List of drop-down responses in the proposed new C Form:

Drop-down options for item 4:
        COBA
        COEHHS
        CHABSS
        CSM
        FYP
        Other

Drop-down options for item 5:
        Summer
        Fall
        Spring

Drop-down options for item 7:
        No
        Yes

Drop-down options for item 8:
        Yes
        No

Drop-down options for item 9:
        No
        Yes

Drop-down options for item 13; "Title" reads: For most courses, the answer will be no.
        No
        Yes, Consent of Instructor [Be sure to include statement in 12d]
        Yes, Consent of Department (Chair or designee) [Be sure to include statement in 12d]

Drop-down options for item 14; "Title" reads: For most courses, the answer will be no.
        No
        Yes, this is an independent study/research course.
        Yes, this is an internship course.
        Yes, this is a generic course and students will be allowed to retake the course as topics change.
        Yes, but this course is not described by the three situations immediately above. (Please complete the second part of this item.)

Drop-down options for item 15:
        No
        Yes, all cross-listings are identified in item #1.
        Yes, but not all cross-listings are identified in item #1.

Drop-down options for item 16a:
        No

Yes; this course is part of a normal 400-level and 500-level pairing.
Yes; this course is part of a 400-level and 600-level pairing, and a strong rationale for this exceptional pairing is provided.
Yes; this course is part of a 300-level and 500-level pairing, and a strong rationale for this exceptional pairing is provided.

Drop-down options for item 17; "Title" reads: Most courses use the "Graded +/-" grading basis
Graded +/-   (Grades are F, D-, D, D+, C-, C, C+, B-, B, B+, A- and A)
Graded RP   (Grades are F, D-, D, D+, C-, C, C+, B-, B, B+, A- and A; also allows the use of the RP [Report in Progress] grading symbol)
CR/NC   (Grades are CR [Credit] and NC [No Credit])
CR/NC w/RP (Grades are CR [Credit] and NC [No Credit]; also allows the use of the RP [Report in Progress] grading symbol)
PreBacc   (Grades are F, D-, D, D+, C-, C, C+, B-, B, B+, A- and A; used for pre-baccalaureate courses to exclude them from GPA calculations and being counted toward graduation)
PB/CRNC   (Grades are CR [Credit] and NC [No Credit]; used for pre-baccalaureate courses to exclude them from GPA calculations and being counted toward graduation)

Drop-down options for item 19:
Yes; some sections of this course may need a final exam period.
No; sections of this course will never need a final exam period or room during finals week.

Drop-down options for item 20 (Primary Lecture); "Title" reads: Select [blank] if there is no lecture
[blank]
02: 1 weekly instructional hour and 1 WTU for each credit unit (usual mode)

Drop-down options for item 20 (Second Lecture (for courses with "breakout sections")); "Title" reads: Select [blank] if there is no second lecture
[blank]
04: 1 weekly instructional hour and 1 WTU for each credit unit (usual mode)

Drop-down options for item 20 (Activity); "Title" reads: Select [blank] if there is no activity
[blank]
07: 2 weekly instructional hours and 1.3 WTUs for each credit unit

Drop-down options for item 20 (Lab); "Title" reads: Select [blank] if there is no lab
[blank]
15: 3 weekly instructional hours and 1.5 WTUs for each credit unit
16: 3 weekly instructional hours and 2 WTUs for each credit unit (science labs)
17: 3 weekly instructional hours and 2 WTUs for each credit unit (clinical labs)

Drop-down options for item 20 (Other (seldom used) instructional modes); "Title" reads: Select [blank] if "other modes" are not used
[blank]
18: Major Intercollegiate Athletics Sports Activities
19: Minor Intercollegiate Athletics Sports Activities
20: Performance/Production
21: Performance/Production Activities

77: Non-workload-generating, non-state-supported
78: Non-traditional instruction, examination or evaluation

Drop-down options for item 20 (Supervision); "Title" reads: Select [blank] if "this is not a supervision course

[blank]
48: 0.25 WTU/student; 45 mins/student/week; usual mode for 1 or 2 units of undergraduate independent study
36: 0.33 WTU/student; 1 hour/student/week; usual mode for 3 or 4 units of undergraduate independent study
25: 0.50 WTU/student; 90 mins/student/week; usual mode for 5+ units of undergraduate independent study, or 1 or 2 units of graduate independent study
24: 0.67 WTU/student; 2 hours/student/week; usual mode for 3 or more units of graduate independent study
23: 1.00 WTU/student; 3 hours/student/week

Drop-down options for item 22:
A complete course syllabus
A detailed course outline
No syllabus or outline as this is an independent study/internship course
No syllabus or outline as this is a generic course

Drop-down options for item 23:
No; individual sections may still be designated as service-learning sections during the schedule build
Yes; all sections will be automatically be designated as service-learning sections in the on-line schedule

Drop-down options for item 24:
Course typically offered Every Semester
Course typically offered in Fall
Course typically offered in Spring
Course typically offered in Summer
Course typically offered Every Third Semester
Course typically offered Intermittently
Course typically offered Every Term (Fall, Spring, and Summer)
No entry (field in PeopleSoft will be left blank)

Drop-down options for item 25:
No
Yes

Drop-down options for item 26:
No
Yes

Drop-down options for item 27:
No

Yes

Drop-down options for item 28:
No
Yes

1. Course Subject Code and Number: | Type the subject code over this text | Type the course number over this text |
Examples of Subject Codes: ACCT, BA, CHEM, DNCE, ECON, FIN, GBM, HD, ID, JAPN, KINE, LBST, MASS, NATV, OM, PE,…
If the course is going to be cross-listed in two or more subjects with the same course number, both subject codes can be entered on the form; if
the course numbers will be different, then each course should be on its own form with the cross-listing noted in item #15.
In choosing a course number, see the Course Number System from the General Catalog (reproduced here):

    1- 99   Pre-baccalaureate
    100-299   Lower-division (may have community college equivalents)
    300-399   Upper-division; may not be taken by graduate students (not equivalent to community college courses)
    400-499   Upper-division; may be taken by graduate students unless the course is certified for General Education
    500-599   Graduate; may be taken by advanced upper-division students
    600-699   Graduate; only open to undergraduates with individual approval
    700-799   Doctoral

Whenever possible, course numbers should not have been previously used; if necessary, course numbers can be 'recycled' if they have not
been used in the past 10 years for undergraduate courses (6 years for graduate courses). Contact Academic Programs for assistance in
determining availability of course numbers. A letter suffix may be used, but not "I" or "O." "L" is commonly used for labs, and "S" for courses
taught in Spanish.

2. Course Title: | Delete this text and type the title here |
Avoid the use of jargon, slang, copyrighted names, trade names, and any non-essential punctuation.

3. Abbreviated Course Title:
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
Please suggest how to abbreviate the course title for use in transcripts, the on-line schedule, etc. The abbreviation may not exceed 30
characters, including spaces. Thirty cells are provided; please enter at most one character or space per cell. It is not necessary to abbreviate
course titles that already have 30 or fewer characters.

4. College: | Choose from drop-down menu | If "Other," please specify here: | | .

5. Desired Term and Year of Implementation: | Choose from drop-down menu |, 20| ?? |

6. Why is this course being proposed? | Delete this text and replace with a rationale |

7. Has this course been previously offered as a topics course? | Choose from drop-down menu |
    If so, please specify the course number of the topic, and when it was most recently offered: | | .

8. Is course also being proposed for General Education credit? | Choose from drop-down menu |
If yes, the course will be reviewed separately at the University level by the UCC for approval as a course, and by the GEC for GE certification.

9. Is this a generic course? | Choose from drop-down menu |
A generic course is the "container" for special topics courses or the "umbrella" under which an individual topic courses can be offered. The title
of a generic course is generally something like "Special Topics in ABCDology." The generic course appears in the catalog, whereas the more
detailed descriptions for individual topics are posted together with the Class Schedule. Because the generic course is just the vehicle for offering
particular topics (which are separately proposed via a Form T, once the generic course has been created), it cannot be submitted for GE
certification, and it is understood that there is no syllabus or student learning outcomes for the generic course. Individual topic proposals may
be considered by the GEC for GE certification and syllabi and SLOs will be required on the proposal forms for individual topics.

10. Number of Units: | Delete this text and replace with a number or a range |
Most courses are for a fixed number of units (3 or 4), but variable-unit courses can also be proposed (e.g., 1-4). A convention from the old CoAS
is to avoid creating variable-unit supervision courses, by instead creating different versions (e.g., BRS 495A, 495B and 495C to differentiate
between the 1-unit, 2-unit and 3-unit offerings). See the separate notes on "Instructional Mode Conventions Used at Cal State San Marcos,"
posted on the Curriculum Forms webpage for further details related to units in supervision courses.

11. Course Description: This has two parts: the plain text portion which explains the content and the italicized text portion, which
explains special conditions [see Registration Conditions in #12, below].

| Delete this sentence and type the "Plain text" portion here. |

| *Delete this sentence and type the "Italicized text" portion here; leave blank if there is no italicized text.* |

"Plain text" portion: The primary purpose of the course description is to explain what is covered in the course. It is useful to keep in mind two
audiences: students trying to determine whether they want to take this course and someone from outside the University who is trying to
understand what was covered in a course appearing on a student transcript. The explanation of course content should not exceed 80 words,
should avoid the use of abbreviations, jargon, slang, copyrighted names or trade names, and should avoid stock phrases such as "This course

covers" and "A study of," etc. It *is* acceptable to use sentence fragments. To avoid confusion with topics courses, synonyms for the word "topics" (i.e., subject matter, areas of study, themes, issues, etc.) should be used, reserving the word "topics" for generic (i.e., variable-topics) courses. Look at the catalog for examples of course descriptions.

"Italicized text" portion: In order, this should consist of (if/as needed):

- Any special conditions concerning the manner in which the course will meet. For example:
  - Course meets for more hours each week than units of credit because it contains a laboratory or activity period
  - Course requires attendance at out-of-class events/activities/field trips
  - Instruction is delivered in a language other than English
- Graded Credit/No Credit (if the Grade Mode requested in #17 is CR/NC or CR/NC w/RP)
- Rules for repeating the course for credit (if the answer to #14 is yes) or if the department wishes to limit the number of times that a student can register for the course. Please use one of the following standard construction, replacing *M* by the appropriate number:
  - [If there is no limit on repetitions.] *May be repeated for credit.*
  - [If there is a limit on repetitions.] *May be repeated for a total of M units.*
  - [If there is a limit on a collection of related courses.] *Together with (list other courses) may be repeated for a total of M units.*
  - [For generic courses] *May be repeated for credit as topics change.*
  - [For generic courses] *May be repeated for a total of M units as topics change.*
- Any special registration conditions. For example, to control the number of times that students may register to take the course, use the following statement: *Students who have remained in this course past the add/drop deadline N times may not register for it an N+1st time.*

12. Registration Conditions. Fill in all that apply.
(Registration conditions should appear at the end of the course description in italics.)
   a. Prerequisite(s): ☐ .
   b. Corequisite(s): ☐ .
   c. Co/prerequisite(s): ☐ .
   d. Enrollment Restriction(s): ☐ .
   e. Enrollment Requirement(s): ☐ .
   f. Recommended Preparation: ☐ .

Registration Conditions enforced by PeopleSoft:
a. Prerequisites: Specific courses which must be taken before enrollment is permitted. It is possible to specify a minimum grade in the prerequisite.
   - If the prerequisite simply reads "ABC 321," then students who are currently enrolled in ABC 321 may register for the course during the priority reservation period – which takes place in the prior semester.
   - If the prerequisite reads "ABC 321 with a minimum grade of C (2.0)," then the default setting in PeopleSoft is to allow students who are currently enrolled in ABC 321 to register.
   - If the prerequisite reads "ABC 321 with a minimum grade of C (2.0)," and the intent is to not allow students to register until a grade of C or better has been posted in PeopleSoft, then please include the phrase "Exclude in-progress credit" in #12a (but not in the italicized portion of #11).
b. Corequisites: Specific courses which must be taken simultaneously with the course.
c. Co/prerequisites: Specific courses which must either be taken simultaneously with the course, or must have been previously completed.
d. Enrollment restrictions: Usually of the form "Enrollment restricted to ABCD majors", "Enrollment restricted to students with senior class standing," or "Enrollment restricted to students who have obtained consent of the instructor," etc.

Registration Conditions enforced by the instructor, not PeopleSoft:
e. Enrollment requirements: Often these have the same format as prerequisites, but these are enforced by the instructor (or department) and not by PeopleSoft.

Unenforceable registration conditions:
f. Recommended preparation: Courses which are recommended but not required to be taken before enrolling in the course.

13. Is Consent Required for Enrollment? ☐Choose from drop-down menu☐

14. a. May the course be repeated for graduation credit? ☐Choose from drop-down menu☐
    b. If directed in part a to complete the second part of this item, explain how the course material changes significantly from offering to offering so that students should receive credit for repeating the course: ☐ .

15. Is this course cross-listed with any other course? ☐Choose from pull-down menu☐ If "Yes," please identify here any cross-listings besides those already given in item #1: ☐ .
    It is recommended that, if possible, both courses should be given the same number. Generally speaking, courses should only be cross-listed with courses of the same level (e.g., 300-level courses with 300-level courses). The exception to this general rule is cross-listing at the lower-division level where 100-level and 200-level courses may occur. Note that if one course is undergraduate (below 500-level) and the other is graduate (above 400-level), then this situation is an example of dual-listing, not cross-listing; see item #16.

16. a. Is this course part of a dual-listing of an undergraduate course? | Choose from drop-down menu |

Dual listing is only allowed between upper-division and graduate courses offered in the same department with similar course content . The titles and descriptions of the two courses must reflect the similarity of the subject matter. Dual-listed courses may not be cross-listed; the following types of courses may not be dual-listed: thesis, creative work, internship, special project, topic, directed reading, research and independent study. The dual-listed courses must meet in the same classroom at the same time and have the same instructor. Dual-listed course pairings normally consist of one 400-level and one 500-level course. The only permitted exceptions to this pairing are 400-level with 600-level and 300-level with 500-level; exceptions require a strong rationale and should be granted only rarely and under extreme circumstances. The course descriptions must indicate that the courses can be dual-listed. The descriptions must specify that if one of the dual-listed courses is completed for credit, the other one may not be taken for credit at a subsequent time, unless approved by petition to the graduate program coordinator.

b. If the course is being proposed for dual-listing, explain why the dual-listing is necessary and the higher expectations to which students will be held in the graduate version: | | .

At the time of the review of the dual-listing, syllabi for both courses complete with course descriptions, course readings and activities, and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) will be submitted to all curriculum committees as support for the dual-listing. Examples of greater expectations may include that graduate students show development of independent critical judgment and evaluation of course material, and that graduate students present the evidence of their original critical analysis. Examples of additional assignments might include significant research papers, oral presentations of research on course assignments, and/or the demonstration of more sophisticated laboratory or studio skills than those required of students in the undergraduate course.

17. Grading Basis: | Choose from drop-down menu |

18. If either "Graded RP" or "CR/NC w/RP" is requested, explain the need for this grading basis): | | .

RP grading symbol is intended for use in situations where the coursework is expected to extend beyond the end of the semester. Common examples are thesis courses.

19. Should a final exam period be scheduled for this class? | Choose from drop-down menu |

20. Mode of Instruction Use pull-down menus to replace each "??" in the central column with a number, and to select either an instructional mode or a blank in the last column

Type of Instruction	Number of Credit Units	Instructional Mode (Course Classification Number)
Primary Lecture	??	Choose from pull-down menu
Second Lecture (for courses with "breakout sections")	??	Choose from pull-down menu
Activity	??	Choose from pull-down menu
Lab	??	Choose from pull-down menu
Other (seldom used) instructional modes	??	Choose from pull-down menu
Total	??	

Or

Type of Instruction	Number of Credit Units	Instructional Mode (Course Classification Number)
Supervision	??	Choose from pull-down menu

Note that a course may not combine lecture/activity/lab units with supervision units. See the notes on "Instructional Mode Conventions Used at Cal State San Marcos," posted on the Curriculum Forms webpage for further details. Note that since the different lecture and activity modes have exactly the same credit:time:workload ratios, the pull-down menus in those categories show the common default values used by the campus.

21. (Skip this item if the answer to #9 is Yes.) Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

| Delete this text and replace with the SLOs or (if the answer to #9 is Yes) N/A |

These should be phrased in terms of what students will know and be able to do at the end of the course. A standard format is, "Students who successfully complete this course will be able to [list student learning outcomes]." Generally speaking, more advanced courses should describe SLOs in terms of higher-order (according to Bloom) cognitive skills (see www.uni.edu/chfasoa/bloom.htm). SLOs should be phrased using concrete action verbs that allow the instructor to determine the extent to which students achieve the SLO (see www.clemson.edu/assessment/assessmentpractices/referencematerials/documents/Blooms%20Taxonomy%20Action%20Verbs.pdf for lists of action verbs arranged according to the taxonomy). For courses that are requirements or electives in a major, it is desirable to connect the course learning outcomes to the programmatic learning outcomes.

22. Attached supporting documentation includes [Choose from pull-down menu]
When a detailed course outline or syllabus is provided, these should contain (i) a list of the specific subject material to be covered, (ii) a tentative reading list, (iii) a list of the major assignments/activities that students will complete (including how the All-University Writing Requirement will be met), and (iv) a grading scheme indicating what will form the basis of student grades.

23. Is this a Service Learning Course? [Choose from drop-down menu]
See the Community Service Learning Courses policy on the Policies and Procedures webpage for the definition of a Community Service Learning (CSL) course at CSU San Marcos. For a course to qualify for designation as a Community Service Learning course, at least 15% of the student's grades will be based on the community service learning portion of the course. It is suggested that the service consist of at least 20 hours of direct, academically-relevant community service.

24. How often will this course be offered once established? [Choose from pull-down menu]

25. Will there be any special fees associated with this course: [Choose from pull-down menu] If "Yes," please specify here: [ ] .

26. Will this course be required in any major, minor, certificate or graduate program? [Choose from pull-down menu] If "Yes," please specify here: [ ] , and submit this course form together with a program proposal (P) or program change (P2) form(s).

27. Will this course be an elective in any major, minor, certificate or graduate program? [Choose from pull-down menu] If "Yes," please specify here: [ ] .
If this course will be an elective in a new program, it should be submitted together with the program proposal (P) form for that program. To have this course recognized in the next catalog addendum as an elective in an existing program, it is necessary to submit a program change (P2) form. If no P2 form is submitted, it will be the responsibility of the program to request that this course be included in the next catalog printing when it reviews the draft catalog copy.

28. Does this course affect other discipline(s)? [Choose from pull-down menu]
A course proposal has "impact" on another discipline if it is cross-listed with a course in that discipline, if it will be taken by students majoring/minoring in that discipline, or if it deals with subject material that is also covered in that discipline. If there is any uncertainty as to whether a particular discipline is "impacted," check "yes" and obtain signature noting support or opposition. Any objections should be stated in writing and attached to this form.

Discipline: [ ]
Signature _____ Support [ ] Oppose [ ] Date _____ Statement Attached [ ]

Discipline: [ ]
Signature _____ Support [ ] Oppose [ ] Date _____ Statement Attached [ ]

Discipline: [ ]
Signature _____ Support [ ] Oppose [ ] Date _____ Statement Attached [ ]

Discipline: [ ]
Signature _____ Support [ ] Oppose [ ] Date _____ Statement Attached [ ]

Add additional lines as needed.

Proposal Signatures:

4

By signing this course proposal, the originator and Department Chair/Program Director (or equivalent) indicate that they understand that course materials need to be provided to IITS/ATS at least one month before being offered for the first time to ensure that course content, including instructional materials and instructional websites, are designed in a manner that incorporates accessibility. (See CSU Coded Memorandum AA-2009-19.)

1. Originator: ‎ Print name here ‎   Signature _____ Date _____

2. Program Director/Department Chair (or equivalent)   Signature _____ Date _____

Approval Signatures:

3. College Curriculum Committee   Signature _____ Date _____

4. College Dean (or Designee)   Signature _____ Date _____

5. UCC Committee Chair   Signature _____ Date _____

6. Provost/VP for Academic Affairs (or designee)   Signature _____ Date _____

Resolution on Opposition to Planned Structure of Office of Community Service Learning
4/24/13

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of California State University San Marcos strongly objects to the current plan for the Office of Community Service Learning (OCSL) and urges the administration to reconsider to incorporate more faculty involvement in the program; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of California State University San Marcos urges the administration to meet with faculty and community partners who are involved in Service Learning to develop a model that recognizes the current strengths of the program and builds on them rather than eliminating them.

RATIONALE:

A plan was developed by upper campus administration to move OCSL out of Academic Affairs and into Community Engagement. There was absolutely no consultation with faculty or service learning experts on campus or in the community in the development of the plan. Senate leadership objected and the Provost and VP for Community Engagement met with them and with the Director of OCSL to discuss the plan. Despite input that showed the faculty director actually does very little administrative work now and spends over 18 hours per week involved in activities where faculty input is essential, the faculty position in the program was cut to one course release.

Despite assurance that the intent of this reorganization is not to dismantle or dramatically change the direction of Service Learning at CSUSM, all actions point to the development of a program with very little pedagogical focus. The faculty director funding would allow workshops through the Faculty Center and work with faculty to develop their pedagogical goals, but would eliminate support for conference attendance and presentations, work on grant proposals which have provided nearly all of the funding for the current program, no actual time to meet with Community Engagement personnel to transition many tasks to them and most significantly work between the faculty director and community partners. It seems by all actions taken that intent is to start from scratch. This program has won awards based on the level of faculty involvement with the community, and the Academic Senate believes it is critical to the very nature of the program. Everything possible should be done to preserve the strengths of the program as it stands and grow it, not to change the direction into something that we, as faculty, do not support.

California State University
SAN MARCOS

Academic Senate   California State University San Marcos   333 S. Twin Oaks Valley Road   San Marcos, CA 92096-0001
Tel: 760.750.4058   senate@csusm.edu   www2.csusm.edu/academic_senate

Date: April 9, 2013

To: Sharon Elise, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Sociology

Jill Weigt, Ph.D.
Program Review Lead, Department of Sociology

From: Linda Shaw, Ph.D.
Chair, Program Assessment Committee

For the Program Assessment Committee: David Barsky, Gerardo Gonzalez,
Karen Irwin, Moses Ochanji, Toni Olivas, Jeff Nessler, Michelle Ramos Pellicia,
Cata Ratiu, and Jill Weigt

Subject: Sociology B.A. Degree Program Review

The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) has reviewed the Program Review
documents for the Sociology B.A. program. In what follows, the PAC summarizes
findings from the Sociology program Self-study Report, the external reviewers, the
Library Dean, the Dean of IITS, and the Dean of the College of Humanities, Behavioral
and Social Sciences. Based on its review, the PAC also offers recommendations for
consideration by the Sociology faculty and those who will participate in the MOU
process.

I. Achieving Educational Outcomes

A. Sociology B.A. Program Goals

The Sociology B.A. program focuses on providing students the knowledge,
critical thinking, research, and communication skills necessary to explore,
understand, and improve their social worlds. A core value of the program is to
promote awareness of the diversity of human experience, and both Department
practices and SLOs support University values of intellectual engagement,
community, integrity, innovation, and inclusiveness. The Sociology B.A. program
seeks to achieve SLO mastery through a set of core and elective courses in the
Standard Concentration as well as the opportunity for depth of study in four
additional concentration areas (Aging and the Life Course; Children, Youth and
Families; Critical Race Studies; and Health Education and Welfare).

The California State University

Bakersfield | Channel Islands | Chico | Dominguez Hills | East Bay | Fresno | Fullerton | Humboldt | Long Beach | Los Angeles | Maritime Academy
Monterey Bay | Northridge | Pomona | Sacramento | San Bernardino | San Diego | San Francisco | San Jose | San Luis Obispo | San Marcos | Sonoma |
Stanislaus

B. Annual Assessment Activities

Since its last program review in 2004, the Sociology program has conducted three annual assessments of its SLOs:

1. AY 2007-2008: The **goal** of this assessment was to determine mastery of SLOs related to students' abilities to engage scholarly discourses in sociology. The assessment focused on an assignment in the major's capstone course (SOC 495: Internship in Community Service) that asked students to locate scholarly articles related to a specific social problem, to analyze the main point of each article, and to make analytic connections between them. The assessment team used a rubric to score student success in locating, understanding, summarizing, and synthesizing the research as well as achieving adequate writing mechanics.

    Findings from this assessment revealed that: 1) students did better at locating scholarly literature than they did at understanding, summarizing, and synthesizing it; 2) they needed to improve their ability to discuss and apply what they learned from sociological literature to what occurred in their field placements; 3) students demonstrated better than adequate mastery of writing mechanics; and 4) many papers reflected thoughtful sociological insights and cumulative sociological knowledge. However, the assessment also revealed two major areas of concern: Students did not do as well at critically assessing articles they found; and students needed to improve their ability to discuss and apply what they learn from the sociological literature to what occurs in their field placements.

2. AY 2008-2009: The **goal** of this assessment was to evaluate course syllabi in order to discover how comprehensively and where SLOs were being integrated into courses.

    Findings from this assessment revealed that: 1) SLOs were represented in 50% or more of the courses where they should be taught; and 2) faculty could more effectively use syllabi to communicate the links between specific SLOs, activities that would enable their mastery, and SLO assessment techniques.

3. AY 2009-2010: NA (furlough year)

4. AY 2010-2011: The **goal** of this assessment was to determine mastery of the program SLO related to the diversity of human experience: "Analyze and interpret the diversity of social experiences using a sociological perspective, especially as they relate to race, class, gender, age, sexual preference, religion, and nationality. A pre-and post-test design was used to assess students' abilities to apply a sociological perspective as they progressed through

selected core courses and through the major to an analysis of a person's experiences with inequality.

Findings from this assessment show mixed results: 1) no significant difference between pre and post-test results in SOC 101, the introductory course in the major; 2) in upper division courses (SOC 311: Inequality; SOC 313: Race and Ethnicity; and SOC 315: Gender and Society) students showed improvement over the course of the semester in their ability to analyze and interpret the diversity of social experience using a sociological perspective; 3) students with prior sociological experience learned more than those who were just being introduced to the subject; 4) even those with no prior experience, but who had an interest in sociology (measured by declaring the major), both scored higher at the beginning of the semester than non-majors and also showed greater ability to apply a sociological perspective at the end of the semester than did non-majors; and 5) students did not use social structural concepts or offer social (vs. individualistic) solutions as competently or as often as faculty had hoped. But, overall, assessment results reveal greater mastery of analytic and interpretive abilities as students progress through the major.

D. Programmatic Changes Made in Response to Annual Assessments

1. **Improved Practices for SLO Curricular Integration and Mastery:** In response to the **2007-2008 Annual Assessment**, faculty decided to require the incremental inclusion of skills in core courses that would result in mastery of the SLO related to completion of a literature review by the time they completed the capstone course.

2. **Commitment to Improved Student Writing Skills:** In response to the **2007-2008 Annual Assessment**, Sociology faculty also agreed to work together to help students improve their wring skills, for example, by posting helpful information on the Department website and through informal brown bag discussions focused on pedagogy.

3. **Incorporation of SLOs and Assessment Tools into Course Syllabi:** In response to the **2009-2010 Annual Assessment**, faculty analyzed their own syllabi and discussed how to incorporate SLOs, activities that would lead to their mastery, and assessment tools into their syllabi and courses. The Department is now primed to ensure that this knowledge is part of the mentoring of new faculty.

4. **Refinement of SLOs:** In response to the **2009-2010 Annual Assessment**, faculty decided to eliminate one of the program's SLOs because they realized that it did not reflect Departmental objectives. The **2010-2011 Annual Assessment** also resulted in developing a new SLO focused on public sociology and potential social solutions or interventions for social problems. A working group within the Department will consider where in the curriculum this SLO

should be addressed and what activities for mastery and course-level assessment of mastery of this new SLO should take place in core courses for the major.

E. Additional Program Enhancements Since the Last Program Review

1. In 2003-2004, faculty **restructured the major from all three-unit courses to four and two-unit courses** in an effort to find more effective ways to achieve program SLOs. For example, four–unit courses in which students have difficulty grasping the material (e.g., theory and methods) enables exposure to course material in greater depth than in a three-hour course format. Two-unit courses enable a greater variety of Departmental offerings and student exposure to a larger complement of courses as well as the opportunity to more efficiently deploy faculty resources;

2. In 2004, the faculty **added a new Critical Race Studies concentration** which strengthens the Department's core commitment to issues of diversity and inequalities and the provision of courses for other programs that share this commitment;

3. In 2004, **SOC 361: Qualitative Research Methods was added to the curriculum** to strengthen the Department's core commitment to provide students with varied opportunities to engage in research;

4. In 2004, students were given the **option of taking either SOC 480: Capstone Seminar in Sociological Scholarship or SOC 495: Capstone Seminar in Community Service** in order to pursue interests in research or social services delivery;

5. In 2006, the **Health and Mental Health concentration was broadened to Health, Education, and Welfare** to reflect new faculty hires that enable the Department to expose students to the widest possible array of social services; and

6. Since 2010, there has been a **greater emphasis on a developmental approach to SLO mastery** as reflected in **development of a course matrix and enforcement of prerequisites** (made possible by enhancements to PeopleSoft).

Additional Sociology B.A. Program Strengths and Accomplishments in Support of Achieving Educational Outcomes

A. The program **Self Study** noted the following additional Sociology B.A program strengths and program accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. Department Mission and SLOs that are tightly aligned with University mission and guiding values of intellectual engagement, community, integrity, innovation, and inclusiveness;
2. Ethos of public sociology committed to social justice, a focus that distinguishes the program from all others in the CSU;
3. The major has shown steady growth over the review period and attracts a diverse group of students, helping to fulfill the University's strategic mission of serving regional needs and addressing educational equity;
4. Dedicated faculty and staff who work hard to deliver a quality program that meets student needs;
5. One of the most racially and ethnically diverse departments on the campus;
6. Willingness of faculty to employ pedagogies that increase student access have lead the Department to be a leader in offering on-line and hybrid courses;
7. Faculty have engaged in additional training to assist them in improving student writing ability;
8. Faculty have increased efforts to communicate with students and faculty at local community colleges to improve student preparedness for university-level work;
9. A curriculum and faculty that are highly valued by students;
10. Innovative pedagogies with emphasis on student research and training; and
11. A history of broad and active service to the College and University.

B. The **external reviewers** noted the following strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

   1. Mission and values:

      a. A strong social justice ethos and commitment to public sociology which emphasizes the dissemination of scholarship that benefits the community realized through extensive partnerships with community organizations and agencies; and
      b. Values realized through courses that encourage community-based research projects, service learning, requirement for quantitative and qualitative research skills, exploration of a wide-range of media to reach non-academic audiences, and the use of GSI and other technical skills, all of which prepare students to translate their sociological skills into labor market skills.

   2. Curriculum:

      a. Course offerings provide an excellent overview of the field of sociology with a curriculum that offers students a comprehensive and integrated learning experience;
      b. The currency of the undergraduate B.A. program is evident in the emphasis on public sociology;

c. The inclusion of critical race theory and human rights courses demonstrates the program's ability to keep current in the development of sociology as a field;

d. The Department has already established many of the recommendations set out in the report by the Task Force on Institutionalizing Public Sociology (e.g., developing new courses, "promotion of community-based research, participation in public forums, writing for mass media, and integration of service learning into the educational and research enterprise of the department" and "linking the department to common institutional mission statements");

e. Courses have incorporated the development of skills needed to publish in popular media through assignments.;

f. Faculty have begun to incorporate issues related to immigration into existing courses;

g. Extensive collaboration between the program and Library faculty has contributed to developing and maintaining a high quality research experience for students;

h. Capstone courses best capture the strength of the program as learning experiences, requiring 100 hours of internship in community agencies followed by research grounded in the literature, provide students an important link between the classroom and job opportunities;

i The Department is dedicated to its own major as well as to GE curricula and service to other departments;

j. Commitment to academic excellence despite the fact that most students need remediation in math and English and are unprepared for the CSU experience;

k. Emphasis on research training as majors complete two upper division research methods courses with research skills developed through original data collection in addition to use of larger data sets such as the General Social Survey and National Youth Survey;

l. The development of some four-unit courses alongside three-unit courses to provide majors extensive coverage of areas in sociology that include a research and or service-learning component; and

m. Cohesiveness of the Sociology B.A. major with the Criminology and Justice Studies B.A. program allows duplication of course offerings, similar pedagogy philosophy, and faculty.

3. Assessment:

a. The program has taken recommendations from the previous review to strengthen and develop the assessment process that is systematic and thoughtful; and

b. Assessments capture SLOs which reflect a solid range of competencies that a SOC major should possess.

4. Faculty:

   a. The Sociology Department is noted for its integration of lecturers into the larger body of faculty; and
   b. Both lecturer and tenure-track faculty are engaged in service learning and pedagogy embedded in the community, which offers students "critical thinking, research, and communicative skills to understand and improve their social worlds."

5. Pedagogy:

   a. Use of current textbooks, new scholarship, and the incorporation of a wide range of pedagogy, reflecting the most updated scholarship in the field, expose students to the most path-breaking research, innovative recent sociological concepts and approaches (e.g. courses addressing race, ethnicity, and inequality), important interdisciplinary work shaping sociology (e.g. critical race theory, whiteness studies, and diversity), and methods offerings that are updated to include visual sociology and internet-based research;
   b. The teaching craft of the faculty includes many different pedagogical principles including the use of small group work, film, class discussion, and lectures; and
   c. The Department's on-line and hybrid courses (e.g., Fall 2012: 23 of the courses were offered on-line, 19 were offered in a hybrid format, and 33 were traditional in-class courses) that lead the University in on-line teaching reflect the Department's innovation, adaptation to student demand for courses, and strong ability to develop teaching skills not readily available in most Ph.D. programs.

6. Student Responses:

   a. Students stated that what they liked about the program was the small class sizes and that they preferred the traditional, in-class offerings to the on-line instruction because it allowed them to discuss the application of theory to social problems;
   b. The experiential learning and small group discussion in a classroom setting was wholeheartedly appreciated by the students; and
   c. Students commented that the faculty are "awesome!"

C. The **Library Dean** noted the following program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. The Sociology faculty have met with the Social Sciences librarian since 2006 resulting in several hundred students consulting with her regarding their research projects.

D. The **Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences** noted the following program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. The program's focus on public sociology is unique within the CSU and nationwide, especially at the undergraduate level;

2. A dedicated faculty who are proactive in seeking learning opportunities for students that support the program's mission;

3. A capstone experience with the opportunity to pursue research-based or community-based experiential learning that provides students career preparedness opportunities that is unique in the College;

4. Significant emphasis on undergraduate research training;

5. Integration of lecturer faculty into the life of the Department, including key conversations about students and the curriculum;

6. Significant investment of time invested in assessment of SLOs that have resulted in meaningful program-level changes;

7. The program, including enhancements since the last review—increase in the units for core courses, increase in the number of concentrations, more rigorous and expansive methods training—provides a robust educational experience;

8. The program is a leader in the College on-line pedagogy;

9. Proactive efforts to manage enrollment, meet unmet demand, and free up resources by reserving seats for majors and selectively increasing enrollment in some courses; and

10. A cohesive faculty who have demonstrated commitment to improvement and to advancing the program and their students.

Sociology B.A. Program Challenges to Achieving Educational Outcomes

A. The Sociology B.A. program **Self Study** noted the following challenges to achieving educational outcomes:

1. Rhythm of annual assessments makes it difficult to implement and reflect on the effectiveness and impact of program-level changes on achievement of program goals;

2. Low alumni survey response rates make it difficult to assess the usefulness of the program beyond graduation;

3. Inability to sequence courses because of student demand makes it difficult to implement prerequisites and sequence courses; and

4. Incoming students are often unprepared for University-level work.

B. **External Reviewers** cited the following challenges to achieving educational outcomes:

1. Balancing the issues of capacity and quality of the program is a challenge:

   a. Unclear how concentrations (Children, Youth and Families; Critical Race Studies; Health, Education, and Welfare; and Aging and the Life Course) benefit the Sociology major and its students but, rather, appear to be aligned with other majors' needs and GE requirements;
   b. The number of electives outweighs the number of current faculty and increases the strain to cover the curriculum;
   c. Numerous service commitments to other majors across the curriculum and extensive course offerings to fulfill GE requirements mean that majors are in competition with non-majors for classes and difficulty getting into capstone courses;
   d. Having non-majors in courses changes the classroom climate and students' learning experience while courses dominated by majors helps to maintain the quality of the courses for majors; and
   e. Two capstone experience are labor intensive for faculty, and the number of sections remains limited.

2. Students are not always able to identify how sociological skills translate into labor market skills;

3. Curricular gaps in the program include a course on immigration and coverage of sexuality and visual sociology in methods courses; and

4. Lack of a clear policy about accessibility of faculty teaching on-line, particularly their availability to meet face-to-face with students.

C. The **Library Dean** noted the following challenges to achieving educational outcomes:

1. Many students in the program's capstone courses (Soc. 480 and Soc. 495) struggle with finding and identifying scholarly articles, and even with the help of the Librarian, students are unclear about how to connect scholarly research to their topics or work they are doing in their internships.

D. The **Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences** noted the following challenges to achieving educational outcomes:

1. Lack of clarity regarding the program's strategic use of on-line courses—which courses are offered, who teaches them, and how this fits into the Department's planning;
2. Lack of clarity about why four-unit courses are pervasive across the curriculum and not confined to core methods and theory courses; and
3. Lack of clarity regarding the role of four-unit vs. three-unit courses in the on-line environment, i.e., How does the program distinguish between three and four units in on-line courses? How does the argument that four-unit courses give students more "seat time" apply in the on-line environment?

II. Developing and Applying Resources

A. The Sociology program **Self Study** cited the following strengths and accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:

1. Rapid growth in majors over the last eight years that has greatly exceeded 2010-2011 CAMP predictions, leading to one of the highest FTES in the College;

2. Strategic hiring and deployment of tenure-track and lecturer faculty who serve both the Sociology and Criminology and Justice Studies (C&JS) majors, as well as programs (requirements for other majors and GE) from around the campus;

3. Proactive practices for acquiring data that have helped predict and manage demand in core, capstone, and other high demand courses; and

4. Good support from IITS for online course delivery.

B. The **external reviewers** cited the following strengths and accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:

1. Shared cost through duplication of courses with C&JS is strategically a wise use of scarce resources, particularly tenure-track lines in the Department.

Sociology B.A. Program Weakness and Challenges Regarding Developing and Applying Resources

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following weaknesses and challenges regarding developing and applying resources:

1. No net growth in tenure-track faculty since 2004, despite the fact that number of majors, FTES, and course offerings have grown considerably;

2. Increased reliance on lecturers who teach more than 50% of course sections across the curriculum, including core courses for the major and in GE;
3. Significant unmet student demand in several courses and allocation of additional resources for courses that meet the needs of students outside the program limits seats available to majors as well as the breadth of course offerings in the major;
4. Increased workload and fewer resources jeopardizes several critical Departmental activities:

   a. Exploration and implementation of new pedagogies;
   b. Curricular development pertinent to the needs of students and the region;
   c. Partnerships with local organizations and K-12 that provide internships, networking, and research opportunities for students;
   d. Conference attendance by faculty; and
   e. Professional memberships that are not reimbursable professional development costs;
   f. Lack of support for professional development among lecturers (e.g., conference attendance); and
   g. Research opportunities for students.

B. The **external reviewers** noted the following weaknesses and challenges regarding developing and applying resources:

   1. Inability of resources to keep up with a growing and successful program;
   2. The ratio of tenure-track to lecturer faculty is far from ideal;
   3. Resources used to maintain concentrations could be used more efficiently;
   4. Extensive service by tenure-track faculty to other departments and the University stretches the already scarce faculty resources; but, withdrawal of tenure-track faculty from these activities places the level of service and contributions to the College, University, and Department in jeopardy;
   5. Limited faculty development funds restrict access to conferences that offer workshops on the scholarship of teaching and learning, participating in academic discussions and exposure to current research and debates in the field, developing and maintaining significant networks crucial to placing undergraduate students into Ph.D. programs; and
   6. Four-unit courses do not limit the time faculty are in the classroom but do limit the number of course offerings by tenure-track faculty.

C. The **Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences** cited the following weaknesses and challenges regarding developing and applying resources:

   1. The program's capacity to meet the needs of students with available resources, resulting in extended waitlists in some courses, affects program quality and students' time to graduation;
   2. Service to other programs is the most significant contributor to the program's capacity problems; and

3. Solutions to the program's capacity problems that are short-term and do not address the fundamental issues underlying them.

III. Sociology B.A. Program Future Plans and Recommendations

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following future plans and recommendations:

1. Seek additional tenure-track positions;

2. Seek funds to support faculty research and conference attendance;

3. Further develop the SLO course matrix, especially regarding integration of the new SLO focused on public sociology;

4. Continue to improve evaluation and apply annual assessment results; follow up on assessment of selected program-level changes resulting from assessment;

5. Investigate ways of addressing/responding to high remediation rates among majors;

6. Increase research experiences for students;

6. Seek full-time technology support to meet student and facility needs; and

7. Explore ways to optimize class sizes and distributions among class types to meet increased student demand, e.g., offering targeted large sections.

B. The **external reviewers** noted the following future plans and recommendations:

1. Assessment:

a. More flexibility is needed to conduct an assessment of SLOs, critically analyze the results, discuss a pedagogically sound plan for changes put into place, and then assess changes.

Program Response: We agree that flexibility is needed in conducting assessments of program SLOs and hope that the annual assessment process can be adjusted to allow for such flexibility. For example, after assessing an SLO and making changes to the program, we would like the option to follow up with an assessment of the effectiveness of these change(s) rather than proceeding to assessment of another SLO.

b. Compare outcomes, specifically sampling the in-class and on-line formats, to ensure that the courses have similar student learning outcome results.

Program Response: We agree that it is important to conduct assessments in both in-class and on-line courses to insure quality across different course formats. In fact, in past annual assessments, we have attempted to assess both in-class and on-line sections of the same courses. However, given low historic response rates that we have experienced in assessing on-line courses, it has been difficult to compare student mastery of SLOs between in-person and on-line courses. However, we will explore other assessment modes and attempt to build such comparisons into the five-year assessment plan that we are currently constructing.

c. Assess long-term quality of program through data on employment and further education of graduates which would also provide community networks for job placement, research, and fund raising.

2. Curriculum:

a. Classes with high non-major enrollments might best be served as on-line classes and reserve more traditional and research-based courses for majors.

Program Response: We currently lack sufficient faculty resources to implement the reviewers' recommendation to move non-majors into on-line courses. That said, we are in the process of discussing how many GE courses we want to offer, but it should also be noted that much of the demand in "high demand courses" comes not from students enrolled in GE courses but, rather, from those who are attempting to enroll in Sociology courses required for majors outside of the Department.

b. Increase enrollment size of on-line courses and reserve smaller classes and research opportunities for majors in upper-division classes.

Program Response: We are in the process of implementing a targeted approach to increasing enrollment in some of our classes. We find the prospect of increasing caps dramatically in on-line classes to be a poor pedagogical choice as many of our students are in need of remediation, and many find the on-line format to be challenging. Larger on-line classes would only increase failure rates precipitously.

c. Revisit offering G.E. courses and those servicing other programs.

Program Response: See response to 2. a. above.

d. Faculty are already teaching in the Extended Learning in the summer for their own personal benefits. This participation in the Extended Learning program needs to be reevaluated in consideration of how the overall Department can benefit by generating faculty development funds and other resources.

Program Response: Rather than teaching in Extended Learning for our "own personal benefits," as a Department, we have thoughtfully considered how to offer courses in Extended Learning during the Intersession and Summer Sessions that best serve Departmental, College, and student needs. We consider ourselves fortunate to have faculty dedicated enough to teach during these sessions. And, we will continue to carefully consider how our students may best be served through Extended Learning. As funds coming back to the Department from Extended Learning increase, we will most definitely deploy these funds to both cover administrative costs as well as give thoughtful consideration to how they may be used to benefit the Department.

e. Reassess concentrations in light of the needs of the majors and focus on limiting the number of course offerings delivered in the classroom.

Program Response: We have consistently been able to supply courses for each of our concentrations as demand dictates. Moreover, we believe that commitment to our concentration areas enables us to prepare students for a range of future careers and insures consistent breadth and diversity in our curriculum and course offerings. Finally, considering both the advantages (e.g., flexibility and access) and disadvantages (students who prefer face-to-face learning environments), we are committed to preserving a balance between both on-line and in-person classes.

f. All tenure-track and lecturer faculty need to be available for face-to-face office hours (including Skype), regardless of teaching on-line or in-class courses.

Program Response: We agree with the external reviewers that both in-class and on-line students need regular access to instructor office hours and that a process for insuring access for on- line instructors needs to be established. In the absence of University or College policies related to this issue, the Department plans to discuss and institute such a Departmental policy during this academic year. And, we have begun to research technologies such as GoToMeeting that would facilitate this process.

g. Explore ways to offer career counseling, such as a career fair or incorporating discussions about skill sets offered in the major, in classes.

Program Response: We offer a capstone internship course in which students may explore future career opportunities as they apply what they have learned in the classroom to the work of community organizations and agencies. The College has also recently launched a Career Readiness Initiative focused on student internships in which our Department is already playing a part. Finally, we look forward to building bridges with Karie White, the Career Center's newly appointed liaison to CHABSS.

h. Offer capstone courses and other research-based opportunities in the summer and winter sessions;

    Program Response: The 12-day winter session is simply too short to offer these intensive, core capstone experiences for students. The Capstone in Sociological Scholarship, SOC 480, has been scheduled previously in the summer but had to be cancelled for lack of enrollment. We are considering offering the Capstone in Community Service, SOC 495, over two summer sessions.

i. Develop more systematic offerings for service learning and student research rather than relying on faculty volunteers; certain courses might be designated as offering a service learning or research experience.

    Program Response: Service learning and the incorporation of research into classes require substantial additional work for faculty who, as our Self Study documents, are already pushed to their maximum capacity. However, as we work on our expanded SLO matrix and our five-year assessment plan this year, we will explore ways to incorporate these suggestions to more systematically offer service learning and research components in our classes. One possible avenue to explore might be the adoption of a lab model that allows students to add a service learning or research component onto a particular course for additional units.

j. Develop a database using service learning and internships to provide students with network opportunities for future employment.

    Program Response: We already have a robust internship database for our capstone internship course that has been developed over many years of partnership with community agencies and that provides academically sound internships. We are continually updating and adding to our internship placements and will work with Karie White, the Career Center liaison to CHABSS, to enhance the database. Additionally, we will work towards highlighting these connections for our graduating seniors by, for example, linking our database to our Departmental webpage and referring graduates to the service-learning database.

k. Expand the database of potential intern opportunities consistent with student interests.

    Program Response: See program response to 2.j. above.

l. Continue to focus on research skills specific to library work in all core classes for the   major including both lower and upper-division courses and collaboration with the Librarian when developing assignments.

    Program Response: This is an excellent idea that is consistent with current efforts to expand the focus on library research skills. For example, in several of our undergraduate courses, the Social Science Librarian works in an on-line video

format with students who are learning to conduct literature reviews, imparting skills, and providing (virtual) hands- on guidance. We will continue to pursue links to the Library to take advantage of the excellent resources and innovative modalities that they provide.

m. Consider limiting class size for courses required for the major and increasing lower-division enrollments (e.g., SOC 101) and upper-division Sociology electives (e.g., SOC 303).

Program Response: As noted in our Future Plan, we are in the process of Departmental discussions about how we will increase class sizes in targeted, high demand courses, such as SOC 101 and SOC 303, that serve a high volume of students from other majors.

n. Continue to include small group work to enhance students' skill sets for employment, including collaborative problem solving and decision making.

Program Response: We appreciate the reviewers' recognition of our innovative pedagogies, such as small group work, and will continue to encourage their use.

o. Continue to ensure that majors have access to traditional classroom instruction and that on-line offerings are limited to specific student populations.

Program Response: We refer the committee back to our response to the first recommendation under Capacity and Subsequent Quality of the Program regarding our approach to, and the reviewers' implicit assumptions about, on-line teaching. We will continue our commitment to quality teaching in both on-line and face-to-face classes as well as a balance between these modalities according to the diverse needs and inclinations of our students.

p. Develop the skill base for public sociology, such as video and photography (e.g., in a summer workshop for majors or through creative joint ventures connecting Department faculty and students with local video documentary producers, filmmakers, cartoonists, web designers as well as non-profit, community-based business or government organizations, as suggested by the ASA Task Force).

Program Response: Some in the program are already actively utilizing these skills in their teaching and research. Expansion of a public sociology skill base such as videography or photography is currently beyond the resource capacity of the department, given current demands as documented in our Self Study. While we are doubtful that a summer workshop would be financially feasible, we will, in the future, consider offering such a workshop as an elective during the year.

q. Given the local population that CSUSM serves, develop a course on immigration and sociology.

Program Response: We recognize the importance of developing a course on immigration and sociology. In fact, in the most recent HAPC call, we requested a hire specializing in immigration issues, since we believe that our curriculum would benefit from development of a number of courses related to this issue. In the meantime, we broadly incorporate a study of immigration into many of our classes including Latino Communities, Families and Poverty, and Race and Ethnicity, among others.

r. Incorporate sexuality into more classes.

   Program Response: Similar to the previous recommendation, we requested a hire in sexualities in the last HAPC call in order to enhance our offerings in this area. Until this position is granted, we cover the topic of sexualities in our inequalities course in addition to our separate course dedicated to the topic (e.g., SOC 307 Human Sexuality). It is difficult to see how to expand this offering without enhanced resources, especially as we will be losing our specialist in sexualities to retirement this year.

s. Further expand methods courses to include video, photography, and other kinds of media to connect with local, state, national, and international organizations.

   Program Response: See program response to 2.p. above.

3. Outreach

a. Develop a systematic tool for disseminating faculty and student scholarship to the larger community.

   Program Response: We like the idea of a newsletter but recognize that this would be a resource and labor intensive endeavor, requiring faculty supervision. Again, such a task is beyond the current capacity of the Department.

b. Develop an on-line newsletter designed by students to disseminate information and highlight community activities and research projects being done by the program.

   Program Response: See program response to 3.a. above.

c. Engage in networking at conferences with a strong public sociology presence.

   Program Response: We agree with this recommendation and would welcome additional faculty Development funds to support attendance at national meetings.

d. University administrators need to assist the Department in obtaining the

cooperation of alumni services in obtaining contact information for graduating majors;

Program Response: We have attempted in the past to obtain contact information for our graduates but were told that we could not have access to this information. We believe that ongoing contact with graduates would cultivate support for both the Department and the University and look forward to assistance from the administration in obtaining contact information for graduating and graduated majors.

4. **Faculty and Student Development**

   a. Prioritize strategies for increasing travel funds for faculty to attend national meetings with a strong inclusion of public sociology.

      Program Response: See program response to 3.c. above.

   b. Create a public sociology award for faculty and students that reinforces the significance of sociologically-informed research and practice.

      Program Response: We have long cultivated a different approach to reinforcing the significance of sociologically-informed research and practice that emphasizes collaboration, rather than competition, among our colleagues. We believe that institutionalizing such awards would be philosophically contrary to our approach as a Department that tries to encourage collaborative participation among faculty and graduate students; we believe that awards would undermine these values that we have worked hard to achieve.

   c. The necessary resources should be given to sustain and grow the program and to insure that probationary faculty have the means to excel.

C. The **Dean of the Library** recommends the following future plans:

   1. Sociology and Library faculty should collaborate to ensure success of all Sociology students, especially with regard to improving mastery of the SLO related to finding and evaluating information; and
   2. Utilize the Library's Information and Literacy Program to assist students with mastery of the Sociology program's SLO related to finding and synthesizing information.

D. The **Dean of IITS** recommends the following future plans:

   1. Take advantage of opportunities offered by IITS for faculty development related to teaching and learning such as summer TULIP and assistance using Cougar Courses as well as cutting edge methodologies that help lessen the burden on faculty for investigating and incorporating new technologies and approaches;

2. Compliance with CSU ATI Guidelines for instructional materials; and
3. Utilize resources for instructional development in MERLOT.

E. The **Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts, Social and Behavioral Sciences** recommends the following future plans:

1. Continue to "close the loop" on assessment by using assessment findings to improve the program and assess the efficacy of curricular changes such as the increased number of concentrations, four-unit courses, and making methods training more expansive and rigorous in future assessments;
2. Take delivery modes into account in assessments to determine the efficacy of the program's on-line course delivery;
3. Consider a "spin-off" of an online Sociology degree, given the number of courses delivered on-line;
4. Make more explicit connections between the curriculum, including concentrations, and preparation for future careers in collaboration with the Career Readiness Initiative;
5. Assess whether so many lecturer faculty teaching core courses is appropriate;
6. Consider the following strategies for prioritizing the program's activities and shifting resources to best serve its undergraduate majors:

   a. Prioritize courses that ought to be offered for four units and reduce the number of four-unit courses as one mechanism to serve more students with available faculty resources;
   b. Provide a rationale for offering four-unit, on-line courses;
   c. Consider reducing GE contributions and increase enrollment in some high demand GE courses (e.g., SOC 303) in order to accommodate more students;
   d. Revisit agreements to provide courses for other majors;
   e. Selectively increase enrollments in courses in which it pedagogically appropriate, and consult NCAT in doing so;
   f. Utilize graduate students to assist as T.A.s in courses with high enrollment caps;
   g. Employ innovative uses of video technology to overcome space limitations on campus to enable offering high enrollment courses;
   h. Reconsider the number of concentrations, given the significant waitlist issues, focusing both on cost and to insure that these concentrations areas have a meaningful impact on students; and
   i. Consider declaring impaction, combined with a reduction in demand from non-majors.

IV. The PAC's Sociology B.A. Program Review Conclusions and Recommendations

The PAC thanks the faculty of the Sociology Department for the completion of their Program Review and especially for its very thorough discussion of its curriculum, SLO

assessment process, resources, and future plans for achieving educational outcomes. It is clear from this review that faculty work extremely hard and are diligent in their efforts to provide a high quality educational experience and achieve goals that fulfill the teaching mission of the University. The PAC acknowledges that the Sociology faculty, like those in departments across the campus, are realizing these accomplishments despite a severe shortage of faculty resources.

Contributors to this Program Review have offered thoughtful observations on the current state of the program as well as a rich array of suggestions for future planning for the Sociology B.A. program. In what follows, the PAC draws upon the program Self Study, as well as recommendations from others who have responded to this review, to offer its recommendations for consideration by the Sociology faculty and those who will participate in the MOU process:

A. **The PAC makes the following recommendations to the University Administration and the Sociology Faculty:**

1. **Tenure-track Hires:** With no net increase in the number of tenure-track faculty since 2004, but a significant increase in the number of majors and FTES since that date, the Sociology program suffers a severe shortage of resources that requires heavy dependence on lecturer faculty for program delivery. To this point, the Sociology faculty have, nonetheless, delivered a robust and thriving high quality program. However, it is clear that this level of effort is not sustainable, and unless additional tenure-track lines are allocated to the program in the near future, the quality of the program will suffer.

   Recommendation: In light of its significant growth, as well as the loss of tenure-track faculty who have retired or taken other positions, the PAC strongly encourages the College to allocate both replacement and growth positions to the program.

2. **Support for Faculty and Student Research:** With few resources available to them, faculty have been dedicated to research in their fields, have worked hard to incorporate students into their research, and have disseminated research results to academic audiences and to the broader community. However, this high level of scholarly productivity and student mentoring cannot continue without greater University support.

   Recommendation: The PAC encourages the Sociology faculty to continue its efforts to increase the research experience for students and encourages the administration to support this effort through full-time technology lab support to meet student and faculty research needs.

   Recommendation: The PAC encourages the administration to provide enhanced support for faculty research, including funds for conference attendance.

3. **The Problem of Demand and Resource Allocation:** The shortage of resources, combined with the demand for courses from students in other majors and GE, is severely taxing the program's ability to serve students, including its majors. This situation also threatens to compromise the curriculum and overall quality of the program in that resources allocated from the Dean's Office tend to follow demand, leading to a concentration of resources devoted to service courses and less variety in the courses available to majors.

Recommendation: The PAC recommends either: 1) that the Sociology program receive enhanced funding for service courses that it provides for other programs; or 2) that the Sociology program selectively re-evaluate its commitments to provide service courses for other programs.

Recommendation: The PAC recommends that the Sociology program consider the following strategies offered by the College Dean for prioritizing its activities and shifting resources to best serve its undergraduate majors:

a. Prioritize courses that ought to be offered for four units and reduce the number of four-unit courses as one mechanism to serve more students with available faculty resources;
b. Provide a rationale for offering four-unit, on-line courses;
c. Consider reducing GE contributions and increase enrollment in some high-demand courses (e.g., SOC 303) in order to accommodate more students;
d. Revisit agreements to provide courses for other majors;
e. Selectively increase enrollments in courses in which it is pedagogically appropriate, and consult NCAT in doing so;
f. Utilize graduate students to assist as T.A.s in courses with high enrollment caps;
g. Employ innovative uses of video technology to overcome space limitations on campus to enable offering high enrollment courses;
h. Reconsider the number of concentrations, given the significant waitlist issues, focusing both on cost and to insure that these concentrations areas have a meaningful impact on students; and
i. Consider declaring impaction, combined with a reduction in demand from non-majors.

B. The PAC makes the following recommendations to the Sociology faculty:

1. **Annual Assessment:** The Sociology program's annual assessment efforts, accompanied by program-level changes based on assessment data, have been exemplary! The PAC has the following recommendations to further enhance these efforts:

Recommendation: The PAC recognizes the faculty's desire to engage in follow-up assessments to determine whether or not changes based on assessment data

have been effective. However, WASC mandates assessment of all PSLOs in a review cycle. The PAC therefore encourages the Sociology faculty to think of creative ways to combine the WASC mandate to assess all PSLOs in a review cycle with their desire to determine the effectiveness of program-level changes they have implemented. For example, the program might concentrate on a few PSLOs with follow-up assessments during the first years of the review cycle and assess the other PSLOs in the remaining years, either with no follow-up or follow-up assessments that are carried over into the next review cycle;

Recommendation: The PAC recommends that the Sociology faculty complete the process of incorporating PSLOs into course syllabi and develop a mechanism for continuously insuring that PSLOs are incorporated into all syllabi; and

Recommendation: The PAC encourages the Sociology program to further develop its SLO course matrix, especially regarding integration of the new SLO focused on public sociology.

2. **Degree Completion Through Online Courses:** The PAC applauds the Sociology faculty for its leadership in implementing diverse modes of course delivery, in particular, on-line and hybrid courses, that meet student learning needs and enhance access to courses in the program. It is important to note, however, that in order to remain compliant with WASC requirements, whenever students are able to complete 50% of their major requirements online, the program must undergo the "substantive change process."

Recommendation: The PAC urges the Sociology faculty to be mindful of the WASC stipulation about on-line offerings and to determine whether or not the program has reached the threshold for completing the Sociology B.A. degree that requires going through the "substantive change process."

3. **"Seat time" in Online Courses:** The PAC appreciates the Sociology program's sound pedagogical rationale for increasing the unit value of some of its courses to four units. The Academic Senate's Credit Hour Policy (CSU Coded Memorandum AA:2011-14—CSU Definition of Credit Hour) passed in spring 2012 requires one hour of in class instruction, plus two hours of student work outside of class, for each unit of credit. This means that a total of 45 hours of work over the course of the semester would be required for each unit of an on-line class.

Recommendation: In response to questions about "seat time" in four-unit, on-line courses, and to insure that students receive the appropriate amount of instructionally related activities in on-line courses, the PAC wants to bring to the attention of the Sociology faculty the Academic Senate Credit Hour Policy which contains statements that should be included in the syllabi for on-line and hybrid courses regarding expectations for the number of hours to be spent in

instructionally related activities for three and four-unit on-line courses (i.e., 3-unit course=9 hours/week; 4-unit class=12 hours/week).

Finally, the **PAC's overall recommendation** for the Sociology B.A. degree is for **Continuation with a Notation of Exceptional Quality** that includes a **seven-year review cycle.** In the absence of a previous MOU, the PAC bases this recommendation on the following criteria contained in the Program Review Guidelines:

- the degree to which the annual assessments have generated useful data and whether assessment results have been used to make appropriate changes;
- the degree to which the five-year plan explicitly and appropriately addresses program challenges and enhances or preserves program strengths; and
- the strengths and challenges identified by the review of educational effectiveness and capacity.

The PAC further bases its recommendation on the following characteristics and program accomplishments related to these criteria:

- student learning outcomes that are highly aligned with the University's mission;
- annual assessments that have generated useful data that has been put into practice to make appropriate changes to the program; and
- the program has met or surpassed many of the challenges stemming from outside the program that have been presented to them.

Finally, the Sociology program has already been asked, along with all other departments, to establish a five-year plan for assessing its programmatic student learning outcomes. Since there will be two additional years, beyond the typical five-year review cycle, before its next Self-Study Report, the PAC suggests that the Sociology program use years six and seven of the next review cycle to do follow up assessments of the efficacy of changes made as a result of annual assessments conducted during the first five years.

The PAC congratulates the faculty of the Department of Sociology on the successful completion of its very excellent review of the Sociology B.A. program. In particular, the PAC thanks the faculty for its hard work, excellent program, and for their ongoing commitment to student achievement while responding to significant challenges. The PAC wishes the Sociology faculty success in their continuing efforts to meet these challenges and in realizing its plans for the future development of its program.

cc: Jackie Trishman, Chair, Academic Senate
Marcia Woolf, Coordinator, Academic Senate
Graham Oberem, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Adam Shapiro, Dean, College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences
Program Assessment Committee

Academic Senate 2012-2013

Faculty Grants Committee -- Annual Report

Members: Ann Fiegen, *Library 12-13(Chair);* Alyssa Sepinwall*, at large 12-14*; Ludmila Matiash, *Lecturer* 11-13; Qi Sun, *11-F12 (*Raj Pillai *Spring 13*), *CoBA*; Salah Moukhlis, *CHABSS-A&H 11-13,*vacant Sp 13; Pamela Stricker, *CHABSS-S&BS* 11-13; Todd Astorino*, CEHHS*, 12-13; *CSM, vacant*; Gerardo Gonzales, *AVP-Research* (*ex-officio)*;

Scope:
        The Committee prepares a call, leads a Faculty Center sponsored workshop, and reviews and recommends grant proposals for University Professional Development grants (UPD). Chancellor's office funds for the Research, Scholarship, and Creative (RSC) Activity Grant program were not available for 12/13. The process is administered and supported by the Office of Graduate Studies and Research.
        The committee met twice this fall to revise and send out the call for proposals, facilitates a faculty grant proposal workshop in early spring, and meets 4 times in spring to review and recommend proposal awards to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research.

Accomplishments:
        Thanks to the Office of Graduate Studies and Research the UPD/RSC grant submission process is paperless. Links to the call and proposal submission are on the Faculty Research page of the Office of Graduate Studies and Research website, as well as links off the Faculty Center website. The Committee uses a Cougar Community Courses managed by Graduate Studies and Research.
        Proposals were due a few weeks into the spring semester (due Feb 18th). A review period for College Deans was built into the schedule which replaces the "dean's signature" requirement. The Committee led a Faculty Center UPD proposal writing Workshop Feb 5, from 12-1 attended by 9 faculty. The Committee reviewed 38 proposals totaling $180,378.30 in requests for funds. The Committee recommended 21 proposals for awards totaling approximately $75,000 the approximate UPD limit for 2012-2013.   One committee member submitted a proposal, report on the status of that proposal is pending notice.

Challenges:
        The Committee appreciates the support of the President and Provost for the Professional Development Grants but has serious concerns that the chancellor's office withholds research funding for the Research and Creative Activity Grants. This action puts the research process in jeopardy for assistant and associate faculty seeking tenure and promotion and significantly limits opportunities for full faculty.

Recommendations:

1.   A comprehensive report of internal research funds available to faculty within colleges and departments across campus would provide a better picture of equity of opportunity for all levels of faculty and serve as resource for faculty searching for different funding sources.
2.   The Committee had scheduling challenges this year again. Having representatives from all colleges on the committee is critical for adding a discipline perspective to committee deliberations. Recommend that the Committee consider a published standing time so those volunteers know in advance what their commitment will be.
3.   The Committee recommends that the colleges, Faculty Center and grant writers increase mentoring for faculty submitting proposals.