Department/Program: Sociology

1) Have formal learning outcomes for the department’s Core courses been developed?

We list below the formal learning outcomes for the Core courses:

   a. Demonstrate the critical, mathematical, informational, analytic, expressive, and creative skills that are essential tools of the educated person well-prepared for a meaningful life and vocation.
   b. Understand the major ideas and methods of inquiry of the scholarly disciplines that comprise the university and be able to use those methods of inquiry as beginning practitioners to address complex contemporary problems.
   c. Be able to identify and articulate the strengths and limitations of the disciplines and the relationship of the disciplines to one another, and demonstrate an understanding of the breadth and diversity of human knowledge as well as its openness to integration in more comprehensive wholes.
   d. Be conversant with and able to discuss intelligently enduring questions and issues that are fundamental to human inquiry and that have shaped the traditions from which the university has emerged.
   e. Demonstrate the ability to apply more than one disciplinary perspective to the same enduring question or complex contemporary problem.
   f. Be familiar with the scholarly exploration of religious faith and understand how faith and reason are related in the search for truth.
   g. Demonstrate the ability to examine their values and experiences and integrate what they learn with the principles that guide their lives.
   h. Be prepared and disposed to use their talents and education as engaged global citizens and responsible leaders in service of the common good.

2) Where are these learning outcomes published? Be specific.

The learning outcomes appear on the University Core website: https://www.bc.edu/bc-web/schools/mcas/undergraduate/core-curriculum/core-renewal/renewed-core-course-goals.html.

3) Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine whether students have achieved the stated outcomes for the Core requirement? (What evidence and analytical approaches do you use to assess which of the student learning outcomes have been achieved more or less well?)

During the fall term, the Assessment Committee normally distributes to all instructors of core Sociology courses (a) a list of the names of a randomly-selected 25% sample of students enrolled in their course(s), and (b) a rubric. The rubric is used to assesses two of the eight
general core formal learning outcomes. Instructors apply the rubric to a 5-page paper or essay exam question from each student in the sample. This was not done this past semester because of the department’s focus on developing new assessment procedures. We will resume this practice in the 2019/2020 academic year.

4) **Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?** (Who in the department is responsible for interpreting the data and making recommendations for curriculum or assignment changes if appropriate? When does this occur?)

The Assessment Committee consists of two full-time faculty members, who also work with the Director of Undergraduate Studies. The Assessment Committee is responsible for (a) creation of the rubric for student work, (b) data collection, compilation, and analysis, (c) provision of summary data and recommended actions to the full faculty, and (d) communication with administration, including annual reports to the Dean of Arts & Sciences.

Annually at the department’s spring retreat, the full faculty discusses the Assessment Committee’s internal report and decides upon programmatic changes.

5) **What were the assessment results and what changes have been made as a result of using this data/evidence?** (What were the major assessment findings? Have there been any recent changes to your curriculum or program? How did the assessment data contribute to those changes?)

As mentioned above, this year the department focuses on developing new assessment procedures. Next year, the committee will use the new assessment procedures to evaluate the core curriculum.

6) **Date of the most recent program review.**

2016.