

Department of Sociology-Anthropology  
Six Year Program Review Report  
18 October 2010  
Laura M Montgomery  
Department Chair 1999-2003; 2004-2010

**1. Executive Summary:**

**Our Mission and Student Learning Outcomes**

The mission of the Sociology-Anthropology Department is to develop our majors' capacities as social scientists to think critically and globally about human experience. The department offers students the richness of a multi-disciplinary study of the ways in which culture and society influence human behavior. We provide students a foundation in the concepts, theories, and methods of sociology and anthropology. Students also have the opportunity to take courses related to social work. Our majors may tailor their course of study around one of three major tracks: General Sociology, Human Services, or Cross-Cultural Studies. Along with a strong academic background in sociology and anthropology, we want our students' interests in these disciplines to be grounded within the Christian faith. We place emphasis upon not only the acquisition of knowledge and skills but also the ability to use them to serve others and to further the building of Christ's Kingdom.

To fulfill this mission, we have developed four major skill areas each with its own specific student learning outcomes, reflecting both disciplinary and college-wide learning standards (noted in parentheses), to direct our curriculum:

- **Conceptual Skills**

1. Students would have a working knowledge of the foundational concepts of sociology or anthropology. (*Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)
2. Students would understand and be conversant in the main theoretical perspectives in one of the two disciplines, particularly current theoretical models and paradigms. (*Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)
3. Students will demonstrate the ability to bring dimensions of diversity, especially gender, social class, and ethnicity and culture to the discussion

and analysis of issues within sociology, anthropology, and social work. (*Diversity, Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)

4. Students will be aware of major controversies, debates, or issues within one or the other discipline. (*Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)

5. Students are able to develop coherent, evidenced-based arguments. (*Critical Interdisciplinary Thinking; Written and Oral Communication*)

- **Methodological Skills**

6. Students are able to develop a research problem and select appropriate methods and data analysis techniques, consistent with the ethical principles of the disciplines. (*Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)

7. They understand and can use the major research methods of both disciplines. (*Critical Interdisciplinary Thinking*)

8. Students would also be able to manage and document appropriately any data they have collected using those methods. (*Technology*)

9. They will understand and can use data analysis techniques such as basic statistics and content analysis. (*Technology*)

- **Applied Skills**

10. Students are able to apply the foundational concepts of sociology or anthropology accurately to the analysis of social behavior.

11. Students can write effectively in sociological or anthropological style. (*Written and Oral Communication*)

12. Students will have applied their knowledge within an experiential learning context such as a practicum, field experience, or approved off-campus program. (*Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement*)

13. Students can converse specifically about how the contributions of sociological or anthropological concepts, theories, and methods can contribute to alleviation of human needs and problems, further building the Kingdom of God. They should also be able to implement such knowledge. (*Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement; Christian Orientation*)

14. Students will through coursework or experiential learning gain increased cross-cultural communication and adaptation skills. (*Diversity*)

15. Students will be able to frame, analyze, and approach issues and problems through the multi-disciplinary lens of sociology, social work, and anthropology. (*Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)

- **Faith and Learning Skills**

16. Students would understand the Biblical concepts of community and justice and demonstrate an ability to use anthropological and sociological knowledge and methods to pursue greater social justice. Likewise, students should be aware of the limits of both disciplines to produce or result in Biblical justice. (*Christian Orientation*)

17. Students will be exposed to materials and experiences which will strengthen their compassion for all peoples, especially the poor, the oppressed, or the weak, and develop their capacity for Christian servanthood. (*Christian Orientation; Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement*)

18. Students are able to use the Biblical concepts and perspectives to engage in cultural and social-critique and to identify and analyze the influence of culture and society upon Christian faith and practice. (*Christian Orientation; Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)

See chart 1 for a schematic of how these skills articulate within the campus-wide learning outcomes.

### **Notable Findings**

- Our sociology program conforms to disciplinary guidelines and recommendations though a course specifically devoted to social stratification to supplement our current offerings on gender and race and ethnicity would enhance the program.
- Our curriculum is equivalent to or broader than what is available at other Christian College Consortium institutions.
- The department has a clearly articulated mission and related student learning outcomes. We have developed a robust assessment program that generates evidence which we use to modify and strengthen our major programs.
- Senior seminar papers meet or exceed the benchmark of a “good paper;” however we would like to see more consistency in their quality.

- All graduating seniors pass a test of the “100 Central Concepts in Sociology.”
- Survey results indicate that our graduating seniors either agree or strongly agree that they have achieved almost all student learning outcomes.
- Our majors who participate in Westmont in Mexico develop greater intercultural sensitivity than those participating in other study-abroad programs.
- Student interest in anthropology has surged with almost the same number declaring it as an alternative major in 2009-2010 as have graduated with the major in the last six years. Sociology majors have also increased their participation in the cross-cultural track.
- Among all Westmont academic departments, we rank 6<sup>th</sup> in the average number of graduates and 7<sup>th</sup> in the generation of student credit hours.
- Westmont College ranks in the upper-third of the top 250 Baccalaureate institutions and 3<sup>rd</sup> in the Christian College Coalition in the number of graduates who complete doctorates in anthropology and sociology
- The department’s average annual number of sociology graduates (excluding anthropology majors) is well above the median reported nationally by sociology departments at Baccalaureate I and II institutions, yet our number of full-time faculty falls below the median at Baccalaureate I institutions.
- The department represents three related but separate disciplines: sociology, anthropology, and social work; the current number of allocated FTEs is unreflective of its multi-disciplinary character.
- Faculty workload should be more equitably distributed.
- Most faculty members make important scholarly contribution but lack of personnel can make it difficult to take advantage of professional development opportunities.

- We anticipate significant turnover in personnel as faculty approach retirement though those dates are currently unfixed.

### **Most Important Next Steps**

- Establish a formal anthropology major staffed by two full-time anthropologists. Using the funds made available through the WIM program for fall 2011, hire a full-time anthropologist for the full 2011-2012 academic year and begin a search for a tenure track appointment beginning in fall 2012.
- Have an orientation and re-entry program specifically tailored for our majors who participate in off-campus programs beginning in spring or fall 2012.
- Increase faculty mentoring to encourage more students to participate in student research conferences or symposia, complete major honors, and attend professional conferences. See annual budget requests.
- As discussed more fully in section 7, continue to improve student learning as needed on particular outcomes for methodological, applied, and faith-learning skills
- More equitably distribute the student advising load and instruction of core courses among department faculty.
- Carefully consider how we hire to replace retiring members to enhance the curriculum, distribute the instruction of core courses more widely, and to create more scheduling flexibility.
- Increase the current 0.66 FTE devoted to social welfare to 1 FTE and consider establishment of a social work major and development of a program proposal. However, this is second in priority to hiring an additional anthropologist.
- College increases funds for the department's annual budget to ensure reliable resources for the annual student-faculty retreat.

## **2. Description of Departmental Mission and Role within the College**

### **Contribution to the Mission of the College**

As stated in the 2009-2010 college catalogue, “The Mission of Westmont College is to provide a high quality undergraduate liberal arts program in a residential campus community that assists college men and women toward a balance of rigorous intellectual competence, health personal development, and strong Christian commitments (p. 7).” We incorporate the college’s holistic approach to intellectual, spiritual, and personal development into our mission in at least three specific ways. One, our curriculum conforms to national guidelines and is equivalent to or broader than what is available at other Christian College Consortium schools. Two, we hold an annual student-faculty departmental retreat where we worship corporately, have guest alumni who share the ways in which sociology or anthropology has influenced their professional, personal, and spiritual lives since graduation, and provide an opportunity for faculty and students to become better acquainted with one another outside of the classroom or office hours. Three, at least every other year, the department has arranged a “Day of Service” where students and faculty volunteer together at a Christian organization or ministry that serves the marginalized, needy, and the poor.

In a broader sense, sociology and anthropology are key disciplines in a Christian, liberal arts education with the goals of educating and developing whole persons. We become fully human with the capacity to honor, glorify, and worship the Lord with all of our mind, heart, and soul and to love our neighbor as ourselves through the social and cultural processes of socialization and enculturation. While each of us are unique expressions of the *Imago Dei*, we are profoundly social beings who develop and live out our physical, spiritual, and emotional lives within a web of shared social meanings and relationships shaped by social structures and

institutions which we in turn maintain and transform. Though limited by human failings, sociology and anthropology provide the concepts, theories, and methods that give us the language to understand and describe with precision not only the nature of our own social world and our role within it but also that of others with the humility that the generation and application of knowledge based upon our own historical traditions may distort another's social reality. Without these tools, Westmont graduates would be less well-equipped to engage an increasingly diverse and interconnected world in meaningful witness and service or to transform social institutions to be more reflective of the Kingdom of God. We pose our students this question from a biblical perspective, "What is a good society?" and enable them to uncover the ways in which sin is more than an individual act but becomes embedded and perpetuated in social structures and institutions creating injustices, oppression, exploitation, and prejudice which are often hidden from view or justified by ideology or our sense of the "natural order of things." Both individuals and the social world must be redeemed.

### **Contribution to the General Education Program**

In addition to the department's academic contribution described above, the department is well embedded within the general education curriculum. We provide fifteen (15) different courses spanning seven (7) general education categories: Thinking Globally, Understanding Society, Speech/Writing Intensive, Quantitative and Analytical Reasoning, Research, Integrating the Major Discipline and Serving Society, Enacting Justice. Nine of these courses are open to non-majors. Each year, an average of 150 students fulfill the Understanding Society requirement through our introductory sociology and anthropology courses, which is significant given that they could choose from courses offered in five other departments. While, with the exception of the social science major, our courses are not required for other majors, four of them fulfill electives or an alternative for a requirement in Communications, French, Political Science,

Religious Studies, and Spanish. Two of our courses are requirements for the gender and ethnic studies minors.

### **3. Basic Statistical Information, Discussion and Analysis:**

#### **Department Contribution to Academic Program**

##### ***Majors:***

One hundred twenty-eight sociology (117) and anthropology (11) majors were graduated from May 2005-May 2010. Over that same period, the annual average number of majors was 21 with a range of 15-27. See chart 2. Over this time period, our average annual number of sociology graduates (excluding anthropology majors) is above the median of fourteen reported by departments of Baccalaureate I and II institutions for the 2006-2007 academic year.<sup>1</sup> Our majors annually represent an average of 6% of the total graduating class and rank 6<sup>th</sup> among all majors. (See chart 3.) Most students (68%) completed the general sociology track; followed by human services (23%), and then the cross-cultural track plus anthropology majors represent 18%. Demographically, women comprise the majority (78%); men represent 22%. Nationally at Baccalaureate institutions 82.2% of graduating sociology majors are women, so we attract slightly more men than is typical.<sup>2</sup> Twenty-two percent (22%) of our graduates represent ethnic minorities. This compares favorably with the total average number (24.1%) of ethnically diverse students enrolled at Westmont which includes non-resident aliens. If we were to include those graduates who identified themselves as “other” and who we know are of mixed ethnicity, our graduates would be more diverse than the overall student body.

---

<sup>1</sup> Spalter-Roth, Roberta. 2008. *What is Happening in Your Department?: A Comparison of Findings from the 2001 and 2007 Department Surveys*. Research Brief. American Sociological Association

<sup>2</sup> American Sociological Association. 2006. *A National Survey of Seniors Majoring in Sociology*.



Our graduates also pursue post-graduate education. Of those from 2005-2010 for whom we have information, twenty-nine (23%) have pursued post-graduate education in social work, anthropology, law, medicine, gerontology, divinity, and international development.<sup>3</sup> Westmont has also produced a significant number of Ph.D.s in sociology and anthropology. According to the Franklin and Marshall study, *Baccalaureate Origins of Doctoral Recipients: A Ranking by Discipline of 4-Year Private Institutions for the Period 1920-1995*, the college ranked 83<sup>rd</sup> (13 doctorates) in the number of doctoral degrees earned in sociology and anthropology out of 250 institutions, representing “the top 50% of all Baccalaureate institutions” (p. 1).<sup>4</sup> Of the Christian College Consortium schools we ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> behind Wheaton (62) and Bethel (14). Using data from the *National Science Foundation Survey of Doctorates* to update this information to 2008—the most recent available—Westmont continues to rank third (18 doctorates) behind Wheaton (76) and Bethel (21). Westmont’s contribution to anthropology and sociology is remarkable given the college is half the age and half the size of these other two, and we have never had a formal anthropology major.

In the last two years, the interests of current majors are increasingly cross-cultural. Since the 2009-2010 academic year, nine students have officially declared anthropology as an alternative major with more students who are in the process of submitting paperwork. This represents a surge in the numbers of declared anthropology majors, almost as many who have graduated in the last six years. Moreover, of the thirty sociology majors who have declared as of October 1, 2010, nine (excluding those double-majoring in sociology with the cross-cultural track and in anthropology) are pursuing the cross-cultural track. In response, the department has

---

<sup>3</sup> Because of the extent of the assessment we were already doing, the Director of Assessment, Marianne Robins, advised us not to do the alumni survey for this six year report but to begin to develop one. We have done this and will finalize it and administer it for our 2010-2011 report.

<sup>4</sup> Franklin and Marshall College. 1998. *Baccalaureate Origins of Doctoral Recipients: A Ranking by Discipline of 4-Year Private Institutions for the Period 1920-1995, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Franklin and Marshall College.

agreed that our next hire will be an anthropologist in order to offer a wider range and more predictability in course offerings, and we will establish a formal anthropology major

We are beginning to explore the possibility of establishing a Bachelor of Social Work (B.S.W) program for a number of reasons. First, we believe that a program would be consistent with the mission of the college as the major would be embedded within the existing liberal arts sociology major. Second, our students have an interest in social work. Twelve of our thirty majors who have graduated with the social service track have pursued a Master's of Social Work degree. A B.S.W. degree is the equivalent of one year of graduate work toward a M.S.W. and would provide an advantage to our students, a potential recruiting tool. Graduates with a B.S.W have many more social service employment opportunities after their undergraduate program than those with only a concentration in social work. (However, they may be more limited in their access to employment more generally related to sociology.) The service orientation of many of the students who attend Christian colleges is very high and the majority of the CCC members offer a social work major. (Wheaton, Westmont, Houghton, Seattle Pacific and Trinity do not; Trinity also does not have a sociology major.) Point Loma and Azusa, who are competitors for our students, do as well. We will be developing a proposal to present to the administration

***Composition of Department Faculty:***

The department represents three related yet distinct disciplines: sociology, anthropology, and social welfare. Currently, 4.66 FTE's are allocated to the department. Three FTEs are assigned to sociology (Enroth, Jaywardene, Zhang), one to anthropology (Montgomery) and 0.66 to human services-social welfare (Alexandre).<sup>5</sup> See charts 4a and 4b; Alexandre is included in charts 5a-5f. While we may appear to exceed the minimum number of three FTEs which the

---

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Alexandre is technically a part-time faculty member, though she functions as a permanent member of the department. While she does not participate in faculty governance, per her contract, she teaches regularly scheduled courses, advises students, attends department meetings and, overall, contributes significantly to the life of the department.

college has determined to be the minimum per department, which in practice has meant discipline, we are, in fact, understaffed as we house more than one discipline. Moreover, 3.66 FTEs in sociology are less than four which is the median number of full-time faculty reported in the American Sociological Association's 2008 survey of departments in Baccalaureate I institutions. This is notable given our average annual number of graduates, 17.2, which excludes students on the cross-cultural track or anthropology majors, is well above the median of the annual graduates from Baccalaureate I and II combined.

With the exception of Dr. Alexandre, we have made limited use of part-time faculty. See charts 5a-f.) Of the adjuncts listed, Dr. Ruben Paredes, was hired twice as a full-time semester replacement while Prof. Montgomery led the Westmont in Mexico (WIM) Program. His salary was funded from the WIM budget. Prof. Perez held a half-time position in the department for the 2006-2007 academic year which was a hybrid position in that she was not a sociologist or anthropologist but had expertise in Latin America, gender, and Chicano Studies.<sup>6</sup> We have hired an adjunct to teach a criminal justice course, a core emphasis within sociology, for which the Provost's Office has occasionally approved the funds. One year, we were able to offer a public health course which was well-enrolled, and students have frequently requested it to be offered again.

Demographically, our department is one of the most diverse on campus. Two of the members are women, and another two are international. We have had two searches in the last nine years for the same position. We first filled it with a Hispanic, male sociologist and then

---

<sup>6</sup> Prof. Perez's hire resulted from a complex set of circumstances. She had been a candidate for a position in Modern Languages but was not offered the position though that decision was not made until very near the end of the spring semester as was the decision to grant an unpaid leave to Prof. Jayawardene. The Provost approached the chair to discuss whether or not Prof. Perez's expertise could be utilized in our department. She was able to teach a course normally offered but which Prof. Montgomery was unable to due to other duties. She also offered a Chicano studies course and did a review of the resources available and needed to support the gender and ethnic studies minor. The funds for salary came from Dr. Jayawardene's unpaid leave.

with a male sociologist from China. In both cases, we explicitly communicated our commitments to the diversity learning standard and to opportunities for our students to study in culturally, ethnically, or socio-economically diverse contexts through off-campus programs as well as our desire to have faculty who can contribute to these commitments. We have also used the opportunity to use the funds that were available to cover Prof. Montgomery's position as WIM resident director to hire someone who would bring our students a Latin American perspective on anthropology and missions. As we look to the future, our goal is to at the least maintain our current diversity within the faculty and, if possible, to expand it.

### ***Faculty Teaching, Research and Service***

#### **Context:**

The department has experienced staffing challenges over the last six years. In spring 2005 we faced the unexpected need to replace a faculty member who had been instrumental in increasing the number of students majoring in the department. Excluding a sabbatical, another member has been on leave for three out of the last twelve semesters without a full-time replacement. Prof. Montgomery has led the Westmont in Mexico Program in the fall of 2005 and 2007 and is scheduled to do so again for fall of 2011. Though we have been able to hire a full-time replacement with funds generated by the program, the challenge has been to find a Christian anthropologist to relocate to Santa Barbara for one semester as we know of no such person in the area; other Christian colleges and universities in the region report the same challenge. Having another full-time anthropologist in the department would provide greater continuity for courses and advising as she continues her involvement with the program, especially since WIM generates financial resources. At least two members (Alexandre and Enroth) are winding down their careers as they approach retirement. Thus, we anticipate more personnel changes in the near future.

**Faculty Load**

We have examined and compared the teaching and advising loads of the department faculty. Table 1 provides information on average annual number course preparations and numbers of students and advisees for each regularly employed department member from 2004-2010; chart 6 provides more detailed load information for the full-time faculty and Prof. Alexandre. Given rotations of course offerings, our analysis of the teaching load indicates that each faculty member teaches comparable average numbers of student credit hours. Overall, sociology and anthropology courses generate an average of 4.9% of the campus total student credit hours ranking 7<sup>th</sup> among departments. (See chart 7.) Prof. Zhang taught a high number of CRSs and Prof. Montgomery taught an overload in 2009-2010 in order to provide the necessary course coverage due to another member’s leave and the difficulty of locating qualified adjuncts. Typically, the annual number of course preparations ranges from 4-6. The review of teaching load and course schedules (not included) points up two of the challenges facing the department. First, while the teaching load may be roughly equivalent, the advising load among the full-time

Table 1: Six Year Average of Course Preparations, Student Credit Hours and Number of Advisees			
	Course Preps	CRS	# of Advisees
<b>Faculty Member</b>			
Judy Alexandre*	3.67	191.33	11.67
Jonathan Cordero**	5.00	488.00	23.00
Ron Enroth	5.17	373.33	19.00
Thomas Jaywardene	3.17	302.67	5.00
*Prof. Alexandre is 2/3 time; **2004-2005 only	5.80	341.83	20.33
Xuefeng Zhang	4.60	470.40	7.00

\*Dr. Alexandre has only a 2/3 appointment; \*\*2004-2005 only

faculty (Enroth, Jayawardene, Montgomery, and Zhang) is not. Over a six year period, the department has an average number of 80 advisees. As shown above in table 1, students are not evenly distributed among full-time professors. Prof Zhang’s numbers will increase over time,

since he was appointed to a tenure track position only in 2007 and as is the practice for new faculty was not assigned advisees his first year. Second, the required core courses are not distributed well among the full-time faculty. For decades, the majority of the core had been taught by one member of the department which is not optimal for our majors. Our students must be exposed to a variety of perspectives, and they should have the opportunity to know more department faculty especially given the college's commitment to high levels of student-faculty interaction. Prior to Dr. Furnish's retirement, students sometimes graduated having taken courses from only two different department members. As a result, it was also possible that some of the faculty had little contact with some of the students before the senior breakfast. We have attempted to address the allocation of core courses in a couple of ways. Prof. Montgomery now teaches SOC 106—Social Research Methods. Though coupled with the department chair course reduction for the last several years, some of the anthropology courses that would otherwise have been taught annually were placed on an every-other-year rotation presenting scheduling challenges for some of our students. In many ways, the rotation generated “new” course preps, because some courses are not taught every year which requires a more frequent re-acquaintance with material. Now that Prof. Enroth is chair, it may be possible to offer some of them again on an annual basis. We added a senior seminar as a requirement and also rotate its teaching assignment among the sociology faculty every two years, though leaves and course reductions have not always made that possible. In spite of those changes and for a variety of reasons we have drifted back towards one professor teaching three of the five core courses. (Since all of the faculty members teach an introductory course, students have a choice of professors.) Unfortunately, tensions with the department have prevented us from addressing the reallocation of the core and an equalization of the advising load.

## ***Professional Activities***

The full-time faculty members engage in a wide variety of professional activities whether publishing, presenting presentations at professional conferences, or speaking on or off-campus in a scholarly capacity. Over the last six years, department members have produced eleven professional publications, given fourteen presentations at professional conferences, and delivered at least nine scholarly lectures. Particular accomplishments are noted in table 2, and more detailed descriptions are provided in individual curriculum vitae found in appendix A. In terms of on-going professional development, our department faculty are involved in a variety of activities, including editorial boards, reviewers for professional journals, board members or research fellows of academic centers, and maintain active research programs. (See

	Professional Publications	Conference Presentations	Other Scholarly Lectures
Ronald Enroth	1*	2	0
Thomas Jayawardene	0	1	5
Laura Montgomery	7**	7	5
Xuefeng Zhang	3**	4	1

Note: \*Edited Book; \*\*Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles, Book Reviews, or Book Chapters

the professional development plans in appendix B.) Dr. Enroth continues his research, writing, and speaking on new or alternative religious movements as well as serves on the editorial board of the *Cultic Studies Review*. His decades-long career studying cults provides this journal with a critical historical perspective in this field. Dr. Jayawardene advises and directs a program that coordinates college, church, and community efforts to continue with development outreach projects in Sri Lanka; serves as a director of the charity, Children of Joy; and lectures on and researches a variety of issues related to international development and globalization. Dr.

Montgomery continues her research, writing, and speaking on short-term medical missions; gender issues in higher education; the development of intercultural communication and adaptation skills, She is co-coordinator of the Westmont in Mexico Program and a member of the Short-term Health Missions Best Practices Working Group. Prof. Zhang researches and publishes on immigration and the relationship of ethnic identity and religion; he was recently appointed a Research Fellow of the Center on Religion and China at Purdue University. Dr. Alexandre, as a practitioner, earns more than the annually required continuing education units, teaches workshops that offer these credits, serves as an ethics consultant for the National Association of Social Workers, participates as a leader in professional organizations, and works as an advocate for and founder of social service organizations. Most faculty maintain memberships in more than one professional association. All are active in their local congregations.

#### **4. Programs**

##### **Student Learning Outcomes**

We have developed four major categories of outcomes for our majors. They include conceptual skills, methodological skills, applied skills, and faith/learning skills. For each category we have identified specific learning outcomes. Below is a list of the eighteen outcomes, which we updated in May 2010 (college-wide outcomes in italics):

- **Conceptual Skills**

1. Students would have a working knowledge of the foundational concepts of sociology or anthropology. (*Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)
2. Students would understand and be conversant in the main theoretical perspectives in one of the two disciplines, particularly current theoretical models and paradigms. (*Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)



3. Students will demonstrate the ability to bring dimensions of diversity, especially gender, social class, and ethnicity and culture to the discussion and analysis of issues within sociology, anthropology, and social work. (*Diversity, Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)
4. Students will be aware of major controversies, debates, or issues within one or the other discipline. (*Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)
5. Students are able to develop coherent, evidenced-based arguments. (*Critical Interdisciplinary Thinking; Written and Oral Communication*)

- **Methodological Skills**

6. Students are able to develop a research problem and select appropriate methods and data analysis techniques, consistent with the ethical principles of the disciplines. (*Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)
7. They understand and can use the major research methods of both disciplines. (*Critical Interdisciplinary Thinking*)
8. Students would also be able to manage and document appropriately any data they have collected using those methods. (*Technology*)
9. They will understand and can use data analysis techniques such as basic statistics and content analysis. (*Technology*)

- **Applied Skills**

10. Students are able to apply the foundational concepts of sociology or anthropology accurately to the analysis of social behavior.
11. Students can write effectively in sociological or anthropological style. (*Written and Oral Communication*)
12. Students will have applied their knowledge within an experiential learning context such as a practicum, field experience, or approved off-campus program. (*Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement*)
13. Students can converse specifically about how the contributions of sociological or anthropological concepts, theories, and methods can contribute to alleviation of human needs and problems, further building the Kingdom of God. They should also be able to implement such knowledge. (*Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement; Christian Orientation*)

14. Students will through coursework or experiential learning gain increased cross-cultural communication and adaptation skills. (*Diversity*)

15. Students will be able to frame, analyze, and approach issues and problems through the multi-disciplinary lens of sociology, social work, and anthropology. (*Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)

- **Faith and Learning Skills**

16. Students would understand the Biblical concepts of community and justice and demonstrate an ability to use anthropological and sociological knowledge and methods to pursue greater social justice. Likewise, students should be aware of the limits of both disciplines to produce or result in Biblical justice. (*Christian Orientation*)

17. Students will be exposed to materials and experiences which will strengthen their compassion for all peoples, especially the poor, the oppressed, or the weak, and develop their capacity for Christian servanthood. (*Christian Orientation; Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement*)

18. Students are able to use the Biblical concepts and perspectives to engage in cultural and social critique and to identify and analyze the influence of culture and society upon Christian faith and practice. (*Christian Orientation; Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking*)

### ***Comparison of Curriculum with Disciplinary Expectations:***

We have compared our sociology curriculum with the recommendations of the American Sociological Association's (ASA) report from The Task Force on the Undergraduate Major, *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated* and another ASA report, *Models and Best Practices for Joint Sociology-Anthropology Departments*. (The American Anthropological Association has not yet published such recommendations for the undergraduate major.) Since anthropology is currently available only as an alternative major, we focused the majority of our review on the sociology major. In addition we evaluated our course offerings in both sociology and anthropology with the other schools in the Christian College Consortium.

Our core requirements of introduction to sociology, sociological theory, a methods sequence which includes training in statistics and SPSS, and a senior capstone are consistent

with the ASA recommendations. We also provide separate introductory and theory courses in anthropology as a best practice for joint departments. Nonetheless, we find it difficult to provide students an adequate exposure to both classical and contemporary sociological theory in a one semester course. Because of our encouragement of participation in off-campus programs, existing difficulties in sequencing other requirements, and our desire to avoid a “high credit hour major,” we have decided for now that the current course will only focus on five or six of the important theorists such as Karl Marx, Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, Pierre Bourdieu, Anthony Giddens, and the major feminist theorists. Regardless of major track—general, human services or cross-cultural—all sociology majors and the anthropology alternative majors complete the methods sequence. The benefit is that students become familiar with the methodological contributions and strengths of both disciplines. Our offerings also include other “standards” such as courses on the family, social deviance, sociology of religion, and race and ethnic relations. Several years ago we restructured the elective selections for the general sociology track to ensure that students were receiving a broad exposure to major topical areas in the discipline as we had found that students could not only focus on a narrow range of material but also take classes from as few as two professors in the department.

While our core and our electives are solid, we have identified courses that would give our program a greater depth appropriate for an undergraduate major and address other standard courses and “hot topics,” for example: gerontology, social organization, urban sociology, demography, globalization, contemporary slavery, terrorism and peace, and criminal justice (occasionally taught by an adjunct). While urban sociology and complex sociology are listed in the catalogue, we have not recently had the staff to teach them. (We are considering removing them from the course listings.) We recognize that this may require more rotation of courses, advanced notice of special topics courses to attract more students, and increased staffing needs as

we must provide currency and vitality in our program. As chart 8 illustrates our regularly offered courses are not under-enrolled (<5), and the 6-year average of students in these courses is ten. The exception would be SOC 180—Human Services and Social Policy which is a course typically taken only by majors on the human services track. Still, the 6-year average enrollment is 9. The average enrollment of all courses represents only those taken in our department **on-campus**. For 2007, 2009, and 2010,<sup>7</sup> the senior cohort took an average of 12-13, 4-unit sociology or anthropology courses (or their equivalent) on off-campus programs which they applied toward their major units. Had all of our students taken their major units on-campus, our course averages would be higher, particularly for SOC 190-field placement as the students who attend the San Francisco Urban Program or Gordon's Boston Program earn those units through their internships there. Thus, dropping courses to make space for new ones is an unacceptable option.

Another ASA guideline for the undergraduate major is to provide core coursework in social stratification, particularly social class, gender, and ethnic inequality. While we have two courses in the curriculum, SOC 189—Racial and Ethnic Relations and AN 135—Gender and Sex Roles in Cross-Cultural Perspective, we do not have one course that addresses all three dimensions together or social class specifically. While issues of social stratification are addressed in many of our courses, we would like, at minimum, to offer another which is focused on issues of social class as we do for gender and race/ethnicity. Highlighting social class is even more salient as the income and wealth distribution within the United States and between countries continues to become more inequitably distributed, a phenomenon with profound negative impacts on the health of a society. However, a new course has implications for staffing

---

<sup>7</sup> This information is taken from our annual senior questionnaire administered each spring in the senior seminar. As noted in our 2006-2007 annual assessment report, we did not distribute it to the 2008 graduating class. The students who attend the Urban Program, with very few exceptions, apply the 8 unit internship toward their sociology major. Some students reported this on the questionnaire as only 1 course. We have corrected the data to reflect that the internship represents the equivalent of 2, 4-unit courses.

and course allocations which will be discussed further below. In the general track, one of the five areas from which students may choose to take coursework is social stratification. SOC 189 and AN 135 are two of the three course options on this topic. However, a student could graduate and not take any of the courses specifically devoted to stratification. Before making a new requirement, we will test senior students' knowledge of social stratification (beyond the identification of related concepts that we assess in the 100 concepts exam) to determine whether students are gaining enough working knowledge in social stratification regardless of the mix of courses taken even though seniors self-report that they are.

Another major recommendation from the ASA concerns the sequencing of courses. We have prerequisites for the senior seminar and sequencing for SOC 106 and 107. If students declare by the end of the first year, we typically do not have problems creating a 4-year program that has the appropriate progression of courses. However, we continue to experience several obstacles to strict enforcement of the pre-requisites. Some of them are common in other institutions; some are more particular to Westmont. We do not have the staffing to offer some of the required courses twice in a year. And, as noted above, we do not have low-enrolled courses that we could potentially drop from the curriculum. Several students declare at the end of sophomore year and want to attend an off-campus program, which we strongly encourage. Many of the programs attractive to our students are in the spring which conflict with SOC 107, AN 145---Culture Theory, and to a lesser extent SOC 195---Senior Seminar. Up until now, culture theory has been offered on an every-other-year basis, but the recent growth in student interest in the cross-cultural track and anthropology coupled with the OCP participation is beginning to make it necessary to offer it every year. Students who transfer and desire to do an off-campus program are at a disadvantage, particularly when they have taken more than the introductory courses at a community college. Since all of our courses are upper-divisional (except SOC 1 and

AN 1), which we do not plan to change, those at community colleges do not represent the depth or workload of the Westmont courses. Thus, under-divisional courses, other than the introductory courses, are not transferable as upper-divisional courses. In addition, more and more students want to graduate in three or three and one-half years. We have updated the “Four Year Plan” posted on our departmental website with information on when courses are typically offered with the hope that this additional information will help our students with advance planning. We have also discussed the potential value of instituting group advising at the beginning of each fall and spring semester as a supplement to individual advising in order to more easily and consistently disseminate information about course offerings, the rationale for the course requirements, and preparation for the senior seminar, i.e., everyone gets the same information in a timely manner. We hope that this additional information will also help them plan more proactively. We will continue to discuss these challenges and to develop a clear rationale of the sequencing for students that will facilitate in the communication of its importance and appear less arbitrary.

We also compared our curriculum with the sociology and combined sociology-anthropology departments of the other Christian College Consortium (CCC) institutions. (See chart 9.) Since those departments’ programs are also consistent with ASA recommendations, all are similar to our own. As discussed above in relationship to ASA guidelines, seven departments have a course specifically titled “social inequality.” Additionally, most also offer race and ethnic relations; only four others have separate gender courses. Only Seattle Pacific and George Fox have all three. Social class, ethnicity, and gender are so tightly interwoven that pulling them apart into separate courses can be artificial. However, a separate course that brought social class to the fore as our two existing ones do for gender and ethnicity is consistent with our emphasis on social justice which is spread throughout the student learning outcomes. Like other schools

we also list courses on organizations, urban sociology, and social psychology, but we have been unable to offer them because current faculty members do not have these areas of expertise. We believe it is important to do so to be consistent with others in the CCC. Another class taught at all schools is contemporary marriage. Brendan Furnish regularly taught this before his retirement. Since then, we have had funding available only twice to schedule it. Given that marriage is a major social institution, its importance within the church, and the focus on it within our student peer culture, we believe that Westmont shortchanges its students by failing to have it available on a consistent basis especially since no other department offers it. Likewise, the college provides no courses specifically devoted to human sexuality which is another important topic in sociology and is central to the human experience. It would also be of interest to students in other disciplines.

Of the thirteen consortium schools, only four have extensive anthropology offerings using course designations in the colleges' catalogues or department websites as an indicator: Bethel (9), Messiah (8), Westmont (9), and Wheaton (12). Given the importance of missions in the evangelical church and the increasing need for a globalized curriculum and learning environment, the scarcity of anthropology courses in the CCC represents an academic weakness. Our department's cross-cultural emphasis provides a distinctive feature for Westmont's academic program and can be a recruiting tool given the growth in student interest across the country in cross-cultural studies.

As mentioned above, we have three co-curricular activities that we incorporate into our program: an annual faculty-student departmental retreat, a biannual faculty-student Day of Service, and a requirement that students attend 26 hours of extra-curricular departmental activities. The retreat and the service day are not a required events. Even though the SOC 192 hours are required and are in that sense "curricular," students choose at their pace to attend a

variety of academic events, including Phi Kappa Phi, Erasmus Society, and colloquiums both inside and outside of the department. The SOC 192 hours are an opportunity to engage our students in intellectual activities beyond the classroom. We have not yet assessed these activities in relationship to our student learning outcomes, because with the exception of one year, the instructor has not received any compensation for supervising this course. This year, the instructor has been paid a one unit stipend for spring and fall semesters, so we will consider establishing a plan for assessment. We have also not assessed the retreat or the “Day of Service.” We are uncertain as to whether or not we would like to do that.

### ***Conclusions***

- The curriculum is solid and meets the core disciplinary standards for an undergraduate major, but we need to give greater consideration to offering a course on social stratification; our students would also benefit from a greater breadth of offerings particularly on “hot” topics.
- Our strong cross-cultural emphasis is a distinctive of our program and by extension the college curriculum, but additional staffing is needed.
- We need more staff to be commensurate with other Baccalaureate I institutions given our number of sociology graduates.
- More faculty would also allow us be more consistent and flexible in course offerings in order for students to have the most beneficial sequencing of courses to underpin their learning in all of their courses and to maximize their preparation for the senior seminar.
- We do not have under-enrolled regularly offered courses that could be dropped or further rotated to provide more flexibility in offerings.
- We will continue to investigate the establishment of a BSW program.



#### 4. Assessment of Outcomes<sup>8</sup>

##### Overview

All student learning outcomes have been incorporated into all syllabi for regularly scheduled courses, i.e. those taught yearly or rotated on an every-other-year cycle. We then mapped the learning objectives of each course to the departmental learning outcomes. (See chart 10; it excludes SOC 192 as we do not have a syllabus.) All are reinforced multiple times in a variety of courses. However, we find that methodological skills, particularly statistical analysis, are the least emphasized. As noted by the ASA, one course in statistics is insufficient to allow students to cement and hone their skills. We have discussed ways in which we can include the use of these skills to strengthen our student learning outcomes by weaving them into a variety of courses, and this will be an assessment goal for our next cycle of program review. For the 2007, 2009, and 2010 annual assessments,<sup>9</sup> we have used a sample of senior seminar papers as a summative, comprehensive evaluation of the learning outcomes, specifically the conceptual skills (#1-5, the methodological skills #6-9, and #10, #11, and #15 of the applied skills). We began developing a rubric (appendix C) in 2007 and finalized it and set benchmarks in 2010. We originally anticipated that the seminar papers would also serve as summative evidence of the faith-learning outcomes; however, based on the evaluation of several papers, we have concluded that separate assignments would be a better measure of student knowledge in this area. We have administered a senior questionnaire in the senior seminar in 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009 and 2010 that has provided student self-reports of achievement for all the outcomes. As a more specific and formative assessment of student mastery of key concepts (SLO #1) we developed and have

---

<sup>8</sup> We consulted the ASA's document, *Creating an Effective Assessment Plan for the Sociology Major* (2005) as we developed our assessment program.

<sup>9</sup> Again as noted in footnote 7, we did not administer the senior questionnaire in 2008.

administered in S 2010 the 100 Central Concepts in Sociology Test (appendix D) at the end of the introduction to sociology course and the senior seminar. To begin our assessment of faith-learning skills (SLO # 16-18) we have collectively shared related assignments from our courses and examined samples of student work to ascertain the range of student skills in preparation for more extensive evaluation. We have begun the collection of pre- and post test IDI results to examine student achievement of cross-cultural communication and adaptation skills (SLO# 14) for our majors who have participated in study abroad off-campus programs. In the next assessment cycle, we plan to do the more fine-grained analysis not captured in our current activities of the conceptual learning outcomes #3 and #4, the faith-learning outcomes #16-#18, the methodological skills, and the applied outcomes #12 and #13. We also would like to enhance our external review through analysis of our archive of supervisor evaluations of our practicum students and to modify the evaluation form as necessary to capture information directly reflective of our learning outcomes especially SLO #12. We also want to send senior seminar papers for outside review by faculty at peer institutions using our rubric. (We have proposed this in previous annual reports but have not had the time available to do it.) We would like to offer a small honorarium to reviewers to encourage them to participate. See annual budget requests below.

### **Notable Findings**

#### ***Benefits to Department Faculty***

One of the great benefits of our activities thus far has been a much greater understanding of the pedagogical strategies we each use in the classroom and a broader overview of what our students are learning and how well. We have also gained a more deeply shared and focused vision for our program. Prior to this review cycle, we each had a sense of the development of the particular students who were in our classes but not an understanding of any particular senior

cohort as a whole beyond the comparison of final grade point averages. Even though we strive for the highest possible achievement of our graduates on all student learning outcomes, we find the results to date to be encouraging.

### ***Senior Seminar Papers***

As mentioned above, we have used the senior seminar papers as a comprehensive, summative tool to assess all four areas of our student learning outcomes. Our evaluation of 2007 and 2009 papers<sup>10</sup> indicated that while they were meeting the benchmark of “good”:

- the papers often did not meet expectations of the assignment and, in some cases, were missing standard elements of a research paper;
- improvement was needed in choosing appropriate theoretical frameworks and placing their research within existing literature;
- the papers were too disparate in form and content to do meaningful comparison;
- students were often unable to incorporate a faith-learning component beyond the personal and devotional even if the topic lent itself naturally to this type of reflection.

We recognized that requiring students to incorporate this dimension regardless of topic often resulted in an artificial or “tacked-on” discussion.

In response to these results we:

- created and refined an evaluative rubric for papers and distributed it to students at the beginning of the senior seminar;
- eliminated the faith-learning section of the senior paper and instead created a separate assignment to be given in the seminar (appendix E);
- created a check-list of the basic elements of a research paper for the seminar students  
(See syllabus for senior seminar in appendix F);

---

<sup>10</sup> As noted in our 2007-2008 report, we did not evaluate 2008 papers due to two senior faculty being away for the fall 2007 semester

- for F 2008, the instructor modified and then refined for F 2009 assignments in SOC 106—Social Research Methods—one of the pre-requisite courses—to strengthen conceptual, theoretical, and methodological skills; see appendix G. Only one student whose paper we evaluated from the 2010 seminar had taken SOC 106 in F 2009, so we are looking forward to see if these new assignments improve student performance in these areas.;
- eliminated the policy project option for the senior paper to have a more comparable student work;
- began discussing the assignments we use in our courses to develop faith and learning and gathering student work to determine what they were and were not capable of doing;
- are asking the college to allocate sufficient funds to keep SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) current so that students can become more proficient in its use (SLO # 8-9) and eliminate the frustrations for both instructor and students that an outdated version creates. We are grateful for the recent upgrade the college funded, but we request that it continue on a regular basis.

### *Senior Questionnaire*

Since 2003, we have administered a questionnaire to seniors in SOC 195—Senior Seminar to measure their self-reported achievement of the student learning outcomes. Tables 3-6 (found at the end of the report) contain the comparative averages for years 2005-2007 and 2009-2010. The findings demonstrate the following.

- For conceptual, applied, and faith learning skills seniors agree to strongly agree that they have achieved the student learning outcomes.

- A consistent finding since 2003 has been that students reported that their methodological skills were the weakest, particularly their statistical skills, which matched our own observations of student abilities. *Helping students develop methodological skills is a challenge faced by many sociology departments across the country*<sup>11</sup>. As we indicated in our 2006-2007 assessment report, we did not distribute the questionnaire to the S 2008 senior seminar as we wanted to wait until we had hired a sociology faculty member to teach SOC 107—Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis. Since the retirement of Dr. Furnish, students had fulfilled their statistics requirement with a general introduction to statistics course either taken in the math department or at another institution. The ASA has pointed out that when statistics are taken outside of the disciplinary context, students often have difficulty transferring their knowledge to the sociological context, which implies no criticism of the Math Department but the more general challenges student often have in connecting knowledge they have learned in one context to another.

In response to these findings, we:

- were encouraged that our graduates consistently continue to report a high level of skill achievement for the majority of student learning outcomes;
- hired Prof. Zhang who has expertise in statistics, so students now must take the subject within the department. The 2008-2009 academic year was the first SOC 107—Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis has been taught in the department in the last six years. The 2011 senior cohort will be the first where more have taken SOC 107 than MA 5.
- will begin tracking whether or not student's self-reports are reflected in their actual work;
- will include in multiple courses at least one assignment that required the knowledge of use of statistical skills as they are not cemented much less mastered by taking a single

---

<sup>11</sup> American Sociological Association. 2005. *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated*

course but must be repeatedly used throughout the curriculum. Although we have discussed this, we have been unable to accomplish it that to date and plan to address that in our next 6-year assessment cycle.

### ***Faith and Learning Skills***

As noted in our response to the faith-learning skills demonstrated in the seminar papers, we began the groundwork in 2008-2009 for assessing these outcomes more directly and specifically throughout our curriculum. Each professor shared examples of the kinds of assignments used in a variety of classes to address these learning outcomes. The assignments ranged from reaction papers to articles in *Christianity Today* and other news media, to analysis of academic articles, to using anthropological and sociological concepts and theories to interpret the Bible, to creating a pericope on a social policy issue, to the development of a Bible study to be used in a church setting related to a social problem, and to reflections upon books which directly addressed faith-learning issues in the senior seminar. See appendix H for examples. We then continued this work in 2009-2010 which is described in the section discussing our more recent assessment activities.

### **Most Recent Assessment Work**

#### ***Senior Seminar Papers As Summative Assessment:***

Excerpt from 2008-2009 annual assessment report:

“As in previous years, we are using the senior seminar final papers to conduct a summative assessment of all four areas of our student learning outcomes.

#### ***Evaluation of Senior Seminar Papers:***

- Again, this May, we collectively read and evaluated five senior seminar papers according to our rubric. (The rubric and the grading sheet are in appendix B; the papers and summary evaluation sheets are contained in appendix C.) Each paper was read and assessed by all of the department members.
- As we have done in previous years, we shared the grading sheets and discussed the similarities and differences in inter-rater scoring. Again, we found that for the

most part we assessed the papers similarly. When we did not, we discussed the rationale behind the variation

### *Interpretation of Results of Evaluating Senior Seminar Papers and Next Steps*

- The papers ranged from poor to excellent. We observed greater variation in the quality of this set of papers than we had in previous years. More of them failed to adhere to the expectations than before. It was unclear as to whether or not the students had received the rubric in the seminar. We emphasized that students must receive it and early in the seminar.
  - In addition, we will distribute a checklist of elements of a research paper for students to follow for S 2010.
  - This fall, as mentioned in our previous annual report we will be giving students materials to get them thinking about a topic for their project before the seminar in the spring.
- As noted in the 2007-2008 report, students received in the Fall 2008, SOC 106—Social Research Methods, a revised literature review assignment to help them better locate their work theoretically. Given the disruption of the course by the November fire, we are unable to judge, at this time, whether or not this exercise had the desired result, although more of the papers referenced theory. Nonetheless, not all students had taken the research course in 2008. This revised assignment will be used again this fall in the research course.
  - An additional assignment given in the second week requires students not only to identify the theoretical model used in peer-reviewed journal articles but also requires them to look it up in disciplinary encyclopedias and to write a summary of its main points
- Continued need to help students locate their work within the scholarly literature.
  - Again this year in the research methods course, the emphasis is on the development of a solid research proposal rather than attempting to develop the proposal and carry out the research to allow more time to develop the literature review. As noted above, the reorganized assignment in the research course will be used again this fall. Since more of the students in the spring 2010 senior seminar will have taken the methods course with the emphasis on developing a proposal, we are eager to see what impact that may have on the quality of the senior papers.
  - We will encourage students in the fall (2009) of their senior year to begin developing ideas for their senior project before the seminar in the spring.
- The work to develop a “Welcome to the Major” packet and an update of information on the major has begun. We want to use it as a way to help students see the trajectory of the major and role of the senior seminar.”

### 2009-2010 Assessment of Senior Seminar Papers

As in 2009, we each assessed 4 randomly selected seminar papers, using an updated rubric which no longer included the faith-learning criteria. The evaluated papers with the scoring sheets are found in appendix I. Our procedure was the same as described in 2008-2009. Since we had been making several changes to the requirements for the paper and how we were instructing students about them in prior years, we are using the scores of 2010 to set firm benchmarks related to each element of the paper. Tables 7 and 8 compare the average scores of the senior seminar papers that we evaluated for S 2009 and 2010.

#### Interpretation of Results

- The average scores for the elements assessed by the rubric were more than 2.0, a “good” rating which was the same benchmark set in our 2006 report. However, a wide variation in theoretical (range of 1.75-3.0) and methodological skill (range of 1.9-3.5) exists.
- The 2010 sample scored higher on 9 of the 10 evaluation criteria than the 2009 sample, though students continue to vary in their ability to follow the assignment guidelines.

Table 7: Spring 2009 Senior Seminar Papers:  
Averages of Combined Scores of Faculty Evaluation

Element Evaluated by Rubric:	Paper 1	Paper 2	Paper 3	Paper 4	Avg. Score of All Papers
Central Problem	4.0	2.2	2.6	2.3	2.8
Argument Evidence-Based	3.6	1.2	2.6	1.7	2.3
Use of Literature & Lit. Review	3.6	1.8	2.2	1.9	2.4
Structure	4.0	1.0	3.4	1.9	2.6
Logic & Argumentation	3.8	1.0	2.6	1.7	2.3
Mechanics	4.0	1.0	3.2	1.9	2.5
Theoretical Skill	2.4	1.0	1.8	1.7	1.7
Use of Concepts	4.0	1.0	3.0	1.9	2.5
Ethics	3.8	1.0	1.2		2.0
Data Analysis & Presentation	3.2	1.0	1.8		2.0

Definition of Scores: 1=Unacceptable; 2=Good; 3=Excellent; 4=Superior; scores rounded to nearest 10<sup>th</sup>.



Table 8: Spring 2010 Senior Seminar Papers:  
Averages of Combined Scores of Faculty Evaluation

Element Evaluated by Rubric:	Paper 1	Paper 2	Paper 3	Paper 4	Avg. Score of All Papers
Central Problem	3.9	3.1	2.1	2.5	2.9
Argument Evidence-Based	3.8	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.8
Use of Literature & Lit. Review	3.7	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.8
Structure	3.7	1.8	2.5	3.2	2.8
Logic & Argumentation	2.5	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.3
Mechanics	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.4
Theoretical Skill	3.0	1.8	1.8	2.2	2.2
Use of Concepts	3.5	2.7	1.9	2.5	2.6
Ethics	4.0	2.3	2.8	3.7	3.2
Data Analysis & Presentation	3.1	1.5	1.4	2.3	2.1

Definition of Scores: 1=Unacceptable; 2=Good; 3=Excellent; 4=Superior; scores rounded to nearest 10<sup>th</sup>.

- The average score for the ethics of the research project was in the excellent range (3.165). Ethics are a critical dimension of the disciplines in general, but Christians, in particular, must be skilled in this area.
- The 2010 papers were more comparable to one another, because as noted in our 2008-2009 report, we eliminated the policy project options. All papers included the sections that comprise a research report in sociology or anthropology, a reflection of the checklist in the syllabus. See appendix F.

### Next Steps

- We see the importance of consistency in the instruction students receive about the guidelines and the rubric as the senior seminar rotates from one professor to another every two years. Our goal is to promote the use of standardized materials.
- While we note an improvement in the theoretical and conceptual scores and the quality of literature reviews, the 2010 group included only one student who had done the revised

assignments for F 2009. We must wait until more of the senior cohort has used the new assignments before we can draw any causal conclusions regarding their impact on performance.

- While improved from the 2009 papers, the weaker scores apart from those related to theory were in areas of data analysis and presentation, mechanics, and logic and argumentation. The lower performance on data analysis and presentation is consistent with self-reports for 2010; we will give closer attention to our instruction in this area, particularly in SOC 106 and 107 to work toward improvement. Emphasis on mechanics, and logic and argumentation should be present in a range of courses. In our next assessment cycle, we will examine our curriculum to determine where greater focus is needed.
- We continue to recognize the importance of helping students to think about topics for senior seminar before the spring of their senior year. Not only is a semester a short period of time to produce and carry-out a quality research project, but also, frankly, too many other activities and demands compete for the attention of last-semester seniors. We hope to begin this preliminary work with students in 2011-2010.
- We will continue in our evaluation of senior seminar papers to build a comparative data base to measure achievement through time.
- We will begin to assess the research proposals developed in SOC 106 for the relationship in quality between these and the senior paper. This will also provide us another formative assessment as SOC 106 is a pre-requisite for the seminar.
- We want to increase senior participation in both the Westmont Student Research Symposium and the Annual Western Sociology-Anthropology Student Research Conference sponsored by Santa Clara University. Based on the few students who have

done this in the past, we anticipate it will improve the seriousness and quality of papers.

They will also have solid evidence of the skills they have acquired which will be beneficial to our majors in their careers or further studies.

### ***Student Self-Assessment of All Student Learning Outcomes***

Excerpt from 2005-2006 Report (only relevant portions included):

...When we began the work for this year's annual report, we recognized that our learning goals would be more easily identified and assessed if they were organized into skill sets rather than listed separately...As a criteria for success, we would like the mean response for each question to be at 4.0 or above (agree to strongly agree.)

#### **Data:**

...The tables report the mean response for each question and the standard deviation; the latter only for 2005 and 2006. As a part of our analysis, we also conducted a T-test analysis to determine if significant differences existed between the mean response scores of the 2005 and 2006 cohorts. Question 11 is the only item where the difference in mean score was significant.

#### **Interpretation:**

We collectively discussed the results of the senior surveys. While we recognize that the survey data represent student self-reports, we were pleased overall with the results with the exception of methodological skills. In the areas of applied and faith and learning skills, students the average scores meet or exceed our benchmark. However, all but two of the seven items in the area of methodological skills have a mean response below 4.0. We also note that we should explore more thoroughly the area of conceptual skills regarding theoretical perspectives, including gender and ethnicity, emphasis on the controversies within sociology and anthropology, and the limits of the disciplines to pursue social justice. While these areas were not our focus for this year=s round of assessment, we will take them up next year.

#### **Use of Results:**

The results confirm the indications from the first year we collected this data in 2003 that our graduating majors perceive themselves to be the weakest in their methodological skills, particularly in the area of quantitative analysis. As a result, we are responding in these ways:

1. ...We will be searching for a tenure-track position in the 2006-2007 and will be seeking candidates who can teach effectively in this area. Our job description already emphasizes this.

2. Once we have a member of the department who can teach quantitative analysis, we will re-institute our two semester methods sequence. We plan to also rework the sequence to incorporate the change described in #3 to give more depth to methodological training. ..

4. In Fall 2006, we will identify topical courses where we can naturally build in methodological skills, particularly quantitative analysis, so that students have more opportunities to maintain and build them.

5. We will also identify particular assignments related to 4 above that we can use to assess student skills.

### **2009-2010 Assessment of Senior Questionnaires:**

We have continued our annual distribution of the Senior Survey to students enrolled in the senior seminar. See appendix J for the 2010 survey instrument. By giving it in the seminar we have had 100% participation rate. Again the responses indicate that students agree or strongly agree that they have achieved the student learning outcomes, again the exception being in the area of methodological skills. As mention above, however, these skills are the most challenging for students to develop at all types of institutions. Tables 3-6 report the mean results for each of the four skill areas for 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, and 2010. (The tables are at the end of this report.) We conducted further analysis to determine if the differences in the means for the three most recent years were statistically significant.

### **Interpretation of Results**

- Using the tables as the reference, the results of the T-tests indicate that a significant difference in the means between 2007 and 2009 occurred on four skills: Conceptual skills, items 21 and 25; Applied Skills, item 29; and Faith and Learning Skills, item 31. Students reported an increase in skill from 2007 and 2009.
- The differences between 2007 and 2010 were significant for only three skills: Conceptual Skills, item 8; Applied Skills, item 29; and Faith and Learning Skills, item 31; students, again, report increases in ability.

- The only significant difference from 2009-2010 occurred for Conceptual Skill, item 8. These findings confirm that overall student self-assessment remains stable from year to year.
- While we note and are pleased that students also state an increase on items 29 and 31 from 2007 to 2009, and would like to pin-point the cause.
- The reported increase in student perceptions about their theoretical skill does reflect the improvement in this area on the senior seminar papers from 2009-2010.

### **Next Steps**

- We will continue to administer the questionnaire annually as it provides a potential data set to compare perceived and actual changes in skill level. While complicated, we would like to develop a way to track the self-reports with performance on student work that is indicative of each outcome as well as pinpoint what is responsible for the stability or change.
- We modified the 2010 questionnaire to capture information on plans for employment and further study, including whether or not they had already secured a job by the day of graduation.

### ***Assessment of Conceptual Skills SLO #1***

Excerpt from 2008-2009 Report:

We have created a formative and approved assessment tool that will evaluate student mastery of one hundred core concepts. We will administer it for the first time to all of the SOC 001—Introduction to Sociology sections during the 2009-10. We will administer in again in the senior seminar. This year we will also give it to the students in senior seminar to get help set a baseline. Our plan is to pre-test in SOC 001; track who becomes majors; administer as post-test to these same students in senior seminar.

In Spring 2010 we administered the “100 Sociological Concepts Test” for the first time to the SOC 001—Introduction to Sociology classes and to the senior seminar at the end of the

semester. Charts 11 and 12 provide the results from the two courses. The average score for the introductory courses (n=43) was a score of 79. Half of the class scored above 80 (B-). The average score for the senior seminar (n=17) was 85.59. Half of the class scored above 87 (B+)

- All senior seminar students passed. The lowest score was 72.
- Student self-reported skills on this learning outcome were higher as well, though this may also be reflective of having recently taken the test and knowing their scores.

Nonetheless, the results indicate increased competency.

### **Interpretation of Results**

- This cohort of seniors had a better knowledge of the concepts than those who had only completed the introductory course.

### **Next Steps**

- We will continue to administer the test at the end of all SOC 001 and senior seminar courses.
- We will begin following majors' scores longitudinally from SOC 001 to the final testing in the seminar to ascertain whether or not higher scores result from completing the major program.
- We will analyze which concepts students do more poorly on and adjust instruction and assignments accordingly with specific attention given to social stratification as discussed above.

### ***Assessment of Faith and Learning Outcomes***

Excerpt from 2008-2009 Report:

- As mentioned in previous reports, we have concerns, again confirmed in our evaluation of this group of seminar papers, that our students' understanding and skill-level in this area tends to be more personal and devotional. Again, this year, we believe that we need to assess this area in more student work than the senior seminar and from earlier in a student's major career. To begin addressing this issue, we devoted two department meetings to discuss the ways we were

incorporating these skills into our classes. We each shared assignments we give our students in each of our courses. With few exceptions the assignments take students beyond the personal and devotional.

### *Interpretation of Results and Next Steps*

- We will each keep sample student work from the faith-learning assignments we assign in our classes for 2009-2010. And we will evaluate this work at our May 2010 assessment meetings. We have started work to refine the faith-learning section of the rubric used for the senior seminar paper to be applicable to a greater range of students work.
- We may have students in the senior seminar write an essay that is specific to these outcomes. We have begun to articulate questions for the essay such as, “How did you use Christian values to generate your research question or hypothesis (for the research paper)?”
- We will begin developing a list of readings that address faith and learning specific to our disciplines for both faculty and student reference and use.

### *2009-2010 Assessment of Faith-Learning Outcomes*

At our annual end-of-the-year assessment meetings in May 2010, we collectively read and discussed a range of student work from some of the faith-learning assignments to provide us a clearer sense of our students’ capabilities for determining the level and breadth of skill we expected on these outcomes that were appropriate for undergraduates. (See appendix K for samples.) In particular we read a sample of faith-learning essays from the senior seminar. Appendix L contains the prompt and the student work. From our assessment of student work this May, most students are better able to integrate faith and sociology when they are given a very directed and specific assignment. As anticipated, we discovered a continuum of ability among graduating seniors. For example, in a research proposal one student had an accurate but undeveloped rationale for the relationship between Christian faith and an understanding of the social development of body image. Yet another offered a highly sophisticated commentary on hetero-normativity. Based on our examination of this student work, we developed a rubric to assess student learning in this skill area. (See appendix M.)

### **Next Steps:**

Our response to this preliminary work on the faith-learning outcomes our plan is:

- to give clear and specific prompts;
- to continue our review and discussion of the particular kinds of faith-learning work that foster development of the most mature integrative perspective in the terms described in the rubric;
- to determine which types of assignments all majors will complete during their major program;
- to develop a formative assessment which would indicate their abilities when they enter the major, probably in the research methods course and again in the senior seminar as these are the two courses that all majors take regardless of major track;
- to continue to develop specific prompts for the senior seminar faith-learning essay.
- to create a list of faith-learning readings to be distributed among ourselves and our majors;
- modified one of the student learning outcomes (#16) to reflect the ability to engage in cultural critique which we believe is a critical skill for our majors particularly in the context of a Christian liberal arts education.

### ***SLO #14: Cross-Cultural Communication and Adaptation Skills***

Excerpt from 2008-2009 report:

We have postponed until 2009-2010 the administration of the Intercultural Development Inventory to our students who participate in off-campus programs to determine which programs are achieving our related learning outcomes the best.

The 2009-2010 academic year was the first time we assessed this outcome. Student learning outcome #14 is the acquisition of cross-cultural communication and adaptation skills through experiential learning in an off-campus program. A very high percentage of our majors



attend off-campus programs. Of our 2010 graduates, 83% had participated in at least one off-campus programs, higher than the campus average of 70%. The high level reflects faculty encouragement, high student interest, and opportunities for our majors to earn upper-divisional credit from several programs. The most commonly attended off-campus programs are the Westmont Urban Program, Houghton in Tanzania, Spring Semester in Thailand, Westmont in Mexico, and the TCC Program in Sevilla, Spain.

We have completed some preliminary assessment of the degree to which participation in study abroad programs results in increased cross-cultural communication and adaptation skills.<sup>12</sup> The IDI measures the development of intercultural sensitivity which is defined by Milton Bennett, one of its developers, as “the way people construe cultural difference...[i]t is assumed that such sensitivity can be described in developmental terms better than as a collection of specific behaviors. In other words, *it is the construction of reality as increasingly capable of accommodating cultural difference that constitutes development.*”<sup>13</sup> Pre- and Post-testing of WIM students is done every year, and our majors have attended WIM in 2005, 2008, and 2009. Thus far the IDI has only been administered pre and post to the students from the S 2010 off-campus study abroad programs. We have pre-and post test data for twelve majors: 7 WIM and 5 Non-WIM..

### **Interpretation**

Tables 9 and 10 report the scores of each group. In the aggregate, the findings appear to indicate that for these students, participation in study abroad did not increase their intercultural

---

<sup>12</sup> We have taken advantage of the work Prof. Montgomery has been doing with the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) to pre- and post-test participants in the Westmont in Mexico Program and Off-Campus Programs for which students have received general education credit for “communicating cross-culturally.”

<sup>13</sup> Milton J. Bennett. 1993. “Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity,” in *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, ed. R Michael Page. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press, p. 24.

sensitivity. At pre- and post-test their average scores reflect the developmental stage of minimization (though they have moved closer to the mid-point of minimization) reflecting a tendency to emphasize cultural similarities (a monocultural perspective) to the neglect of cultural differences. The ability to balance similarities and differences is indicative of a more intercultural position. In addition, their cultural disengagement scores suggest that they are still struggling to achieve a clear sense of belonging to any particular cultural group.

However, when the scores of the WIM and non-WIM majors are disaggregated, we find striking differences which parallel those found in comparisons between all WIM and non-WIM students for whom we have pre- and post-test data. Tables 9 and 10 illustrate that our majors who participated in the WIM Program make much further progress towards an intercultural perspective than do our majors who attended other study abroad programs. In fact the two groups move in opposite directions despite being within 2.65 points of each other on the average pre-test

Student:	DO Pre-Test	DO Post-Test	Pre/Post Difference	CD Pre-test	CD Post-Test	Pre/Post Difference
KB	119.39	133.98	14.59	4.6	4.6	0.0
KC	80.47	132.11	51.64	2.2	3.2	1.0
MS	125.31	137.04	11.73	3.2	4.4	1.2
BM	87.35	84.21	-5.93	4.4	4.2	-0.2
AP	90.14	84.21	-5.93	5	4.4	-0.6
CB	96.96	84.41	-12.55	3.4	4	0.6
SL	68.69	81.54	12.85	2.89	2.8	-0.09
Average	95.47	108.82	13.35	3.6	3.94	0.27

Note: The cultural disengagement (CD) scores are measured separately from the development orientation (DO) scores. Developmental Orientations: Defense/Denial or Reversal—55.0-84.9; Minimization—85-114.9; Acceptance/Adaptation—115-135; median score=100.

Table10: Sociology-Anthropology Non-WIM Off-Campus Program Participants' Intercultural Development Orientation and Cultural Disengagement Pre- and Post-Test Scores						
Student:	DO Pre-Test	DO Post-Test	Pre/Post Difference	CD Pre-test	CD Post-Test	Pre/Post Difference
AK	104.82	101.61	-.3.21	3.8	3.4	-0.4
MM	71.82	75.84	4.02	3.4	2.6	-0.8
SK	105.28	90.58	-14.70	4.8	4.6	-0.2
ST	92.31	84.75	-7.56	3.8	3.6	-0.2
CV	89.89	79.52	-10.36	3.6	3.8	0.2
Average	92.82	86.46	-6.36	3.88	3.6	-0.28

Note: The cultural disengagement (CD) scores are measured separately from the development orientation (DO) scores. Developmental Orientations: Defense/Denial or Reversal—55.0-84.9; Minimization—85-114.9; Acceptance/Adaptation—115-135; median score—100

scores. The non-WIM group moves backwards towards a more monocultural perspective **losing** an average of 6.36 points, remaining barely within minimization. The WIM students have moved toward the upper limits of minimization **gaining** an average of 13.35 points, and therefore are much closer to developing an intercultural perspective. The two groups also moved in opposite directions almost reversing their pre and post averages on their cultural detachment scores. Though still unresolved, the WIM group moves toward more resolution with an average score of 3.94, a gain of 0.27 points, while the non-WIM group moves backwards to an average score of 3.6 losing 0.28 points. (A score of 4.0 indicates resolution on this scale.) In other words, the WIM students seem to be experiencing a strengthening of their cultural identity while the other group's appears to weaken.

### **Next Steps**

- While the results represent a small group, we believe it raises some interesting questions and concerns as to how best to utilize off-campus programs as a mechanism for achieving our students' cross-cultural capacities. We do not interpret the differences in the IDI scores between those who participate in WIM and non-WIM study abroad programs to

mean that non-WIM programs offer our majors very little “value-added” to their education. All of us have heard students recount the many ways in which their experiences have changed them positively. Nonetheless, these programs appear not to increase inter-cultural sensitivity as measured by the IDI.

- Since the major programmatic difference between the study abroad programs is that WIM students participate in a required pre-departure orientation seminar, an in-country integrative seminar, and an optional re-entry seminar, we want to consider whether or not providing similar training for our majors on non-WIM study abroad programs would enhance their achievement on this outcome. We may run a pilot program in S 2011 when Prof. Montgomery, who has taught these for WIM and is familiar with the curriculum, will be back after a sabbatical leave and leading the F 2011 WIM as resident director. However, given the increase in student interest in anthropology, we would need increased resources to staff courses that she would be unable to teach.
- We will continue to use the IDI to determine whether the findings of the preliminary study continue to be true through time. Of course, if we institute training seminars, we will track whether or not they are the variables responsible for the difference in scores.

***Conclusions:***

For this 6-year review cycle, we have accomplished a great deal toward a systematic and thorough evaluation of our student learning outcomes. We have done this in spite of staffing discontinuities and difficulties due to an unrenewed contract, sabbaticals, other leaves, course reductions, or assignments to other college programs and tensions within the department which have prevented us from addressing or carrying out our assessment plans. Fortunately, the assessment results thus far indicate that these challenges have not deteriorated student achievement on the outcomes as reflected in the senior seminar papers and the senior self-report

data. We believe that the resolution of these problems will only strengthen our major program and our assessment activities to the benefit of our students.

### **5. General Education Courses:**

One FTE is assigned to teach introductory courses which meet the understanding society requirement. We offer five introductory to sociology and one introduction to anthropology sections each year. For the last six years, we have had an average total enrollment of 150 students or 25 students per section per year. As stated earlier in this report, we provide fifteen different courses spanning seven (7) general education categories: Thinking Globally, Understanding Society, Speech/Writing Intensive, Quantitative and Analytical Reasoning, Research, Integrating the Major Discipline and Serving Society, Enacting Justice. Nine of these courses are open to non-majors; if the teaching load for these courses is included, excluding the introductory courses, an additional 0.58 FTE is dedicated to general education.

To date, the G.E. Committee has only assessed the thinking globally and the serving society/enacting justice requirements of the general education program, so our courses that fulfill other categories have not yet been assessed. One course approved for both categories is AN 140—Food Systems. SOC190—Practicum and SOC 175SS—Child Welfare Lab are also approved to fulfill serving society/enacting justice. The G.E. Committee's response and the instructor's reply related to global thinking for AN 140 is in appendix N.

Instructors of courses meeting the serving society/enacting justice worked with the dean of curriculum to develop a rubric. We then assessed material from the beginning and the end of the semester for those courses taught in S 2009. The instructor's evaluation of student work for SOC 175SS---Child Welfare Lab is in appendix O; the actual student work is a PowerPoint Presentation and can be found in the department's assessment archive. The SOC 190—

Practicum course assignments and other related materials are in appendix P; because of the volume of representative student work, it is also in the department's archive. As a result of the review of student work, the instructor modified the supervisor evaluation and the materials students had to produce for the practicum.

The instructor's assessment of AN 140 for the serving society/enacting justice category and sample student work are in appendix Q. One observation from the assessment of this course was that despite clear instructions to address theological issues and assigned readings to facilitate this several students did it poorly or not at all. As an adjustment for F 2010, the instructor has increased the amount of time spent on the relationship between faith and the course content, changed one of the readings, and has deducted points if this was not addressed in the initial assignment. In the letter approving the course, the committee commented that the instructor should encourage personal action plans to be focused off-campus. She has encouraged that, and in F 2010 most student were involved in off-campus activities, such as the Food Bank, Community Gardens, Bread of Life Ministry, and the Unity Shop. In fall 2007, the G.E. Committee also assessed its contribution to the global thinking category. The one aspect that the committee felt could be strengthened was emphasis on the contingency of knowledge. Again this fall which is the first time she has taught the course again, she will in those sections that are relevant devote more time to this perspective in class discussion and on exams.

Other discussions we have had with the committee relate to the criteria for approving courses for the reasoning abstractly category. MA 5—Introduction to Statistics was initially listed as fulfilling this requirement but was later removed by request of the Math Department but this was in process when we were preparing to submit SOC 107—Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis for approval. We find the restriction of this category in particular to mathematics, religious studies, philosophy, computer science courses to be highly artificial as abstract, formal

reasoning is not unique to these disciplines. We also expressed our deep dissatisfaction to the General Education Committee via the former dean of curriculum about a course taught by faculty untrained in the social sciences on a Europe Semester that was approved to fulfill the understanding society requirement which should not have been permissible given its description. Apart from concerns about content, such authorization ignores the specialized, disciplinary expertise of the social sciences; such action diluted student introduction to a social scientific perspective which is the purpose of the requirement.

## **6. Financial and Program Resources:**

### **Financial Resources**

#### ***Annual Budget***

We have managed our annual budgets well using our resources but carefully avoiding over-spending our funds. (See appendix R for the last six years' budgets.) We have not incurred a deficit over the last six fiscal years. However, living within our means is not equivalent to having adequate funds to meet all of our needs. While we occasionally shift funds from one line item to another, their allocation represents the current needs of the department, in particular our use of media in the classroom. Specifically we request \$2,500.00 for these activities:

- **Annual Retreat (\$750.00):** Even though we have not assessed the retreat, it has been a meaningful event for our professors and majors. We have shared the costs with the Provost's Office usually splitting them. The last two years, due to college-wide financial constraints, we have funded it through our budget but that has been possible because the hosting location has extended us a considerable discount, and we have supplied the food making it less than a retreat for the faculty. We would like our budget increased to

include the average cost of the retreats so that we can rely on a specific amount from year to year.

- **Funding for Student Travel to Conferences (\$1,500.00):** One of our strategies for increasing the quality of seminar papers is to have more of our seniors participate in the annual undergraduate student research conference at Santa Clara University. We also want to sustain and even increase our contribution to the production of doctoral degrees in our discipline. New Christian Ph.D.s in both sociology and anthropology are critical to maintain this “voice” within the disciplines themselves and to nurture the next generation of faculty members for the Christian liberal arts colleges as the current one nears retirement. Based on the experiences of taking students to professional conferences before the period covered by this report, it was inspiring for them. They can see the breadth of interests available to them as well as have an opportunity to observe their professors in an outside professional context. In the past, we have also been able to fund a few students who are interested in pursuing graduate study and careers in social welfare to attend workshops or national conferences, but we have been unable to fund all who would like to do so. Having this kind of resource would enrich our students’ education and allow them the opportunity to explore their professional aspirations. Some of our students have volunteered at some of these conferences to reduce or waive their registration fees.
- **Funds to Compensate Outside Reviewers of Senior Seminar Papers (\$250.00):** To encourage and receive quality evaluations of five papers--the number we would typically review internally--we would like to offer a \$50.00 stipend to sociology or anthropology faculty at peer institutions.



- **Funds to Maintain SPSS:** We are not proposing that our budget funds the necessary upgrades to keep the program current. Other departments make use of it for research and instruction. We do ask the college to allocate sufficient funds to do so. This program is widely used in our disciplines. Before the recent upgrade in 2010, the version available to us was outdated and created difficulties for teaching students how to use it not only in SOC 107 but also for their senior research projects. Student ability to become proficient in its use is implied in our outcomes for methodological skills (SLO # 8 and 9).

### *Funding for Additional Personnel*

For the immediate future, we request an increase of one full-time position. It would be used to hire another full-time anthropologist to fit the growing demand for an anthropology major, create more predictability in course offerings as described earlier in the report when the current anthropology professor is on sabbatical, is leading WIM, receives a course reduction for professional development, is chairing the department, or fulfilling other college needs. (Prof. Montgomery has yet to be able to utilize a Wandering Scholar Award she received several years ago, because of the need to offer courses.) It will also give students exposure to a different disciplinary perspective, geographical areas other than Latin America, and other important topics not currently offered. Given the large number of our students who study abroad and the college's desire to expand Westmont's off-campus program, an additional anthropologist would only enhance the college's endeavors and provide our students who do go abroad something to "come back to" creating continuity between the on- and off-campus experience. An additional faculty member would also allow Prof. Montgomery to offer courses that would better prepare our students to study abroad and return to campus in order to better achieve our student learning outcome of increased skill in cross-cultural communication and adaptation. Our next priority would be to add 0.33 FTE to the current 0.66 dedicated to social welfare which would bring our

staffing closer to the staffing levels of sociology departments at other baccalaureate institutions. We would hire an individual who could maintain the current course offerings and staff the contemporary marriage course as well as enrich our human services track. The marriage course was very well-subscribed when it was offered regularly.

### ***Program Resources***

We have not yet obtained information directly from our majors to ascertain their satisfaction with these services, so our comments relate, to our experience as faculty.

A. Library: An adequate library collection and database resources are critical to our courses and our own research. As long as these do not change, they are mostly adequate with the exception of the book collection. Each year we have insufficient funding to keep the book collection current because not all of the important ones are available on-line. Our students do not have access to the most recent years' issues of *Current Anthropology*, a major journal in the field that has been used in classes. The recent change in the library interface where a number of links to resources have "disappeared" after working to build it up is frustrating, to say the least. A suggestion would be for the library to work with the department to discuss changes before they happen so everyone is on the same page.

B. Library Staff: Our library liaison, Diane Ziliotto, provides excellent instruction to our students and has been helpful in discussing our needs and changing resources. She has been a good listening ear. We have discussed strategies to help students "find" material, even though sometimes they seem to mysteriously "lack" the ability to find it readily even when one directs them to the database.

C. Internship Office: We do not make use of this office as we have our own practicum program supervised by Dr. Alexandre.

D. Office of Life Planning: Dana Alexander has regularly given a presentation in our senior seminar, and we have been pleased with his work.

E. Off-campus Programs: As discussed earlier, more than four-fifths of our students attend off-campus programs, so the office is very helpful to us. One suggestion we have is for the office to maintain regularly updated lists of *all* general education requirements met by each program. The current listing is partial.

F. Disability Services: This office has been very cooperative in helping us to meet the needs of students with disabilities for extended test times, note-takers, etc.

## **7. Conclusion and Long-term Vision**

### **Major Departmental Accomplishments**

- We have developed a robust assessment program which generates evidence which we use to modify and strengthen our curriculum. In particular, we have:
  - refined the instruction for the senior seminar papers, designed an evaluative rubric, and assessed student papers;
  - on an on-going basis, surveyed students' self-assessment of their achievement of the student learning outcomes;
  - begun assessing the impact of study abroad programs on the achievement of cross-cultural communication and adaptation skills;
  - hired a faculty member to teach statistics to improve our students' methodological skills;
  - laid the groundwork for meaningful assessment of our faith-learning outcomes;

- identified areas for future assessment and for a finer-grained analysis of what we are already doing.
- Senior Survey data demonstrates that our majors perceive they have increased their abilities in terms of the student learning outcomes.
- Arising out of the assessment process, the department faculty have a more cohesive and shared vision for our major programs;
- We have a clear picture of how our department compares to sociology departments at other Baccalaureate I institutions in general and CCC institutions in particular
- We have established that our core requirements for the sociology major meet disciplinary expectations.
- Even before this assessment cycle, we developed unique and creative opportunities to supplement our formal coursework requirements with a mechanism for students to engage intellectual issues more broadly (SOC/AN 192), an annual retreat, and a Day of Service to holistically nurture our majors' intellectual, spiritual and personal lives in the context of a sociological imagination.

### **Long-Term Vision: Six Year Goals**

Our vision is to have a vibrant sociology and anthropology program that is a central contributor to the establishment and growth of the global initiative at Westmont and the broader academic program of the college. Its strength and vitality would be evident in multiple areas. Our programs continue to conform to disciplinary expectations for highly selective Baccalaureate I institutions. As faculty, we contribute regularly to our respective academic disciplines and to Christian scholarship. Both inside and outside of the academy, our graduates

are able to communicate and utilize the specific skills they have learned as sociology or anthropology majors in the workplace, the church, and within their personal and spiritual lives. Above all, we desire to maintain the strength of the current program in light of our student learning outcomes, enhancing it further and, in particular, serving as a model for the teaching of sociology, anthropology, and social services in Christian higher education.

### **Plan for Achieving Goals: Time Line and Responsible Individuals**

We believe these to be the specific steps toward the achievement of our long term vision with a time-frame and an indication of the individuals responsible for shepherding them:

- Offer a formal anthropology major staffed by two full-time anthropologists. Using the funds made available through the WIM program for fall 2011, hire a full-time anthropologist for the full 2011-2013 academic year and begin a search for a tenure track appointment beginning in fall 2012. Responsible individual: chair in consultation with the current anthropology faculty member and the department.
- Beginning this academic year (2010-2011) more equitably distribute the student advising load and instruction of core courses among department faculty. Responsible individual: chair with the Provost serving as facilitator as needed.
- Within the next few years, we anticipate a significant turnover in faculty due to retirements. We will carefully consider the job descriptions in terms of our student learning outcomes, broader distribution of the instruction of core courses, and the maintenance and enrichment of our curriculum. At this point, the timing of those retirements is unfixed.
- Related to having an additional anthropologist and careful consideration of how we hire to replace retiring members, we would have sufficient course coverage so that faculty can

take advantage of professional development opportunities without a negative impact on course offerings. Responsible Individual: chair in collaboration with department faculty

- Have an orientation and re-entry program specifically tailored for our majors who participate in off-campus programs beginning in spring or fall 2012. Responsible individual: anthropology faculty.
- Our students are regularly participating in student research symposia both on and off – campus beginning 2012-2013. Responsible individual: instructors of research sequence and senior seminar with all department faculty assisting as mentors.
- Building on the prior step, develop an initiative to encourage more students to complete major honors projects through active recruitment by faculty of students who will be juniors in 2013-2014 Responsible individuals: instructors of research sequence and senior seminar with all department faculty assisting as mentors
- Assess the student learning outcomes which have not yet been specifically and directly evaluated as noted in the earlier discussion. See multi-year plan as discussed below. Individual responsible: chair as coordinator with participation of all department members.
- From the present forward, sustain continuity in instruction of courses as instructors rotate or substitute for one another. Individual responsible: Coordinated by chair to foster greater collaboration between instructors of relevant courses
- Our students have a more cohesive vision and rationale for major requirements with these efforts beginning in fall 2010. Individual responsible: chair delegates another department member to take the lead in keeping informational materials, including the website, up-to-date and in coordinating group advising sessions to supplement the individual meetings with advisors.

- Consider establishment of a social work major and development of a program proposal. Have final proposal ready for submission to administration in 2013-2014. Individual responsible: social welfare faculty member in consultation with other department members.
- Improve student learning specifically in these areas:
  - Our graduates demonstrate and perceive that they have strong methodological skills.
  - Our graduates develop mature faith-learning skills as measured by the rubric.
  - Our graduates have greater skill in cross-cultural communication and adaptation.
  - Our seniors produce seminar papers that are consistently of high quality.

The steps to improve these are already in place and will be continued as noted in the multi-year assessment plan below. Responsible individual: Chair coordinates regular collaboration between department faculty, particularly those teaching the courses which focus on these areas.

### **Multi-Year Assessment Plan:**

#### 2010-2011

- Faith-Learning (SLO #16-18)
  - Review student work gathered in 2009-2010 and evaluate with rubric to determine which existing assignments from earlier and later in the major most develop this set of outcomes
  - Refine prompt for senior seminar faith-learning essay and assess essays using rubric
- Finalize and administer alumni survey
- IDI testing of majors on study abroad programs

- Give the “100 Central Sociology Concepts Test” at end of all introduction to sociology classes and the senior seminar
- Evaluate 4-5 senior seminar papers
- Administer Senior Questionnaire in senior seminar

#### 2011-2012

- Analyze alumni survey results
- Focus on methodological skills particularly # 8 and #9
  - determine how to address these skills “early and often” throughout the curriculum
- Consider development of a formative faith-learning assessment
- Continue assessment with IDI, senior seminar papers, 100 Concepts test, and senior questionnaire

#### 2012-2013

- Begin comprehensive assessment of Methodological Skills #6-9 in relationship to SOC 106 and SOC 107 (research sequence)
- Begin analysis of SOC 190—Practicum supervisor evaluations in light of learning outcomes (SLO #12)
- Administer formative faith-learning assessment to a cohort of first-years/sophomores and juniors/seniors and then evaluate student work
- Continue assessment with IDI, senior seminar papers, 100 Concepts test, and senior questionnaire

#### 2013-2014

- Continue with assessment of Methodological Skills #6-9 and Conceptual Skill #2 in SOC 106 and 107



- Continue analysis of SOC 190 and modify supervisor evaluation form to reflect relevant student learning outcomes
- Continue assessment with IDI, senior seminar papers, 100 Concepts test, senior questionnaire, and formative and summative evaluation of faith-learning outcomes.

#### 2014-2015

- Begin Assessment of Conceptual Skills #3-4
- Assess SOC 192—Extra-curricular Departmental Activities
- Begin assessment of Applied Skills #13 and 15
- Continue assessment with IDI, senior seminar papers, 100 Concepts test, senior questionnaire, and formative and summative evaluation of faith-learning outcomes.

#### 2015-2016

- Assess SOC 192—Extra-curricular Departmental Activities
- Continue assessment of Conceptual Skills #3-4
- Continue assessment of Applied Skills #13 and 15
- Continue assessment with IDI, senior seminar papers, 100 Concepts test, senior questionnaire, and formative and summative evaluation of faith-learning outcomes.
- Administer and analyze alumni survey

