### PART ONE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the learning objectives?</th>
<th>How, where, and when are they assessed? Committee/person responsible?</th>
<th>What are the expectations?</th>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>How will/have the results be used? Committee/person responsible?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate knowledge of word processing, statistical analysis and spreadsheet use.</td>
<td>Initially assessed in Research Methods (3620) &amp; Statistics (3610); terminally assessed via exit exam embedded in capstone course. Course instructors discuss results with assessment coordinator for analysis and curricular revision.</td>
<td>Score of 70%-80% on assessment exam; course letter grade C for satisfactory performance</td>
<td>GRADE: 58.5% exceeded expectations; 28.7% met expectations; 12.8% did not meet expectations. ASSESSMENT EXAM: 28.8% exceeded expectations; 12.1% met expectations; 59.1% did not meet expectations</td>
<td>Courses are revised as necessary to enhance opportunities to acquire objective. Curriculum committee and relevant course instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate knowledge of sociological theories &amp; applications</td>
<td>Initially assessed in Theory (2850 &amp; 3250); terminally assessed via exit exam embedded in capstone course. Course instructors discuss results with assessment coordinator for analysis and curricular revision.</td>
<td>Score of 70%-80% on assessment exam; course letter grade C for satisfactory performance.</td>
<td>GRADE: 39.4% exceeded expectations; 40.8% met expectations; 19.7% did not meet expectations. ASSESSMENT EXAM: 12.1% exceeded expectations; 15.1% met expectations; 72.7% did not meet expectations</td>
<td>Courses are revised as necessary to enhance opportunities to acquire objective. Curriculum committee and relevant course instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demonstrate knowledge &amp; understanding of skills</td>
<td>Initially assessed in Research Methods (3620); terminally</td>
<td>Score of 70%-80% on assessment exam; course letter grade C for satisfactory performance.</td>
<td>GRADE: 67.3% exceeded expectations; 30.9% met expectations</td>
<td>Courses are revised as necessary to enhance opportunities to acquire objective. Curriculum committee and relevant course instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Objective</td>
<td>Assessment Methodology</td>
<td>Grade Requirement</td>
<td>Assessment Results</td>
<td>Course Revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for conducting sociological research</td>
<td>assessed via exit exam in capstone course. Course instructors discuss results with assessment coordinator for analysis &amp; curricular revision</td>
<td>grade C for satisfactory performance.</td>
<td>57.6% exceeded expectations; 21.2% met expectations; 1.8% did not meet expectations</td>
<td>Curriculum committee and relevant course instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrate sociological consciousness/imagination, recognizing the link between individual experiences/issues &amp; larger social forces</td>
<td>Initially assessed in Intro Sociology (2710); terminally assessed via exit exam in capstone course. Course instructors discuss results with assessment coordinator for analysis &amp; curricular revision</td>
<td>Score 70%-80% on assessment exam; course letter grade C for satisfactory performance</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT EXAM: 57.6% exceeded expectations; 21.2% met expectations; 21.2% didn’t meet expectations</td>
<td>Courses are revised as necessary to enhance opportunities to acquire objective. Curriculum committee and relevant course objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demonstrate a sociological perspective promoting multicultural understanding, tolerance &amp; acceptance of diversity</td>
<td>Initially assessed in Stratification (2721); terminally assessed via exit exam in capstone course. Course instructors discuss results with assessment coordinator for analysis &amp; curricular revision</td>
<td>Score of 70%-80% on assessment exam; course letter grade C for satisfactory performance</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT EXAM: 39.4% exceeded expectations; 12.1% met expectations; 48.5% didn’t meet expectations</td>
<td>Courses are revised as necessary to enhance opportunities to acquire objective. Curriculum committee and relevant course instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstrate an ability to think critically</td>
<td>Initially assessed in Theory (3250); terminally assessed via exit exam in capstone course. Course instructors discuss results with assessment coordinator for analysis &amp; curricular revision</td>
<td>Score of 70%-80% on assessment exam; course letter grade C for satisfactory performance</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT EXAM: 21.2% exceeded expectations; 15.2% met expectations; 63.6% didn’t meet expectations</td>
<td>Courses are revised as necessary to enhance opportunities to acquire objective. Curriculum committee and relevant course instructors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART TWO. Summarize changes and improvements in curriculum, instruction, and learning that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. While this section should focus on the current academic year, some departments may find it useful to discuss trends in longitudinal data.

Last summer (2002), the Department of Sociology and Anthropology revised a number of core courses, based on assessment, to enhance learning objectives. Sociology 2850 (Classical Sociological Theory), formally 3520 (History an Development of Sociological Thought), was reduced in course level to encourage students to take the course earlier in their college career. Similarly, Sociology 3250 (Contemporary Sociological Theory), was formally Sociology 4250. Theory is the heart and language of the discipline, and students needed exposure to such fundamentals earlier in their careers to appreciate and excel in later coursework. The instructors coordinated the selection and use of the same textbook to provide to students a sense of continuity and development in sociological theory.

Sociology 3610 (Statistics) was formally a 3 hour course. It was increased to a 4 hour course to accommodate the inclusion of a 2 hour lab component to increase student exposure to statistics and their applications and to provide students the opportunity of practical exercises in statistics.

To coincide and coordinate with Sociology 3610, Sociology 3620 (Research Methods) began employing SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences), an analytical program, and GSS data. The continuity of analytical programs and common data sets provide students a familiarity that facilitates accelerated comprehension and makes the relationship between statistics and methods seamless.

Since these changes have been in place only one year, the full impact has yet to be assessed. However, the faculty’s professional assessment is that these changes will strengthen and enhance student accomplishment of learning objectives and improve program quality for the benefit of students.
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On occasion, assessment activities will not fit preconceived institutional templates, nor should they. Meaningful assessment ought to be dynamic and proactive, or it becomes rote and staid, executed more in response to the mandate of “doing” assessment, rather than in response to its intent to continually seek programmatic improvement.

On April 28, 2004, Blair Hall was gutted by fire and it was later determined that the Department of Sociology and Anthropology lost its assessment materials and measurement mechanisms in that fire. Prior to the fire, assessment efforts in the Department were substantially quantitative, and while its assessment reports are on line electronically, without the original measurement mechanisms
(questionnaires and exams) on which those reports were based, longitudinal comparisons would be methodologically unsound and even disingenuous. Without the ability to reconstruct those original, internally-developed mechanisms, the Department is exploring a new point of assessment departure, and that has again included consideration of commercially-available, nationally-normed assessment exams. However, as in the past, that has ultimately been rejected because of three interrelated philosophical and pragmatic reasons: such nationally-normed exams are expensive; such nationally-normed exams turn assessment into a profit industry that diminishes the nature of local responsibility; such nationally-normed exams do not recognize the unique character and requirements of individual programs and may ultimately solicit a “teaching to the test.” Hence, it is the intent of the department to begin anew, developing its own “home-grown” exit exam for assessment purposes. A new (and improved) exam will be drafted during the fall semester and administered at the end of the spring semester, and the last quantitative results of assessment (presented above) will serve as the baseline for the Department’s new assessment mechanism, but again, it must be acknowledged that the commonality between the “old” assessment results and the “new” assessment results is merely focus on core areas, and explicit comparisons are precluded since different instruments yielded the results.

On April 28, 2005, ironically, one year to the day following the Blair Hall fire, intensive exit interviews/discussions were conducted with 33 graduating majors. Program assessment was discussed openly and candidly with the students, and it was made clear that the intent of program assessment was to improve the major for the benefit of the students. Students were encouraged to be honest in their critique of the program, and they were given to understand that only they could genuinely recognize deficiencies from a student perspective. Examples of program revision driven by assessment were identified so that students could better comprehend the nature and intent of assessment.

**Assessment Driven Program/Curricular Revisions Prior to April 28, 2004**

- Developing a classical theory course at the 2000 level to encourage early enrollment
- Reducing the contemporary theory course from 4250 to 3250 to encourage earlier enrollment and exposure
- Adding a lab component to statistics, and taking it from a 3 hour course to a 4 hour course
- Adding new elective courses for student selection, including environmental sociology and medical sociology.

Students were asked to individually identify any 2 or 3 improvements that they could envision for the major in sociology. Student recommendations revolved around only several issues (numbers in parentheses indicate the number of students who independently made the recommendations):

**Core Course Revisions**
• Remove introduction to anthropology as a core requirement (3); to be referred to the Assessment and Curriculum Committees.
• Creation of a second required statistic course, with 1 at the 2000 level and 1 at the 3000 or 4000 level (7); to be referred to the Assessment and Curriculum Committees.
• Make research methods a 2000 level course to encourage earlier enrollment (3); to be referred to the Assessment and Curriculum Committees.
• Create a second methods course (2); to be referred to the Assessment and Curriculum Committees.
• Offer more core courses in the summer (2); to be taken under advisement by the chair and in consideration of the number of majors year to year. As a note, the Department offered three core courses this summer (2005) and all courses enrolled over 30 students each.
• Require more comprehensive research projects to employ the entire methodological process (3); to be referred to all faculty, particularly those teaching upper division courses, for considered implementation within individual courses.

Elective Course Revisions
• Create more criminology courses or create a criminology minor (6); to be referred to Assessment and Curriculum Committees, but ultimately dependent upon new staff positions and faculty expertise; an interdisciplinary minor is currently being discussed with political science.
• Create more coursework in the area of social work (2); to be referred to the Assessment and Curriculum Committees.
• Offer multiple sections of electives at different times throughout the day (3); this is currently not possible with existing staff unless less diversity of courses is offered each semester.
• Promote independent studies and internships more (2); to be referred to faculty at large, with particular focus on departmental advisors.
• Create an applied sociology course that would address different employment settings for BA’s in sociology (2), work placement upon graduation (1), and would incorporate presentations by those with sociology degrees who are working in various settings (1); to be referred to Assessment and Curriculum Committees.
• Require more comprehensive research projects to employ the entire methodological process (3); to be referred to all faculty, particularly those of upper-division courses, for considered implementation within individual courses.

Technology Issues
• Have better/newer technology in classrooms (2); this will occur with the reconstruction of Blair Hall.
• Offer courses via WebCT (2); to be referred to all faculty for their considered implementation.
**Student Research Opportunities**

- Create a “departmental research fair,” giving research-active faculty the opportunity to present their current research agendas at the beginning of each academic year to all interested students who would qualify for independent study credit (see 4th bullet under Elective Course Revisions), the intent being to match up faculty research with student interests; *to be referred to all research-active faculty for discussion and possible implementation.*

While students were highly positive regarding the communication between students and professors, and the preparation and knowledge of professors, they were acutely insightful and focused on programmatic revision and improvement, as witnessed by their above suggestions. Rather consistently, students exude a dread of statistics, research methods, and theory, yet they realized that more, not less, is better, suggesting that they realistically recognize these substantive areas as the “heart and soul” of the discipline and that gives further credence to the recommendations offered. Moreover, their recommendations, deriving from qualitative perceptions, are not inconsistent with the results of the quantitative indicators of previous assessment efforts. Recommendation referrals regarding core courses, the substantive focus of assessment within the Department, will be held by all committees and faculty at large until quantitative measures from the Departmental exit exam are obtained; if quantitative measures suggest that substantial deficiencies within core areas are present, student recommendations will be taken under further advisement for possible implementation; regardless, student recommendations are not to be summarily dismissed, but are ultimately to be weighed as part of the totality of assessment strategies within the Department.

That said, it is also acknowledged that some recommendations offered are well beyond those suggested by quantitative measures alone. Particularly intriguing is the proposed “research fair” that would pair up faculty/student research interests. While that alone would not ultimately involve a large number of students, it would expose all interested students to the nature of research being done by faculty, giving them the opportunity to engage a diversity of research experiences (from research designing to collecting, coding and analyzing data, to presenting and publishing), and is the sort of feature/activity that distinguishes high quality programs.