



# Program Review Self-Study Template

Academic unit: Sociology

College: Fairmount College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

Date of last review 2010

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) NA

List all degrees described in this report (add lines as necessary)

Degree: Bachelor of Arts CIP\* code: 45.11

Degree: Master of Arts CIP code: \_\_\_\_\_

Degree: \_\_\_\_\_ CIP code: \_\_\_\_\_

\*To look up, go to: Classification of Instructional Programs Website, <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?v=55>

Faculty of the academic unit (add lines as necessary)

Name

Dr. Jodie Hertzog

Dr. Twyla Hill

Dr. Makiko Hori

Dr. Jennifer Pearson

Dr. Kathleen Perez

Dr. Lisa Thrane

Dr. Chase Billingham

Affiliated faculty now in administrative positions:

Dr. Charles Koeber

Dr. Ron Matson

Dr. David Wright

Signature

Jodie Hertzog

Twyla Hill

Makiko Hori

Jennifer Pearson

Kathleen Perez

Lisa Thrane

Chase Billingham

Submitted by: Dr. Jodie Hertzog, Chair  
(name and title)

Date 4/1/14

**1. Departmental purpose and relationship to the University mission (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).**

**a. University Mission:**

The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good.

**b. Program Mission (if more than one program, list each mission):**

The mission of the Department of Sociology is to educate students in the core theoretical and methodological knowledge of the discipline, providing them with perspectives and skills that are applicable to a broad range of careers (including research, social services, business, education, and healthcare) and that prepare them to work in a diverse and changing society. The department aims to develop insights in our students about the effects of social structures on individual lives, communities, and the broader society. Our mission is achieved by emphasizing research and teaching related to economic inequality, gender, race and ethnicity, and aging as well as social institutions such as the family, education, and work. *A further mission of the M.A. program in Sociology is to provide students with the methodological skills necessary for pursuing a PhD or gaining employment in a variety of applied settings.*

**c. The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission: Explain in 1-2 concise paragraphs.**

The Department of Sociology contributes in several ways to accomplishing the University Mission at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. First, as a social science discipline in the liberal arts, sociology intends to aid the university and its students in the development of the "educational and cultural tools" needed to survive in a complex/diverse world. Through our instruction, we have a long history of providing students knowledge of diverse social groups, cultures, and sources of inequality in society. Second, sociology has an active faculty who individually and collectively contribute to strong teaching, scholarship, and service. In turn, our students gain an understanding of the interactive and changing nature of societal and economic trends that enable them to make important contributions in their careers, in their communities, and in their individual lives. Third, the Department of Sociology works in the community to improve opportunities for our students and to improve the quality of life in Wichita and South Central Kansas. Finally, the Department of Sociology combines community and professional service with teaching and scholarship to benefit our faculty, students, and numerous constituencies in the profession and the region.

**d. Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review?** ☒ Yes ☐ No

*If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?*

A department goal for the 2012-2013 academic year was to work with the Sociology faculty to review and revise elements of our current assessment plan and departmental mission so that it better aligned with the recently revised university mission. As part of this process, it was agreed that a unified mission for the undergraduate and graduate programs would be more reflective of our departmental vision (see 1.b. above).

**e. Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the program (s) (programmatic). Have they changed since the last review?** ☒ Yes ☐ No

*If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.*

As a science, sociology is particularly interested in immersing our students in real world problems while supporting the acquisition of knowledge, research skills, and habits of the mind. The curriculum in Sociology is designed to provide students the opportunity to explore various sub-disciplines within the field (ex: sex & gender, family sociology, educational sociology, deviance, & medical sociology) while nurturing the development of core skills. Specifically, our students must be aware of the theoretical, methodological, and statistical dimensions of sociological practice in order to identify real world social issues, read and evaluate research, design and conduct research projects, and critique social and economic policy. In addition, Sociology as a discipline identifies and studies the

effects of structural issues in society, i.e. race/ethnicity, economic inequality, age, gender, etc., and thus it is important that our students develop insights about the effects of these structures on individuals, communities, and societies. It is within this vision that the following learner centered goals were developed.

***Goals for the undergraduate program:***

The undergraduate program in Sociology caters to both majors and to the general education of students at WSU. Nineteen courses in our curriculum are approved general education courses. Five of our courses are cross-listed with other departments.

***Goal 1: Understanding and application of sociological research skills.***

**Outcome 1: Theory** ~ Sociology majors will be able to differentiate between the major classical theoretical perspectives of the discipline by applying a theoretical framework to a sociological problem.

*Measurement of goal 1, outcome 1:* Students in SOC 545, Sociological Theory, submit their final papers for review. Papers are blind reviewed by two independent faculty coders who assess whether papers are satisfactory or not based on established criteria. Department standard is set to 80% satisfactory completion.

**Outcome 2: Scientific Method** ~ Sociology majors will be able to apply their understanding of the scientific method by carrying out an empirical project that addresses research design, methods, and analysis in developing a specific research question.

*Measurement of goal 1, outcome 2:* Students in SOC 512, Measurement & Analysis, submit their final papers for review. Papers are blind reviewed by two independent faculty coders who assess whether papers are satisfactory or not based on established criteria. Department standard is set to 80% satisfactory completion.

***Goal 2: Develop understanding of a structural perspective.***

*\*Note:* The outcomes associated with goal two were altered since the last program review in order to encourage assessment across the curriculum. Goal 2 outcome 3, is new, based on KBOR's Core Outcome objectives for Sociology agreed upon in 2012, and focuses on lower division courses while outcome 4 was slightly revised to relate to 2013 Core Outcome objectives for Sociology and focuses on higher division courses.

**Outcome 3: Structural Issues** ~ Sociology majors and non-majors will be able to examine the role of social institutions like family, state, economy, religion and education in contemporary society.

*Measurement of goal 2, outcome 3:* Students in 100- or 300-level courses such as Introduction to Sociology (SOC 111), Contemporary Social Problems (SOC 320), Marriage & Families (SOC 315), submit their papers for review. Papers are blind reviewed by two independent faculty coders who assess whether papers are satisfactory or not based on established rubric criteria. Department standard is set to 80% satisfactory completion.

**Outcome 4: Social Issues** ~ Sociology majors and non-majors will be able to identify and discuss how the consequences of social issues in society vary by social location (ex, class, race, age, sexual orientation, or gender).

*Measurement of goal 2, outcome 4:* Students in 300- or 500-level courses [such as Deviant Behavior (SOC 322), Contemporary Social Problems (SOC 320), Social Inequality (SOC 330), Introduction to Gender Studies (SOC 306), Medical Sociology (SOC 538)], submit their social issue papers for review. Papers are blind reviewed by two independent faculty coders who assess whether papers are satisfactory or not based on established rubric criteria. Department standard is set to 80% satisfactory completion.

***Goals for the graduate program:***

The graduate program in Sociology caters mostly to students admitted to our M.A. program as well as students seeking to obtain a Masters in Liberal Arts & Sciences with a designated concentration area in Sociology.

**Goal 1: Develop data management skills in use of institutional data for research and evaluation purposes.**

*Measurement of goal 1:* Students in SOC 847, Seminar in Data Management and Syntax are required to demonstrate mastery of related skills (i.e., writing code, extracting data from larger data set) through the successful completion of course assignments.

**Goal 2: Develop tool-based skill development in statistical software for preparation in employment settings and research doctoral programs.**

Measurement of goal 2: Students in are required to master SPSS statistical software across courses and in the completion of their thesis research.

**Goal 3: Demonstrate report writing and presentation skills.**

Measurement of goal 3: Students are required to demonstrate professional writing in courses such as SOC 845 (Seminar in Sociological Theory), SOC 801 (Applied Advanced Statistical Techniques), and SOC 812 (Advanced Research: Qualitative Methods). Each of these courses requires students to develop presentations on their research which they present to the class. In addition, students are required to complete an oral presentation of their final research projects in both our thesis & non-thesis options.

\*Note: we plan to review/refine the graduate program goals and outcomes before the next program review cycle.

2. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, graduates, and scholarly/creative activity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Complete the table below and utilize data tables 1-7 provided by the Office of Planning Analysis (covering SCH by FY and fall census day, instructional faculty, instructional FTE employed, program majors, and degree production).

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles		Number Presentations		Number Conference Proceedings		Performances			Number of Exhibits		Creative Work		No. Books	No. Book Chaps.	No. Grants Awarded or Submitted	awarded \$ Grant Value
	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	*	**	***	Juried	****	Juried	Non-Juried				
2011	3	1	2	6												1	19,000
2012	5		4	7												2	23,000
2013	6		5	6										3		3	4,267

\* Winning by competitive audition. \*\*Professional attainment (e.g., commercial recording). \*\*\*Principal role in a performance. \*\*\*\*Commissioned or included in a collection.

**Provide assessment here:**

Despite being a small department (three year rolling average of 6.6 full-time tenure eligible faculty with a low of 5 in 2012, see Appendix 1 OPA Table 4), our faculty is highly productive in regard to publishing research (a total of 14 refereed articles), grant writing (6 grants were submitted), and presenting at regional and national conferences (a total of 11 refereed and 19 non-refereed presentations) while maintaining credit hour teaching loads above the university and college as evident in the table above and Appendix 1 Tables 5a-5c of the OPA data and Appendix 3. In addition, our faculty reviewed 32 journal articles and 43 conference proposals. Many projects faculty are engaged in are interdisciplinary and include collaborations across disciplines or with community organizations.

Central to our mission is training students in the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. Our faculty evaluated 191 research projects in Introduction to Gender Studies (SOC 306), and 120 in Introduction to Social Research (SOC 312). At the 500-level, 71 students completed research work in Measurement and Analysis (SOC 512), and faculty oversaw an additional 62 research projects in Sociology of Education (SOC 528). In addition to their thesis projects, graduate students all complete pilot qualitative research projects to provide the opportunity to crystalize knowledge and practice skill development in this area. Students completed 15 qualitative research projects during the previous three years with one project awarded the Delano Maggard Research Award to continue the research and three resulted in conference presentations. Finally, it is not uncommon for faculty to provide research opportunities to both undergraduate and graduate students outside the traditional classroom environment, including students in community research, mentoring McNair or Honors projects, and/or directing other independent research projects with students in both Sociology and

the MLAS program (see Appendix 3). For instance, in 2013, three Sociology graduate students presented papers at the Midwest Sociological Society's annual meeting and two undergraduate students jointly participated in the MSS undergraduate poster competition in which they were awarded 1<sup>st</sup> place out of over 30 entries. Additionally, four undergraduate students, five graduate students, one undergraduate alumni, and one graduate alumni presented research at the first annual one-day Sociology Department Symposium held in the Fall of 2013.

Finally, faculty SPTE scores indicate strength in teaching with scores ranging from "good" to "high" with the majority in the "very good" to "high" categories across most classes. In order to maintain quality in teaching and research, faculty regularly engage in professional development opportunities with six faculty participating in over 29 trainings or workshops on campus or at regional/national conferences.

3. **Academic Program:** Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students for each program (if more than one). Attach updated program assessment plan (s) as an appendix (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information).

**\*\*See Appendix 5 for updated Undergraduate Assessment Plan.**

- a. ***For undergraduate programs, compare ACT scores of the majors with the University as a whole. (Evaluate table 8 [ACT data] from the Office of Planning and Analysis).***

At the University level, average ACT scores for calendar years 2008-2012 have remained fairly steady (22.7 ) with a moderate increase to 23.0 in 2012 suggesting that the quality of academic achievement of WSU's Juniors and Seniors has shown a recent moderate gain. In comparison, ACT scores among students entering the university as sociology program majors' are slightly lower overall at 21.5 for the same time frame, though it should be noted that less than half of student ACT scores were reported during the last two years.

- b. ***For graduate programs, compare graduate GPAs of the majors with University graduate GPAs. (Evaluate table 9 [GPA data] from the Office of Planning and Analysis)***

The mean application GPA of admitted graduate students to the University has held steady at 3.5 with no variation since 2007. The 5-year average GPA for students admitted to the sociology graduate program was also 3.5 but with a modest decline in 2012 (GPA = 3.2) followed by a slight increase in 2013 (GPA = 3.6). The percent reporting GPA information was 89% for the 2009-2013 period but with a noticeable decline in 2013 to 60%.

- c. ***Identify the principal learning outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes in the table below. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e. Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome with proposed actions based on the results.***

Based on past reports, Sociology has been regularly meeting our specified learning objectives. However, it is going on eight years since the department reviewed these objectives as a whole. As a new chair, a departmental goal has been to learn more about KBOR assessment expectations, while working with Rick Muma to identify available resources, such as the American Association of Colleges and Universities' 15 VALUE rubrics, which we decided to use as templates for developing more discipline specific rubrics related to our learning objectives. We also reviewed assessment guidelines proposed by the American Sociological Association for nationalized goals for the discipline. Both of these resources act as "best practices" from which Sociology will align our future objectives.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
UNG Goal 1, outcome 1: Theory Application	Rubric used to assess final paper from SOC 545	80% will demonstrate satisfactory performance	Rubric completed 12/13 for data collection in fall 2014	See below
UNG Goal 1, outcome 2: Scientific Method	Rubric used to assess research paper from SOC 512	80% will demonstrate satisfactory performance	84% met standard	See below
UNG Goal 2, outcome 3: Social Institutions	Rubric used to assess issues papers from 100 or 300 level courses	80% will demonstrate satisfactory performance	81% met standard	See below
UNG Goal 2, outcome 4: Social Issues	Rubric used to assess issues papers from 300 or 500 level courses	80% will demonstrate satisfactory performance	Spring 2014 is scheduled data collection phase	See below

#### **UNG Goal 1, outcome 1: Theory Application**

In 2009, 100% of students in SOC 545 met the standard requirements. From 2010-2012, the department was reorganizing and reassessing the focus of the undergraduate and graduate theory courses as responsibility for teaching the courses shifted from one faculty member to another. In 2013, the department began revising the rubric used for assessing the outcome to be more in line with the AAC & U Value rubrics. As of December 2013, the rubric was completed and incorporated aspects of both the creative and critical thinking AAC & U rubrics into our criteria for evaluation.

#### **UNG Goal 1, outcome 2: Scientific Method**

The rubric for outcome 2 was also revised in 2013 to incorporate the AAC & U Value rubrics (Inquiry and analysis, ethical reasoning, and quantitative literacy). In the fall of 2013, the 2-person sub-committee reviewed 19 papers from SOC 512 concluding that 84% of the research projects submitted met the standard. Recommendations by the sub-committee were to provide more specific criteria about whether ethical issues had been fully addressed, whether to separately examine writing conventions (such as formatting, references, and writing style) in the sociological conventions component, and to specify whether the criteria for identifying a research question should reflect sampling strategy employed.

#### **UNG Goal 2, outcome 3: Social Institutions**

As discussed in section 1e, outcome 3 is a new objective for this reporting period. In 2013, a rubric was developed by a faculty committee, and was utilized to evaluate SOC 111 papers from the fall of 2013. The sub-committee reviewed 54 papers and reported that 81% fulfilled the criteria. The sub-committee recommended revising the assignment to examine two social institutions rather than five to better address how social institutions are interrelated and connected to broader social inequality. Overall, students showed particular strength in the identification of social institutions but were less skilled at examining the connections to social structure and social groups. As expected, introductory sociology students had the most difficulty with applying theory to their analysis.

#### **UNG Goal 2, outcome 4: Social Issues**

In 2013, the rubric to assess student learning regarding social issues was revised by a faculty committee, incorporating components of the critical thinking and inquiry and analysis AAC & U Value rubrics into the standards for evaluation. The rubric will be piloted in the Spring of 2014.

#### **Graduate Program Learning Objectives**

The goal of the graduate program learning objectives focus on developing skills necessary to enter employment or doctoral programs of study and include demonstrating proficiency in data management skills for research and evaluation purposes (goal 1), tool-based skill development in statistical software for preparation in employment settings and research doctoral programs (goal 2), and development of report writing and presentation skills (goal 3, see 1e).

These objectives are measured through direct observation of student mastery and have been continually met since last program review. Students demonstrated proficiency in **data management skills** through completion of the SOC847 Seminar in Data Management and Syntax Development course. Each student was responsible for writing code and managing the extraction of data from the Sociology Graduate Program Data Library pertinent to their research topic including sample selections for universe populations. Students demonstrated **proficiency in tool-based skill development by using SPSS statistical software** to perform data management and analysis for their research. Each student wrote a primary syntax data management file and ran data analysis at the univariate, bivariate (t-test, anova, and correlation) and multivariate (OLS and logistic regression) levels. Additionally, students demonstrated **proficiency in report writing and presentation skills** by completion of the SOC801 Applied Advanced Statistical Techniques class (oral presentation of research findings including complete research design stages) and completion of thesis oral defenses and non-thesis oral presentations. The above skills were further demonstrated by several graduate students who made presentation of their research at regional conferences, and one student has had a peer reviewed article published from her MA research.

- d. **Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results (if applicable), employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the outcomes of the program as listed in 3c). Evaluate Table 10 from the Office of Planning and Analysis regarding student satisfaction data.**

In regard to Appendix 1 Table 10, the average level of **UG major satisfaction** was 4.2 for 2012 (N = 41) and 2013 (N = 54) which resulted in between 79.6%-82.9% of students reporting satisfaction with the program which is about 3% lower than the university UG level. Overall, the college division reported satisfaction levels of 84% in 2012 and 86% in 2013. Data from the UG Online Application for Degree Exit Survey, however, indicated that between 81%-82% of our majors were satisfied with the quality of course instruction (see table below), while satisfaction with feedback from faculty on coursework ranged from (78-79%) between 2012 and 2013. Furthermore, as assessed by the Exit Survey administered to majors in SOC 512 (Appendix 4), it should be noted that 93% of UG majors were satisfied or very satisfied with the teaching quality of the sociology faculty. In terms of reported satisfaction with the **graduate program**, 100% of students report being satisfied or very satisfied. The average was 4.8 in 2012 and 4.7 in 2013 which is markedly higher than the college (77%) and university (83%) measures for 2013.

#### Results from UG Online Application for Degree Exit Survey

		2012	N	2013	N
		Satisfied or VS		Satisfied or VS	
Rate overall satisfaction with program	Total	83.7%	361	86.9%	906
	Sociology	82.9%	41	81.0%	95
Satisfaction with faculty on feedback of coursework	Total	83.7%	361	87.7%	906
	Sociology	78.0%	41	78.9%	95
Satisfaction with quality of course instruction	Total	83.1%	361	86.9%	906
	Sociology	80.5%	41	82.1%	95

Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass rates) by year for the last three years				
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
1				
2				
3	13	SOC 512 UG Major Exit Survey (see appendix 4)	93% Satisfied/VS with Teaching Quality of Sociology Faculty	

### **Exit survey data assessment**

#### **UNG Goal 1, outcome 1: Theory Application**

Data collected from the exit survey administered in SOC 512 (Measurement & Analysis) is used to elaborate and supplement the evaluation of papers collected for the UNG learning goals. Four fifths of sociology majors who completed the SOC 512 Exit Survey (N =13; Response Rate = 67%) reported that they understood basic theoretical paradigms (85%) (Appendix 4).

#### **UNG Goal 1, outcome 2: Scientific Method**

Exit data provide further support for the acquisition and application of research skills. Based on the SOC 512 Exit Survey (N =13; Response Rate = 67%), it was evident that all of our students (100%) could design and complete a research study, identify appropriate methodology, understand the role of quantitative and qualitative approaches to knowledge creation, and evaluate the scientific merit of internet-based information. In addition, 92% reported that they could distinguish between independent and dependent variables, identify ethical issues in sociological research, evaluate methodological approaches for gathering data, and use sociological statistics. Over four-fifths of students could use statistical software to analyze data (85%) while 83% said that they could write a report from sociological information that could be understood by non-sociologists (Appendix 4).

#### **UNG Goal 2, outcome 3: Social Institutions**

Results from the SOC 512 Exit Survey (N =13; Response Rate = 67%) revealed that our students can examine the role of social institutions in society. All students indicated that they learned about basic sociological concepts (including culture, socialization, institutions, or stratification (100%) with 85% reporting that they knew the meaning of a social institution and could provide examples of individual-level impacts and appreciating that we lived in a mutually interdependent and unequal society (92%) (Appendix 4).

#### **UNG Goal 2, outcome 4: Social Issues**

Self-report findings provide support for the ability of our majors to identify and discuss social issues. The results from the SOC 512 Exit Survey (N =13; Response Rate = 67%) indicated that 85% of students strongly agreed that they learned to present opposing viewpoints and alternative hypotheses on various issues and 77% reported gaining knowledge of sociological explanations about social issues (Appendix 4).

- e. *Provide aggregate data on how the goals of the WSU General Education Program and KBOR 2020 Foundation Skills are assessed in undergraduate programs (optional for graduate programs).*

Outcomes:	Results	
	Majors 2012 (N = 41)	Majors 2013 (N = 95)
Undergraduate Online Application for Degree Exit Survey, on scale of 1-5, where 5 highest	4 to high	4 to high
Oral and written communication	90.20%	86.30%
Numerical literacy	73.20%	67.40%
Critical thinking and problem solving	87.80%	86.30%
Collaboration and team work	80.50%	77.90%
Library research skills	75.60%	71.60%
Diversity and globalization	85.40%	82.10%

Note: Not all programs evaluate every goal/skill. Programs may choose to use assessment rubrics for this purpose. Sample forms available at: <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/>

- f. *For programs/departments with concurrent enrollment courses (per KBOR policy), provide the assessment of such courses over the last three years (disaggregated by each year) that assures grading standards (e.g., papers,*



*portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) course management, instructional delivery, and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections. NA*

*g. Indicate whether the program is accredited by a specialty accrediting body including the next review date and concerns from the last review. NA*

*h. Provide the process the department uses to assure assignment of credit hours (per WSU policy 2.18) to all courses has been reviewed over the last three years.*

***Provide information here:***

During curriculum review, credit hours for coursework are assessed based on guidelines from WSU policy 2.18. During this program review, the department submitted and received approval to change the credit hours for one graduate course, SOC 860, from 1 credit to 3 credits. In line with the new federal mandate, credit hour expectations are also now clearly delineated in all syllabi.

*i. Provide a brief assessment of the overall quality of the academic program using the data from 3a – 3e and other information you may collect, including outstanding student work (e.g., outstanding scholarship, inductions into honor organizations, publications, special awards, academic scholarships, student recruitment and retention).*

***Provide assessment here:***

Based on the data from this review, Sociology faculty are active within the discipline and strive to provide a quality learning experience for our students. We receive positive student feedback on SPTEs and consistently meet our discipline specific learning goals at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and a high percentage of students consistently report that they are satisfied or very satisfied with the sociology major and the quality of instruction they receive. Self-reported satisfaction rates are higher at the graduate level where more engaged learning takes place, so we are working toward increasing undergraduate student satisfaction by offering more opportunities for undergraduates to engage in out of classroom learning such as participating in research, engaging with the campus and community through Soc Club, connecting on Facebook, highlighting achievements in our department newsletter, and by encouraging travel to regional conferences or other professional development opportunities. While self-reports on General Education skills are lower in some areas than we would have anticipated, it is possible a disconnect in the types of skills/behaviors students are associating with different jargon such as “numerical literacy” exists. In order to increase student perceptions of learning related to these general education skills we are making concrete attempts to link specific course objectives, activities and assignments to the various skills particularly numerical literacy and information literacy (i.e., library skills). We are also working at incorporating direct assessment of General Education skills as comparison to the self-report data collected on the exit surveys. For example, several of our SOC 111 (Introduction to Sociology) courses participated in the university-wide evaluation of writing skills in the Fall of 2013. The OPA assessment which used the AAC & U Value rubric found a significant pre-post increase in the quality of overall writing among Sociology students participating (see Appendix 2).

**4. Analyze the student need and employer demand for the program. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).**

***a. Evaluate tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning Analysis for number of applicants, admits, and enrollments and percent URM students by student level and degrees conferred.***

**Undergraduate program.**

For the five-year rolling average, there were 32 undergraduate applicants with this figure inflated due to an unusually high number of applications in 2012. In comparison an average of 29 applicants were admitted to the program suggesting that most students met the minimum requirements for admission. On census day, there was an average of 19 admitted students who were actually enrolled. The percent of URM enrolled as Sociology majors on census day is roughly 1 in 5, which is consistent with college numbers but higher than the university as a whole. Degreed conferred

URM students for the program (15.2%), however, was slightly lower than for the college (18.3%) over the 2008-2012 period. The five year rolling average of total Sociology majors from 2008-2012 was 126 (appendix 1 table 6).

#### Graduate program.

The MA program has five year rolling averages of 13 applicants, 9 admitted, and 7 enrolled in 2009-2013, but these rates have declined with fewer students admitted &/or enrolling on average since 2011. We have had 11 people graduate from the MA program since Spring 2011. The percent URM (33%) enrolled is higher than at the college level (18%) and much higher than the university level (9%). The percent URM (27%) that receive degrees is also higher than at the college level (16%) and much higher than the university level (8%).

**b. Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program.**

Employment of Majors*							Projected growth from BLS** Current year only
	Average Salary	Employment % in state	Employment % in the field	Employment % related to the field	Employment % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	
Year 1							
Year 2	30,800	60%	20%	60%	20%	7%	
Year 3	31,727	72%	27%	46%	27%	8%	15% (Faster than average)

\* May not be collected every year

\*\* Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: <http://www.bls.gov/oco/> and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

- **Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis and from the table above. Include the most common types of positions, in terms of employment graduates can expect to find. Provide assessment here:**

#### UG Online Application for Degree Exit Survey Data

Note: the number of respondents in 2013 is almost double that in 2012. Unclear if there was a higher response rate, a different method of data collection or if there is some other rationale for the difference.

		2012	N	2013	N
		YES		Yes	
Applied or accepted a job	Total	15.8%	361	13.7%	906
	Sociology	12.2%	41	11.6%	95
Worked off campus during UG degree	Total	84.2%	361	83.8%	906
	Sociology	80.5%	41	77.9%	95
Currently employed	Total	66.8%	361	67.0%	906
	Sociology	63.4%	41	62.1%	95
Academic background useful or higher in career	Total	82.0%	361	84.1%	906
	Sociology	73.2%	41	73.7%	95

Nearly two thirds of our undergraduate students are employed and that has remained consistent between 2012 and 2013. The university exit survey indicates another 12% applied for or accepted a job prior to graduation, and 78% of sociology majors worked off-campus during their degree completion. Based on the employment of majors table above, a high percentage of Sociology majors find employment within the State of Kansas (72% in 2013).

Nearly three out of four (73%) Sociology students reported that their academic background was useful for their career. The SOC 512 Exit Survey for sociology majors further indicated that over half (54%) of our majors were choosing sociology because they wanted a general major rather than one focused on a specific career. This is reflected in the distribution of students reporting employment within the field, in a related field, and outside the field. We plan to include additional employment related questions on our SOC 512 survey in the future after learning that several of the employment questions gathered at the university level (e.g., the position was full-time, out-of-state, or directly related to the degree as well as the salary) only pertain to the 12% of sociology majors who applied for or accepted a new job (Appendix 4).

Data from the departmental-level Exit Survey for Sociology Majors administered in the spring of 2013 (Response rate = 67%; N = 13), however, provided a framework for evaluating factors that influenced the need and demand for our UG program. The data reported in this report reflect the percentage of respondents who "agree/strongly agree" with the questions. Nearly all respondents reported they based their decisions on an interest in studying people (100%), a desire to better understand themselves (100%), change society (100%), find a job helping people (100%) and because they enjoyed their first Sociology course (100%). The perceived reputation of the sociology department (92%), gaining research related skills (85%) and understanding global issues (85%) also featured prominently in their decisions (Appendix 4).

Our UG program is drawing URM freshman and sophomores with dramatic shifts from a low of 4.2% in 2007 to a high of 33.3% in 2012. URM's among juniors and seniors have been relatively steady with a slight decline to 15.7% in 2012. The census day rolling average has steadily increased since 2007-2012, but improvements need to be made in retaining students as is true for the university as a whole.

Finally, between 7-8% of our majors pursued graduate degrees rather than immediate employment. The BLS projected a 15% increase for entry level jobs with a Master's degree in Sociology. Of the 11 graduates of our Master's program since 2011, three (27%) enrolled in PhD programs, six are employed in the field (55%) and two are employed outside the field (18%). Those employed in the field have research jobs (3 at universities, 1 at a business) or teach at community colleges (2). Some of our former graduate students also teach entry-level courses for us. Many of our students are employed in the profit and non-profit sectors; therefore we are a source of skilled personnel for the community. Earlier graduates are employed as research associates by KU Medical School, non-profit agencies such as Catholic Charities and the Wichita Area Sexual Assault Center, government agencies such as the Central Plains Agency on Aging and the Social Security Administration, and for-profit companies such as Koch, Intrust Bank, and Cessna.

5. Analyze the service the Program provides to the discipline, other programs at the University, and beyond. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Evaluate table 16 from the Office of Planning Analysis for SCH by student department affiliation on fall census day.

a. ***Provide a brief assessment of the service the Program provides. Comment on percentage of SCH taken by majors and non-majors, nature of Program in terms of the service it provides to other University programs, faculty service to the institution, and beyond.***

Provide assessment here:

**Service provided to other programs.** The sociology program offers 19 general education courses for the university resulting in a significant amount of service provided to non-program majors (generally averaging about 90% of SCH with a slight increase to 92% in 2011). The UG program generates nearly 8% of SCH and the graduate program garners less than 2% which was bolstered by SCH production from 2008-2009 and reflects the appointment of Dr. David Wright as the Associate Vice President for Academic Data Systems & Strategic Planning. Dr. Wright was the Graduate Coordinator and Graduate advisor to most students while teaching the majority of the graduate courses. Student credit hour production on average was 4,839 over the most recent five-year period with a substantial

decline in 2012 (SCH = 4,149) which represents the appointment of Dr. Ron Matson as the Interim Dean of LAS. Dr. Matson was a key driver of SCH production in the department filling several large (above 200 students) courses each semester. Program UG majors average 369 student credit hours for 2008-2012 with a noticeable increase in 2010 (SCH = 454).

The data support the conclusion that our program has a meaningful impact on other departments by offering a sociological focus to their students. We offer specialized further studies courses on globalization; aging; gender; family diversity; and social inequality. Through this curriculum, we reach not only our majors but students from other disciplines such as Business, Education, and Health Professions, who can benefit from being able to identify and recognize changing societal trends. Our curriculum represents an interdisciplinary perspective with Issues and Perspectives courses including SOC316: Men and Masculinities, SOC336: Work in Modern Society, and SOC346: Sociology of Globalization. We also promote the cross-listing of courses with Women's Studies and Aging in the UG and graduate programs with SOC306: Introduction to Gender Studies, SOC516: Sociology of Gender, and SOC837: Global Women's Health cross-listed with Women's Studies and SOC513: Sociology of Aging, SOC543: Aging and Public Policy, and SOC520: Family and Aging cross-listed with Aging.

**Graduate program service provided.** All of the courses in the graduate program are taught by full-time tenured or tenure track faculty. Enrollment in the core courses is generally 10 or fewer students, enabling the faculty to pay close attention to the progress of students. The core courses are sequenced & predicated on the scientific process (theory, methods, statistics). All core courses (SOC 860 Proseminar, SOC845 Theory, SOC811 Quantitative Methods, SOC812 Qualitative Methods, SOC801 Statistics) are offered every year. In addition, all prerequisite courses (SOC545 Theory, SOC501 Statistics, SOC512 Measurement & Analysis) are offered for students admitted with deficiencies. Seminars (800 level) and 500 level courses are offered as electives. The number of courses offered each semester is sufficient for students to graduate within 2 years. The five-year average for time-to-degree completion is 4.5 semesters. Few students take the core courses if they are not Sociology MA students, although SOC 812 attracts MALS students every year. More non-Sociology students take the 500 level courses including graduate students from Fine Arts, Criminal Justice, Psychology and Education, as examples.

**Service to the Institution.** Faculty in Sociology provide a variety of forms of service to the university including serving on the LAS College Council, serving on the LAS Tenure & Promotion committee, serving on the graduate council, serving on the Institutional Review Board, and serving as WSU's liaison to the American Association of University Women. In addition, three faculty members serve as faculty advisors to four different recognized student organizations on campus.

**Service Provided to the Discipline.** As mentioned in previous sections, Sociology faculty are active members of both regional (Midwest Sociological Society) and national professional organizations including the American Sociological Association and the National Council on Family Relations. As engaged members, they organize paper and/or roundtable sessions, and review conference proposals (n=43). During 2013, one faculty member was elected the Kansas State Director to the MSS Board of Directors, and one undergraduate student was elected to the MSS Student Issues Committee. Additionally, Sociology faculty peer reviewed 32 journal articles submitted to respected journals in the field.

#### **Research funding**

In addition to receiving competitive internal funding, our faculty have successfully obtained external funding from agencies such as Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the American Educational Research Association for a total of \$46,267 and are currently seeking grants from National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation for the amount of \$73,526. Many of these projects are interdisciplinary and include collaborations with community organizations. For instance, the RWJF grant was a campus-community collaboration involving Catholic Charities of Wichita, the Wichita Area Sexual Assault Center, and the 259 school district.

**6. Report on the Program's goal (s) from the last review. List the goal (s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).**

(For Last 3 FYs)	Goal (s)	Assessment Data Analyzed	Outcome

Goals were not requested as a component of the last program review. As this is the first review with this new template, no data is available for this section. One process goal for the graduate program since the last review, however, was to increase involvement of all faculty in all areas of the graduate program to provide students with more options for research and a more varied experience. This is a shifting model for the program which previously was more dependent on the graduate coordinator to chair thesis projects. Since 2011, we have had seven different thesis advisors, thereby meeting our goal to engage all faculty in student research. Additionally, we have reviewed the graduate curriculum, and now have more variety in the faculty teaching the 800-level courses required for the Master's program. Lastly, we are working on strengthening ties with other local/regional two- and four-year institutions, as well as alumni, as part of developing a graduate student recruitment plan.

## **7. Summary and Recommendations**

- a. Set forth a summary of the report including an overview evaluating the strengths and concerns. List recommendations for improvement of each Program (for departments with multiple programs) that have resulted from this report (relate recommendations back to information provided in any of the categories and to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e). Identify three year goal (s) for the Program to be accomplished in time for the next review. Provide assessment here:*

During the 2010-2013 program review, the sociology department transitioned to a new Graduate Coordinator and a new department Chair, as the two faculty members previously holding these positions moved to administrative positions within the university as Interim Dean and Associate Vice President. A third faculty member has continued to be jointly appointed to a faculty/administrative position as an Associate Dean in LAS. Despite these transitions and our small faculty size, we have been able to maintain a high level of SCH production between majors and non-majors and we strive to provide unique opportunities for student engagement within and outside of the classroom. For example, our department was awarded the competitive *Sociologists for Women in Society* 2011 Feminist Activist speaker visit with Dr. Akosua Adomako Ampofo, providing sociology students and the larger WSU community the opportunity to interact with a renowned international sociologist. At the end of 2013 we were also awarded a Visiting Scholars grant from the *Midwest Sociological Society* in 2013 for a state-wide conference we will host in Spring 2014.

Based on exit survey data, the majority of our graduating majors (81% of undergraduates; 100% of graduates) report that they are satisfied or very satisfied with the sociology program at WSU. Over the past three years, we have revised our department mission, streamlining the goals of our undergraduate and graduate programs, and worked to improve our assessment of student learning. We have reviewed both the undergraduate and graduate curriculums and are working to develop plans for offering undergraduate courses that have not been offered in some time. Based on the limited data we have been able to collect so far, we are meeting our program learning goals at both the undergraduate and graduate levels and we will strive to continue to do so in the future. Over the next three years, we plan to focus on expanding departmental strengths that align with the new goals of the university, specifically goal 1 (applied learning/student research), goal 2 (emerging societal/economic trends), and goal 3 (discovery/transfer of new knowledge).

***Goal 1: Guarantee an applied learning or research experience for every student by each academic program.***

A focus on teaching students research related skills is firmly ingrained in our revised department mission statement as well as infused across undergraduate core required and general education courses and in graduate courses. The strategy for further advancing the mission of Goal 1 in the Sociology department in the next 3-5 years is curriculum infusion, guaranteeing either an “applied learning” or “research” related activity across our undergraduate curriculum with the type of experience incorporated varying appropriately at the 100, 300, and 500-levels. This strategy will help to “guarantee” that not only all straight Sociology majors, but BGS and Field majors, are developing hands on learning, while ensuring minors and students taking Sociology courses as either general education or cross-listed electives (90% of our credit hours are from non-majors) will be further developing those skills as well.

***Assessment of Progress:*** At the end of *Year 1*, we will have the following outputs: 1) A tally of the number of applied learning activities/assignments in existing courses; 2) A tally of the number of research activities/assignments in existing courses; 3) A list of the most popular courses taken by BGS/Field majors; and 4) A system for reporting and tracking the number of applied learning (including co-op/internships) and research activities/projects completed by students taking Sociology courses. At the end of *Year 2*, outputs will include 1) the number of “applied learning”/research assignments revised or created for infusion; 2) the number of students completing “applied learning” activities by type of activity; 3) the number of students completing research projects or activities by type of activity. At the end of *Year 3*, outputs will include the same outputs as year 2 with the addition of 1) a syllabus for the new Sociological Practice course (if staffing resources permit); and 2) student self-reported assessments of their applied learning/research experience from the University exit survey. Finally, across all 3 years, we will assess student learning outcomes related to theory application, research development, and social issue analysis, which are part of our on-going departmental assessment procedures.

***Goal 2: Capitalize systemically on relevant existing and emerging societal and economic trends that increase quality of educational opportunities.***

Through our instruction, we have a long history of providing students knowledge of diverse social groups, cultures, and sources of inequality in society assisting students in developing an understanding of the interactive and changing nature of societal and economic trends including focusing on demographic changes and methods of curriculum delivery. For instance, while issues of diversity are infused across our curriculum, we offer specialized further studies courses on globalization; aging; gender; family diversity; and social inequality. Through this curriculum, we reach not only our majors but students from other disciplines such as Business, Education, and Health Professions, who can benefit from being able to identify and recognize changing societal trends. For example, the MCAT recently added a section on Sociology emphasizing the importance of a sociological perspective across disciplines. In terms of trends in instructional delivery, Sociology has been integrating on-line learning into its curriculum (60% of our majors take an online course). We have had 3 of our full-time faculty and 1 lecturer go through the “reboot camp” training at WSU. We have one additional lecturer who has taught on-line for Butler Community College and has transferred that knowledge to WSU. As is evident on the Office of On-line Learning’s review of general education courses, Sociology currently offers 5 general education courses on-line, the largest offering currently in LAS. Further, our offerings cross the curriculum from 100 to 500 level and we piloted a graduate seminar on-line last year as well (course delivery to grow graduate program). Consistent with the minor requirements, our goal is to offer at least five separate courses over a two year period including Intro and at least one 500 level option.

***Assessment of Progress:*** In *Year 1*, we will submit to the College Curriculum Committee the appropriate (1) curriculum change forms for institutionalizing our Sociology of Race & Ethnicity course (currently an experimental course, SOC399P); and (2) the program change forms for the online Sociology minor. In addition, we will begin to monitor related student knowledge outcomes (in select courses) as part of our program review process using rubrics to assess our student’s abilities to comprehend how experiences of “social institutions” and “social issues” vary by social location (age, gender, race/ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation, etc.) in order to assess their understanding of changing societal trends. In *Year 2*, if approved by the College Curriculum Committee, we will begin offering the online Sociology minor option ensuring that the number of 100/500 level courses necessary are available and a minimum of six unique courses are offered over a 4 semester period. In *Year 3*, we will ensure that at least 50% of the tenure-track and

adjunct faculty who teach on-line will have completed a peer-based evaluation or other assessment program. Since our department aims to provide an enriching learning environment, we will continue to strive for excellence in the quality of the course offerings working with the Office of Online Learning to assess the course design of our online offerings.

***Goal 4: Accelerate the discovery, creation and transfer of new knowledge.***

Despite being a small department, our faculty are highly productive in regards to grant writing, publishing research, and presenting at regional and national conferences. Many of these projects are interdisciplinary and include collaborations across disciplines or with community organizations. Central to our mission is training students in the creation and dissemination of new knowledge as well. Several of our students (undergraduate and graduate level) have begun to share their research at the university, regional, and national levels. For example, two of our undergraduates co-authored a poster at the Midwest Sociological Society (MSS) meeting last year that won first place in the poster competition out of over 30 submissions. Our graduate students also regularly present at MSS. Several graduates (undergraduate and graduate level) have gone on to PhD programs or to find employment that utilizes their research skills enhancing the discovery or creation of knowledge. To further enhance Goal 4 over the next program review period, Sociology plans to focus on increasing the visibility of both faculty and student research. This will include: 1) encouraging more students to present their research (on campus & in professional arenas); 2) encouraging more students to apply for the newly available research funding for undergraduate research at WSU; and (3) better marketing/highlighting the scope of faculty research.

Assessment of Progress: Starting in *Year 1*, we will (1) compile a list of public and professional outlets appropriate for marketing departmental research findings; (2) monitor the number of emails sent to those outlets about faculty research; (3) track the number of references to faculty research highlighted by the targeted outlets; (4) track the number of students submitting research for funding &/or presentation at WSU/regional/national conferences; and (5) track the number of student research and faculty projects highlighted in the Sociology newsletter and at the annual Sociology Symposium. In *Year 2*, we will begin tracking the number of visitors going to the sociological research website.

***Graduate Program Summary & Goal:***

Graduate Faculty in the department met several times over the past few years to discuss program assessment to identify strengths/weaknesses and recommendations. The general consensus was that we have a very successful program in terms of instructional content and structure, marketable skill acquisition, and processing of students in a timely manner. We decided we should increase the involvement of all faculty in all areas of the graduate program to provide students with more options for research and a more varied experience. We are implementing those changes, and students report being highly satisfied with the graduate program. We will continue to encourage professional development amongst our graduate students through presenting research findings across campus and at regional conferences (in line with goal 1 above), and through employment within the department as teaching assistants (nearly 100% of our graduate students become teaching assistants within the department). Our major goal for the graduate program for next program review is recruitment. We have already begun attempts to increase student recruitment efforts by opening communication with other area colleges (Friends, Newman, McPherson, etc.), and by tabling at campus events such as Welcomefest. In 2014 we will have a table at the Midwest Sociology Society conference (in Omaha for 2014 and Kansas City in 2015), and begin developing/revising marketing materials. Our initial goal for recruitment is to admit a minimum of 8 qualified students on an annual basis.



# WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Sociology Program: Sociology

Tables 1 through 7 provide data for Section 2 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

**Table 1: Fiscal Year Summation of Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production**

Course level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)										Rolling 5 FY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2007-2012	2008-2012	2009-2013		
Total	11,092	10,565	10,957	11,042	11,906	12,695	10,107	11,112	11,433	11,341			
100-299	3,744	3,303	4,176	3,651	4,083	4,566	3,690	3,791	3,956	4,033			
300-499	5,901	6,122	5,557	6,132	6,938	7,382	5,071	6,130	6,426	6,216			
500-699	1,170	973	1,061	1,117	767	655	1,259	1,018	915	972			
700-799	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0			
800-899	277	167	163	141	118	92	87	173	136	120			
900-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings summated by FY for each census day; in some cases department level SCH includes entire department offerings.

**Table 2: Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production at Fall Census Day**

Course level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2006-2011	2007-2011	2008-2012		
Total	4,947	4,468	4,669	4,807	4,991	5,577	4,149	4,776	4,902	4,839			
100-299	1,785	1,665	2,082	1,680	1,911	2,313	1,458	1,825	1,930	1,889			
300-499	2,354	2,100	2,117	2,556	2,732	2,988	2,106	2,372	2,495	2,496			
500-699	702	631	389	507	290	259	540	504	415	397			
700-799	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0			
800-899	106	72	81	63	58	37	45	76	62	57			
900-999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: SCH of all enrolled department offerings at Fall census day.

**Table 3: Student Credit Hour (SCH) Production among Department Instructional Faculty on November Employee Census Day (entire term SCH)**

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Program total	n/a	n/a	4,525	4,919	4,565	5,298	2,676	n/a	n/a	4,397			
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	3,535	3,896	3,599	4,267	1,038	n/a	n/a	3,285			
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0			
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	627	666	609	1,041	1,284	n/a	n/a	845			
GTA	n/a	n/a	363	357	357	0	354	n/a	n/a	286			
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0			
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0			
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
faculty/staff with active class assignments and employment at November freeze; employee type based on ecls and egpr matrix.													

**Table 4: Instructional FTE Employed on November 1st Census Day**

Employee type:	Year of November Census Day										Rolling 5 year average		
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012			
Program total	n/a	n/a	12.0	11.0	9.0	11.0	10.0	n/a	n/a	11			
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	9.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	n/a	n/a	7			
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	0			
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	2.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	n/a	n/a	3			
GTA	n/a	n/a	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	n/a	n/a	1			
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	0			
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	n/a	0			
GSA, GRA, UG std	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0			

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze; employee type based on ecls and egpr matrix; fle of 1 based on 80 hour bi-week appointment; employee type based on ecls and egpr matrix; KBOR minima for faculty (TTF) 3 for UG, plus 3 for masters, plus 2 for doctoral.



## WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Sociology Program: Sociology

Table 5a: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for University Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
(University level) Total	n/a	n/a	225	247	236	231	222	n/a	n/a	232
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	214	240	228	216	194	n/a	n/a	219
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	298	330	301	286	290	n/a	n/a	301
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	280	287	274	269	295	n/a	n/a	281
GTA	n/a	n/a	190	201	214	210	204	n/a	n/a	204
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	116	121	106	149	121	n/a	n/a	123
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	14	n/a	n/a	3
GSA, GRA, UG sid	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5b: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for College Division Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
(College Division level) Total	n/a	n/a	241	255	249	256	238	n/a	n/a	248
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	220	245	232	252	189	n/a	n/a	228
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	251	263	251	244	284	n/a	n/a	259
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	327	367	333	313	335	n/a	n/a	339
GTA	n/a	n/a	266	242	265	265	295	n/a	n/a	267
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	149	148	109	99	119	n/a	n/a	125
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
GSA, GRA, UG sid	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

Table 5c: Student Credit Hour (SCH) by FTE for Program Instructional Faculty on November 1st Census Day

Employee type:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
(Program level) Total	n/a	n/a	377	447	507	482	268	n/a	n/a	416
Tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	393	557	600	608	208	n/a	n/a	473
Non-tenure eligible faculty	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
Lecturers	n/a	n/a	314	222	305	260	321	n/a	n/a	284
GTA	n/a	n/a	363	357	357	n/a	354	n/a	n/a	286
Unclassified professional	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
Classified staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
GSA, GRA, UG sid	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0

note: active employment positions at November 1st freeze.; employee type based on ecls and egrp matrix; instructional defined as active course enrollment.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Sociology Program: Sociology

Table 6: Program Majors (including double majors) on Fall Census Day

Student Class	Year of Fall Census Day					Rolling 5 year average				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
Total	128	129	122	131	128	130	119	128	128	126
freshmen	4	7	8	13	10	11	11	8	10	11
sophomore	20	17	13	18	22	19	19	18	18	18
junior	26	28	37	30	31	44	35	30	34	35
senior	56	58	45	48	54	44	48	52	50	48
masters	22	19	19	22	11	12	6	19	17	14
post masters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: majors include all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; other includes guest or non degree students; KBOR minima 25 UG, 20 GR masters and 5 GR doctoral.

Table 7: Degree Production by Fiscal Year

Degree level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)							Rolling 5 FY average		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013
Total	43	39	30	26	28	30	29	33	31	29
Doctoral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Masters	10	8	5	6	4	4	2	7	5	4
Bachelor	33	31	25	20	24	26	27	27	25	24
Associate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; KBOR minima 10 UG, 5 GR masters & 2 GR doctoral.

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Sociology Program: Sociology

Tables 8 provides data for Section 3a of the Program Review Self Study Template.

**Table 8: Mean ACT score of Juniors and Seniors Enrolled on Fall Census Day (source=Fall Census Day)**

Statistic:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
University level	22.1	22.3	22.5	22.5	22.5	22.7	22.8	23.0	22.4	22.6
Program majors	20.4	21.3	21.2	21.3	21.7	21.7	21.8	21.7	21.2	21.5
Program majors count	82	86	82	78	85	85	88	83	83	83
Percent reporting ACT	43	43	37	44	51	41	41	41	44	43
Percent reporting	52.4%	50.0%	45.1%	56.4%	60.0%	46.6%	49.4%	52.8%	51.6%	51.4%

note: if ACT missing and SAT available, SAT is used converted to ACT metric; KBOR captures ACT data for enrolled juniors & seniors only, KBOR minima >=20.

Table 9 provides data for Section 3b of the Program Review Self Study Template.

**Table 9: Mean Application GPA of Admitted Graduate Student Majors (source= Applications)**

Statistic:	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013
University level	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Program majors	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5
Program majors count	16	7	17	9	4	8	5	11	9	9
Percent reporting GR gpa	16	6	15	9	4	7	3	10	8	8
Percent reporting	100.0%	85.7%	88.2%	100.0%	100.0%	87.5%	60.0%	94.3%	91.1%	88.4%

note: graduate student application gpa based on last 60 hours of course work earned.

Table 10 provides data for Section 3d of the Program Review Self Study Template.

**Table 10: Satisfaction with Program among Undergraduate and Graduate Students at End of Program Exit**

Student level:	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013
University Undergraduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	79.5%	82.9%	n/a	n/a	n/a
College Division Undergraduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	84.2%	86.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Program Undergraduate majors:										
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	82.9%	79.6%	n/a	n/a	n/a
mean	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.2	4.2	n/a	n/a	n/a
median	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	4	n/a	n/a	n/a
count	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	41	54	n/a	n/a	n/a
University Graduate level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	80.0%	82.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a
College Division Graduates level	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	77.0%	77.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Program Graduate majors:										
Percent satisfied or very satisfied	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100.0%	100.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a
mean	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.8	4.7	n/a	n/a	n/a
median	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5	5	n/a	n/a	n/a
count	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	3	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: primary majors only; data from the Application For Degree Exit Survey; scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being high (very satisfied).

WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Sociology Program: Sociology

Tables 11 through Table 15 provide data for Section 4 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

**Table 11: Applications, Admits and Enrollment for Undergraduate and Graduate Applicants**

Student level:	Fiscal Year (summer-fall-spring sequence)						Rolling 5 FY average				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2007-2011	2008-2012	2009-2013	
Undergraduates:											
Applicants	24	34	27	30	29	45	30	29	33	32	
Admitted	23	31	24	26	27	41	28	26	30	29	
Census day	15	19	11	17	19	26	23	16	18	19	
Graduates:											
Applicants	23	10	20	11	9	12	13	15	12	13	
Admitted	16	8	17	9	5	8	5	11	9	9	
Census day	13	5	14	6	5	5	4	9	7	7	

note: unduplicated count as last record of FY; applicants exclude incomplete or cancelled applications.

**Table 12: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) on Fall Census Day**

Student level:	Year of Fall Census Day						Rolling 5 year average			
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012
<b>University level:</b>										
Freshmen & Sophomores	15.3%	14.5%	15.0%	15.7%	17.0%	18.0%	18.5%	15.5%	16.0%	16.8%
Juniors & Seniors	12.3%	12.0%	12.3%	13.0%	14.0%	14.9%	15.4%	12.7%	13.2%	13.9%
Masters	5.8%	6.6%	6.8%	7.8%	8.2%	9.7%	11.3%	7.1%	7.8%	8.8%
Doctoral	5.0%	6.9%	6.8%	5.6%	6.6%	5.4%	6.7%	6.2%	6.2%	6.2%
<b>College division level:</b>										
Freshmen & Sophomores	23.7%	20.7%	19.9%	20.9%	20.9%	27.1%	26.0%	21.2%	21.9%	22.9%
Juniors & Seniors	20.5%	20.1%	19.1%	20.6%	22.5%	22.3%	22.2%	20.6%	20.9%	21.3%
Masters	10.8%	15.7%	15.7%	17.1%	17.4%	18.9%	20.6%	15.3%	16.9%	17.9%
Doctoral	14.1%	15.5%	14.3%	11.4%	16.0%	10.7%	11.8%	13.4%	13.3%	13.0%
<b>Program level:</b>										
Freshmen & Sophomores	12.5%	4.2%	14.3%	29.0%	12.5%	23.3%	33.3%	14.5%	16.7%	22.5%
Juniors & Seniors	24.4%	16.3%	17.1%	20.5%	21.2%	20.5%	15.7%	19.9%	19.1%	19.0%
Masters	4.3%	23.8%	28.6%	25.0%	36.4%	58.3%	16.7%	23.6%	34.4%	33.0%
Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

## WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Sociology Program: Sociology

Table 13: Race/Ethnicity on Fall Census Day

Student level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012					
Total	128	129	128	131	128	130	119	128	128	126					
Total URM	24	20	22	29	26	32	24	24	26	27					
Freshmen & Sophomores															
Total	24	24	21	31	32	30	30	26	28	29					
white non-hispanic	18	19	16	19	22	19	16	18	19	18					
black non-hispanic	2	1	3	4	4	5	5	3	3	4					
hispanic	1	0	0	3	0	2	4	1	1	2					
asian non-hispanic	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0					
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0					
foreign	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	1					
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
multiple race	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0					
unknown	0	2	1	2	2	3	0	1	2	1					
Juniors & Seniors															
Total	82	86	82	78	85	88	83	83	84	83					
white non-hispanic	53	52	55	48	54	60	54	54	56	54					
black non-hispanic	11	9	11	15	14	13	9	12	12	12					
hispanic	7	5	3	0	4	5	4	4	3	3					
asian non-hispanic	7	6	2	6	2	0	2	5	3	2					
american indian/alaskan native	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0					
foreign	0	2	3	1	1	3	4	1	2	2					
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
multiple race	0	0	1	0	4	5	2	1	2	2					
unknown	2	2	7	7	6	2	8	5	5	6					
Master															
Total	22	19	19	22	11	12	6	19	17	14					
white non-hispanic	19	12	13	14	3	3	5	12	9	8					
black non-hispanic	0	1	1	3	3	3	0	2	2	2					
hispanic	1	3	4	1	1	2	0	2	2	2					
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0					
american indian/alaskan native	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	1					
foreign	1	2	1	2	3	2	0	2	2	2					
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
unknown	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0					
Doctoral															
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

**WSU Program Review Appendix      College: LAS Social Sciences      Department: Sociology      Program: Sociology**

**Table 14: Percent Under-represented Minorities (URM) of Degreed Conferred Students by Fiscal Year**

Degree level:	Year of Fall Census Day						Rolling 5 year average				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012	
<b>University level:</b>											
Doctoral	8.7%	1.5%	7.2%	6.1%	6.3%	6.5%	6.5%	6.0%	5.5%	6.5%	
Masters	4.9%	6.0%	6.4%	6.1%	6.4%	8.7%	10.5%	6.0%	6.7%	7.6%	
Bachelor	10.2%	10.7%	11.3%	11.1%	12.0%	12.7%	12.7%	11.1%	11.5%	11.9%	
Associate	21.4%	13.8%	11.8%	16.0%	18.8%	18.4%	23.1%	16.4%	15.8%	17.6%	
<b>College division level:</b>											
Doctoral	12.5%	14.3%	13.3%	0.0%	30.0%	8.3%	20.0%	14.1%	13.2%	14.3%	
Masters	10.9%	10.7%	17.3%	14.9%	13.8%	18.6%	13.1%	13.5%	15.1%	15.5%	
Bachelor	18.1%	17.4%	15.5%	15.5%	18.6%	22.2%	19.9%	17.0%	17.9%	18.3%	
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

**Program level:**

Doctoral	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Masters	0.0%	12.5%	20.0%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	9.8%	19.8%	27.3%			
Bachelor	18.2%	12.9%	8.0%	25.0%	12.5%	23.1%	7.4%	15.3%	16.3%	15.2%			
Associate	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes; URM includes black non-hispanic, hispanic, american indian/alaskan native & hawaiian.

**Table 15: Race/Ethnicity of Degreed Conferred Students by Fiscal Year**

Degree level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012					
Doctoral	Total	43	39	30	26	28	30	29	33	31	29				
	Total URM	6	5	3	6	3	8	3	5	5	5				
	white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Masters	unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
	Total	10	8	5	6	4	4	2	7	5	4				
	white non-hispanic	10	6	3	5	2	2	1	5	3	2				
	black non-hispanic	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1				
	hispanic	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	american indian/alaskan native	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0				
	foreign	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	1				
	hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
unknown	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0					

(Table continued on next page)

## WSU Program Review Appendix College: LAS Social Sciences Department: Sociology Program: Sociology

(Table 15 continued)

Degree level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average			
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012				
<b>Bachelor Total</b>	33	31	25	20	13	16	21	27	27	25	24			
white non-hispanic	24	25	19	13	16	17	21	19	19	18	17			
black non-hispanic	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1			
hispanic	2	2	1	2	1	1	5	1	2	2	2			
asian non-hispanic	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0			
american indian/alaskan native	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0			
foreign	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1			
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
multiple race	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1			
unknown	3	1	0	1	3	2	1	1	2	1	1			
<b>Associate Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
white non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
black non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
asian non-hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
american indian/alaskan native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
foreign	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
multiple race	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

note: includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

Tables 16 provides data for Section 5 of the Program Review Self Study Template.

Table 16: Department Student Credit Hour (SCH) by Student Department Affiliation on Fall Census Day

Major & student level:	Year of Fall Census Day										Rolling 5 year average			
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-2010	2007-2011	2008-2012				
<b>Total</b>	4,947	4,468	4,669	4,807	4,991	5,577	4,149	4,776	4,902	4,839				
Program UG majors	313	381	285	349	454	389	366	356	372	369				
Program GR majors	153	112	120	117	63	51	48	113	93	80				
Non-program majors	4,481	3,975	4,264	4,341	4,474	5,137	3,735	4,307	4,438	4,390				
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%				
Program UG major	6.3%	8.5%	6.1%	7.3%	9.1%	7.0%	8.8%	7.5%	7.6%	7.6%				
Program GR major	3.1%	2.5%	2.6%	2.4%	1.3%	0.9%	1.2%	2.4%	1.9%	1.6%				
Non-program majors	90.6%	89.0%	91.3%	90.3%	89.6%	92.1%	90.0%	90.2%	90.5%	90.7%				

note: program majors includes all active program matching majors among 4 possible major codes.

## Appendix 2: Introduction to Sociology (SOC 111) General Education Assessment Data

## General Education Writing Rubric Assessment, Fall 2013

Sample: 314 students in 3 Sociology 111 classes (all different instructor) during regular fall 2013 term of which 2 were morning sections and 1 afternoon section all occurring Tuesday & Thursday; no statistical difference in test scores among classes nor time/day offering.

Scoring (4=high)	Mean Writing Rubric Score*		Context of & Purpose for Writing		Content Development		Genre & Disciplinary Conventions		Control of Syntax & Mechanics	
	Pre test	Post Test	Pre test	Post Test	Pre test	Post Test	Pre test	Post Test	Pre test	Post Test
mean	1.95 *** ^	2.18	2.05 *** ^	2.39	1.96 *** ^	2.23	1.81	2.05	1.98 ***	2.03
std dev	0.45	0.40	0.58	0.58	0.64	0.52	0.63	0.55	0.59	0.53
* Sources rubric excluded due to incomplete data; *** statistical difference at the p<.000 level; ^ effect size > .20.										
4	0	0.0%	1 <sub>a</sub>	.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	26 <sub>a</sub>	15.8%	42 <sub>b</sub>	28.2%	30 <sub>a</sub>	18.2%	18 <sub>a</sub>	10.9%	26 <sub>a</sub>	15.8%
2	125 <sub>a</sub>	75.8%	103 <sub>a</sub>	69.1%	98 <sub>a</sub>	59.4%	99 <sub>a</sub>	60.0%	110 <sub>a</sub>	66.7%
1	14 <sub>a</sub>	8.5%	3 <sub>b</sub>	2.0%	37 <sub>a</sub>	22.4%	46 <sub>a</sub>	27.9%	28 <sub>a</sub>	17.0%
0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2 <sub>a</sub>	1.2%	1 <sub>a</sub>	.6%
Note: Values in the same row & sub table not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< .05 level.										

**Summary:** Mean Writing Rubric post-test score was statistically higher than pre-test measure; while sub scores of Context, Content & Genre were statistically higher at post-test, Syntax post-test score was not statistically different from pre-test score.



Appendix 3: Faculty Data

Year	# Journal Articles Reviewed	# of Popular Media Citations	# of conference proposals reviewed	# unpaid research consulting	# student research assistants
2011	8.00	0.00	19.00	0.00	5.00
2012	14.00	1.00	14.00	0.00	5.00
2013	10.00	3.00	10.00	1.00	2.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>43.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>12.00</b>

Year	# SOC 306 research projects directed	#SOC 312 research projects directed	# SOC 512 research projects directed- students	# SOC 528 projects directed
2011	64	40	25	10
2012	67	41	25	20
2013	60	39	21	32
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>62</b>

Year	# Students served as Thesis Chair- Grad Yr only	# McNair Scholar Projects	# Honors' Projects	# Independent Readings	# Directed Research Projects
2011	2	1	0	6	4
2012	4	1	0	7	0
2013	4	1	1	7	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>

### Why did you major in sociology ...

### Percentage

I have always been interested in studying people	100%
I think it might help me understand more about myself	100%
I thought it would prepare me to help to change society	100%
I enjoyed the first course I took in sociology	100%
I think it will prepare me for a job helping people	100%
I heard good things about the sociology department at WSU	92%
I thought it would prepare me to do different kinds of research	85%
It might help me understand my place in a global and international world	85%
looking for a more general major rather than one focused on a specific career	54%
I heard it was a fairly easy major	31%

updated 2/14/14

\*missing cases removed from distribution

\*\*percent of respondents who "agree/strongly agree"

Survey Response Rate: 67%; N = 13

As part of your sociology major did you learn ...	Percentage**
Basic concepts in sociology (including culture, socialization, institutions, or stratification)	100%
That people live in an interdependent and unequal society and world	92%
To present opposing viewpoints and alternative hypotheses on various issues	85%
What is meant by a social institution and to give examples of their impact on individuals	85%
Basic theoretical perspectives or paradigms in sociology	85%
Current sociological explanations about a variety of social issues	77%
About the effects of domestic and global forces on social institutions	70%

\*missing cases removed from distribution

\*\*percent of respondents who "agree/strongly agree"

Survey Response Rate: 67%; N = 13

As part of my sociology major, I learned to ...	Percentage**
Design and complete a research study	100%
Apply sociological knowledge to social problems	100%
Use computers to find information to develop a bibliography or a list of references	100%
Evaluate scientific merit of information found on the Internet	100%
Identify basic methodological approaches	100%
Describe the general role of quantitative methods in building sociological knowledge	100%
Describe the general role of qualitative methods in building sociological knowledge	100%
Know the difference between a dependent and independent variable	92%
Identify ethical issues in sociological research	92%
Write a clear and concise sociological analysis of a social event, topic, issue, or problem	92%
Compare and contrast basic methodological approaches for gathering data	92%
Understand and apply basic statistical tests sociologists use	92%
Use standard statistical software packages, such as SPSS, SAS, or STATA to analyze data	85%
Write a report from sociological information that can be understood by non-sociologists	83%

\*missing cases removed from distribution

\*\*percent of respondents who "strongly agree/agree"

Survey Response Rate: 67%; N = 13

**Sociology Undergraduate Assessment Plan Grid—Program Review**  
(Developed September 2005; updated February 2014)

Program Initiated Goal/Objective	When, Where, and How Monitored	Expectation for Satisfactory Performance	Decision Point	Observation of Student Performance	When and by Whom are Results Analyzed	Outcome of Analysis	Department Follow-up
<b>Majors</b>							
<b>Goal 1:</b> Acquisition and application of sociological research skills <b>Outcome 1:</b> Apply a theoretical framework to a sociological problem	Final Papers from SOC 545 kept by sociology chair each fall (about 25 per year).	Students will distinguish between major classical theoretical perspectives in sociology.	Papers read by two faculty, not the instructor of the course, who agree on appropriate content; rubric developed.	% who met performance standard % who did not meet performance standard	First February faculty meeting every other year, beginning in <b>2014</b>	Rubric completed 12/13 for data collection in fall 2014. (80% is the standard)	Data collection for next cycle in collection phases
<b>Goal 1:</b> <b>Outcome 2:</b> Use the scientific method to conduct a research project	Final Papers from SOC 512 kept by sociology chair each spring (about 25 per year).	Students will successfully complete all aspects of a research paper (e.g., design, methods, and analysis)	Papers read by two faculty, not the instructor of the course, who agree on appropriate content; rubric developed.	% who met performance standard % who did not meet performance standard	First September faculty meeting every other year	84% met the standard (80% is the standard) N = 19 (2013)	Data collection for next cycle in collection phases

Program Initiated Goal/Objective	When, Where, and How Monitored	Expectation for Satisfactory Performance	Decision Point	Observation of Student Performance	When and by Whom are Results Analyzed	Outcome of Analysis	Department Follow-up
<b>Majors/Non-Majors</b>							
<b>Goal 2:</b> <i>Describe structural issues</i> <b>Outcome 3:</b> <i>Examine the role of social institutions in society*</i>	Student assignment papers written by students in 100-300 level courses will be collected and kept by chair each fall	Students will be able to <i>examine the role of social institutions like family, state, economy, religion, and education.</i>	Papers read by two faculty, not the instructor of the course, who agree on appropriate content; rubric developed.	% who met performance standard % who did not meet performance standard	First February faculty meeting every other year	81% met the standard (80% is the standard) N = 54 (2013)	Data collection for next cycle in collection phases
<b>Goal 2:</b> <b>Outcome 4:</b> <i>Identify and discuss the consequences of social issues. **</i>	Student assignment papers written by students in 300-500 level courses will be collected and kept by chair each spring	Students will be able to <i>identify and discuss the consequences of structural issues in society like class, race, age, gender, etc.</i>	Papers read by two faculty, not the instructor of the course, who agree on appropriate content; rubric developed.	% who met performance standard % who did not meet performance standard	First September faculty meeting every other year	Rubric completed 12/13 for data collection in Spring 2014. (80% is the standard)	Data collection for next cycle in collection phases

RED denotes changes to original Sociology Undergraduate Assessment Plan Grid

\* Outcome 3: Institutions: 111, 306, 315, 320, 326, 336, 338, (528)

\*\* Outcome 4: Social Issues 306, 315, 320, 322, 330, 346, 515, 516, 528