Annual Assessment Report 2022

Department: Sociology and Anthropology
Academic Year: 2021-2022
Date of Submission: September 15, 2022
Department Chair: (interim chair, Spring 2022) Felicia Song; (returning chair) Sarah L. Jirek

I. Response to the previous year PRC's recommendations

Item: The PRC encouraged ongoing effort to submit curricular revisions to the Academic Senate in a timely fashion.	**Response:** We are thrilled to report that the department completed and submitted the entirety of our Sociology curricular revisions to Academic Senate by the end of Fall 2021. The revisions were approved by Senate and entered into the Academic Catalog effective AY 2022-2023. Curricular revisions involving Anthropology are currently on-hold, due to the current vacancy in the anthropology line in our department.
Item: The PRC requested a planned timetable for addressing the written communication portion of the Written/Oral Communication PLO.	**Response:** The department plans to alternate between oral and written assessments when that PLO is scheduled to be assessed. Therefore, written communication is scheduled to be assessed AY2026-2027.
Item: The PRC requested additional information regarding when the department plans to discuss how to integrate the teaching of oral communication into the rest of the curriculum.	**Response:** This topic is scheduled to be discussed during our October 2022 department meeting.
Notes:	

II A. Program Learning Outcome (PLO) assessment
If your department participated in the ILO assessment you may use this section to report on your student learning in relation to the assessed ILO. The assessment data can be requested from the Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness.

Program Learning Outcome	Integration of Faith and Learning ("Students will be able to explain the integration of Biblical principles with sociological, anthropological or social work issues.")
Who is in Charge /Involved?	Entire department
Direct Assessment Methods	Methods: Graduating seniors enrolled in SOC/AN 195 Senior Seminar finish their semester with a Final Reflection Essays of Faith Integration. These essays were assessed via a scoring rubric developed this year. The essay prompt and rubric are included in the Appendices. We assessed four elements of faith integration: (1) Understanding of texts: *Does student understand what the texts are proposing as a Christian vision?* (2) Analysis and explanation of texts: *Does student understand what the implications of the Christian vision are?* (3) Engagement of Christian perspective from personal faith position: *Can student position themself in relation to the proposed Christian vision?* (4) Self-awareness of personal faith position: *Can student recognize their own stance and what it implies?* Each element was scored on a 5-point scale: excellent (score = 5), good (score = 4), satisfactory (score = 3), barely acceptable (score = 2), and unacceptable (score = 1). There were thirteen students enrolled in the course and each completed an essay. Three faculty members (those of whom were present during the spring semester) separately scored each essay. *Rationale for Assessment Method*: Every year, the senior majors take the Senior Seminar class and produce an essay that asks them to reflect on how their thinking has developed as they have grown in disciplinary sophistication and journeyed in their faith. We acknowledge that, even though it would be ideal to have comparative data that could evaluate student progress in their faith and learning, an adequate assessment would require more advanced planning. We decided that there was sufficient benefit in using this assessment to help gather data about how our graduating seniors manage to navigate the particular challenges of integrating faith and learning as sociology/anthropology majors as they have progressed through the major and their experiences during their college years. In the planning process for the assessment, department members had a lengthy discussion about the need to construct a rubric that did not presume that all students would self-identify as being a person of Christian faith, but that would sufficiently evaluate the degree to which students had appropriately engaged the Christian perspectives that had been discussed during their time as Sociology majors. The rubric was intentionally developed and fine-tuned with these concerns in mind.

Indirect Assessment Methods	N/A
Major Findings	All data were inputted into an Excel spreadsheet and summary statistics of means and standard deviations were calculated for the four categories in the rubric. Averages for each faculty member per category were also calculated to account for the range of scores demonstrated by each faculty member. The spreadsheet is included in the Appendices. Within a scale of 1-5 (5 being the highest), the category for "Understanding" (M = 4.08, SD = 0.90) ranged from 4.46 to 3.77. The category for "Analysis" (M= 3.72, SD = 0.94) ranged from 3.92 to 3.46. The category for "Engagement" (M = 3.72, SD = 1.05) ranged from 3.92 to 3.46. The category for "Self-Awareness" (M = 3.87, SD = 1.26) ranged from 4.08 to 3.69.

The highest average was in "Understanding of the Texts," and the lowest averages were in "Analysis & Explanation of the Texts" and "Engagement of Christian Perspective from Personal Position." |
| **Closing the Loop Activities** | 1) The assessment exercise gave the department an opportunity to consider how we could be more intentional in coordinating our efforts as a department to encourage cultivation of faith and learning. In discussion, an example was raised from the Chemistry Department: while they do not assess for faith and learning, they do have their majors become familiar with a range of Christian paradigms that scientists can bring to their research. A question was raised on whether some kind of similar range of paradigms or perspectives might be helpful to consistently teach in senior seminar.

2) A proposal was made to reconsider the PLO language to (a) not only expect integration, but also application, and (b) to broaden the focus from "Biblical principles" to move towards an articulated understanding of the "faith" component of "faith and learning" as including not only Scriptural engagement, but also familiarity with historical Christian theology and traditions of spiritual formation and practice.

3) A discussion was had about how one co-curricular way of enhancing faith and learning for our students may be for faculty members to become more familiar with the college chapel's programming. A suggestion was made that faculty members commit to more regular attendance at chapel in order to increase faculty awareness of what "faith conversations" students are having and create more opportunities for further engagement in faith and learning from our department's perspective. |

Collaboration and Communication

After the data had been tabulated, department members met to discuss the results. After noting that individual faculty members' standards for evaluating the essays were varied (but internally consistent), there was further acknowledgement of some limitations in this

assessment method. The original assignment prompt was not designed with the assessment rubric in mind, so there were distinct ways in which the assignment and rubric did not necessarily line up. Also, some faculty members were less familiar with the texts that students wrote on in their papers, so it was more difficult to gauge the degree of understanding, analysis, and explanation of those texts.

A major point of discussion was oriented around the particular cultural moment our students have ben inhabiting in recent years. Given the national and political climate, several sociology students articulate experiencing their Christian faith to be in opposition to interest and care for sociological issues. That is, many come from faith backgrounds where they increasingly experience their convictions and care for social justice and the marginalized as being perceived to be threats or problematic to their Christian faith. As a result, the SOC/AN department becomes one of the few spaces where they feel they can work out how these two aspects of their identities and interests can not only be reconciled, but be regarded as a generative dynamic that motivates both rigorous sociological/anthropological analysis and further deepening in one's Christian faith journey.

or/and

II B. Key Questions

Key Question	N/A—We focused on our assessment of the Faith and Learning PLO this year.
Who is in Charge/Involved?	
Direct Assessment Methods	
Indirect Assessment Methods	
Major Findings	
Recommendations	
Collaboration and Communication	

III.   Follow-ups

Program Learning Outcome or Key Question	
Who was involved in implementation?	
What was decided or addressed?	
How were the recommendations implemented?	
Collaboration and Communication	

IV. Other assessment or Key Questions related projects

Project	Previously, the PRC had requested a progress report on the department's efforts to check and update the language in all GE courses' syllabi for compliance with certification requirements (as a follow-up to our last 6-year review).
Who is in Charge /Involved?	The entire department
Major Findings	
Action	Due to the extended efforts needed to successfully complete the curriculum revision, the unexpected vacancy opened up in the Anthropology line (and unexpected teaching needs and deliberations that followed), AND the juggling between two department chairs during AY2021-22, we have had to postpone this task and intend to review and update GE syllabi language during AY 2022-2023.
Collaboration and Communication	

```
                                                                                              

```

V. Adjustments to the Multi-year Assessment Plan (optional)

Proposed adjustment	Rationale	Timing
This is not an adjustment request, rather it is a re-statement of our department's working timetable. However, we are unsure if this is in alignment with the expectations of the PRC's assessment schedule. ***We request clarification and confirmation of the submitted timetable from the PRC.***	Last year, we had re-submitted this timetable as our Assessment Schedule (this was the same one from our post-Six Year Review documents submitted earlier). After some misunderstanding about the timing of our 2023-2024 Six Year Review, we request some clarification on when the PRC expects the NEXT Six Year Review (is it 2029-2030?) to be completed. We would be grateful for this clarification to avoid future confusion or concern—thank you ☺	2022-2023: Research & Methods **2023-2024: Six Year Review** 2024-2025: Core Knowledge Competence 2025-2026: Core Knowledge Application 2026-2027: Oral & Written Comm 2027-2028: Faith & Learning 2028-2029: Research & Methods **2029-2030: Six Year Review**

VI. Appendices
   A. Prompts or instruments used to collect the data: **SOC/AN 195 Final Essay Prompt**
   B. Rubrics used to evaluate the data: **Scoring Rubric for Faith and Learning PLO Rubric**
   C. Relevant assessment-related documents (optional): **Spreadsheet of Scores and Summary Statistics**

AN / SOC195
Final Reflection Essay of Faith Integration
3-4 pages
Double-spaced, 12-pt size
DUE by THURSDAY, May 5, 10 AM
(150 points of final grade)

Like other students graduating from Westmont College, you likely have had your religious and faith imaginations formed and re-formed through your experiences with fellow students, professors, readings, and other life encounters. One of the hopes for Senior Seminar is to continue widening your imaginations by exploring a range of Christian responses and paradigms for engaging the injustices and brokenness of our world. The disciplines of sociology and anthropology provide helpful tools for recognizing and diagnosing these problems, but often offer little in the way of hope and paths forward.

In this course, we have read/listened and discussed the following texts:
- King on Nonviolence and Toughness/Tenderness
- Wink on The Powers
- Thurman on Jesus and the psychology of Disinheritance
- Victor Boutros interview on vocation and anti-trafficking efforts
- Katongole and Rice on Reconciliation
- Yamaguchi on Palace/Street Mentality and Training

Each of these texts sought to work against some of the existing distortions or incomplete understandings of what Christian witness in the world actually means.

Hopefully, during your time at Westmont, you have found *other* helpful perspectives from *other* classes—either within or outside of the department—to be helpful in shaping your imagination.

This assignment asks you to **choose TWO texts from the above list** and discuss the following:

(1) What do the two texts propose as helpful ways to understand the role of religion or faith in social and public life? (Put another way, according to these texts, how does religious faith intersect with sociology/anthropology?)
(2) How do their arguments inspire *you* to re-imagine how to live well into the challenging realites of difference and inequalities that mark our world? Be specific about linking their arguments with what you understand now.

SCORING RUBRIC FOR FAITH AND LEARNING PLO ASSESSMENT
SPRING 2022

NAME:	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Barely Acceptable	Unacceptable
1. Understanding of texts = *Does student understand what the texts are proposing as a Christian vision?* **5 points**	Shows masterful comprehension of central argument and sub-arguments in texts (5)	Recognizes central arguments in texts but does not appreciate its fullness and nuance (4)	Attempts to engage with texts; focuses on unconnected sub-arguments arguments and misses central arguments (3)	Minimal engagement with texts; misuses or mischaracterizes arguments (2)	No meaningful engagement with the texts (1)
2. Analysis and explanation of texts = *Does student understand what the implications of the Christian vision are?* **5 points**	Sophisticated and nuanced analysis and interpretation of texts (5)	Competent and effective analysis and interpretation of texts (4)	Adequate analysis and interpretation of texts (3)	Undeveloped analysis and interpretation of texts (2)	No attempt to construct an analysis and interpretation of of texts (1)
3. Engagement of Christian perspective from personal faith position = *Can student position themself in relation to the proposed Christian vision?* **5 points**	Compelling, eloquent, and insightful engagement of key insights, using specific, concrete, and clear observations/ examples (5)	Clear, competent, and thoughtful engagement; effective use of observations/ examples (4)	Discernible but underdeveloped engagement; somewhat thoughtful use of observations/examples (3)	Mostly vague and unclear engagement; use of observations/ examples lacks thoughtfulness (2)	Lacks any substantive engagement; no use of observations/examples (1)
4. Self-awareness of personal faith position= *Can student recognize their own stance and what it implies?* **5 points**	Masterful articulation and comprehension of personal faith position (5)	Good expression and understanding of personal faith position (4)	Adequate expression and understanding of personal faith position with minor overgeneralizations (3)	Attempts to express personal faith position, with some significant overgeneralizations (2)	No serious attempt to express personal faith position; contains multiple significant overgeneralizations (1)

SPREADSHEET FOR SCORES AND SUMMARY STATISTICS

Understanding of Texts	Analysis of Texts	Engagement Xian Persp.	Self-awareness	Ind total		
3	3	3	4	13	4.00	Understand avg
5	5	4	4	18	3.77	Analysis avg
3	3	3	3	12	3.77	Engage avg
5	5	4	3	17	3.85	Awareness avg
3	3	4	5	15	FAC #1	
3	3	4	4	14		
5	5	3	3	16		
4	3	2	2	11		
5	5	5	4	19		
5	4	5	5	19		
5	4	4	5	18		
3	3	3	3	12		
3	3	5	5	16		
3	2	2	2	9		
4	4	4	5	17		
3	2	1	3	9	3.77	Understand avg
3	3	3	1	10	3.46	Analysis avg
4	5	5	5	19	3.46	Engage avg
3	3	4	5	15	3.69	Awareness avg
4	4	4	4	16	FAC #2	
5	4	5	5	19		
5	4	2	1	12		
5	4	4	5	18		
4	4	5	5	18		
4	4	3	3	14		
2	2	3	4	11		
4	3	3	3	13		
5	4	5	5	19		
3	2	2	3	10	4.46	Understand avg
4	4	3	1	12	3.92	Analysis avg
4	3	5	5	17	3.92	Engage avg
4	4	4	5	17	4.08	Awareness avg
5	5	4	4	18	FAC #3	

5	5	5	5	20
5	5	3	3	16
5	5	4	5	19
5	4	5	4	18
5	4	4	5	18
4	3	4	5	16

4.08	3.72	3.72	3.87	mean
0.90	0.94	1.05	1.26	std

Histogram for individual student overall scores
(N=39, 13 students x 3 scores)

Bin	Count
[9, 10]	4
(10, 11]	2
(11, 12]	4
(12, 13]	2
(13, 14]	2
(14, 15]	2
(15, 16]	5
(16, 17]	4
(17, 18]	7
(18, 19]	6
(19, 20]	1