

UCC Program Review Committee summary of review

Program – Department of Sociology and Anthropology

This program includes the following degrees, minors, and certificates:

- B.A. Sociology
- B.A. Sociology – Pre-Law
- B.A. Sociology - Criminology
- B.A. Sociology – Honors Tutorial College
- B.A. Anthropology
- B.A. Anthropology – Honors Tutorial College
- Minor in Sociology
- Minor in Anthropology
- M.A. Sociology



Recommendation

This program is found to be **viable**, see report for commendations, concerns, and recommendations.

Date of last review – AY 2008

Date of this review – AY 2017

This review has been sent to department chair and the dean. Their responses are attached.

This review was sent to the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council endorses the recommendations in the reports and returned them to Program Review Committee without further comment.

Review of Sociology and Anthropology

Review team

- Jeffrey Chin, Professor of Sociology, Le Moyne College, Syracuse, NY (external)
- Diane Mines, Professor of Anthropology, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC (external)
- Mary Jane Kelley, Professor, Modern Languages (internal)
- Robin Muhammad, Associate Professor, African American Studies (internal)
- John Cotton, Associate Professor, Mechanical Engineering (internal)

Executive Summary

On Oct 25-27, the review team met with faculty and students in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. The department offers the following degrees:

- M.A. Sociology
- B.A. Sociology
- B.A. Sociology-Criminology
- B.A. Sociology-Prelaw
- Sociology Minor
- B.A. Anthropology

The department functions under a single chair and shares common committees in areas such as Promotion and Tenure and Budget and Merit. However, curricular decisions are made separately, and as we found during the visit, there are two distinct identities between the two programs. As such, the body of this report will split into separate answers to Sociology and Anthropology programs.

Areas of concern

- This department has several natural institutional divisions. Unfortunately, there are difficult communications across some of these divisions. These include senior and junior Group I; Group I and Group II; Sociology and Sociology-Criminology; and internally within the Biological Anthropology and Archeology faculty. The latter difficulties in particular are impacting student experiences, and students are normalizing unprofessional behavior.
- The curriculum of each major would benefit from a critical examination using resources suggested below.
- There needs to be stronger emphasis and full communication of course objectives to all faculty teaching classes. Inconsistency was seen in multiple section introductory and service classes as well as capstone courses. The programs are aware of the need for consistency and plans are in the works to remedy this problem.
- Across both Sociology and Anthropology, mentoring of pre-tenure faculty is uneven with some pre-tenure faculty reporting good mentoring, and others receiving little advice, even regarding level of expectations of annual review and dossier format

- Generally, the identity of the department and its individual programs is unclear among some students and faculty. A mission and vision statement might be useful in stating and communicating what makes Sociology and Anthropology at Ohio University unique and valuable.

Recommendations

- External facilitation should be considered to improve communication issues.
- The acute personnel issues in Anthropology are known at departmental and college levels and are being actively addressed. We recommend that this effort be given its due attention.
- In anthropology, students reported upper-level course offerings required for graduation are not communicated beyond the current semester, leading to students registering for classes that don't align with their professional focus just to complete an area. Even if tentative, a plan for two (or even one) years should be made and communicated.
- In anthropology, take advantage of the ideas new faculty bring to join with established departmental faculty to re-envision the curriculum. One specific idea to consider is moving Theory and Methods classes to the third year, leaving room for a capstone course to be implemented in the fourth year.

Commendations

- The department has been making excellent hires in both Sociology and Anthropology, which presents opportunities to reinvigorate both programs.
- Anthropology has robust community engagement with the local community, and high impact activities for students through programs such as the field school and study abroad. Sociology and Anthropology both provide students with internship and research opportunities. Both programs actively participate in several interdisciplinary themes: Wealth and Poverty, Food Studies, Making and Breaking the Law, and War and Peace
- The curricula for all majors meet national standards.
- Sociology is creating a discipline-specific statistics class inside the department that both makes curricular sense and demonstrates faculty collectively acting on assessment
- Sociology and Anthropology have high teaching loads, providing service classes to a significant portion of university undergraduates as well as teaching, advising, and mentoring over 400 undergraduate majors.

Overall judgment: The program is considered viable.

Sociology

1. The program as a whole:

a. Number and distribution of faculty

Sociology has 18 faculty members (Group I and II) who combine with graduate teaching fellows and a few group III to teach roughly 13,000 student credit hours per year. Overall, the department performs exceptionally well with the existing faculty configuration. However, moving forward, the number of full-time faculty must be increased for the continued success of the programs.

b. RSCA

The department has demonstrated innovation and creativity with its existing resources. However, the department will require more resources for professional development and several initiatives outlined in the self-study.

c. Service Mission

The department does an effective job in serving its mission and that of the university. It has been instrumental in bringing together research, teaching, and service to campuses and the larger community. Participation of faculty in programs (such as WGSS) and themes that cross disciplines is commended.

d. Financial resources, staff, physical facilities, library resources, technology

Currently, the department is only getting enough resources to hold excellent programs in Sociology and Sociology-Criminology (and Anthropology) in stasis. Moving forward for these programs will necessitate more investment in their faculty, staff, lab, and new technologies to fulfill and extend its mission.

2. Undergraduate Program:

a. Is the Department fulfilling its service role, adequately preparing nonmajors for future coursework and/or satisfying the needs for general education?

Yes. The review team observed no major concerns in this area in the self-study or in faculty meetings. However, starting with consistent communication of course objectives, as well as statements of assessment practices would help the program make the case.

b. Is the program attracting majors likely to succeed in the program? Is the number of majors appropriate for the program? Is the program attracting a diverse group of students?

Yes. As reflected by retention rates (variable by year but averaging 76%) we have no concerns. Graduation rates (54%-68% for 5 year rates, although data are a bit old) appears roughly consistent with the college of Arts and Sciences as a whole. Male/female distribution is roughly equal, while minority enrollment (16%) exceeds that of the university as a whole.

c. Does the undergraduate curriculum provide majors with an adequate background to pursue discipline-related careers or graduate work following graduation?

Yes. The sociology curriculum at Ohio University meets national standards as articulated in Pike et al (2017). The core consists of an introductory course, statistics, research methods, theory and a capstone course. There are many electives that support the core.

Students currently take a statistics course (PSY 2110) offered by the Psychology Department. The department is creating a new statistics course that will replace (PSY 2110). We support this decision.

Evaluation of post graduation employment and education is undertaken by staff, and reflects a strong effort to collect data. This takes place mostly through personal contacts, and while in some ways is ad hoc, demonstrates graduates pursue various careers and educational opportunities. These data are communicated to current students and staff in a very public manner (including graduate profiles in the hallway.) Jeffrey Chin's addendum will discuss this in more detail.

d. Are the resources and the number of and distribution of faculty sufficient to support the undergraduate program?

No. The current teaching demands of majors and service classes leave the department with a 29:1 student to faculty ratio which is very high. This is achieved with large course enrollment in some sections, especially those taught by Group II and graduate fellows (second year graduate students).

e. Are pedagogical practices appropriate? Is teaching adequately assessed?

Yes. Practices seem appropriate. Assessment, like that in many programs at the university, remains a work in progress. Members of the department reflected activities ongoing to address these issues. Increased awareness and communication of course objectives is essential and should be a high priority.

f. Are students able to move into to discipline-related careers and/or pursue further academic work?

Yes. The department made the decision to remove the internship course from the list of courses that are required for the major. The faculty should consider how students are best prepared for work after graduation if not with an internship. Consider reviewing the section on employment in Pike et al. (2017).

Much of this is addressed under section c above. Jeffrey Chin (external reviewer) adds additional comments in his addendum.

3. Graduate Program:

a. Is the program attracting students likely to succeed in the program? Is the number of students appropriate for the program? Is the program attracting a diverse group of students?

The review team met with first semester Sociology students. They reflected confidence in the program and their ability to succeed. Students reflected a mixture of Ohio University undergraduates and graduates of other universities. Diversity appeared lacking.

b. Does the graduate curriculum provide an adequate background to pursue discipline-related careers following graduation?

Yes. The graduate curriculum consists of advanced courses in theory, methods, and electives in the areas of specialization of Group I faculty. Students have three options for completing the program: two that can be completed in one year include an examination or writing a policy paper, and one that requires two years, a thesis. The two-year option includes completing a seminar on teaching, an apprenticeship with a faculty member and the opportunity to get experience teaching a course as the instructor of record.

Career data are collected by staff through personal connections, but a strong effort is made. Anecdotally, these data support the claim that many graduates are well placed in jobs or Ph.D. programs. Jeffrey Chin has additional comments in his addendum.

c. Does the program provide adequate mentoring and advising to students to prepare them for discipline-related careers?

The evidence of this was not clear.

d. Are the resources and the number of and distribution of faculty sufficient to support the graduate program?

The Graduate Program needs more resources to maintain a minimal level of support to students and faculty. The ongoing limitations might encourage most students toward a one year program, rather than two years and a thesis. Limitations on funding for graduate student travel and research also diminish graduate student experiences. There are enough group I sociology faculty who remain active in research to advise research for the number of graduate students in the program. The review committee heard that some of dual listed courses do not fully challenge graduate students, e.g. the discussion is superficial, which ultimately is an issue of faculty resources and meeting the burden of undergraduate teaching. The department might through discussion better define strengths of its graduate program within sociology, and recruit students with a more focused niche.

e. Does the program offer appropriate financial support to graduate students?

No. Current resources available to graduate students has led to the emphasis on a 1 year M.S. degree, although up to 4 teaching fellowships are available to pursue a thesis during a second year. Graduate students expressed concerns about the cost of university provided health insurance as well as high student fees cutting into stipends that were not high to begin with.

f. Is teaching adequately assessed?

Yes.

g. Are students able to move into to discipline-related careers?

Yes. See b above

4. Areas of concern.

In addition to the concerns in the executive summary, the Sociology program should extend further support to the graduate teaching experience. Professional development of faculty was also a concern. Finally, maintenance of connections with regional campuses should be strengthened, or at least better communicated.

5. Recommendations.

The program in the self-study made a strong case for funding new hires in both teaching loads, as well as areas where hires are needed.

6. Commendations.

The program demonstrates excellence in teaching, as well as lab and grad work.

Anthropology

1. The Program as a whole:

a. Number and distribution of faculty

The current number and distribution of faculty seems sufficient to carry out the broad overall mission of the Department. The program is productive in the area of research, and as the current Assistant Professors are promoted to Associate with tenure, the service obligations will gradually become more equitably distributed.

b. RSCA

The reviewers were impressed by the RSCA of the Anthropology program; faculty members have productive research agendas. The department provides funding to faculty for travel to conduct or present research. Research funding from various sources, both internal to Ohio University and from external agencies such as the NSF, are commendable.

c. Service mission

The anthropology program fulfills its service mission admirably. In addition to departmental governance and service on College of Arts and Sciences and Ohio University committees, anthropology faculty participate in the administration of various interdisciplinary programs across campus. International Studies, The Center for Law, Justice and Culture, Environmental Studies, as well as Arts and Sciences Themes all benefit from participation by anthropology faculty. Service beyond the university is evident, as well, as most faculty serve as reviewers for professional journals and perform public service in the region, whether through guest lectures, student internship placements, or serving on the boards of local organizations (e.g., Athens Community Food Initiatives, SEPTA Correctional Facility, My Sister's Place, Food Policy Council, and more) and through direct work with the historical societies of the Little Cities of the Black Diamond and the Shepherd Higher Education Consortium on Poverty.

d. Financial resources, staff, physical facilities, library resources, technology

Financial resources, administered for the department as a whole, seem adequate in some areas. However, the department chair is unable to adequately fund faculty research for such things as travel to conferences. The main departmental office is staffed by two competent administrators, and Bentley Annex provides comfortable offices and conference rooms. The department has two teaching labs for archaeology and biological anthropology courses, which seem amply equipped for their purpose. The new lab in the Central Classrooms building offers a state-of-the-art research space for biological anthropology and archaeology research, with ample space for faculty and student research (independent and collaborative), including six work stations, several microscopy stations, 3-D imaging technology, a wet sedimentation sifting system, and curation space.

2. Undergraduate Program:

a. Is the Department fulfilling its service role, adequately preparing non-majors for future coursework and/or satisfying the needs for general education?

The Anthropology Program participates robustly in general education with three courses (ANT 1010, 2010, and 2020). Enrollments in these courses are high, and are intended both to prepare majors for more advanced coursework in anthropology and to teach non-majors about cultural and biological diversity over time, including human evolution and variation. Faculty generally teach two sections of these general education courses per year, guaranteeing high quality instruction in these courses.

b. Is the program attracting majors likely to succeed in the program? Is the number of majors appropriate for the program? Is the program attracting a diverse group of students?

The program currently hosts 81 majors, an increase by 20 over figures reported for 2016. With 6.5 full time faculty (Dr. Patton being assigned half time to Food Studies), 81 majors is a large enough number, especially considering the service role of the department in general education. With 81 majors, upper division courses will easily fill adequately. Graduation rates in the program appear to indicate a good success rate among majors. Data provided suggest that the diversity of majors, while objectively lower than national averages, is on par with the low diversity of Ohio University as a whole. (Increasing diversity is a project that belongs at the highest level of university leadership.)

c. Does the undergraduate curriculum provide majors with an adequate background to pursue discipline-related careers or graduate work following graduation?

Anecdotal evidence provided indicates that Anthropology graduates succeed in finding related careers and graduate school placements. Anthropology is not a “vocational” degree, but rather a liberal arts degree that prepares students for careers that stress social relationships and cultural diversity. Ohio University students appear to be finding discipline-related careers such as Assistant Professor of Anthropology at Princeton University, Campus Coordinator of International Education at Ohio U, Director of Bloomsburg Children’s Museum, Marketing Coordinator, Peace Corps Volunteer, Refugee Services Advocate, and Archaeology Field Technician. Students go on to study in graduate programs not only in Anthropology (including top tier programs) but also Law School, Public Administration, and Conflict and Dispute Resolution, to name but a few.

d. Are the resources and the number of and distribution of faculty sufficient to support the undergraduate program?

Distribution of Faculty. Students interviewed during the review process indicate that they are sometimes unable to find senior level courses that best fit their sub-disciplinary focus in Anthropology (that is, Cultural Anthropology, Archaeology, or Biological Anthropology). For example, only one senior level course was offered this Fall semester, and that was a highly specialized Archaeology methods course in lithics (the study of stone tools from an archaeological perspective). For the majority of students in the class, who identified as “cultural anthropology” majors, this course did not allow them to develop or demonstrate senior level research capacities in their perceived sub-disciplinary track. Students noted that they often had

trouble finding courses they needed, in part because they had no way to predict what courses might be offered from semester to semester. Because faculty in the program are very active in leadership roles across campus, they have unpredictable course releases that might at times leave students unable to plan adequately.

Resources are adequate. The department has two teaching labs with ample collections for teaching archaeology and biological anthropology courses in human evolution and osteology.

e. Are pedagogical practices appropriate? Is teaching adequately assessed?

Pedagogical practices at the course level, as reflected in provided materials (course syllabi) are for the most part appropriate, though there is some unevenness. Course syllabi display good and, for the most part, up-to-date readings and topics in anthropology. Most, but not all, course syllabi include a list of student learning outcomes or objectives.

Assessment practices remain in the design phase, and have not yet been fully implemented. Key in the design is the designation of capstone experiences, through which faculty can measure student achievement of the program's learning outcomes.

4. AREAS OF CONCERN:

The reviewers identified three broad, somewhat related, areas of concern that we find to be most pressing. In the recommendations section below, we offer possible pathways to resolution.

a. Communication

From conversations with several constituencies, we became aware of tensions, some quite serious, among the faculty. These tensions are not universal in the program but are serious enough to be clearly delineated, and even normalized, by students who report "cliques" among students allied with different professors. Students believe that some professors are not willing to work with students who identify as "the student" of another professor. The result is that students do not take full advantage of program faculty. Finally, it appears that faculty on early retirement may be inappropriately exasperating conflictual communications.

b. Curriculum and its delivery

The key concerns regarding the curriculum are:

- Availability of appropriate courses at the senior level.
Students complain about the shortage of courses, especially at the senior level, as well as about their ability to plan ahead for courses beyond one semester. Students we interviewed said they were unable to take a course in their favored concentration (cultural anthropology) at the senior level as none were offered Fall 2017. Senior year is the time to integrate and advance one's knowledge in the field and write advanced papers appropriate for graduate school applications.
- Horizontal integration of the "three-field" approach.
The department is strongly committed to a "three field approach" to undergraduate anthropology in which students acquire some advanced

knowledge of biological anthropology, cultural anthropology, and archaeology. This aim is in keeping with the history of anthropology education in the United States, however OU's curriculum could do better in achieving an *integration* of the three fields; both faculty and students strongly self-identify as either Cultural, Archaeological, or Biological anthropologists.

- Sequencing of courses from freshman to senior year.

After taking the three intro classes, students choose from a menu of content classes. The distinction between 3000- and 4000-level classes is not consistently clear from course titles or descriptions. The curriculum lacks a rich array of integrative capstone or other senior level courses where students are able to put their knowledge of theory, method, and analysis to use on an independent research project in their area of concentration. The review team acknowledges that there are some courses now identified as capstone experiences, but because some foundational theory and method courses are left for the senior year, there is little scope for application before graduation.

c. Mentoring of Junior Faculty

All anthropology junior faculty are impressively mature in their research, classroom teaching, and extracurricular work with student research. However, all tenure-track faculty can benefit from the advice of a trusted senior colleague who is familiar with the hurdles along the path to tenure at a particular institution. The reviewers recognize the structural problem of having more junior than senior faculty right now, but consider problematic the lack of a consistent mentoring program for tenure-track faculty in the anthropology program. Some faculty report that they are well-mentored, while others feel the need to go outside the program informally for advice.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS.

The first three recommendations correspond to the areas of concern articulated above; additional recommendations offer suggestions for other programmatic changes that would benefit students and faculty.

a. Communication.

Conflicts threaten the health of the program and need to be addressed immediately and deeply. Needed conversations regarding the program's curriculum, assessment, and vision for the future require respectful and open dialogue among all members of the program, and before this can happen, several steps may be necessary. Moving forward productively may first require mediation among individual parties and later the presence of a facilitator at an initial faculty meeting. A facilitator could lead a day-long or weekend retreat (away from the department) with an agenda developed by all involved. Such a retreat could represent the initiation of an on-going dialogue that guides the evolution of the program.

In addition, current faculty should recognize and communicate that retired faculty no longer constitute stakeholders in the program's future.

b. Curriculum. One important focus of those dialogues should be the curriculum. Conversations regarding the curriculum might take into account one, some, or all of the following:

- If the three-field approach is highly valued, how could the curriculum better integrate the sub-disciplines? Possible models include offering courses that are themselves three-field courses, or at least two-field courses that clearly aim to integrate the disciplines (courses on material culture, ethnohistory, archaeologies of landscape, medical anthropology that takes an integrative approach, and so on). Collaborative faculty/student research could integrate the subfields, and clearer advising might explain and model subfield integration.
- If faculty do not wish to integrate the subfields in their own teaching or research, then faculty may wish to consider whether or not the three field model is pedagogically viable beyond an introductory level. Instead faculty might consider guiding students towards deeper mastery of their sub-disciplinary specializations and/or consider other thematic concentrations that creatively include courses from different subfields.
- Vertical integration of the curriculum could be improved. Perhaps put all methods and foundational theory courses (including History of Theory) at the 3000 level, then design advanced, topical seminars (either integrative three-field or ample separate sub-disciplinary) at the 4000 levels that can serve as capstones.
- How can the current curriculum be made more efficient such that sufficient 3000- and 4000-level courses be offered each semester to give students ample appropriate choices? Does the department need a new faculty line , buy-out replacements for faculty who receive course releases, and/or better forward curriculum planning (so students can plan at least a year in advance)? Can capstones be offered as sub-sections of seminar courses?
- We recommend that faculty survey other departments of anthropology of a similar size and see what other new models are out there. Because of the influx of new faculty with their own specializations and interests, this would be a good time to think about the curriculum as a whole.

c. Junior Faculty mentoring. The department chair and/or program coordinator should work with each assistant professor to identify a mentor early in the probationary period. Perhaps sociology professors could mentor anthropology faculty or the chair and the assistant professor might identify a mentor from a related program housed elsewhere on campus.

d. Assessment. The program seems to have some good ideas regarding improvements to assessment of student learning outcomes. We commend the plan noted in the program report. Each anthropology student should complete some kind of a capstone project that allows faculty to measure student achievement of programmatic learning outcomes. Students at the senior level who we interviewed were able only in general and vague terms to articulate what their major was all about. If students had to produce capstone research, it would give them a chance to develop an integrated vision of the anthropology in relation to their own interests.

e. Professionalization. We recommend the department consider more effective ways to deliver information to students regarding possible professional and/or academic pursuits after graduation: through advising, alumni visits to campus, presentations by faculty, or even a one credit “professionalization” seminar where faculty and university career counselors could rotate through to discuss relevant topics. Majors feel they are somewhat on their own in this regard.

f. Facilities.

While facilities are good, there are a few potential areas of growth in laboratory spaces.

- Currently it appears that two of the four anthropological sciences faculty have access to new lab space for their own research as well as student research projects. Adequate lab space for all faculty needs to be addressed equitably.
- One lapse in the new anthropology lab in the Central Classrooms building is an adequate disposal system for sediment. Currently large vats of muddy water are being dumped in an old, unused parking lot behind the building. Professor Patton would like to solve the problem sustainably and productively (in relation to Food Studies projects) by building and filling a set of raised planting beds in this unused area. This need could easily be met by granting him permission and several hundred dollars.
- Lab space for cultural anthropology. It is becoming more common for cultural anthropology faculty to require some lab space, too, for multimedia and sensory ethnographic work. With visual anthropology and media anthropology a growing focus in the department, it seems that some sort of ethnographic sensory lab might be in order. Such a lab offers audio and visual equipment, editing software, and other media technologies. These are great resources for creative student projects, as well.

6. COMMENDATIONS.

Commendable characteristics of the anthropology program include:

- Extensive, interdisciplinary involvement of faculty across campus.
- Strong participation in general education service courses.
- Exceptional new hires of tenure-track colleagues with active research agendas, cutting-edge course syllabi, and creative teaching innovations (collaborative research with students, internship support, sense-lab, to name a few).
- Overall, high quality faculty, who excel in teaching, research, and service. Multiple faculty have received teaching awards, apply for and receive internal and external grants, and serve on many committees at the level of program, department, college, university, profession, and community. Publication records are strong, often exceeding expectations outlined in the P&T document.
- Program offers ample opportunities for students to engage in collaborative research with faculty.

Dr. Jeffrey Chin¹²
Le Moyne College
Syracuse, NY 13124-1399
Voice: (315) 445-4594
E-mail: chin@lemoyne.edu

Report on the Sociology and Criminology Curricula, Ohio University

September 25-27, 2017

¹ Jeffrey Chin is a Professor of Sociology at Le Moyne College in Syracuse, New York. He is a member of the Department Resource Group (DRG) of the American Sociological Association (ASA). The DRG provides training, organizes workshops, and recommends consultants for program reviews. He is also trained as a reviewer for curriculum certification by the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS).

² While this addendum to the full report is written by Chin, the full report is written by the review team: Diane Mines, Department of Anthropology, Appalachian State University, and internal reviewers John Cotton, Mechanical Engineering, Mary Jane Kelley, Modern Languages and Robin Muhammed, African American Studies, all of Ohio University.

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

Executive Summary

This document is an addendum to the main report co-authored by the review team: Diane Mines, Appalachian State University (the external reviewer for anthropology), and internal reviewers John Cotton, Mechanical Engineering, Mary Jane Kelley, Modern Languages, and Robin Muhammed, African-American Studies. This addendum comments on the sociology curriculum.

A special thanks to the internal reviewers who accompanied us on our interviews and provided important institutional context.

This report is based on a reading of written documents and conversations with members of the Department of Sociology at Ohio University on October 25-27, 2017.

Recommendations are based on *The Sociology Curriculum in the Changing Landscape of Higher Education* (Pike et al. 2017), and *Creating an Effective Assessment Plan for the Sociology Major* (Lowery et al. 2006).

The recommendations contained in this report are made in the spirit of strengthening the department and assisting its efforts to deliver the best possible curriculum. The recommendations are listed below as they appear in the full report. There is a narrative accompanying each recommendation and, in some instances, ways to implement it.

Recommendation 2017-1: consider posting the mission statement on the department's webpage.

Recommendation 2017-2: consider writing an identity statement for the sociology, criminology, and graduate sociology programs.

Recommendation 2017-3: consider revisiting the learning outcomes for the sociology, criminology, and graduate sociology programs.

Recommendation 2017-4: consider revisiting the learning outcomes for each course in the sociology, criminology and graduate sociology programs, make sure they are all consistent with institutional standards and initiate conversations about these learning outcomes.

Recommendation 2017-5: agree on learning objectives for all multiple-section courses and post them prominently on the first page of every syllabus using language consistent with institutional standards.

Recommendation 2017-6: consider revisiting the decision to remove the internship as a core requirement for the sociology and criminology curricula.

Recommendation 2017-7: consider performing a zero-based curriculum exercise

Recommendation 2017-8: consider adding additional pre-requisites for all 300-level courses; add all courses in the sociology core as pre-requisites for all courses at the 400-level.

Recommendation 2017-9: consider developing guidelines for what constitutes a 100/200/300/400-level course.

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

Recommendation 2017-10: consider keeping an electronic repository of all syllabi taught for each course that is easy for all faculty to access.

Recommendation 2017-11: consider making syllabi more readily available for students to review.

Recommendation 2017-12: consider requiring students to write papers using the format and citation conventions of the discipline.

Recommendation 2017: consider instituting regular formative classroom observations for all faculty.

Recommendation: consider regular observations for all adjunct faculty

Recommendation: consider instituting a series of discussions on pedagogy.

Recommendation: look for ways to enhance communication with adjuncts and with students.

Recommendations from the 1999-2007 Review of Sociology

The following recommendations were included in the 2008 report that was written by Dr. Timberlake. They are reproduced here in a **different colored font** and numbered along with a comment concerning their status. Those that are still relevant will be discussed in this report.

Recommendation 2008:1 Create a new category of courses for the SOC/Crim program on inequality (in progress)

Recommendation 2008:2 Hire a criminologist (done but need to be done again with the departure of Faust)

Recommendation 2008:3 Add MA-level instructor to manage internships (done)

Recommendation 2008:4 Fill open positions (marginal success)

Recommendation 2008:5 Get Dean to accept separate lists for hiring SOC/ANT (done)

Recommendation 2008:6 Block non-major enrollment in courses required for majors (not done)

Recommendation 2008:7 Get Dean to prioritize requests to hire by workload equity (on-going)

Recommendation 2008:8 Improve communication with tenure-track faculty including clarifying expectations and instituting a 4th year review (done)

Recommendation 2008:9 Increase staff support based on university-wide equity (done)

Recommendation 2008:10 Increase support for professional travel (done but needs to be monitored with on-going cuts to department budgets)

Recommendations from last review for graduate SOC program

Recommendation 2008:11 Create a 4+1 MA program (under consideration)

Recommendation 2008:12 Add a regression course for MA students (done in the form of an alternative methods course)

Recommendation 2008:13 Add requirement of GRE for grad admissions (done)

Recommendation 2008:14 Develop recruitment strategies to increase # of applicants (done)

Recommendation 2008:15 Expand methods training (done)

Recommendation 2008:16 Establish a tracking system for graduates (in progress)

Recommendation 2008:17 Establish an interdisciplinary PhD program (re-directed to establishing an on-line MA instead)

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

Concerns

- Improve assessment
 - There is an assessment committee charged with doing this
- Find ways to do more with less
 - Generate revenue?

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Recommendations from the 1999-2007 Review of Sociology	3
Introduction	6
Overview	7
Curriculum Development	8
The Undergraduate Sociology Core	9
Undergraduate Sociology Electives	10
Undergraduate Criminology Concentration	11
Sociology - Graduate Program	13
Careers in Sociology	14
Assessment	15
Curriculum Mapping	15
Non-Curricular Issues	15
Conclusion	16
Bibliography	16

Sociology at Ohio University

Introduction

Ohio University is a public university located in Athens, OH, 90 minutes southeast of Columbus. Athens is a quintessential college town and the university is rightfully known as one of the prettiest campuses in the country.

The school enrolls over 18,000 undergraduate students. According to the self study, there are 470 students majoring in sociology, criminology and another 97 students with a sociology minor.

The department is located on the first floor of the Bentley Annex. Most faculty offices are there plus there are two full-time administrative assistants with their own offices. There is a large common area with mailboxes and tables. I often saw students working there - some were work-study students. There are two conference rooms in the area. There are with a few faculty offices below on the ground floor.

The Department of Sociology consists of 18 full-time sociologists: Professors Anderson, Burmeister, Li and Vander Ven, Associate Professors Castellano, Henderson, Hoffman, Mattley (chair), Scanlan, Welser, Assistant Professors Kaufman, Lee, Miller, Morgan, Terman. Ohio University has a designation called "G2" that describes individuals on term contracts who are eligible for promotion but not tenure. Their teaching loads are heavier and they are not assessed for scholarly productivity. In this department Collins, Cox, Roberson are G2s.

The purpose of the visit on which this report is based is to respond to the department's self-study and address the charge put to the review team by the program review committee.

Prior to the visit on which this report is based, the emailed the following materials.

Materials included:

- The department's self-study
- CVs of all full-time members of the department
- Statistical data

Upon request, the following materials were sent along:

- The 2009 program review: report of the external reviewer and response from the department
- Curriculum vitae of adjunct faculty

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

At my request, the administrative assistant, Bennett uploaded copies of syllabi to a folder in my google drive.

The visit spanned three days and consisted of individual meetings with each faculty member in the department, faculty from allied departments, administrators and students:

- Airport pick-up and lunch with Prof. Scanlan
- Individuals meetings on wednesday with Profs. Lee, Hoffman and a meeting with the first-year cohort of graduate students - either Profs. Cotton or Muhammed and sometimes both attended these meetings with me
- Dinner with Profs. Mines (external reviewer for anthropology), Mattley and Ciekawy
- Individual meetings on thursday with Profs. Anderson, Morgan, Welser, Cox, Terman, Terman, Catellano, Kaufman, Roberson, a lunch meeting with Prof. Li, and a meeting with Prof. Cox's capstone class - either Profs. Cotton or Muhammed and sometimes both attending these meetings with me
- Dinner with Profs. Mines, Scanlan, Curran
- Individual meetings on friday with Profs. Collins, Vander Ven, Burmeister, Miller, Associate Provost Hatch, Provost Descutner and Dean Frank - either Profs. Cotton or Muhammed and sometimes both attending these meetings with me
- An exit meeting with the department although quite a few senior faculty were absent
- An exit meeting with Mattley including a ride to the airport on saturday morning

Prior to a Departmental Resources Group visit, the American Sociological Association (ASA) typically sends the department contact a "welcome packet". The chair and that she did not receive these materials.

This report will begin with general impressions and a summary of points made during the meetings. Interspersed throughout this commentary will be a series of recommendations. Recommendations for the department to consider are in **blue**. Each recommendation is also included in the Executive Summary. Recommendations from the 2008 report that still need to be addressed will be included in **red**.

The standards against which the department's curriculum will be measured are those recommended by the American Sociological Association in their documents cited in the list of references.

Overview

The Department Resources Group of the American Sociological Association <http://www.asanet.org/teaching-learning/department-leaders/department-resource-group> is a group of highly-trained individuals who specialize in assisting departments with program review. It is the expressed mission of the DRG to focus on curriculum development. While there are undoubtedly structural, personnel and resource issues that need to be addressed, DRG reviewers do not include these issues in their reviews except insofar as they must be addressed for productive curriculum development to take place.

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

Fortunately, the program review process at Ohio University formulates a review team to include external reviewers to look at curriculum and internal reviewers to look at everything else. For that reason, this report focuses entirely on curriculum and should be viewed as an addendum to the report generated by the entire review team.

Curriculum Development

Important disclaimer: The curriculum must be the product of collective decision-making by the faculty. For that reason, most of the recommendations in this document should be treated as “things to consider” and not as mandates. Ultimately, the decisions about which of these recommendations will be adopted, and how they might be implemented, must be made by the department’s faculty members. For this reason, the comments in the previous section are especially important.

Recommendations on the topic of assessment should be viewed as mandatory.

The university has a Mission Statement and a “2020 Vision Statement” (<https://www.Ohio.edu/Ohio2020>).

I was told in the department exit interview that the department has a Mission Statement and that it used to be on the webpage as recently as this past summer but it is no longer there. The department should work with the webmaster to make sure the Mission Statement is prominently displayed on the department’s webpage.

Recommendation 2017:1³: consider posting the mission statement on the department’s webpage.

I would recommend one additional exercise that parallels the department mission statement. I recommend that the department develops an identity statement. While a Mission Statement is a public declaration of the goals and objectives that the department hopes to accomplish, an identity statement is a document for internal use only that articulates who the faculty are. The faculty might want to think about which areas interest them, what topics they typically research and prefer to teach and what is appropriate given the institutional context. An identity statement will define the niche that the department occupies.

Recommendation 2017:2: consider writing an identity statement.

What follows should be a discussion of curricular learning objectives based on a revisited Mission Statement and a new identity statement. While the department has learning objectives, revisiting the Mission Statement and writing the identity statement is a good time to revisit the learning outcomes.

According to the self study, the learning objectives are (2017:11-12):

1. Students will develop an understanding of sociological theories and concepts.
2. Students will develop knowledge of the data collection and analysis techniques that sociologists use to gather and evaluate empirical data.
3. Students will develop the ability to critically evaluate sociological research.
4. Students will develop an understanding of the diverse forms and sources of social stratification, inequality, and difference that exist in society.

³ There are many recommendations that will be repeated throughout the report. Some will appear here as part of a discussion of sociology, some will appear again as part of a discussion of criminology and some will appear again as part of a discussion of the graduate sociology program. To reduce the total number of recommendations, they will bear the same number.

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

5. Students will develop understanding of the social and cultural processes and structures that inform social interaction.
6. Students will develop the skills of citizenship through a sociologically-informed understanding and commitment to democratic values and civic responsibility.

The learning outcomes for sociology students are (2017:14):

- A. Through the development of an understanding of sociological theories and concepts students can demonstrate the role of theory in sociology.
- B. Students can demonstrate an understanding of data collection and analysis techniques that sociologists use to gather and evaluate empirical data. Students will develop the ability to critically evaluate sociological research.
- C. Students can demonstrate an understanding of the diverse forms and sources of social stratification, inequality, and difference that exist in society.
- D. Students will develop understanding of the social and cultural processes and structures that inform social interaction. Students can articulate an understanding of how culture and social structure operate.
- E. Students will develop an understanding of the reciprocal relationships between individuals and society, and explain how the self develops sociologically.

Recommendation 2017-3: consider revisiting the learning outcomes for the sociology program.

This conversation should be carried down to the level of individual courses. What are the learning objectives of each course? This should be a department-wide conversation so that it is clear to all faculty what students can be expected to know when completing a course.

Recommendation 2017-4: consider revisiting the learning outcomes for each course in the sociology program, make sure they are all consistent with institutional standards and initiate conversations about these learning outcomes.

Learning objectives for multiple-section courses should be discussed so that they are agreed upon and identical on each syllabus. This is especially important for the capstone course.

Recommendation 2017-5: agree on learning objectives for all multiple-section courses and post them prominently on the first page of every syllabus using language consistent with institutional standards.

The Undergraduate Sociology Core

The core curriculum consists of the standard courses necessary for a sociology major including an introductory course (Introduction to Sociology, SOC1000), courses in theory (Development of Sociological Theory, SOC3000) and methods (Elementary Research Techniques, SOC3500) and a capstone course (Sociology Capstone SOC4950). The department requires a statistics course, taught outside the department but they are working to develop a course taught by sociology faculty. The collection of these courses is consistent with discipline-wide “best practices” and recommendations made for the discipline by the American Sociological Association’s *The Sociology Major in the Changing Landscape of Higher Education* (Pike et al. 2017).

The sociology core is structured to encourage study-in-depth. The introductory course is a pre-requisites for both Research Methods (3500) and Theory (3000). The methods course also

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

requires statistics. The capstone course (4950) requires all of these core courses plus senior standing as pre-requisites.

The internship is not required for the sociology major. The department might consider adding it as a requirement as the literature shows that such experiences are an excellent preparation for transition to the labor force. They also alleviate students' anxiety about "what they are going to do with a sociology major" (Pike et al. 2017).

Recommendation 2017-6: consider revisiting the decision to remove the internship as a core requirement for the sociology curriculum.

Undergraduate Sociology Electives

The department currently offers a large number of electives. This program review might be a good time to re-think what elective courses should be offered. The mission statement but especially the identity statement will be helpful with this task. It would make sense to offer courses that faculty feel are:

- central to the discipline
- represent the strengths and interests of the faculty
- serve the larger institution

To accomplish this task, the department should consider conducting a zero-based curriculum exercise where no course is sacred⁴ and faculty members are free to imagine a perfect curriculum. Again, the ASA's liberal learning (Pike et al. 2017) and assessment (Lowery et al. 2005) documents can be helpful here.

Recommendation 2017-7: consider performing a zero-based curriculum exercise

When the department completes a zero-based curriculum exercise, it will be apparent what curricular gaps need to be filled and the staffing needed to fill them. A request to hire that is based on these data is the most compelling argument to an administration. The external reviewer would be happy to participate during and after the completion of this exercise.

The department might also revisit the pre-requisites on their electives. Most electives have a pre-requisite of SOC1000. Some of the electives for the criminology curriculum require Criminal Justice (SOC2600) as a pre-requisite which, in turn, has SOC1000 as a pre-requisite. In summary, almost all courses require the introductory course as a pre-requisite. Thus, the electives follow a model referred to as a "ferris wheel" where SOC1000 is the "ticket to ride". The ASA's guide on curriculum develop (Pike et al. 2017) recommends a three-tiered curriculum that allows for study in depth. While this is the case for sociology majors, it is not the case for students taking upper-level sociology electives.

Recommendation 2017-8: consider adding additional pre-requisites for all 300-level courses; add all courses in the sociology core as pre-requisites for all courses at the 400-level.

⁴ Put differently, no faculty member "owns" a course. This frees the discussion to be about the ideal curricular model and not protecting any person's pet course. The flip side of this assumption is that no one faculty member is expected to be the only person teaching a course, especially core courses such as intro, theory and methods. All faculty should participate in delivering the core.

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

This conversation will be facilitated by determining guidelines for what exactly constitutes a 100/200/300/400-level course.

Recommendation 2017-9: consider developing guidelines for what constitutes a 1000/2000/3000/4000-level course.

These conversations will have the additional benefit of making faculty aware of what is going on in other courses. This is especially important for all courses that have pre-requisites. Having this awareness may free faculty from covering material that students were already familiar with. It will also give faculty the freedom to teach courses with greater depth.

Students complained about this. They were especially adamant about the apparent lack of coordination between their methods and statistics courses. By creating a statistics course that will be taught in-house, this problem can be alleviated as long as faculty teaching both statistics and methods chat about what they cover in their courses.

In order to accomplish this, viewing syllabi should be as easy as possible.

Syllabi are maintained in a repository called Office Share. The administrative assistants collect syllabi and place them there but since submitting syllabi is not mandatory, the repository is incomplete. The chair also has access. If a faculty member is interested in reviewing the syllabus for a course either within the department or in another, ideally they should be able to retrieve them from this repository.

Recommendation 2017-10: consider keeping an electronic repository of all syllabi taught for each course that is easy for all faculty to access.

Syllabi should be posted for students to review. The department has excellent space where physical syllabi could be posted and students could browse them. However, giving students access to an electronic repository would also increase the likelihood that students would take advantage of this opportunity.

Recommendation 2017-11: consider making syllabi more readily available for students to review.

My meeting with students is typically one of the highlights of a site visit. Ohio students were no exception. They impressed me as a bright and thoughtful bunch and like most sociology students, they are often viewed by their peers as slightly quixotic. Like any “minority” group, they are characterized by in-group/out-group dynamics and one thing that I believe will help them develop a sense of professional identity is to know and be asked to use ASA style in their professional writing. Certainly students in the capstone class should be required to format their papers in ASA style.

The ASA recently released the 5th edition of its style manual and it can be purchased by the department to give to sociology majors as a way to welcome them to the discipline.

Recommendation 2017-12: consider requiring students to write papers using the format and citation conventions of the discipline.

Undergraduate Criminology Concentration

The department has a major in Sociology with a concentration in Criminology. Students take the same sociology core as students who have a major in sociology with additional electives

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

in crime and delinquency. The criminal justice course (SOC2600) is a pre-requisite for most criminology courses.

Should the department wish to enhance their criminology curriculum, they might wish to consult the websites of professional organizations such as the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (www.acjs.org)⁵ and to review their model curriculum for four-year schools. Many of the courses recommended for a four-year program in criminal justice are already being taught at Ohio University. (Unfortunately, the professional organization for criminology, American Society of Criminology, www.asc41.com, does not have model curricula.)

The learning outcomes for the criminology curriculum are:

- A. Through the development of an understanding of theories of crime, law, and the criminal justice system, students can demonstrate the role of criminological theory as framework for understanding crime rates and patterns.
- B. Students can demonstrate an understanding sources of crime data and analysis techniques used to study crime and the criminal justice system. Students will develop the ability to critically evaluate criminological research and crime measurement
- C. Students can demonstrate an understanding of the forms and distribution of crime. Students should develop an understanding of the social correlates of crime and the distribution of crime across time and space.
- D. Students can demonstrate an understanding of social control as it is practiced in everyday social life.

The sociology faculty might consider writing a public Mission Statement and a private identity statement parallel to the exercise conducted for the undergraduate sociology curriculum.

Recommendation 2017-1: consider writing a Mission Statement for the criminology program.

Recommendation 2017-2: consider writing an identity statement for the criminology program.

This is especially important to help prospective and continuing students understand why it is a criminology program within a sociology program

The faculty might consider revisiting the learning outcomes for the criminology program. Following this task is to have a conversation on the learning outcomes for each course, consistent with institutional standards, so that all sociology faculty, but especially those teaching criminology classes, are familiar with what students are mastering in each class. Post these learning outcomes prominently on the first page of every syllabus.

Recommendation 2017-3: consider revisiting the learning outcomes for the criminology program in sociology.

Recommendation 2017-4: consider establishing (or revisiting) the learning outcomes for each course in the criminology program consistent with institutional standards and initiate conversations about these learning outcomes.

⁵ The author is certified by ACJS to review criminal justice curricula and can help out here.

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

Recommendation 2017-5: agree on learning objectives for all multiple-section courses and post them prominently on the first page of every syllabus using language consistent with institutional standards.

Again, because there are multiple sections of the capstone course, ensure that learning objectives are consistent for all sections whether they are on a sociology or criminology topic.

Recommendation 2017-6: consider revisiting the decision to remove the internship as a core requirement for the criminology curriculum.

Sociology - Graduate Program

There are no national standards for graduate programs in sociology similar to those that the ASA has developed for the undergraduate major. The closest thing to such a document is: <http://asa.enoah.com/Bookstore/Curriculum-Development-and-Departmental-Management/BKctl/ViewDetails/SKU/ASAOE113T09>

And in 2008-2011, the ASA conducted a longitudinal study of graduate students: (<http://www.asanet.org/research-publications/research-sociology/research-projects/study-masters-candidates>)

However, using the model in Pike et al. (2017) as a model, it is reasonable to assume that a graduate MA program in sociology should include advanced courses in theory and quantitative methods and perhaps also advanced courses in statistics. Comparable programs that have applied research as the focus might also have courses on sampling or qualitative methods and data analysis.

The learning outcomes for the graduate sociology curriculum are:

- A. Students will demonstrate an advanced understanding and ability to use sociological paradigms, theories, and concepts.
- B. Students will demonstrate an advanced knowledge of the logic, methods, and applications of sociological inquiry.
- C. Students will demonstrate the ability to independently critically evaluate and apply sociological theories and research methods to specific sociological problems.

The MA program at Ohio University provides students with three “capstone” options, each of which guides students in different directions. The quickest options are to do a policy paper based on materials collected during two semesters’ classes or to take comprehensive examinations. The format of the exams depends on the preference of the faculty member overseeing the exams. They might take the form of confucian-style closed book exams in a single day or they might be take-home exams and therefore open book. Students choosing either of these two options can complete the program in one year.

Most first-year graduate students receive at least partial funding.

The option for students hoping to continue their studies at PhD programs is to do a thesis. This option typically takes two years and funding is provided in the form of teaching (typically) or research (occasionally) assistantships. The department had four TA positions in 2016-17. Funding in the form of TA position is only available to second-year students. Second-year students take a course on teaching, apprentice with a faculty member as a TA and teach at least one class as the instructor of record. These are often but not always courses that occur during the summer. While this is an excellent experience for the graduate student, reports from undergraduates was that courses taught by TAs from other departments were

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

often disastrous. One hopes that this was anomalous and not representative of courses taught by TAs across the university and definitely not by sociology graduate students.

The MA program in sociology at Ohio University strikes me as one that needs to refine its image. It strikes this reviewer as a good all-around program but one that does not distinguish itself as markedly different from other MA programs. For example, the MA program at Ball State is clearly designed to produce students who can slide right into jobs that demand the candidate to conduct analysis of social science data. What is the niche that the program at Ohio University hopes to fill?

The sociology faculty might consider writing a public Mission Statement and a private identity statement parallel to the exercise conducted for the undergraduate curriculum.

Recommendation 2017-1: consider writing a Mission Statement for the graduate program.

Recommendation 2017-2: consider writing an identity statement for the graduate program.

The faculty might consider revisiting the learning outcomes for the graduate program in sociology. Following this task is to have a conversation on the learning outcomes for each course, consistent with institutional standards, so that all sociology faculty, but especially those teaching graduate classes, are familiar with what students are mastering in each class. Post these learning outcomes prominently on the first page of every syllabus.

Recommendation 2017-3: consider revisiting the learning outcomes for the graduate program in sociology.

Recommendation 2017-4: consider revisiting the learning outcomes for each course in the graduate program consistent with institutional standards and initiate conversations about these learning outcomes.

Since all students in the MA program in sociology have made the commitment to be professional sociologists, students should be required to format all papers in all graduate courses following the conventions of ASA style (ASA 2014).

Recommendation 2017-12: consider requiring all papers in all courses to follow the conventions of ASA Style (ASA 2014).

Careers in Sociology

A common student complaint is an uncertainty of what to do with a major in sociology. The students at Ohio are no different. The department currently implements many tried and true strategies to address this problem. The American Sociological Association has several resources that would be useful for students and they recently published a document on this topic (Pike et al. 2017).

One of these is to require students to do an internship (Pike et al. 2017). In the sections on both sociology and criminology curricula, we recommended that the department revisit the decision to make the internship optional.

The sociology student association, like all student organizations, is intermittently active, but when it is, this is arguably the best way to address student interests. Students inducted into

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

Alpha Kappa Delta (the sociology honor society) may also be able to play a role here, especially when it comes to activities that are more scholarly in nature.

Assessment

A conversation with Associate Dean Hatch indicates that the department is doing adequate work in the area of assessment. Her evaluation of the department is that they are somewhere in the middle of the pack. She reports that they have not yet “closed the loop”.

The department has an assessment committee comprised of Professors Morgan and Welser. They have chosen to focus on assessing student learning in the methods class. While this is entirely defensible data point, the department should consider assessing student learning in the capstone course. Prior to doing so, the department needs to do some house cleaning.

The courses that currently have multiple sections (e.g., SOC1000) need to have common student learning objectives. An examination of syllabi indicates that there is no uniform set of student learning objectives for this course and indeed, many syllabi do not articulate any student learning objectives. This can be remedied fairly easily - I think that most instructors of an introductory course want their students to leave the course with an understanding of the sociological perspective, knowing a few concepts and theories, gain an appreciation of social science research methods and perhaps one or more things. Getting the faculty to agree on some SLOs for this and other multiple-section courses should be fairly easy but will require some time in conversation.

This conversation does not need to result in standardization of any topics, pedagogy or reading materials.

In the case of the capstone course, there is currently no uniformity across sections. This must be done prior to opening conversations about assessment using the capstone course as a data point.

Curriculum Mapping

The department has taken advantage of a service provided by Drs. Stephen Sweet (Ithaca College) and Susan Ferguson (Grinnell College). Drs. Sweet and Ferguson have developed a curriculum mapping tool and by providing them with information on the program, they can generate a report.

Drs. Sweet and Ferguson have generated a report for the department and conversations about this report will be handled outside of this document.

Non-Curricular Issues

Discussion during the visit revealed some procedures and practices that the department may wish to address. While they don't deal directly with curriculum reform, they may help to improve the work environment and support faculty's ability to perform at their best.

Effectiveness in the classroom is important. Peer review of teaching is obligatory for fourth year review and when going up for tenure. It is not clear what the policy is for observing adjuncts. Consider instituting a policy that is predictable and sustainable.

Observations can take two forms: formative and summative. I will address the former as a supplement to the university-wide policies on summative observation.

Sociology and Criminology at Ohio University

The purpose of formative peer observation is, very simply, to provide constructive feedback on how to do the best possible job in the classroom. Peer observations can be performed reciprocally or not, by mentors or not, by other members of the department or not, on a regular basis or not. These observations, should they be put in writing, would **not** become a part of the official record. Instead, the observer and the observee would sign the document that would state clearly that this document was voluntarily generated at the request of both individuals and that it would only be used for summative purposes with the written consent of both individuals. (Summative evaluations are typically more formal and used for the purposes of determining competencies for promotion, tenure, merit raises, etc. Formative evaluations are performed solely for the purposes of faculty development.) For this reason, these observations are almost never conducted by the chair.

Recommendation: consider instituting regular formative classroom observations for all faculty.

While the department should consider formative observation for all full-time faculty, both tenured and tenure-track, the department should also consider regular evaluation for all adjunct faculty who teach for the department. While some adjunct faculty have been observed, there does not appear to be a system in place for making sure this is always done, especially in the faculty member's first semester. At least one adjunct faculty member I spoke to had never been observed. This round of observations may be summative or formative, depending on what the department decides. Which full-time faculty member should observe which adjunct (that is, it should not be the sole responsibility of the chair) should also be determined by the entire department.

Recommendation: consider regular observations for all adjunct faculty.

At least one faculty member expressed a desire to get together periodically to talk about teaching. Such discussions could be formal or informal, within the department or college-wide, regularized or not. The Center for Teaching and Learning would be an obvious place to start.

Recommendation: consider instituting a series of discussions on pedagogy.

Communication was another theme that emerged from our discussions. G2s are now invited to department meetings. They appreciate the invitation.

Recommendation: look for ways to enhance communication with adjuncts and with students.

Conclusion

The department is strong and has the potential to become one of the premier departments at the university. Importantly, the faculty are eager to work towards this goal.

With many new hires, the department is in a period of transition. It is a crucial time to step back and think about what the department and the curricula it will offer will look like in the future. The conversations recommended in this report will provide a roadmap that will provide answers to many of these questions.

Bibliography

American Sociological Association. 2014. *Style Guide*, 5e. Washington DC: American Sociological Association.

Lowery, Janet Huber, Carla B. Howery, John P. Myers, Harry Perlstadt, Caroline Hodges Persell, Diane Pike, Charles H. Powers, Shirley A. Scritchfield, Cynthia M. Siemsen, Barbara Trepagnier, Judith Ann Warner, Gregory L. Weiss. 2005. *Creating an Effective Assessment Plan for the Sociology Major*. Washington DC: American Sociological Association.

Pike, Diane L., Teresa Ciabattari, Melinda Messineo, Renee A. Monson, Rifat A. Salam, Theodore C. Wagenaar, Jeffrey Chin, Susan J. Ferguson, Margaret Weigers Vitullo, Patrick Archer, Maxine P. Atkinson, Jeanne H. Ballantine, Thomas C. Calhoun, Paula England, Rebecca J. Erikson, Andrea N. Hunt, Kathleen S. Lowney, Suzanne B. Maurer, Mary S. Senter and Stephen Sweet. 2017. *The Sociology Major in the Changing Landscape of Higher Education: Curriculum, Employment and Online Learning*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

- available as a free PDF at: <http://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa-booklet-2017.pdf> or for purchase at <http://asa.enoah.com/Bookstore>



OHIO
UNIVERSITY

College of Arts and Sciences

Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
Bentley Annex
Athens OH 45701-2979

DATE: January 2, 2018

TO: David Ingram, Program Review Committee

FROM: Christine Mattley, Chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology

RE: Seven-year review of Sociology and Anthropology

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology has reviewed the report submitted by the internal and external reviewers as part of our 2009-2016 Program Review. We value their careful work in examining our programs and are in basic agreement with their assessment and recommendations.

We appreciate the reviewers' recognition of the high quality of our faculty and our contributions to the education of students at all levels at Ohio University; undergraduate and graduate, lower division and upper division, majors, general education, to interdisciplinary programs and our substantial and significant contributions the College of Arts and Sciences Themes. Moreover, we value the recognition of the ways the department serves the university in both quantity and quality of its programs and instructional excellence across all majors: anthropology, sociology, sociology- criminology, sociology-prelaw. Additionally, we are appreciative of the commendations regarding the highly productive research, scholarship, and creative activity of our faculty, especially in light of heavy teaching loads and our weighted student credit hour production. Additionally, we are pleased that Dr. Chin says of us, "The department is strong and has the potential to become one of the premier departments at the university. Importantly, the faculty are eager to work towards this goal."

However, we would like to offer some corrections to the report. Our programs include an Anthropology minor which is not listed in the executive summary of the report. In the Anthropology section 2.b., the report states: " With 6.5 full time faculty (Dr. Patton being assigned half time to Food Studies)..." Actually we have 8 full time Group 1 faculty members in Anthropology, not 6.5. Patton is not assigned to Food Studies half time; his entire position is located in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology and he is an Assistant Professor of Anthropology, not Anthropology and Food Studies.

We find the specific recommendations from reviewers in line with department goals and efforts and are making progress in implementing many of them. For instance, Sociology and Sociology-Criminology have already taken advantage of the American Sociological Association's Curriculum Mapping Tool which enables a department to assess their curriculum in light of disciplinary learning objectives and to make changes based on the report generated by the exercise. Anthropology has already had a series of discussions and has been working on the Anthropology curriculum especially in terms of capstone experiences for our seniors and assessment. We are reviewing our mentoring practices, revisiting mission statements for both the department and for our programs, and striving to find ways to further support our graduate program.

Of greatest concern for the reviewers was communication. The communication issues are well known to us and the College and we look forward to continue to work with the College to finalize a plan to remedy these issues.

Finally, we appreciate the support expressed for providing adequate resources to a department as large, diverse, and productive as ours. As the reviewers suggest, our current levels of support will barely hold us in stasis and in order to move forward we will require more resources. With the support of the university, we look forward to fulfilling Dr. Chin's prediction of becoming one of the premier departments at Ohio University.



College of Arts and Sciences

Office of the Dean
Wilson Hall, College Green
1 Ohio University
Athens OH 45701-2979
T: 740.597-1833
F: 740-593-

Date: December 5, 2017
TO: David Ingram, Program Review Committee
FROM: Robert Frank, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
RE: Seven-year review of Sociology and Anthropology

I am responding to the 2017 program reviewers' report for the Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

I concur with the report's positive comments regarding the achievements of the faculty as teachers and scholars. Many faculty in the department have well-deserved reputations for excellence in these two areas. I agree that we have made excellent hires recently, and also applaud the interdisciplinary efforts of the faculty. I agree that communication among the faculty (both Group I and II in both Sociology and Anthropology) should be improved, and recognize that the general atmosphere of collegiality in the department is not what it should be. I look forward to receiving a plan regarding the ways in which improvements will be pursued. I also endorse a fresh look at the curriculum as suggested in the report. It seems advisable for this examination to occur within the context of a comprehensive strategic planning effort by the department.