor Berg
Assessment Committee:	Chair-Professor Migliaccio
RTP Committee:	Chair-Professor Kingsnorth

The Department of Sociology's general approach to governance is to maximize opportunities for faculty to serve. Thus, membership of the Graduate Committee is open to all who teach in the graduate program. Membership of the curriculum committee is open to all who wish to serve and membership of the RTP committee is composed of all tenured and FERP faculty. As we have noted earlier, faculty responses to the survey questionnaire gave the department a mean score of 3.6 on this item, compared to 3.1 of University faculty as a whole.

B. Student Involvement in Department Governance

The Sociology Department makes no provision for student involvement in Department governance.

C. Department's Relationship with College and University

The department feels its relationship with the College administration is very positive. The department chair works effectively with the Dean and Associate Dean and believes we are treated with fairness and consideration by these officials.

V1. Institutional Support/Resources

Faculty were surveyed in order to determine their views of the adequacy of institutional support. Their responses are summarized below:

A. Library:

1. Curriculum Support

Many faculty expressed frustration because students cannot obtain the articles they identify through online abstract searches. This is because our journal subscriptions are perceived by faculty as “paltry”. This is a problem not only for students but also for faculty who are increasingly expected to engage in scholarly activity only to find the resources necessary to support such activity are not available. Some faculty report the necessity to go to UC Davis to find the resources they need.

2. Library services provided:

Soc. Faculty are unanimous in their favorable comments regarding Kathy Blackmer Reyes. This is particularly true of the faculty who teach research methods, for whose students Kathy “provides an excellent introduction to bibliographic database searching.”

B. Computer/Technology.

Technology resources are generally perceived as adequate with one major exception. Smart classrooms are in short supply which creates constant problems. There is continual competition for these rooms and we are forced to allocate them on a rotating basis. This is particularly discouraging for newer faculty who have been encouraged to embrace new technologies. Many of these faculty have taken advantage of summer workshops to upgrade their skills and have received new computers to implement those skills. They then find the smart classrooms unavailable to them. There is, consequently, disappointment that the budget has been cut for these classrooms. Faculty recently hired from other institutions report CSUS to be woefully behind in the provision of these classrooms.

Faculty report favorably on support services provided by SSIS computer services staff. Problems are promptly addressed and effectively resolved.

Faculty teaching statistics and methods courses report a problem, however, in the student labs. Apparently, computer services insists on installing the latest version of SPSS on the computers in these labs. The textbook publishers cannot keep up, and therefore there is a lack of up to date training materials.

C. Student Support Services.

The faculty generally perceive these services as adequate.

D. Faculty Support Services

Nowhere, it seems, do the self-study guidelines specifically request faculty views of the level of institutional support for scholarly and creative activity. This is an interesting omission. New faculty are required to

engage in scholarly activity in addition to heavy teaching loads and mounting administrative responsibilities. Many of our colleagues feel they are confronting a situation of rising expectations unaccompanied by institutional support. Nowhere is this discrepancy more true than the miserably deficient level of institutional support for scholarly activity. In 1991, in response to a state budget crisis the university slashed the Research and Scholarly Activity budget. In spite of the subsequent economic recovery, funding levels have never been restored to pre-crisis levels with the result that the university now funds only 20-25% of proposals. This is extremely discouraging to new faculty who at this stage of their careers deserve more support than the university provides. This is particularly important since CSUS now requires scholarly activity as part of the RTP process. The Dean of SSIS does what he can internally within the school to make resources available but this is not an adequate substitute for expanded university funding. The tensions surrounding this issue go a long way towards explaining why more than half of the faculty agreed with the statement in the Faculty Survey "My responsibilities create conflicting demands that are a source of personal strain".

With respect to other support services the faculty are satisfied. Many colleagues have participated in such university sponsored workshops as Writing Across The Curriculum and Teaching with Technology. The Office of Community Collaboration was also identified as helpful. The department cooperates with the Advising Center through the placement of one of our colleagues (Barajas) in the center to advise students in lieu of teaching one class.

E. Physical Facilities and Equipment.

There is a serious shortage of large classrooms. Given enrollment increases and the nature of our discipline we are able to offer a number of large sections (i.e. 80+, and in several instances 120+). The Dean encourages us to offer classes of this size and we are willing to do so since it brings certain advantages to the department and faculty. However, the classrooms are simply not available in sufficient number.

Office space is adequate and all full time faculty are housed on one floor. Two adjunct faculty share an office outside the building but do not report this as a serious problem.

Faculty report a problem with facilities maintenance. There are not enough lecterns in Amador and some rooms are constantly without one. Some faculty are concerned about an apparent lack of maintenance of overhead (transparency) projectors.

F. Financial resources:

As a result of hiring activities over the last 8 years the department is in a good position vis-a vis the adequacy of faculty to support the curriculum. The Dean's office has provided enough financial support to hire adjunct faculty as needed. We anticipate some difficulty in the near future due to loss of faculty for a number of reasons. One faculty member is leaving for another institution and another is entering the FERP program in the Fall, 2005. Two more faculty are completing their FERP program in the Spring of 2005. This is creating some gaps in key areas that will have to be filled. One area of difficulty is statistics and methods and this is a particularly difficult area to fill with adjunct faculty.

Staffing of the office is adequate and the situation has recently improved due to restoration of a position (Administrative Support Assistant 1) previously removed for budgetary reasons. This is a half time position. However, the department secretary reports that we are entitled to two student assistant positions which are currently not filled for budgetary reasons.

The operating expenses budget is perceived as fair and adequate. Thanks to the strenuous efforts of our new secretary the department has dramatically reduced its paper budget bringing us more line with other departments in SSIS. These savings have released funds to support other faculty activities and desires (e.g. book purchases, new software, professional subscriptions, etc.)