

# **Texas A&M International University Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER)**

**Date Submitted** January 29, 2007

**Assessment Period Covered (2006)**

**Academic Program/AES Unit** Bachelor of Arts in Sociology

**Person(s) Preparing Review** John Kilburn

**Provide summary of the last cycle's use of results and changes implemented**

The faculty continue to offer a curriculum that covers the specific important contemporary issues of the day. In terms of focusing on the employment survey and curriculum response results of the majors, there are very few majors so we can not offer any definitive results regarding program details. Data gathering will continue.

Section I: Planning and Implementation
--

**Institutional Mission**

Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, prepares students for leadership roles in their chosen profession in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society ... Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University embodies a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

**Academic Program or Administrative/Educational Support Unit Mission**

The Bachelor of Arts in Sociology is designed to support the mission of the university by 1) increasing student's ability to communicate through the use of the written and spoken word; 2) develop their appreciation of culture and social integration and 3) develop their sense of self-realization. This program addresses the College (COAS) goal of preparing students for a variety of professions and roles by providing a broad-based liberal arts education.

**Identify outcomes and the relationship to Strategic Plan**

**Outcome 1**

**Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**

Students will demonstrate the ability to read and understand sociological research reports/articles.

**Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 1**

Goal 1 Academics

**Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 1**

1.7 Establish and pursue student learning outcomes appropriate for each program with systematic assessment and use of results for continuous quality improvement.

**Identify methods of assessment to be used**

Program faculty assessment of student work in the senior proseminar course.

**Indicate when assessment will take place**

Fall

**Criteria/Benchmark**

All students in Senior Proseminar will demonstrate an understanding of the peer-reviewed literature in their review of literature.

---

**Outcome 2**

**Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**

Students will present opposing viewpoints and alternative hypotheses.

**Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 2**

Goal 1 Academics

**Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 2**

1.7 Establish and pursue student learning outcomes appropriate for each program with systematic assessment and use of results for continuous quality improvement.

**Identify methods of assessment to be used**

Paper assignment in Social Inequaility

**Indicate when assessment will take place**

Spring

**Criteria/Benchmark**

Students will write papers that demonstrate competency in understanding opposing viewpoints and interests in society.

---

**Outcome 3**

**Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**

Students will have some understanding of the primary process of analyzing and interpreting data.

**Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 3**

Goal 1 Academics

**Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 3**

1.7 Establish and pursue student learning outcomes appropriate for each program with systematic assessment and use of results for continuous quality improvement.

**Identify methods of assessment to be used**

Research Methods assignments.

**Indicate when assessment will take place**

Fall

**Criteria/Benchmark**

Students will average a 2.0 on the research methods rubric.

## Section II: Analysis of Results

### **When (term/date) was assessment conducted?**

#### **Outcome 1**

December, 2006 and January, 2007

#### **Outcome 2**

January 2007

#### **Outcome 3**

December, 2006 and January, 2007

---

### **What were the results attained (raw data)?**

#### **Outcome 1**

Professors reviewed the Senior Proseminar (taught by Kilburn) final papers with a concentration on the Review of Literature Section.

Rubric

0=did not use peer-reviewed literature

1=used peer-reviewed literature but did not demonstrate a clear understanding of its meaning

2=used peer-reviewed literature and demonstrated a clear understanding of its meaning; just a simple report

3=used peer-reviewed literature demonstrating a clear understanding of its meaning, with strong indications of synthesis among topics

There were a total of 9 papers read (rubric score=2). In terms of quality of research, all nine papers used peer reviewed sources, and demonstrated a general understanding of the main points from the professional literature. However, none of the papers clearly demonstrated a well-developed synthesis between the theoretical perspectives put forth by the research they reviewed (rubric score=3).

#### **Outcome 2**

Due to the unexpected retirement of Dr. Kimberly Folse, Social Inequality was not taught this past semester and papers for this course were not reviewed. Instead, Sociology faculty discussed our general perceptions about student work related to diverse viewpoints. The general discussion led to the conclusion that while our students are exposed to various viewpoints, many students tend to generalize their personal experience in Laredo to be the same as other parts of the United States.

#### **Outcome 3**

Students were required to critique and analyze research articles from the top three journals in the field of Sociology (American Sociological Review, American Journal of Sociology, and Social Forces). Specifically, they were asked to examine the theory section, the methods section and the results and discussion of each article.

0=Student fails to demonstrate understanding of basic concepts and principles related to standard scientific methodology

1=Student demonstrates some understanding of basic concepts and principles related to standard scientific methodology, but fails to apply these to actual research.

2= Student demonstrates some understanding of basic and advanced concepts and principles related to standard scientific methodology

3= Student demonstrate some understanding of basic and advances concept and principles related to standard scientific methodology, and is able to apply them in actual research practice

Students also had to undergo an online certification training on how to deal with human subjects (offered by the National Institutes of Health). All students passed and received a certificate from the from the NIH.

Twenty students were reviewed (though only 3 were Sociology majors).

No students were rated 0

Three students were rated 1

Twelve students were rated 2

Five students were rated 3

---

**Who (specify names) conducted analysis of data?**

**Outcome 1**

Cecilia Garza, John Kilburn, Judith Warner, and Marcus Ynalvez

**Outcome 2**

Cecilia Garza, John Kilburn, Judith Warner, and Marcus Ynalvez

**Outcome 3**

Marcus Ynalvez, Cecilia Garza, John Kilburn, and Judith Warner

---

**When were the results and analysis shared and with whom (department chair, supervisor, staff, external stakeholders)? Submit minutes with data analysis to [assessment@tamiu.edu](mailto:assessment@tamiu.edu) (Please use Minutes Template located on the **Project INTEGRATE** web page.)**

Meeting minutes shared January 29, 2007

**NOTE: Submit all assessment documentation (i.e., surveys, rubrics, course exams with embedded questions, etc.) to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.**

**Use of Results: Indicate whether criteria were met/not met and what changes, if any, have been identified based on the data collected?**

### Outcome 1

Met    Not Met

**Provide narrative:** Professors reviewed the Senior Proseminar (taught by Kilburn) final papers with a concentration on the Review of Literature Section. There were a total of 9 papers read. In terms of quality of research, all nine papers used peer reviewed sources, and demonstrated a general understanding of the main points from the professional literature. However, none of the papers clearly demonstrated a well-developed synthesis between the theoretical perspectives put forth by the research they reviewed.

### Outcome 2

Met    Not Met

**Provide narrative:** We did not offer this course due to the unexpected retirement of Dr. Kimberly Folse. Instead, we discussed how the general principles were covered in numerous courses across the discipline. Our general consensus was that students tend to generalize their experience in Laredo to those across the United States. This led to the general consensus that we should add a course on globalization.

### Outcome 3

Met    Not Met

**Provide narrative:** Students were required to critique and analyze research articles from the top three journals in the field of Sociology (American Sociological Review, American Journal of Sociology, and Social Forces). Specifically, they were asked to examine the theory section, the methods section and the results and discussion of each article.

0=Student fails to demonstrate understanding of basic concepts and principles related to standard scientific methodology

1=Student demonstrates some understanding of basic concepts and principles related to standard scientific methodology, but fails to apply these to actual research.

2= Student demonstrates some understanding of basic and advanced concepts and principles related to standard scientific methodology

3= Student demonstrate some understanding of basic and advances concept and principles related to standard scientific methodology, and is able to apply them in actual research practice

Students also had to undergo an online certification training on how to deal with human subjects (offered by the National Institutes of Health). All students passed and received a certificate from the from the NIH.

Twenty students were reviewed (though only 3 were Sociology majors).

No students were rated 0

Three students were rated 1

Twelve students were rated 2

Five students were rated 3

---

**How have these data-based changes improved your program/unit?**

For outcome #1, we plan to allocate more time in the Senior Proseminar class for writing and reviewing the literature. In other Sociology courses, we plan to make a special effort to take time in our courses to show the students the significance of peer-reviewed literature. For outcome #2, we plan to reformulate our specific outcome measures to adjust to the new faculty changes as well as develop a course in Globalization so that students may extend their studies beyond Laredo. For outcome #3, we plan to introduce more peer reviewed literature with data tables. By explaining these tables in all content classes (2000 level and above), students will have a general exposure to this type of research before they begin the Research Methods course. Faculty will make a conscious effort to discuss how statistics, quantitative methods, and qualitative methods are used in the research they share with their classes.

Section III: Programmatic Review

**Are resources affected by the changes identified in Section II?**    Yes    No

**If so, specify the effect(s) using the chart below:**

Funding	Physical	Other
<input type="checkbox"/> New resources required	<input type="checkbox"/> New or reallocated space	<input type="checkbox"/> Primarily faculty/staff time
<input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation of current funds		<input type="checkbox"/> University rule/procedure change only
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other: Enter text here

**Provide a narrative description and justification for requested resources (include linkage to Strategic Plan)**

Enter text here

<b>Identify proposed outcomes for the next assessment cycle:</b>
Continuation of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for continuation): We will continue outcome #1 assessment with the Senior Proseminar course. We will also continue outcome #3 assessment with the Research Methods course.
New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below): Enter text here
Modification of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for modification): Because we do not plan to have a full-time faculty member offering Social Inequality, we plan to review papers from other courses (Such as Race and Ethnicity and the soon to be developed course on Globalization). We will as students' ability to understand diversity, as well as diverse opinions.

\*\*\*\* This section to be completed by dean/director/vice-president \*\*\*\*

**Are resources requested a priority for the academic program/AES unit?**

Yes    No

**Comments:**

Enter text here

**If funding, physical or other resources were requested, what is the impact of the budget decisions on the academic program/AES unit?**

Enter text here