Annual Assessment Report

Department: Sociology and Anthropology

Academic Year: 2019-2020

Date of Submission: September 15, 2020

Department Chair: Sarah Jrek (incoming chair, beginning AY 2020-2021); Felicia Song (outgoing chair)

I. Response to J J

Item: Requested progress in establishing internship requirement

Response: Discussions of establishing a new internship requirement were enfolded in the larger discussions about curriculum revision because of the ways a new requirement would potentially impact the required core class and the credits needed for major completion, as well as a shift in how SOC 190 is currently taught (since it is presently only required for students in the Human Services track).

Item: Describe current issues at stake in reviewing effectiveness of cross-cultural track

Response: The existing cross-cultural track is premised in an outmoded understanding of sociology as a "US/domestic" discipline and anthropology as a "global/international" discipline. It is already being undone by the range of sociology classes which are taught with a cross-cultural perspective, as well as anthropology courses that tend to be comparative, holistic, ethnographically/ empirically grounded and global in scope. The dept would like to create a curriculum that reflects this updated view that is held by anthropologists and sociologists alike. If, however, the cross-cultural track is abandoned, and given the fact that the department is limited to only officially granting sociology degrees, the practical questions of how the existing Anthropology courses will get adequate enrollment and how anthropology can be more adequately woven into the broader college curriculum remains to be addressed. We intend to pursue ways of contributing more centrally to the Global Studies minor. As a result, discussions of these issues were enfolded in the larger discussions about curriculum revision.



What was decided or addressed?

As discussed in the above responses to the PRC's recommendations, the existing questions about the wider effects on the department's curriculum when the internship requirement is introduced and the future of the cross-cultural track and its relationships with the Anthropology courses, were all bound up in a number of other live questions at play in the department's desire to revise its existing curriculum structure. Other live questions include what core courses students should be required to take (therefore, addressing the question of what we believe sociology graduates ought to know), how to retain a distinctiveness that can be easily documented

Collaboration and Communication

Over the course of the entire academic school year, we held 4-5 extended meetings to discuss curriculum revision. Michelle Hardley was brought in to advise us regarding deadlines and recommendations for how to implement the changes we were considering. During this time, the department was also preoccupied with running a search to fill a tenure-track Sociology position during the fall and early spring semesters.

While there remains some homework to be done in looking at what peer institutions do for particular parts of the curriculum (such as the Human Services track or the unofficial Anthropology major), and while the discussions held often moved to difficult but necessary philosophical questions about what our disciplines are about, who our majors are, what they need to know, and how they need to be equipped, it has been determined that – given the challenges to be expected in AY 2020-2021—the need to focus on the practical solutions for the time being override the more idealistic hopes for settling some of the deeper philosophical questions that simply demand much more capacity than the department can give right now.

Three possible plans of the curriculum were drafted and considered in the last meeting of the school year as a way to determine how to realistically move forward given the existing constraints on our faculty. These three plans were generally inspired and modeled after the

Project	
Who is in Charge / Involved?	
Major Findings	
Action	
Collaboration and Communication	on

V. Adjustments to the Multi-year Assessment Plan

Proposed adjustment	Rationale	Timing
Postponing the Annual assessment schedule by one year	Because of the extenuating circumstances characterizing the spring semester of 2020, the schedule of annual assessments needs to be adjusted to reflect the postponement of this year's PLO assessment.	The assessment schedule will need to be re-adjusted to reflect the following: 2020-2021: Oral & Written Comm 2021-2022: Faith & Learning 2022-2023: Research & Methods 2023-2024: Six Year Review 2024-2025: Core Knowledge

VI. Appendices

A. Relevant assessment-related documents