

**Quality Enhancement Review
Department of Sociology
Florida State University
Spring Semester 2007**

- Section 1: Mission
- Section 2: Comparable Departments
- Section 3: Priorities and Accomplishments
- Section 4: Program Outcomes
- Section 5: Student Learning Outcomes
- Section 6: Instruction, Research, and Public Service
- Section 7: Relationship with Other University Units
- Section 8: Constituencies
- Section 9: Resources
- Section 10: Self-Assessment/Outside Assessment
- Section 11: Problems over the Next Five Years
- Section 12: Attainment of Goals, Increased Success and Recognition
- Section 13: Future Contribution and Resources

Graduate Policy Committee Review

- GPC 1: Doctoral Graduates
- GPC 2: Placement (Graduate and Undergraduate)
- GPC 3: Recruitment and Enrollments
- GPC 4: Professional Preparation of Graduate Students
- GPC 5: Library and Other Resources
- GPC 6: Curriculum
- GPC 7: Additional Student Data

Florida Board of Governors Review

- FBOG 1: Identify the last and next specialized accreditation review. What degrees are covered?
- FBOG 2: Identify instructional outcome measures you are currently using or planning to use.
- FBOG 3: Describe ways in which past evaluations of departmental performance have led to improvements and any plans to use current and future measures to further improve the program.
- FBOG 4: Provide statement of goals and objectives in areas of teaching, research, and public service.

Section 1. Mission

When was the department organized? What are the key historical events in its development? Are there any legal or other requirements for its existence?

The Department of Sociology at Florida State College for Women (FSCW) was established in the Fall of 1918, with the arrival of Raymond F. Bellamy, a true man for all seasons. Dr. Bellamy taught political science, economics, and history in addition to sociology and served as head of the Sociology Department until 1950, 32 years in all. Dr. Bellamy wrote a history of the Department from 1918 to 1948 (and Professor Francis Allen wrote one covering 1948 to 1979), painting a colorful picture of its early days at the Florida State College for Women.

Under Bellamy's leadership, the department grew to five or six faculty, although some taught social work and anthropology. The School of Social Work separated from sociology in 1947 and the Department of Anthropology did so in 1950. Bellamy's history describes the lively controversies that surrounded the teaching of sociology in the early years at FSCW. More than once, legislators, colleagues, and local ministers demanded that Bellamy be fired and forbade his use of particular textbooks. He was accused of teaching evolution and of saying there is no god. When the legislature nearly passed a law outlawing the teaching of evolution in "state schools," Dr. Bellamy wrote: "Had it passed, I would have gone into court and demanded that every dictionary and encyclopedia in the schools of the state be removed." Although Bellamy was repeatedly sanctioned for teaching controversial topics, President Conradi refused to fire him. Reasons given by his enemies for firing him, as summarized by Bellamy: ". . . teaching evolution, being Pro-German (this was a serious charge at that time), being a Bolshevik (they would say Communist now), teaching free love, teaching atheism, and being a Damyankee." Despite these dynamics, Bellamy never avoided controversial issues and he actively fostered a critical perspective on society, following the very principles our faculty affirm and embody today.

The change from a women's college to a University, just after World War II, saw the department grow in faculty size as demand for education for returning veterans prompted conversion and expansion. By 1968, the Department was the size it is presently with 21 tenure-track members and three empty lines.¹ At our last QER review--in 2000, the department had 21 members, most of whom had been here for several years (six were hired before 1977, five in 1977-1985, three in 1985-1990, and eight after 1991). As of January 2007, most of our faculty are "new." Only seven were here in 2000 (Brewster, Eberstein, Martin, Orcutt, Padavic, Reynolds, and Quadagno). Multiple retirements (Armer, Fendrich, Ford, Hazelrigg, Kinloch, Hardy, Isaac), a death (Imershein), and the departure of five other faculty (Boyd, Dahms, Heron, Myles, and Reid) required

¹ Dr. Susan Losh moved from Sociology to the College of Education, effective spring term 2000 (and is not counted in departmental data in this report). At the time, Losh's move left the department with 21 faculty lines (and 3.5 vacant). Dr. David Sly previously had moved from Sociology to Geography (in 1997). By agreement with the Dean of Social Sciences, Sly continued to teach sociology courses and appear in departmental teaching productivity data for some years. As with Losh's line, Sly's line was not replaced, resulting in a reduction of two lines for our Department.

aggressive recruitment, resulting in the hiring of 17 new faculty since 2000 (13 in tenure track positions). Our faculty composition is very different rank-wise from 2000. We have 10 tenure track faculty at the assistant professor level plus one in a non-tenure-track teaching line, and two other “teaching faculty” hired in visiting positions with OPS funds, one of whom is helping to develop our Applied Social Research MS program.

There are no legal or other requirements for the department’s existence.

Selected key events in our history include:

- Establishment of the Sociology Research Laboratory (1953), which later became the Institute for Social Research and gave rise to the Center for the Study of Population and the Pepper Institute on Aging and Public Policy. The Institute for Social Science Research has since been disbanded.
- Sociology Ph.D. program established in 1954. First degree awarded 1958.
- First Ph.D. in the Interdivisional Program in Marriage and Family (Sociology) awarded in 1955. Sociology Department withdrew from participation, circa 1990.
- External departmental reviews by Bonjean/Wilson (1977), Board of Regents (1987), FSU Graduate Policy Council (1989), QER/Sullivan (2000).
- Dr. Jill Quadagno joined department as an Eminent Scholar (1987), housed in the Claude and Mildred Pepper Institute on Aging
- Dr. Patricia Martin named Daisy Parker Flory Professor (1989)
- Our Applied Social Research masters degree program established (2000)
- Dr. Isaac Eberstein named Charles Meade Grigg Professor of Sociology (2002)
- Dr. Larry Isaac (now at Vanderbilt) named Claude and Mildred Pepper Chair of Sociology (2002)
- Full Professors R. Jay Turner and Elwood Carlson joined the Sociology Department (2002)
- Dr. Elwood Carlson named Charles B. Nam Professor of Sociology (2002)
- The Center for the Study of Population renamed Center for Demography and Population Health (2002)
- Dr. Jay Turner named Marie Cowart Professor of Epidemiology and Sociology (2004)
- Dr. Annette Schwabe appointed as sociology’s first non-tenure track faculty member (2006)
- Recruited ten outstanding new assistant professors, 2001 to 2006.
- Recruited our first full professor African American colleague with tenure, Dr. Verna Keith (2006)
- From 2002 to the present, we substantially increased our external grant applications and success rates
- Since 2001 to the present, we dramatically improved the quality and number of our doctoral student recruits

What is the program’s mission?

In preparation for the recent SACS Accreditation, the Department prepared the following mission statement: The mission of the Department of Sociology includes “excellence in undergraduate and graduate teaching, in research and scholarly publication, and in public service to the community and discipline.” We report our priorities and contributions shortly.

Describe the intellectual arena of sociology in general and at FSU.

Sociology celebrated its 100 anniversary as an academic discipline in the U. S. in 2005. One of our faculty members, Jill Quadagno, who served as President of the American Sociological Association in 1998, was celebrated during our centennial year. (Quadagno was only the seventh woman to be elected ASA president in its first 92 years of operation.) Sociology is the study of all aspects and dynamics of human collectivities—including schools, families, play groups, communities, corporations, and states. It addresses basic questions such as, “How is society possible? What is the relationship between individuals and society? What social forces and relations account for a society’s culture, character, practices, and effects on members, the environment, other societies? What fosters inequality and what are its effects? How do societies change?” Sociologist Joan Huber has claimed that sociology has three primary emphases² which are (1) social organization (e.g., family, religion, complex or formal organizations), (2) social stratification or inequality (e.g., based on class, race, gender, age, sexual orientation), and (3) demography (the study of birth, deaths, migration, and age). But others dispute this characterization as overly narrow.

Sociology is anything but narrow. The American Sociological Association, with a membership of 14,000+, lists 73 “sections” (substantive or methodological divisions) that help members associate with others with similar interests. The sections range in content from Crime and Delinquency, to Collective behavior and Social Movements, to Sex and Gender, to Family, Demography, Economic Sociology, Sociology of Culture, Social Psychology, Medical Sociology, Mental Health, Aging, Comparative Historical Methods, Work and Occupations, Organizations, Emotions, Political Sociology, and more. We are a “multi-paradigm” field that addresses diverse topics and issues. We have debates about whether we should speak to the public—that is, do “public sociology”—or whether we should focus on “ourselves.” We debate substantive and research priorities, methods, theories, and the relative significance of subfields.

We resemble the humanities in many respects, e.g., many sociologists publish research monographs that resemble work by historians and cultural anthropologists. Contrariwise, some sociologists’ work resembles that of economists and biologists, in being quantitative papers but, even there, our work differs. Our articles typically require extensive theoretical development at the front end and our papers routinely require two or more years to develop, another year (or more) for peer review, and another year (or more) for publication. As a result of this lengthy gestation period, our articles, even those in our leading journals, are typically cited only after some years have passed. Very different

² Joan Huber (1995) “Institutional perspectives on sociology,” *American Journal of Sociology*, 101:194-216.

from the “natural sciences,” our articles often increase rather than diminish in impact over time. They do not, that is, have a short “half life.” Finally, unlike faculty in most physical science, math and engineering fields, many sociologists make major contributions in their later years. Jessie Bernard, for example, a highly influential sociologist of the family and gender in the 1960s, 70s and 80s, wrote all of her path-breaking books after retiring from her Pennsylvania State University faculty position. Robert Merton, William Form, Judith Lorber, Joan Acker, Robin Williams, Howard Becker, Joan Huber, Arthur Stinchcombe, and our own Charles B. Nam (and others like them) similarly kept/keep contributing to our discipline long after officially retiring.

Trends in sociology nationally, 1966 to 2004. We draw attention to two trends in sociology nationally: The ups and downs in sociology degrees earned over the past 40 years and the growing percentage of women in our field, as both students and faculty. First, we consider *sociology degrees awarded*. Data from the US Department of Education indicate that the number of U. S. sociology degrees awarded peaked in the 1970s with 36,000 BS degrees, 3200+ MS degrees and 734 PhD degrees. A downward trend followed, particularly in BS and MS degrees, until the mid-1980s when an upturn began. The upturn, primarily for BS and MS degrees, continued through 2004. In 2004, 27,020 sociology BS degrees were earned, a number not equaled since the mid-1970s. Similarly, 2031 MS degrees were earned, again a figure last achieved in 1976; and in 2004, 598 PhD degrees were awarded, fewer than the most ever awarded (734 in 1976) but higher than for the 1990s (1990s Mean=523; 2000-04 Mean=595). These data indicate that demands on our department for teaching, mentoring, and instruction at all three levels will continue to accelerate, as was the case over the past seven years. Except for our Applied Social Research program, our data reflect national trends. We have more graduate students (and more of them funded) than ever before (we had 56 in Fall 2006 vs. 37 in Fall 2001) and our undergraduate majors and course enrollments (in terms of both FTEs/SCHs) have increased. **(See Section 3, on Priorities.)**

Gender. National data on gender in sociology show our field increasingly populated by women, particularly in the student arena but increasingly among faculty too. In 2004, 71% of all sociology BS degrees, 67% of MS degrees, and 60% of PhDs were awarded to women. The change is mirrored in other social science fields, particularly psychology (69% of PhDs in 2004 were awarded to women). The shift in sociology is dramatic, from 18% women (of all degrees earned) in the late 1960s to 59% today (and psychology increased from 21% to 68% in the same period.) As to sociology graduate student enrollment, in 2002, 64% nationally were women, an increase of 25.4% from 1990 (with men’s enrollment declining by 14%), amidst an overall head-count increase of 7.8%.

Gender in Sociology at FSU. When current department chair Patricia Martin studied in the FSU Department of Sociology graduate program in the 1960s, the Department had only one woman faculty member (and she did not receive tenure). She had not a single woman instructor in seven years of graduate school. To have a woman on her PhD committee, she recruited a geneticist, Margaret Menzel, as her outside member. (Margaret gave her extremely useful editorial help and recruited Pat to sign a class action lawsuit against FSU over gender bias in 1971.) The Department had no women at the full professor level until it recruited Jill Quadagno from outside FSU and Pat Martin from

social work in 1987. A few years later, Melissa Hardy was the first woman faculty member to rise through the ranks in sociology at FSU from assistant to associate to full professor. Some years later, Irene Padavic did the same. The Department later recruited Monica Boyd for a named chair and, at one point, had four women in named chairs. Today two women and three men have named chairs (one Eminent Scholar with the remainder occupying “named” chairs established by the Provost). As to gender composition, FSU sociology today has 11 women and 11 men, with four men and four women full professors, two women and one man associate, four women and six men assistants, and one non-tenure track woman.

Table 1.1. Gender Composition of FSU Sociology Department Faculty, 2006-2007

Academic Rank	Women	Men
Full	4	4
Associate	2	1
Assistant	4	6
Assistant in	1	0
Total*	11 (10 in Tenure Track)	11

*In 2006-2007, in addition to 22 regular faculty lines, we have two “Visiting” faculty members, supported by OPS funds; one of them assists with undergraduate teaching and the other, with our Applied Social Research masters program.

If we compare FSU data to national data, FSU today has more senior women than many sociology departments. Among all graduate sociology departments in 2000-2001, 25.6% of full professors were women, 42.4% of the associates were women, and 52.2% of assistants were women (61.0% of instructors/lecturers were women). Current FSU data reflect several changes from the past. For example, in 1997-1998 (the last year in the prior QER report), 30 percent of our full professors (4 of 13) were women, 67 percent of our associates were women (2 of 3), and 40 percent (2 of 5) of our assistants were women. Today, women make up one-half of the full professors and one-half of the faculty overall.

Faculty/programmatic areas. We recently restructured our graduate program to reflect faculty members’ interests and expertise and identified four areas of programmatic concentration: Health and Aging, Inequality and Social Justice (gender/race/class, politics and social movements), Demography, and Social Psychology. We have a nationally known and highly respected faculty in each area and are confident that we offer an excellent doctoral preparation in each. The diversity of faculty interests is indicated by the following list of specializations within our four programmatic areas:

- Mental health
- Retirement, aging, social policy
- Social inequality (due to gender, race, age, class and sexual orientation)
- Gender (masculinity, femininity)
- Political sociology
- Demography/population
- Work and organizations
- Social movements and collective behavior
- Education
- Sociology of emotions
- Substance abuse (drugs, alcohol)
- Social psychology
- Race/ethnicity and health
- Sociology of religion
- Sociology of youth, childhood

- Welfare state policies and dynamics

Does the academic department have a strategic statement or guiding document?

No. However, we updated our Departmental Bylaws in the Fall of 2006 and, in the course of reviewing them, discussed some of our goals and procedures.

Section 2: Comparable and Aspirational Departments

How does this department compare with others in same or closely allied disciplines on campus, in SUS, or nationally? Use five aspirational and five comparable departments/universities in terms of mission, size and quality (you may use NRC data).

Comparisons of the quality of academic departments and graduate programs typically use either (1) *productivity measures*, such faculty publication rate or amount of grant support, or (2) *reputational measures* based on ratings by survey respondents, such as the well-known *U.S. News & World Report* (hereafter, *US News*) ratings of “America’s Best Graduate Schools.” In this self-study, we use both approaches to assess how the Department of Sociology at FSU compares with other graduate programs.

Table 2.1 shows how FSU compares with five other sociology departments at large, Research-I, public universities that are closely matched to our department in size of faculty and in terms of reputational ratings of “scholarly quality of program faculty” based on the 1993 NRC survey (93Q). These six departments are closely grouped between 2.60 and 3.08 on the NRC scale (range = 0-5), which means survey respondents generally saw them as “good” in quality of faculty. With 17-21 faculty members, these departments would be classified as medium in size.

Table 2.1. Sociology Departments Comparable to FSU in NRC Quality and Size of Faculty

<u>Department</u>	<u>NRC 93Q^a</u>	<u>N Faculty^b</u>	<u>Per Capita Productivity Score^c</u>	
			<u>Articles 70-89</u>	<u>Books 72-89</u>
FSU	2.96	20	1.13	0.49
Univ Florida	2.68	21	0.32	0.57
Univ Georgia	2.60	19	0.60	0.44
Michigan State	2.72	17	0.52	0.42
Washington State	3.08	20	1.07	0.69
Univ Iowa	2.80	18	1.08	0.55
<u>Mean Reputational Rating and Rank in <i>US News & World Report</i></u>				
<u>Department</u>	<u>Rating 1998</u>	<u>Rating 2005</u>	<u>Rank 1998</u>	<u>Rank 2005</u>
FSU	2.6	2.9	47	42
Univ Florida	2.5	2.8	51	46
Univ Georgia	2.6	2.6	47	55
Michigan State	2.9	2.9	36	42
Washington State	3.0	3.0	35	38
Univ Iowa	3.1	3.1	28	34

^aNational Research Council Rating of Quality of Sociology Graduate Programs in 1993

^bFaculty listed in American Sociological Association *Guide to Graduate Departments*, 2005

^cTable 2 in Keith and Babchuk, *Social Forces* 76 (1998), pp. 1508-09

Productivity data (in two right-hand columns of top panel of Table 2.1) come from Keith and Babchuk’s (1998, pp. 1508-09) comparative analysis of sociology departments based

on per capita faculty publications in seven leading sociological journals from 1970-89 and books published from 1972-1989. This study provides the most comprehensive and reliable measures of faculty productivity available, although it is unfortunately dated. In productivity of journal articles, FSU's productivity score was substantially higher than scores for the University of Florida, the University of Georgia, and Michigan State University. However, article productivity at FSU was only slightly higher than that for Washington State and the University of Iowa. The six departments in Table 2.1 did not differ substantially on book productivity per faculty member for the time period studied.

It is worth noting that, **among 112 sociology departments included in the Keith and Babchuk study, FSU ranked 21st nationally in article productivity among all departments, both public and private, and ranked 11th in productivity among departments at public universities.** In comparison, the University of Florida ranked in the bottom half at 65th among all 112 universities on per capita article productivity.

Despite the gap between FSU and several other comparable departments in article productivity, reputational data in the bottom panel of Table 2.1 suggest that differences in scholarly output have yet to be fully translated into a corresponding advantage in national recognition. The *US News* ratings and rankings for 1998 show FSU slightly ahead of the University of Florida, tied with the University of Georgia, and ranked lower than the other three departments on ratings of the "academic quality" of their doctoral programs. However, the 2005 *US News* ratings, based on a national survey of sociology department chairs and graduate program directors, show FSU as having greater recognition for the quality of its graduate program, moving into a tie with Michigan State for #42 among all departments (and #27th among public universities). The only other comparable department to experience an increase in national reputation from 1998 to 2005 was the University of Florida, which was ranked at #46 among all departments.

In addition to this overall gain in national reputation, **the 2005 *US News* ratings ranked FSU 10th among all departments in the specialty area of Sex and Gender and 14th in the area of Sociology of Population.** In contrast, four comparison departments (Table 2.1), including the University of Florida, did not achieve a ranking in any of the six sociology specialty areas that were considered in the 2005 *US News* survey (although the University of Iowa ranked 3rd in Social Psychology). Furthermore, our Sociology of Mental Health program (in the Health & Aging area) is gaining national recognition as being one of the most productive and prominent in the United States.

Before drawing conclusions from comparisons, we consider similar data for departments whose national standing and size of faculty are in the tier above FSU. Again, we used the NRC 93Q reputational scores and size of faculty in 2005 as criteria for selecting five departments at Research-I, public universities to which we could reasonably aspire relative to national stature. The comparisons of FSU with these departments are shown in Table 2.2. In this case, NRC ratings of faculty quality are all above "good" (ranging from 3.06 to 3.30) and size of faculty can be characterized as medium-large (ranging from 24 to 33).

Table 2.2. Sociology Departments Ranked a Tier Above FSU (“Aspirational” Departments)

Department	NRC 93Q ^a	N Faculty ^b	Per Capita Productivity Score ^c	
			Articles 70-89	Books 72-89
FSU	2.96	20	1.13	0.49
U Maryland	3.06	31	0.53	0.47
SUNY Albany	3.22	24	1.41	1.09
U Minnesota	3.29	30	0.63	0.86
Ohio State U	3.28	33	0.61	0.85
UC Santa Barbara	3.30	26	0.67	0.71
Mean Reputational Rating and Rank in <i>US News & World Report</i>				
Department	Rating 1998	Rating 2005	Rank 1998	Rank 2005
FSU	2.6	2.9	47	42
U Maryland	3.2	3.5	24	25
SUNY Albany	3.4	3.5	21	25
U Minnesota	3.5	3.6	19	22
Ohio State U	3.4	3.7	21	20
UC Santa Barbara	3.2	3.3	24	29

^aNational Research Council Rating of Quality of Sociology Graduate Programs in 1993

^bFaculty # listed in American Sociological Association *Guide to Graduate Departments*, 2005

^cTable 2 in Keith & Babchuk, *Social Forces* 76 (1998), pp. 1508-09

Only one of these more highly ranked departments—SUNY Albany—exceeded FSU in article productivity in prior decades. This point reinforces our comment about possible downward lag of FSU’s reputational standing relative to productivity in article publication (as measured by Keith and Babchuk). On the other hand, all five “aspirational” departments except the University of Maryland had higher scores than FSU did on book productivity. While the emphasis of scholarship at FSU has been on publication in professional journals rather than monographs and other books, we have distinguished colleagues, notably Jill Quadagno, who regularly publish path-breaking research monographs.

The reputational ratings and ranks based on *US News* surveys in 1998 and 2005 place all five departments ahead of FSU, which, of course, is part of the reason why we selected them for “aspirational” comparisons. However, we note that the national reputational ranking of FSU increased from 1998 to 2005, while three of these five programs dropped several ranks (SUNY Albany, Minnesota, and UC Santa Barbara); two were essentially unchanged. This pattern perhaps reflects the relatively high article productivity of FSU in previous years that may still have a positive reputational effect on the national visibility of our department today.

Just like we were, three of our “aspirational” departments, SUNY Albany, Ohio State, and UC Santa Barbara, were nationally ranked in two specialty areas in the 2005 *US News* ratings. Maryland and Minnesota were nationally ranked in three and four specialties, respectively. Thus, in terms of national visibility for specialized areas of research, FSU more closely resembles these larger, more highly ranked departments than it does the five departments that are more comparable to us in size.

Finally, comparative data on external funding suggests that we are doing well on this indicator of productivity. Data from NSF (reporting federal funding from all sources) show that **FSU ranked 24th out of 100 institutions in federally financed R&D expenditures for FY 2004, with FSU sociology totaling \$2,201,000** (<http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/nsf06323/tables.htm>). By comparison, the University of Florida sociology department ranked 52nd in federal funding in FY 2004 (with \$413,000). Furthermore, FSU ranked ahead of all other comparable departments in funding and ahead of four of the five “aspirational” departments, the exception being the University of Minnesota. **Within the social sciences at FSU, federal funding for sociology was slightly higher than that for political science (\$1,922,000) and considerably higher than for economics (\$186,000).** (Section 9 presents additional data on external grants.)

The state and national standing of the Department of Sociology at FSU is similar to that of the Department of Political Science. By virtually any measure, both departments rank at the top in their area in the State of Florida. The faculty of both departments also rank highly on national measures of productivity, especially in publication of journal articles. Yet, both rank lower nationally on reputational measures than might be expected from their productivity. FSU Political Science’s ranking of 38th in the NRC 93Q ratings was just slightly lower than the corresponding ranking of Sociology at 36th, whereas Political Science ranked slightly better than Sociology in the 2005 *US News* ratings (37th versus 42nd).

The “negative halo effect” of the institutional context on both programs may help to suppress reputational ratings. Many other departments at FSU do not fare as well in national reputational studies. **For instance, Sociology and Political Science were two of only four graduate programs at FSU to show improvement in “quality of faculty” from 1982 to 1993 in the NRC ratings.** Some other doctoral programs in the social and behavioral sciences failed to even appear among the graduate departments ranked in the 2005 *US News* survey (e.g., History and Economics).

Overall, data reported in this section support the conclusion that the Department of Sociology has a productive, well-regarded graduate faculty. We see clear signs of progress toward greater national visibility for certain specialty areas as well as the department as a whole.

Section 3. Priorities and Accomplishments

What are the department's highest priorities?

1. Faculty retention, rewards and recruitment. Without exception, we have an outstanding faculty. This report provides ample evidence for this claim, as summary data in the UAS tables (in the Appendix) and other evidence show. It is noteworthy that our National Research Council "countable" article productivity rate and our citation results are nearly double their level in the late 1990s. For instance, **since the late 1990s, our mean rate of article production increased from 2.36 per faculty member to 4.58 per faculty member and our mean citation rate increased from 8.45 to 15.74** (see data in the QE3-A and QE5 forms). Also, in the 2001-2005 period, our mean level of grant funding was \$867,312 (QE5), a far greater figure than before. We are delighted then, that despite comparatively low salaries and salary compression that make our best members "easy-pickins" for other programs, we are able to retain outstanding faculty (although we lost Hardy and Isaac in 2004). We avoid losing more faculty due, we believe, to a highly collegial and supportive department where colleagues help each other through collaboration on research and in other ways.

Since our last QER review, we lost eleven senior faculty members (all but two of whom were full professors, four due to retirements and one to a death) and replaced all but four (Carlson, Keith, Turner, Simon) with assistant professors. Presently, one-half of our faculty is at the assistant professor rank and they need their time and energy protected so they can earn tenure. We find it difficult to protect them and also accomplish the work of the department, since a collegial setting requires collaborative decision-making where all participate. Thus, we walk a fine line between asking junior faculty to do service and protecting them from service.

In 2004, we instituted an informal mentoring program led (by Dr. Robin Simon) for assistant professors. It has two parts. One asks junior faculty to select a mentor and use their advice and help in any way they see fit. The other asks junior faculty to form a group and invite senior faculty to present to or work with them, again as they see fit. Junior colleagues seem pleased with the program. Its effectiveness will be seen, one supposes, when we know whether they achieve tenure and promotion.

Rewarding faculty. How to reward tenured faculty, and/or faculty who are negatively affected by compression, is a challenge we intend to address. Since merit funds are limited and, indeed, unless one has a counter-offer basically impossible to obtain (except at certain junctures, determined by the legislature and bargaining agreement or unless a market equity fund is established), we hope to develop creative ways to reward our top faculty. For example, perhaps internal semester-long research leaves, summer salaries for writing grant proposals or papers, and course releases under specific conditions can be instituted. As to recruitment, former Dean Marie Cowart supported us in recruiting Full Professors R. Jay Turner and Elwood Carlson and Turner's arrival has been dramatically improved our ability to secure external funding, which we appreciate. Dean Rasmussen also has supported us in recruiting senior faculty and supports us now in this regard. We have had excellent success in two recent hires--Dr. Robin Simon at the associate level

and Dr. Verna Keith at the full level--and we hope to have more. Having more senior faculty will add to our reputation and production success and relieve pressures on junior faculty to do more service than is in their interest until after tenure. (See **Section 11** for more on faculty rewards.)

2. Graduate program expansion and improvement. We aim to expand and improve both of our graduate programs. We shall continue improving the quality and number of doctoral students including working to publish with them and to place them in desirable post-doctoral and Research I institutions upon graduation. We are developing a comprehensive strategy to improve our applied program and, if it fails, we will consider other options. We have dramatically improved the quality of our entering doctoral students. **The Verbal/Math total GRE score for our entering cohort in Fall 2006 was 1242 (excluding three foreign students) compared to 998 in Fall 2001 and 1057 in Fall 2004.** We increased stipends from \$9,000 to \$12,000 in Fall 2001 and from \$12,000 to 12,750 in Fall 2006. We hope to increase them to \$14,000 in Fall 2007, in order to remain competitive. We applaud Dean Rasmussen's allocation of three discretionary \$3000 scholarships (for up to three years) for top recruits and believe it has had a very positive impact on our ability to attract top recruits.

We improved also in regards to numbers. **We increased total graduate student enrollment from 37 students in Fall 2001 to 56 in Fall 2005 and 56 in Fall 2006** (see Table 3.4). Table 3.1 shows a gradual increase in number of students entering with funding between 2001-2003 and 2006, although the total of *new* Ph. D. students has remained flat since 2002.

Table 3.1. Graduate Ph. D. Entering Cohorts by In-Out-of-State/Non-national Status & Funding, 2001-2006

Starting Year	In-state	Out of state	Foreign	Funded (of total entering)	# new PhD students
2001	0	6	0	6	6
2002	9	4	1	6.5	14
2003	5	5	3	5	13
2004	11	3	0	7	12
2005	9	7	0	8	14
2006	4	4	4	10	12

Table 3.2 shows the number of graduate students funded by our department from AY 2001-2002 to AY 2006-2007. (We could not locate data for Fall 2002 and 2003). In Fall 2001, sociology funded 20 students and in Fall 2006, 37, for an increase of 85 percent in total number of students who are funded. Since fall of 2004, we have funded 19 or 20 graduate students with OPS funds, with the remaining students funded by research grants, fellowships/scholarships, or distance learning funds (see below). In Fall 2001, we funded 14 with OPS funds (and six with research grants) whereas in Fall 2006, we funded 20 students with OPS funds, representing a 43 percent increase.

Table 3.2. Sources of Funding for Sociology Graduate Students, 2006, 2005 & 2004 (figures are for Fall & Spring; an additional 3.5 FTEs were funded by DL in summer 2006)

Source	2001-2002	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
OPS funds	14	19	19	20
Distance learning	0	6 FTE	10 FTE	10.5 FTE
Research grants	6	6 FTE	6 FTE	4.5 FTE
Fellowships/Scholarships	0	3***	3**	2*
Total	20	35	38	37

* FSU Presidential Fellowship & American Sociological Association (ASA) Minority Fellowship; another ASA Minority Fellow graduated in 2006.

** Two ASA Minority Fellowships; one Pepper Institute Dissertation Fellowship

*** Two ASA Minority Fellowships; one McKnight Foundation Fellowship

Table 3.2 reflects an important resource of new revenue since our last QE review--FSU's "distance learning" (DL) program. **Six FTE sociology graduate students were supported with DL funds in 2004-2005 and 10 in AYs 2005-2006 and 2006-07.** The DL program works as follows. During two semesters of development of a new course, distance learning buys one-quarter of a faculty member's time to develop the course. It also pays for 30 hours (over two semesters) for a Graduate Assistant for the professor (although we have to pay the tuition waiver). After the course is developed, the Department pays the faculty member's salary and the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) pays a stipend and tuition waiver (at an in-state level) for a 20-hour "Mentor" appointment for every 40 students enrolled. In AY 2005-2006 (summer, fall, & spring), we served 826 undergraduate students in 15 DL courses (and in summer & fall 2006, 572 students in nine courses). By offering DL courses in summer, we can support graduate students whom we otherwise could not. **NOTE:** Two sociology faculty members recently developed a hybrid version of our course *Introduction to Sociology* that serves many undergraduate students, as discussed in a later section.

We are working to remove any obstacles that unnecessarily extend "time to degree" for our doctoral students. As noted already, we have revised our curriculum by focusing our four PhD areas and removing the Doctoral Review Paper as a requirement. Results in Table 3.3 show that our students take a median of six to seven years after their BS to complete the Ph.D. Given that we encourage publication while in graduate school and application for post-doctoral fellowships upon graduation, we feel our 'time to degree' is appropriate. Furthermore, we are pleased to note that several students who have had full-time employment or other major status changes nevertheless completed their PhDs, one notable example being Cynthia Davis who defended this Fall, 14 years after entering our program.

Table 3.3. Time from entry to PhD, 2001-2006

Year graduated with PhD (calendar year)	Number of students	Mean # Years from BS to PhD
2001	5	6.4
2002	2	6.0
2003	4	10.25*
2004	2	9.0
2005	2	5.0
2006	7	7.14**

*Students finishing in 03 had begun 11, 11, 9 and 10 years earlier.

**Without one student who took 14 years, the mean is 6.0.

An area that needs improvement is the size of our applicant pool (Table 3.4). Compared to sociology departments in Research I universities nationally, our applicant pool is small. A mean of 83 applicants applied for 59 Research I sociology departments in 2001 compared to our total of 30 for that year; Research I sociology departments admitted 36.2% (on average) of their applicants whereas we admitted 77%. (Note: The latest available national data are from 2001.) In 2006, we admitted 92% of our applicants. One explanation for this high acceptance rate is that Dr. Quadagno, our Graduate Program Director, actively advises potential applicants about their prospects for admission and funding. She discourages those whose credentials fall short and encourages those whose credentials meet our standards. The result is that fewer unqualified students formally apply. Nevertheless, we would like to increase the size of our applicant pool.

Unfortunately, recent steps taken to increase the number of graduate student applicants have not proved effective. For instance, for several years running, we “rented” a poster and table at our national meetings where we talked with students who were shopping for a graduate program. To our knowledge, this led to only one student matriculating and he proved to be weak and dropped out. Additionally, Drs. Turner and Quadagno mailed over 1000 letters in 2004-2005 to graduate and undergraduate programs around the U. S., in an effort to recruit students into our newly configured Health and Aging program. We believe this resulted in two or three students coming to us who perhaps otherwise would not have come. Since our current students tell us our webpage is important for recruiting, we make every effort to keep it up to date and informative. Indeed, we have revised our webpage already to the newly recommended FSU portal/format.

Table 3.4. Ph. D. Program Applicants, Acceptances, GRE Scores, and Enrolled by AY

Year	Number of Applicants	Number Accepted	GRE total for those accepted	Number Enrolled	GRE total for Enrolled	Total # students enrolled in Fall
2001-02	30	23	1014	6	998	37 (4,33)**
2004-05	64	37	1219	12	1057	56 (10,46)
2006-07	36	33	1135	12	1242*	56 (3,53)

*Excludes foreign students who were admitted based on TOEFL and other academic criteria.

**The first number in parentheses is the number of MS degree students, the second is PhD students.

We also need to improve support for advanced students who are writing their dissertations. Our students routinely apply for and receive the small grant offered by

FSU's Office of Graduate Studies (of four students who applied in Fall 2006, three were funded) but we need support from other sources. One advanced student received a Pepper Institute Fellowship to conduct her dissertation study last year and in the period 2001-2006, one student received a Dissertation Improvement Grant from the National Science Foundation and another applied for this grant recently. (NSF fellowships do not provide stipends, however, only expense funds.) Several students have applied for other fellowships (e.g., American Association of University Women, American Council of Learned Societies, Woodrow Wilson), so far to no avail. Our students fail to qualify for the COSS DeVoe Moore Dissertation Fellowships due to a requirement that the dissertation address governmental regulation and an interpretation of this criterion as meaning "local government regulation." We need an endowment that could be used to support the dissertation research of our best students and provide them with a sustained period to complete their work. On a positive note, we regularly nominate our students for regional and national awards and, often, they are selected. Margaret Leaf (in her third year) won a national award in 2006 from the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction for her master's project study of self-injury.

Regarding our Applied Social Research Masters Degree program, we are committed to making a success of this program or consider abandoning it. Dean Rasmussen supported us this AY to hire George Luke, who has had extensive experience in state government in health, to assess the program, see if internships can be developed, and recommend and develop courses. This process began in August 2006 and, we anticipate, will require two years to fully develop. (We review challenges associated with this program in Section 6 below.) We may want to offer new distance learning courses for Applied students by creating new ones or altering some of our undergraduate DL courses to accommodate full-time workers and/or those who cannot travel to Tallahassee. Also, we may need to consider assigning tenure track faculty to take turns teaching in the Applied Social Research masters program, as we do for Basic Studies and our core undergraduate and PhD program courses. This policy would spread the obligation around, over time, and perhaps increase faculty commitment to the program. It would also help assure the ability to offer a regular set of courses on an annual basis. As to the latter point, we anticipate that a full-time non-tenure-track faculty member may be needed to head the program and to organize and supervise internships as well as teach required courses. We say more about this later.

3. Enhance our programmatic areas. Our programs in gender and demography/population are well-known and highly regarded, as indicated by reputational ratings from *US News* in 2005 (see **Section 2**, above). The degree to which these programs, as well as Health and Aging, attract and hold students' interests is indicated by the topics of our students' dissertation research (See Table 1.1 under GPC 1 near the end of this document). Since Fall 2001, ten students completed dissertations in Inequality (five in gender, three in politics and one each in race and work), eight in Health and Aging (3 in health, 5 in aging), and four in Demography. None has completed a dissertation in Social Psychology yet but we only revived this programmatic area recently. Health is a relatively new focus for us also but with strong faculty in the area, we expect its visibility and reputation to increase rapidly. While all areas cannot be equally prominent, we view the obvious synergy between Health/Aging, Population and Inequality as boding well for the

department. We also hope to align our strengths with the College of Social Sciences and other departments on campus where interests and expertise overlap.

4. Obtain more external funds. We have made excellent progress since 2000 on this goal (see below). However, knowing the importance of external funds to both faculty and doctoral students, we maintain this priority. Faculty with grants regularly buy-out of classroom teaching, enabling them to conduct more research and help the department support graduate students. Additionally, students funded on grants learn through an apprenticeship relationship with faculty and frequently co-author publications with them. Finally, the overhead that comes back to the College and the Centers where the PI is located is a valuable resource for faculty situated in the Centers and, at times, for other faculty as well. (See next section on the policy of returning overhead to Centers.)

5. Increase faculty and graduate student diversity. We have had this goal for years and continue to embrace it. We hired Dr. Verna Keith this Fall and offered one of her graduate students at Arizona State funding in order to support Dr. Keith (the student declined our offer, for personal reasons). We have brought several minority faculty visitors to campus for recruitment and/or colloquia purposes, including one in December 2006 whom we are working hard to recruit. We have had some success since 1999 attracting minority students, as we report in **Section 6** of this report.

What are the five most important contributions of this department in recent years?

1. Increased the quality and quantity of PhD students and improved our PhD program. As noted above, we have increased the number of funded graduate students and our entering cohorts have higher GRE scores than before. We have had greater success obtaining fellowships for our graduate students. We raised admission standards (since the review in 2000) from 3.0 **or** 1000 on the GRE to 3.0 **and** 1000 on the GRE. We revised our graduate curriculum to facilitate student progress in the program (dropped the critical review paper and advanced research seminar requirements) and shortened the students' time to degree. We developed up-to-date reading lists for students' use in preparing for their preliminary comprehensive exams and added critical courses to the graduate curriculum to reflect faculty interests and expertise and better prepare our students for careers as sociologists. We are working now to improve our Applied Social Research masters degree program. We have encouraged faculty to urge students to complete their degrees expeditiously and co-author research papers with students, which they have done, thus enhancing our graduates' career prospects.

2. Obtained more external grant funds, since 1999. We have dramatically increased our success at obtaining federal funds since the last QER/BOR review of our department. Table 3.5 presents data on *SRAD* funds for the University, College, and Department of Sociology. [The University deposits indirect costs charged to grants in its *Sponsored Research and Development Trust Fund (SRAD)* which is then used for a variety of purposes such as the operation of the Office of Research and start-up costs for new hires. The funds also support faculty research across the campus. For example, the Council on Research and Creativity provides internal funding for research through eight programs. The Office of Research distributes portions of these funds to colleges and schools, and

their departments, according to a formula based upon the amount of F&A cost-recovery each unit generates.]

Table 3.5. Total Indirect Costs from External Grants with Sociology PIs

Sociology’s Contribution to Total Indirect Costs Charged, FY 2002-6

Fiscal Yr	University	COSS	Sociology	% of COSS	% of FSU
2002	\$14,194,263	\$266,420	\$4,456	1.67%	0.03%
2003	\$14,690,631	\$241,738	\$27,955	11.56%	0.19%
2004	\$17,715,043	\$1,181,047	\$266,624	22.58%	1.51%
2005	\$19,513,702	\$664,170	\$395,368	59.53%	2.03%
2006	\$21,755,904	\$677,734	\$370,156	54.62%	1.70%

Centers and PIs Associated with Contribution to Total Indirect Costs Charged, FY 2002-6

Fiscal Yr	Center for Demography & Pop Health				Pepper Institute on Aging		Sociology (various PIs)
	Brewster	Carlson	Eberstein	Turner	Quadagno	Reynolds	
2002	---	---	\$1,992	---	\$1,431	---	\$1,033
2003	---	---	\$10,967	---	\$3,497	\$12,972	\$519
2004	---	---	\$7,354	\$233,679	\$6,942	\$15,547	\$3,101
2005	\$7,305	---	\$221	\$356,909	\$21,810	\$5,192	\$3,931
2006	\$29,289	\$1,639	\$627	\$329,433	\$5,483	---	\$3,685

Source: Detailed SRAD Reports at <http://www.research.fsu.edu/activity/sradreports.html>

The Department of Sociology became the primary source of SRAD funds for the College of Social Sciences between FY 2002 and FY 2006. In FY 2002, indirect costs charged to PIs in sociology made up less than \$5000 or 1.7% of COSS total indirect costs charged. Sociology’s share grew dramatically thereafter, largely due to Dr. R. Jay Turner who joined the faculty at that time. **In 2005 and 2006, sociology PIs’ externally funded projects brought in more than one-half of the indirect costs for the entire College, and around two percent for the university.** Over the five-year period, the indirect costs charged for sociologists’ projects totaled more than \$1 million.

The bottom section of Table 3.5 lists six faculty members by name and the amounts of SRAD funds produced by their grants between FY 2002 and FY 2006. It should be noted that current policy allows faculty to submit grants through Centers which then receive SRAD (overhead) distributions, instead of the Department. Only one percent of SRAD funds produced by sociology faculty are returned to the Sociology Department. As a result, faculty who are located in Centers have access to more resources to use in support of their research. The logic behind this arrangement has historically been that research units that provide staff support for proposal preparation and administration of external awards need and deserve additional resources. These units provide various forms of support to their faculty associates--office space, telephone, travel subsidies, computers, and software. Grant overhead returned to Centers is intended to foster applications for additional extramural support for faculty research and, of course, direct costs provided by

grants support faculty buy-outs of teaching and graduate student stipends, which benefit the Department as well as individual faculty. And, yet, equity issues accompany this policy, as discussed in later sections (e.g., **Section 9**).

R. Jay Turner, who is one of the 300 most highly cited social scientists worldwide regardless of discipline and one of five most highly cited faculty members at Florida State University, brought one large grant to FSU when he arrived in Fall 2002 and, since then, acquired two additional external grants and an internal FSU Social Science Program Enhancement Grant (SSPEG). Funds from one or another of Turner's grants have bought release time for seven Sociology Department faculty--Turner, Lloyd, Taylor, Reynolds, Barrett, Tillman, and Eberstein--and supported multiple graduate students, including 3.5 in AY 2006-2007 (Gayman, Lewis, Russell, and Keller). Quadagno also has received an internal FSU SSPEG (for \$100,000) in addition to extensive state and federal grant funds that have supported graduate students and a full-time Research Associate, Dr. Debbie Street, who obtained grants and wrote articles for publication while supervising graduate students' research. Among the students supported by Quadagno's grants are Burge, Baird, Schmidt, Stewart, Lipsman, and Brown. Between Fall 2001 and Spring 2005, 19 tenure track faculty collectively applied for a total of 87 grants, including internal and external applications, for a mean of 4.6 per faculty member; with 59 proposals funded, for a mean of 3.1 per faculty member (see **QE5**). In a single year--2004, four sociology faculty members (Orcutt, Simon, Taylor, and Tillman) received summer funding from the FSU COFRS program, reflecting the high regard in which research by our faculty is held, and two more received this award in Summer 2005 (Barrett and Ueno).

3. Assembled an excellent faculty. We have assembled an excellent faculty which includes 14 new members--three at the full professor level (Carlson, Keith and Turner), one at the advanced associate level (Simon), and 10 at the assistant level (Barrett, Taylor, Lloyd, Schrock, Tillman, Rohlinger, Ueno, Dixon, Starks, and McCabe). Each brings excellence to our core areas and is an excellent teacher and dedicated mentor and advisor to our students. The stature in which our faculty is held is indicated by the national awards and recognition they have received during the review period. For example, research articles by Robin Simon, Jill Quadagno, and Patricia Martin were recognized in 2003 and 2004 by the American Sociological Association (Best Paper Award, Eliot Freidson Best Article Award, and Distinguished Article Award, respectively). Due to her path-breaking research on the U. S. health insurance crisis, Quadagno was invited by U. S. Senator Harry Reid to address all Democratic senators at their annual issues workshop in 2006 and by Ira Flatow to serve on a panel for the well-known National Public Radio program "Science Friday" on end of life issues.

In 2002, R. Jay Turner received the national Leo G. Reeder Award for Distinguished Contributions to Medical Sociology from the American Sociological Association for his sustained record of scholarship in that area. Patricia Martin received the Distinguished Feminist Lecturer Award from Sociologists for Women in Society in 2001-2002 (that required her to deliver lectures on her research at institutions around the U. S.) Martin's 2005 monograph, *Rape Work*, was a 2006 finalist for the C. Wright Mills Book Award from the Society for the Study of Social Problems (one of seven in a field of 80), and she is being featured by Phi Beta Kappa in its Fellows Lectureship Panel for the Southeastern

U.S. in 2006-2007. As figures in **QE5** (in the Appendix) show, our faculty collectively received a grand total of 38 awards for their research between 2001 and 2005. Presentations by our faculty at and beyond FSU enhanced our visibility and stature; between 2001 and 2005, we made an average of 7.7 presentations (**QE4**). Additionally, our service as officers and/or committee members of national and international professional sociological associations promotes the same result.

4. Published relevant research that speaks to pressing social issues. Among the many pressing social, economic, political and cultural issues addressed by our faculty are lack of universal health insurance in the U. S.; depression and parenthood; aspirations of African American youth; immigrant families' influence on children; effects of hurricanes on mental health; social disparities in mental illness and substance use problems; emotions and gender; dynamics of the Red Hat Society (senior women organize in their collective interests); identity conflicts among transsexuals; gender bias at work; childcare arrangements of the poor; and so forth. Our faculty take pride in doing research that addresses the range of problems that Americans face and that our government must address to assure our nation's and citizens' well-being. While we mostly do so-called "basic research," much of what we publish has policy and other kinds of practical implications. We are proud of this fact and view it as one reason we are able to obtain external support for our projects.

5. Implemented innovative teaching methods that deliver effective and efficient instruction and that, as we note below, help undergraduates and support our graduate program and faculty development goals. We have improved our undergraduate program, e.g., added Population and Religion to Liberal Studies and regularly offered honors courses and courses in Broward's and Bryan Hall Living and Learning Programs. We have added new undergraduate courses in medical sociology, African Americans in U. S. society, globalization, the changing workplace, and the sociology of media/cultural studies. Eberstein and Reynolds have developed, with funding from CTL, a hybrid version of *Introduction to Sociology* that allows our faculty to reach more students, offer exciting data analysis opportunities, and reduce the demands for multiple sections (or graduate student assistants) to offer them. They taught it once together, when they were developing it, and Eberstein taught it in Fall 2006, with the help of two Graduate Teaching Assistants. We would like to develop and offer more hybrid courses but, presently, our faculty are too busy to develop them. Compared to other departments in the College of Social Sciences, we offer far more distance learning courses (which, as noted earlier, help us accommodate undergraduates and provide support for our graduate students). Our collective support for excellence in teaching is indicated by our regular policy of peer evaluation of classroom instruction and by a 20+-year-old practice of awarding to both a faculty member and graduate teaching assistant an annual "Best Teacher Award." We recently named our faculty-level sociology teaching award for former faculty member Michael Armer (retired) who was acclaimed "Best Teacher" in the Department and at the university level multiple times during his years at FSU.

Section 4. Program Outcomes

We report program outcomes for three degree programs as well as the criteria used to evaluate progress toward meeting them and our results for AY 2005-2006. We believe our results and plans for improvement show where we have been and where we hope to go.

Undergraduate BS Program in Sociology

Teach principles of sociology [Program Outcome-41372]

Define Outcome: By the end of the year, the program will assess the extent to which students in our required for majors sociology courses view them as high in quality.

Assessment and Evaluation Process: This will result in 66% of the students for 2005-2006 in all sections of SYA 4010: Sociological Theory, SYA 4300: Methods of Social Research, and SYA 4400: Social Statistics indicating “strongly agree” or “agree” to having learned a great deal from the course(s) as evidenced by survey results.

Results: The majority of students (81%) “strongly agree” or “agree” to having learned a great deal from their sociology courses. (The criterion is measured with Item C1 on the SPOT evaluation sheet.)

Improvements Made or Action Plan Based on Analysis of Results: Results are well above the 66% criterion established for this program outcome. In order to remain successful in meeting this standard, we will continue to encourage and support effective teaching. Also we shall raise our standard to 80% for the coming year.

Applied Social Research Masters of Science Program

Train applied sociologists [Program Outcome-41375]

Define Outcome: By the end of the year, the program will assess whether students enrolled in the Applied Masters Degree Program can employ the techniques of sociological research needed for employment.

Assessment and Evaluation Process: The Sociology Department Graduate Program Committee will review the Applied Masters Degree program with an eye to better meeting students’ needs and will consult with employers to see if graduates are meeting their needs as evidenced by department assessment.

Results: We failed to do this evaluation in the past year. But we are doing it in the present academic year (see below). Of four students who entered in Fall 2005, one is employed part-time doing applied social research (survey research). One student completed all requirements but entered an MBA program and two transferred into our Ph.D. program in Sociology before completing the ASR

degree. The fourth is working part-time in an applied job and will graduate from our program in December 2006. Since three of the four decided to pursue further education, we are unsure whether their skills prepared them for applied employment.

Improvements Made or Action Plan Based on Analysis of Results: Previously, we evaluated our admission requirements for admitting students to the Applied Social Research masters program and raised our standards; as a result, we had no students drop out or fail in the past year. Our graduates have so far obtained employment or gone on to further education. We have recently employed a visiting faculty member to review the program, talk with people across campus and in employment settings, and offer recommendations for improvement. During 2006-07, the Graduate Program Committee and Research Methods Committee, along with this faculty member, will offer an action plan for improvement. As noted above, we are reviewing our program, considering revisions, and trying to ascertain whether the program is viable. It may take two years to know the answer to this question. By Spring 2008, we should know whether the program can succeed and/or what must be done for it to thrive.

NOTE: Most of our Applied Social Research program students reflect one of four patterns. (a) They were gainfully employed when they entered and remained so through graduation; (b) after completing the degree, they continued on in graduate school in sociology or other fields (business, communication); (c) after completion, they obtained employment but not a research job (e.g., television, sales); or (d) after completion, they obtained a research job that utilizes skills acquired in the program. Our data indicate that the job-related skills acquired in our program, even though the program was not well developed to meet their needs, are valued on the job market. This fact gives us encouragement for moving forward.

PhD Program in Sociology

Employment [Program Outcome-41378]

Define Outcome: By the end of the year, the program will assess whether our Ph.D. graduates have found employment commensurate with their qualifications in academia, government, or private industry (or have begun a post-doctoral placement).

Assessment and Evaluation Process: We expect 100 percent of our graduates to obtain appropriate employment or placement in a post-doctoral program as evidenced by a survey. We will contact and interview students a year after they complete their Ph.D. to discover the results.

Results: We met the criterion. Our review confirmed that seven students graduated and seven students found employment commensurate with their Ph. D. degree. However, two students obtained “visiting” academic appointments, one because

s/he followed his/her partner. The second had difficulty finding a position possibly due to being considerably older than the modal new Ph. D.

Improvements Made or Action Plan Based on Analysis of Results: We will continue to track this outcome. We will ascertain in Summer 2007 whether two graduates now holding visiting positions obtained permanent appointments.

Section 5. Student Learning Outcomes

Over the past three years, we have assessed our educational mission and practices relative to seven Student Learning Outcomes for our undergraduate program and two each for our graduate programs. The results indicate that each program, while not perfect, is effective. An Appendix (**SACS Data**) at the end of this document lists the **Student Learning Outcomes** for our three degree programs (seven SLOs for undergraduate and two each for the graduate programs).

Undergraduate Sociology BA/BS degree. Assessment of seven *student learning outcomes* for our BS program shows that our undergraduate statistics courses is effective, with improvements needed in research methods and theory. In statistics, we met our goals of teaching critical thinking skills and interpreting sociological evidence [over 60 percent of students in statistics receiving numerical scores of 80% or greater (a) on an assigned research project and (b) an embedded assignment (on an exam)]. Our required undergraduate course in research methods (SYA 4300) is somewhat less effective. [We fell slightly short of a goal of having 66% of students achieve 80% or higher on two standards of “conduct research and report results” and “evaluate research designs”--9 percent short on the first, and 10 percent short on the second.] Similar results were observed for our required theory course, SYA 4010. [We aspired to a standard of 66 percent of our students achieving scores of 80 percent or higher on the learning outcomes of define and apply sociological concepts and compare (at least two) sociological theories; results fell short by 9 and 8 percent, respectively.] Plans for improvement, which we are implementing, require our Undergraduate Program Committee to review these results and recommend actions for improvement. Our goal of requiring students to demonstrate knowledge of inequality was met [with 81 percent of students achieving a score of 80% or higher on a written report or essay on this issue].

Applied Social Research Masters Degree. We have had this degree program on the books since Fall 2001. Since the program began, 22 students have participated (Sociology Data Booklet, p. 2) and, to date, 13 have graduated with a masters degree in Applied Social Research. We were encouraged to create the program by COSS Dean Marie Cowart who believed it would serve a need in our capital city (where state-level employees manage large data sets), that our graduates could find useful employment, that it would bring self-paying masters students into the College and University, and that it would increase the size of our graduate student FTEs. The program has failed to fulfill these hopes. Frankly, we have not sufficiently invested in conceptualizing and developing courses aimed at helping students acquire applied skills. Our success can be increased, we believe, by a thorough redesign of the program and by aggressive recruiting. To help the department progress toward these goals, we sponsored Dr. George Luke's participation in October 2006 in a national meeting of Clinical/Applied Sociology Programs where he met with over 100 sociologists from across the US, including ASA staff, to explore ways to improve. He came away convinced that our entire faculty will have to participate in the program if it is to succeed. Toward this end, he has met with our job candidates this Fall to explore their willingness to be involved and to ask for their ideas and suggestions.

Two *student learning outcomes* for the Applied program are critical thinking skills and communication skills. Our assessments for the past two years show we are meeting these goals [exactly 75 percent met the first criterion and 100 percent met the second, in 2005-2006]. Nevertheless, we realize that we have erred in requiring the applied students to take our PhD courses and failed to offer them applied courses. As a result and in an effort to improve, Dean Rasmussen supported us in AY 2006-2007 to hire a faculty member in a visiting capacity with extensive applied experience in state government, to review the program and recommend improvements. Dr. George Luke has consulted our faculty (e.g., our departmental Research Methods Committee and Graduate Program Committee) on possibilities for integrating applied and academic teaching objectives in existing course offerings. He has also consulted with faculty and administrators in COSS and in other schools about how to structure and manage applied programs. He has canvassed local employers in state agencies and private research firms to identify the best “fit” between their needs and the needs of our students, and to gauge their interest in partnering with our program as internship providers. He has developed a new course, and is in the process of outlining two others oriented to teaching applied research skills. To begin recruiting, he spoke in every upper-level undergraduate sociology classroom and sent a recruiting letter to each high GPA COSS undergraduate student in Fall 2006. While a one-year horizon is likely too short, we believe the program can be invigorated in a two-year period. We should have a sure sense of its potential by summer 2008. Key to the program’s success is student recruitment. If we cannot attract students, we cannot offer the program. So far, our students have been a mixed bag--some first rate, some too weak academically to succeed at graduate education. We shall expand our recruiting efforts in Spring 2007 in hopes of attracting a qualified and enthusiastic cohort for Fall 2007. We will continue developing and refining the program’s focus on training masters degree graduates who will be competitive in the local labor market.

One possibility to consider is aligning our Applied Social Research program with the COSS masters programs in Aging and Demography. These programs have much in common, for instance, they are social science terminal degree programs aimed at producing employable graduates with a masters degree. Perhaps we should consider developing one Applied masters degree with varying foci, where students can specialize in Aging, Demography, or generally in sociology. We might develop a substantive focus on health but the new MPH program in the College of Social Sciences may suggest otherwise. At any rate, we are open to considering the pros and cons of such options.

Ph. D. Program. Two *student learning outcomes* for the Ph. D. program were met resoundingly. Regarding communication skills, 86 percent of our new graduates (or 6 of 7 new PhD graduates) published in the period immediately prior to or after graduation. [Our goal is 100 percent and we hope to achieve it in 2006-2007.] The second criterion--of critical thinking skills & content/discipline knowledge and skills--was met by eight of 10 students who sat for our comprehensive exam. While we want every student to pass the comprehensive preliminary exam, we support high standards and realize that some students may fail to demonstrate mastery. We believe our exams achieve their intended aims.

Section 6. Instruction, Research, Public Service

Do this department's undergraduate/graduate instructional programs and the research and public service programs interact and support each other? Does one detract from the other?

The short answer is Yes, our programs support each other. However, our Applied Social Research has detracted from our PhD program in the past, as we note shortly. As background to our assessment of our three programs, we present data in Tables 6.1-6.3 that show a modest increase in four years in student credit hours and degrees awarded and a sizeable jump in number of majors, which suggests we'll have more student credit hours and degrees to report soon. We have seen a large percentage increase in masters degrees awarded, with the PhD program second (percentage-wise). Our Applied program has bolstered masters degree productivity, although most masters degrees in our department since 2002 (28 of 41) were earned by students progressing toward a PhD.

Table 6.1. Sociology Credit Hours, 2002-2005 by Level (Sociology Data Booklet, p. 8)

Level	2002	2003	2004	2005	% Change
BS	17,925	16,578	19,517	21,391	+19
MS	598	672	727	727	+22
PhD	722	798	855	866	+20
Total	19,250	18,048	21,099	22,984	+19

Table 6.2. Sociology Degrees Awarded, 2000-2006 by Level (Soc. Data Booklet, p. 6)

Level	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	% Chg
BS	81	87	98	75	75	98	+21
MS	3	7	5	7	10	12	+300
PhD	3	5	2	3	3	4	+33
Total	87	99	105	85	88	114	+31

Table 6.3. Sociology Majors 1998-2006 by Level (% change 2000-6; Soc Data Book p. 4)

Level	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	%Ch
BS	154	166	186	211	221	213	223	251	291	+56
MS	10	9	8	4	9	8	12	10	6	-25
PhD	30	33	38	33	33	39	43	46	50	+32
Total	194	208	232	248	263	260	278	307	347	+50

Undergraduate and Graduate programs. These programs support each other in important respects. First, our faculty teach at both graduate and undergraduate levels in their specialty areas thus they bring enthusiasm and expertise to students at both levels. Second, sociology participates extensively in FSU's **distance learning programs**, providing support to "distance" students and to our PhD program. Our department has developed and regularly offered the following undergraduate courses via distance learning: Theory, Methods, Statistics (three core requirements for sociology majors), Medical Sociology, Aging and the Lifecourse, Population, Sociology of Law, Deviance and Social Control, the Social Psychology of Groups, Sociology of Global Justice and Sociology of the Environment (partially developed but never offered by distance). Alcoholism and Drugs is in development in Spring and Summer 2007. Developing and

offering these courses supports our graduate program in important ways, as noted in Section 3.

To review, the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) pays for one-quarter of a faculty member's salary for two semesters to develop a new course. During this time, CTL provides 30 hours of stipend support (although the Department pays the student's waiver) for a student to assist the instructor. (See Section 3.) When the course is taught for the first time, the Department pays the faculty member's salary and CTL pays a stipend and in-state tuition for a .5 FTE graduate student for every 40 students enrolled. During most recent terms, we have supported 10 FTE graduate student mentors with these funds (Table 3.2.). CTL does not pay out-of-state tuition waivers, although they have done so on occasion. Graduate student mentors assist instructors with managing Discussion Boards, grading, exercises, and related tasks. These arrangements benefit FSU undergraduates by allowing them to obtain courses without coming to campus and they help our graduate program by providing financial support and teaching skills in distance learning technology and delivery. In this day of increasing reliance on technology to provide educational enrichment and degrees, our students leave FSU with valuable skills in distance learning methods that help them on the academic job market.

Applied Social Research & PhD programs. The relationship between our Applied and PhD programs is problematic. Some years ago, we accepted academically weak students into the Applied program and placed them in our Ph. D. courses where they suffered and "dragged down" the courses for others. Some Applied students were over their heads and they also failed to obtain skills that are needed to work as applied sociologists. Faculty at the time saw them as a detriment to our Ph. D. courses, diverting class time and causing management problems. Also, the Applied students felt that our PhD courses were too "abstract" and failed to meet their needs. In fall 2004, our Graduate Program Committee raised admission standards for the Applied Students (to a *GRE total of 1000 and a GPA of 3.0 or higher*, the same as for our Ph. D. students), removing the problem of unqualified students. However, this action may have driven away applicants. In Fall 2006, only one student was accepted into our Applied Social Research program. Her qualifications were excellent but she quit school mid-term, due to health problems. In the current year, we have three applied students, one of whom is finishing her program this term and the other two are enrolled part-time. Key to overcoming these problems is the creation of an applied program that culminates in non-academic professional employment. If we establish a track record of professional employment, the applied program should sell itself to potential recruits. Applied students can then be defined as students with unique career goals and needs for graduate professional education.

Applied Masters Program and Public Service. Central to the idea of an applied degree program is the link between academics and public service. If the applied program truly takes hold, it can have a substantial impact in this regard. Sociology historically has struggled with a disconnect between academic and applied sociology. For whatever reasons, many view sociology as containing little of practical value although our methods, techniques, and products of sociological thinking increasingly dominate daily life. The rigors of academic publishing have produced a sometimes esoteric and inaccessible form of sociological results. Our applied program is a way to re-establish

connections between sociology and the public in the local area. Apart from the service of filling a needed for trained researchers, we anticipate ancillary benefits from forging relationships between the university and State of Florida government agencies and non-profit agencies, to laying the groundwork to move Tallahassee closer to the model of integrated applied and academic research at North Carolina's Research Triangle. Other Universities with successful applied social research programs have experienced multiple spin-offs in the form of departmentally-based research institutions that contract for social research and that engage faculty and student interests. Making this scenario a reality will depend on the implementation and support of a well-conceived applied program. On a related point, we note that our faculty teach courses that assist graduate students in other programs, e.g., students in the new MS program in Public Health.

Provide a statement of how instructional assignments are made among the faculty.

Formally, the chair makes instructional assignments after taking departmental needs and faculty preferences into account. To establish courses for an upcoming term, several steps are followed. Our Graduate Program Assistant emails faculty asking them to report their teaching preferences (with options) for the term in question. Two, the department chair contacts the Chairs of our graduate area committees to ask about area needs for the graduate program. Three, our Graduate Program Assistant advises the chair about the particular kinds and number of seats likely to be required in our undergraduate program. The Department chair then assigns teaching duties to assure that required courses for both undergraduate and graduate programs are offered. The chair tries to assign faculty to the courses they request, subject to institutional and programmatic needs—e.g., undergraduate major requirements (core theory, methods, and statistics plus upper level electives), Liberal Studies, Bryan and Broward Hall, FSU Honors Program, and diversity/multi-cultural requirements, providing enough seats for undergraduates, and graduate program scheduling. When Martin became chair, she began assigning courses to untenured assistant professors as follows, when feasible: Two sections of an undergraduate course in one term and one graduate course and one undergraduate course in the other term. She discouraged junior faculty from developing too many new courses (no more than five or six in their pre-tenure years). She avoided assigning junior faculty to teach “mass sections” until well along in their pre-tenure years and, even then, only once unless their skills and personality make the practice feasible (and avoids causing headaches for the department or themselves). Since most junior faculty arrive at FSU with one or two courses prepped, our demands for new preparations in the pre-tenure period are manageable.

Several of our senior faculty teach large undergraduate sections (e.g., Carlson, Eberstein, Padavic, Reynolds, and Simon). Our non-tenure-track faculty member, Dr. Annette Schwabe, and our “visiting instructor” Dr. Gloria Lessan, also teach large sections of Introduction to Sociology and Social Problems. One of our top priorities when assigning Graduate Teaching Assistants is to assign them to faculty teaching large sections to help them manage those courses. We also assign Graduate TAs to assist with our required methods and statistics courses. Finally, we assign Graduate TAs and RAs to assist our untenured faculty. Since we have many large sections, several simultaneous sections of

statistics and methods, and 10 untenured faculty, the demands for Graduate Teaching Assistants is high.

“Typical” & “aspirational” faculty assignments

A *typical assignment* for instruction in our department is two formal courses per term (six credit hours). Taking into account advising and supervising graduate students and the occasional Directed Individual Study course, a **typical teaching assignment percentage is 55 percent**. Exceptions include the chair and graduate director, with the chair having a one and one load and the Graduate program director a one-course release annually (thus a one- and two-course load). Most sociology faculty teach at least one graduate seminar per year. Our typical **research and service assignments are 40 percent and 5 percent**, respectively. This service percentage is unrealistically low, particularly for good citizens who spend many hours on departmental committees and other university and professional service, but this is what we assign nevertheless. We have no standards about how many students a faculty member must teach in a year or the particular kind(s) of courses she/he must teach. However, student demand for undergraduate courses means a typical undergraduate course enrolls 50 to 65 students. Relative to graduate courses, most faculty teach one substantive seminar annually and those who teach required core courses--theory, research methods, and statistics--may teach two graduate-level courses in one year.

An *aspirational assignment* for faculty is *a one and two teaching load*--that is, one semester each year at 30% teaching/advising, 65% research and 5% service (with the other term at two courses or 55% teaching/advising, 40% research, and 5% service). Such an assignment would help junior faculty conduct more research and publish more and would enable senior faculty to apply for and obtain more external grants. Senior faculty in sociology have better odds of obtaining external funds for research due to their experience, publication records, and (often) insider knowledge from having served on national grant review panels. Relieving them of one course per year would be time well spent not only in these ways but also, when they secure more grant funds, supporting graduate students as well.

What are the goals for the relative contribution to the teaching mission by graduate assistants, adjuncts and others? At what course levels?

Our goals in terms of the teaching mission of regular faculty, graduate assistants, adjuncts and others are as follows:

Regular faculty (non-visiting or part-time or temporary) should cover core graduate and undergraduate courses and our graduate programmatic area courses.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty only should teach in our Ph. D. program, except that non-tenure track faculty with a PhD should teach in the Applied Social Research program, when and if their skills and background warrant it.

Non-tenure-track teaching faculty should, unless otherwise assigned, teach several sections of large enrollment classes per term. We try to accommodate the faculty member's interests, however, and thus assign them to courses that hold particular appeal. For instance, we have assigned Schwabe to teach undergraduate methods and medical sociology and Lessan, the sociology of law, courses that have particular appeal for them.

Graduate assistants should teach courses that contribute to their training as future faculty and help the department meet its obligations at the undergraduate level. We consider teaching a course on one's own as a one-half time (20-hour) assignment. Students must have a master's degree to teach on their own.

Adjuncts should teach undergraduate courses for which they are qualified and where demand outstrips our ability to assign graduate students or regular faculty to cover them. They should be skilled at teaching large sections. We typically use adjuncts to teach Introduction, Social Problems, and Family Problems (all of which count for Liberal Studies credits). While adjunct faculty should be used primarily to fill holes in the schedule, we have employed them extensively in the past few years to cover undergraduate courses. Currently, **we have no adjuncts teaching in our program except advanced doctoral students who teach in this status in their final year of dissertation work.**

During summer after their first year, graduate students take a course in Teaching Sociology to prepare them to teach and many of them teach for the first time in the summer after their second year. As noted, students are regularly assigned to assist faculty with large sections or distance learning courses. The Department provides only four years of funding for doctoral students. If a student is here a fifth year and there is demand for courses (which there nearly always is), the Department pays the student to teach at an adjunct rate. While we prefer faculty to teach our core undergraduate courses, we sometimes assign advanced graduate students to teach them, particularly in summer. We regret the practice but the courses must be offered and few of our faculty choose to teach in summer. As a rule, we avoid assigning graduate students to core/required undergraduate courses during the academic year.

How accurately can the department measure student demand? What is level of unmet demand?

We do not really measure unmet demand. However, we know our courses are popular because every seat we offer at the undergraduate level fills, with the exception of the occasional 8 a.m. class. We are regularly lobbied by upper administration and COSS advisers to add seats to our sections, and to add new sections, to meet student demand, particularly for Introduction, Social Problems, and Family Problems. We try to and nearly always accommodate such requests. At the graduate level, our required courses routinely fill and some are so popular that we place "majors only" stop orders on them to assure our students a seat. At the urging of our Dean, we increased the cap in our graduate courses to 20 students and, on occasion, enrollment surpasses this number.

Evaluate the extent of diversity in the department among faculty, students and staff.

Our faculty are diverse on gender, with 11 men and 11 women. We are less diverse on race/ethnicity. We have one African American and one Japanese faculty member, among 21 tenure track faculty. Our one non-tenure-track faculty member is a white woman and a Filipina and a white man hold Visiting (teaching) positions currently. We regret our dearth of minority faculty and have attempted, and are attempting, to improve this situation.

Our majors are diverse at the undergraduate level, based on reports from faculty who teach and on institutionally provided data. As majors, we have more girls than boys and a relatively robust percentage of minority students, with girls making up 58% of students enrolled in our courses in 2006 (a somewhat less skewed pattern than was true in 2005, when 64% were girls). Regarding race/ethnicity, 65% were White, 23% African American, 6% Hispanic, and 6% Other. At the graduate level, 37 of 56 students are women (or 66%). In the graduate program, we have modest race/ethnic diversity with two African American women (one of whom completed her PhD in December 2006), two Hispanic/Latino American men and one Latina woman, one Asian American man, two Asian women (from Korea and India), and one Israeli woman. Two African American women completed PhDs recently (one in 2003 and one in summer 2006). All of our staff are white, with three women and one man, with the man (Dr. Jesse Taintor) shared across four programs, as a computer technician.

Describe ongoing faculty development activities and resources (TAs, RAs, equipment, etc.) available to faculty.

Our priorities prompt us to provide untenured faculty with 20-hours of graduate assistance every academic-year term (although not summer; see above). Typically, students work 10 hours as a Teaching Assistant and 10 hours as a Research Assistant (although faculty can assign the student to only teaching or research, after consulting with the Graduate Program Director and the student). On occasion, we use our (limited) departmental SRAD funds to help untenured faculty support their research. The process Martin has followed for two years asks the PI to write a short proposal that she runs by the Personnel Committee and, if they approve and departmental funds are available, the request is funded. If the Department lacks the funds, the Chair asks the Dean for help and he has not turned down such a request so far.

Every faculty member receives a new computer upon appointment and we try to replace computers every three to four years with an updated model. We purchase any software a faculty member needs and Dr. Taintor keeps it working and up-to-date. (Taintor also assures that virus protections, etc., are up-to-date and functioning in every computer, both for faculty and in the Graduate Student Computer Lab). The Department does not help faculty prepare and administer research grants, although the Center for Demography and Population Health has a skilled staff member who is helpful in this regard, Ms. Barbara Rousseau. The College of Social Sciences has no infrastructure support to assist faculty with grants applications or management, a condition that poses a problem for

inexperienced faculty and faculty who simply need help managing budgets, appointments, travel, and reports. This problem is long-standing and was brought to the attention of the former Vice President for Research and former Dean of COSS and remains a disincentive relative to grant applications and management. We do note that for the past several years, the Dean's Office has supported a COSS faculty member, Dr. Bill Berry (in Political Science), to conduct a summer workshop for faculty members and advanced graduate students on grant proposal development. Several of our faculty and students have availed themselves of this opportunity to good effect.

Overall, nine tenured/tenure-track sociology faculty are located in the Center for Demography and Population Health and four are located in the Pepper Institute on Aging and Public Policy, leaving eight tenure track sociology faculty in the Department but without Center support. In contrast to faculty in the Center for Demography and Population, faculty in the Pepper Institute and in the Department receive no help applying for or managing external grants.

The Department's travel policy, in place for many years, pays (a portion of) faculty travel expenses to two regular professional meetings annually (but at a less than adequate rate; see **Section 9** on Resources). Typically, the meetings are one national and one regional or specialty conference. As to resources associated with the Centers, faculty associates in Pepper receive \$1000 annually that can be used to supplement travel or for other purposes (hire a student assistant, purchase software or assist their research in other ways). On occasion, they are given partial summer salary based on an agreement to write an external grant. Faculty associates in the Center for Demography and Population Health receive travel support for two meetings annually, up to \$750 for an international conference, up to \$500 for a national conference, and up to \$250 for a regional conference.

The department typically subsidizes travel at a rate of \$500-600 for a national conference and \$250-\$350 for a regional conference. (We also fund graduate student travel but at a lower level.) Presently, the Department provides travel support to all sociology faculty who request it, including faculty located in Centers. [NOTE: Some sociology faculty members located in Centers do *not* request travel support from the Department in addition to that provided by the Center.] When Martin became chair, she differentiated Center from non-center faculty and awarded non-Center faculty more travel support (e.g., \$550 for non-Center faculty, \$450 for Center faculty). This differentiation is intended to reduce inequity, prompted by the fact that some faculty receive full support for travel by tapping into resources in both the Department and Center.

Regarding faculty development, we encourage senior faculty to collaborate with junior faculty and with graduate students to produce articles and develop and implement research projects, including external proposals. Many do so. Senior faculty who do these things (e.g., place junior faculty on grants as Co-PIs and co-author with them) orient junior faculty to the world of grants application and administration and help them learn the craft of publishing as well, thus enhancing the productivity and visibility of all.

Section 7. Relationships with Other University Units.

How does the department relate to other teaching and research units to enhance the mission of the department? Describe those within the College of Social Sciences, and those in other colleges and schools. Describe any formal or informal relationships.

Sociology relates well to other FSU teaching and research units. Our faculty regularly serve on dissertation committees for students in the College of Social Sciences (e.g., in Public Administration, Political Science, Urban and Regional Planning, Geography) and in departments/units across campus (in Education, Business, Psychology, Human Sciences, Religion, Social Work, Criminology, Information Studies, Communication). Students from other departments enroll in our undergraduate and graduate courses. The Department of Geography sends undergraduates focusing on Environmental Studies and Criminology sends their undergraduate majors to take our research methods course and the Program in Interdisciplinary Social Science orients students to take our web-based courses. At the graduate level, students in Human Sciences, Social Work, Communication, Business, Criminology, Public Administration, Urban and Regional Planning, Education, Nursing, Geography, Psychology, Anthropology, and Religion regularly enroll in our seminars. Sociology offers part of the curriculum required for an undergraduate certificate in Demography and the graduate and undergraduate certificates in Gerontology offered by the Pepper Institute on Aging and Public Policy. Sociology also provides core courses in the MS program in Demography (Center for Demography and Population Health) and electives in the new masters degree program in Public Health.

Sociology faculty comprise the core of two research centers in the College of Social Sciences—the Center for Demography and Population Health and the Pepper Institute on Aging and Public Policy. Faculty situated in these centers teach, conduct research, and perform administrative duties. Other members of our faculty relate to various units on a project-specific basis, e.g., to develop “cluster” proposals or other projects that require interdisciplinary collaboration. These relationships generate funding opportunities for faculty and students and support for our research. Informal relationships exist with many units, inside and outside the College, including the Law School, Department of Management in the College of Business, Women’s Studies and Black Studies. R. Jay Turner currently leads a group applying for a “Pathways of Excellence” cluster award and proposes collaboration with the Department of Psychology and College of Human Sciences. Two sociology faculty members, Padavic and Martin, collaborated with two English Department faculty members on a cluster proposal in the first round in 2005-2006 (that was not selected for funding).

Section 8. Constituencies

Other than students, who are the primary beneficiaries of the activities provided by this academic department? What would be the impact to the constituencies and the University if this organization were not in existence.

Sociology is a benefit to all of society. We offer critical insights about how society “works” when we publish our research, give lectures around the nation and globe, talk with journalists about our findings, and collaborate with agencies and leaders in the non-academic world. In the past year, research by 10 FSU sociology faculty members has received extensive national and international attention through the wire services, newspapers, radio and television, and web-based venues. For instance, Robin Simon’s study of depression and parenthood prompted a firestorm of media coverage; John Taylor’s and Don Lloyd’s results on substance abuse and Taylor’s work with graduate student David Russell on the mental health effects of Hurricane Andrew were widely disseminated. John Reynolds’ work on the unrealistic educational aspirations of adolescents and Kathryn Tillman’s on immigrant youth showed how family, race/ethnic, and class situations affect contemporary U. S. youth’s aspirations and practices and received national coverage. Jill Quadagno’s study of the U. S. failure to provide universal health insurance received national attention, including participation Ira Flatow’s “Science Friday” on National Public Radio. Jay Turner’s research on stress and health and Anne Barrett’s and Deana Rohlinger’s study of the “Red Hat Society” have been recognized as offering insights into contemporary U. S. social and cultural dynamics. Journal articles by Quadagno and Simon were featured for several weeks by the American Sociological Association on its main webpage, where members and non-members alike could “download” a copy for free. Such recognition shows the high regard in which our faculty are held nationally and the relevance of our scholarly work to contemporary social life.

Graduates of our programs leave with valuable skills and knowledge that enable them to contribute to diverse employment settings including education, government, non-profit organizations, and private industry. Our research helps society by shedding light on pressing social issues--e.g., end of life care, work with rape victims, drug use and abuse, national health insurance, mental illness, stress, adolescent/educational issues. Students at FSU would be the poorer, intellectually and practically, if denied exposure to a sociological perspective and associated conceptual and analytical skills. Our courses regularly change students’ lives, not only their understanding and knowledge. A sociological viewpoint helps one identify, analyze, and confront social dynamics, relations, and problems and contributes to a higher quality of life. All of society is enriched by the perspectives, knowledge, and skills that we impart to the community (and our students) through disseminating our research. Any university without a Department of Sociology would be inadequate.

Section 9. Resources

Comment on the perceived adequacy of the E&G budget, including how building space is allocated and used. Is equipment adequate?

We are fortunate to have received strong support from Dean David Rasmussen for the past several years for recruitment and for allowing us to use funds from empty lines for graduate student support and to respond to undergraduate course demands. The following comments are positioned against a backdrop of appreciation for this support. We continue to face challenges that, in part, reflect a dearth of and/or constraints on flexibility and quantity of resources.

Salary. Sociology faculty salaries are not woefully inadequate but they are substantially less than those characteristic of the kind of department we want to become. This situation reflects, in part, the Florida Legislature's failure to allocate adequate raises to faculty each year and/or the inability of FSU deans to give raises to faculty except (a) when funds are provided by senior administration for merit purposes; or (b) when faculty produce a competitive counter-offer. We are grateful to Dean Rasmussen for allowing us to appoint new assistant professors each year at the University of Oklahoma "mean" for sociology assistant professors plus ten percent. In recent years, this amount has gone up by approximately \$3,000/year which, in short order, means an assistant professor in her or his fourth or fifth year can suffer from salary compression. We are gravely concerned about this situation. Salaries for highly productive sociologists at top-ranked Research I institutions have sky-rocketed of late and we are definitely behind in this regard. The current system offers few opportunities for improving this situation. Individuals seeking counter-offers is one method but this system has drawbacks. When a faculty member goes on the job market, there is always a chance that his/her loyalties will shift and she/he will leave. Counter-offers are a risky method for rewarding outstanding faculty. Furthermore, this strategy is gendered. We know from research on gender that women less often seek counter-offers due to feeling uncomfortable playing the "counter-offer" game. We also know that proportionally more FSU women are "stuck" at the associate professor level, perhaps because they are less skilled at pursuing counter-offers. This situation can contribute to a widening gap in salaries for women and men. A solution that would not result in gender inequity and that would reward productive faculty members is for the University to allocate greater funding to a market equity pool. This resource can be used, as appropriate, to boost the salaries of outstanding but underpaid faculty.

Faculty Lines. Our department needs more tenure track faculty. Some years ago, we had 25 tenure track faculty. In the 1999 GPC review, political science and sociology were more or less equal in size (PS had 22, sociology had 21 faculty) whereas today, sociology has 21 filled tenure track lines (and 3 empty lines) while political science has 27 filled tenure track lines. Sociology needs more faculty to meet the demands we face. Pressures on faculty to teach more, publish more, and do more service have escalated, making us feel as if we never do enough. The Provost's policy of reducing senior faculty lines to the assistant level, while understandable, has produced a strain on senior faculty to (a) adequately teach and supervise graduate students; (b) perform critical service functions within and beyond the department; and (c) apply for and manage external grants. Our

faculty are stretched to the hilt regarding time and energy. They work very hard and feel pressured to do even more. We understand that junior faculty members' time must be protected but protecting it is a cost to senior faculty who must perform a disproportional share of service to keep the department and College, University, and profession viable.

In regards to faculty lines, we have lost three lines since the 1990s. One was formerly held by Susan Losh who moved into Education; one by David Sly who moved to geography and recently retired (in 2006); and one by Graham Kinloch who retired in March 2006 (but is retained by the College of Social Sciences on OPS). In each instance, we were not given replacement lines nor funds from these lines (e.g., in Kinloch's case). In earlier years, we had more faculty and a workload that was more manageable. Faculty who have been here a long time are keenly aware of the increase in workload that has developed.

Expense and OPS. Our expense funds pay for faculty travel, postage, telephones, and copying and our OPS (other personnel services) funds pay for graduate student stipends, adjuncts, and visiting faculty salaries. Data in Table 9.1 show the amount of OPS and Expense allocated to Sociology at the start of the past several years. (Institutional Research did not provide actual expenditure data on these categories.) Two facts are clear. We experienced growth in OPS between Spring 2003 and Fall 2004 and between Spring 2005 and Fall 2006. The jump from 2004-2005 to 2005-06 was substantial, at 32 percent. We saw no increase in Expense funds from Fall 2001 through AY 2005-2006, however, and then only a modest rise of \$6,000 (14 percent).

Table 9.1. OPS and Expense Funds to Sociology, 2001-2006 (Soc. Data Book, p. 20)

Beginning of Year Budgets:	OPS	Expense
2001-02	\$97,718	\$40,388
2002-03	96,312	40,388
2003-04	116,922	40,388
2004-05	116,922	40,388
2005-06	171,481	46,127

These data prompt two generalizations. Our **OPS funds** have increased by 75 percent since Fall 2001, an increase that allowed us to support more graduate students and hire adjuncts and temporary faculty to help meet undergraduate course demands. We increased graduate stipends from \$9000 to \$12,000/AY in Fall 2001 and to \$12,750 in Fall 2006. Yet, our OPS allocation falls short of the norms for top sociology programs nationally (and is dramatically less than Political Science's total, down the hall). We hope to increase our stipends to \$14,000 in the Fall of 2007. As noted earlier, Dean Rasmussen gave us additional OPS funds two years running to award three \$3,000 "supplementary scholarships" (for up to three years) to our top recruits. As a result, and due to other scholarships/fellowships that were aggressively sought and obtained by Dr. Quadagno, our success recruiting first rate students has improved (see Table 3.4 in Section 3). And yet, we are supporting only 20 graduate students with OPS funds in 2006-2007 with an additional 10.5 students supported by distance learning funds.

Due to demands on the department for more and larger undergraduate courses, we appoint graduate assistantships primarily as teaching assistants (either assisting or as a sole instructor) rather than as research assistants. Graduate students are not able to work solely as research assistants during most of their time in our program, although an exception holds for students hired by Principal Investigators to work on grants.

Expense Budget. Second, regarding data in Table 9.1, our expense budget is inadequate to fund faculty travel to professional meetings. Presently, we reimburse about \$600 for a national professional meeting and between \$300-350 (depending on availability) for a regional professional or specialty meeting. [NOTE: To receive support, a faculty member must present a paper at the meeting.] These amounts fall substantially short of the cost of participating in the meetings, e.g., with registration fees of \$100 or more, and high airfare and hotel costs. For instance, plane tickets to the 2006 ASA meetings in Montreal were \$600-700, not to mention \$200/night hotel rooms, even when shared. Due to this situation, some of our faculty have reduced their participation in professional meetings. This is unfortunate for them and our department. Junior faculty urgently need to “network” in their areas of expertise and senior faculty need to assume leadership positions in our professional associations as officers and committee chairs. Also, faculty who hold offices in professional associations often must remain at the meetings longer, adding to their expenses and financial burden.

A concern regarding faculty travel relates to resources available to Center faculty--those in Demography and Population Health and the Pepper Institute--that are unavailable to Departmental faculty not located in Centers. We along with Center faculty need to review our various policies on travel support to assess and clarify our premises and procedures and to assure clarity and equity.

SRAD Distribution. Some of the departments in the College of Social Sciences receive all SRAD overhead from external grants written by their faculty but Sociology does not. The bulk of SRAD funds generated by sociology faculty goes to the Centers of Demography and Population Health or to the Pepper Institute on Aging and Public Policy. We need to review the policy that allows Centers to receive the bulk of SRAD distributions in order to assure that funds generated by sociology faculty are used to support sociologists and their research. The Sociology Department receives only 1% of the SRAD funds “that go back to the unit,” a practice that should be reviewed to assure that funds from sociology grants are not being used to support travel by non-sociology faculty. We should also address whether faculty in Centers should be able to obtain travel support from both the Center and department, if this means their travel costs are fully funded while Departmental members are reimbursed at a fraction of their costs.

OCO/Equipment. Thanks to Dean Rasmussen and the College of Social Sciences, we have adequate OCO funds to support faculty members’ and graduate students’ research. All faculty members have a private office, telephone, and desktop computer with internet connection. Many faculty have laptops and printers purchased by the Department. Our Graduate Computer Lab that is available to sociology graduate students around the clock, year-round contains 13 “state-of-the-art” computers, a high speed laser printer, and a high quality scanner. All 13 computers have WORD OFFICE and SPSS, eight (8) have

STATA 9, and three (3) have ATLAS.ti (a qualitative data analysis program). Dr. Jesse Taintor keeps the computers for faculty, staff, and graduate students in tip-top shape. Sociology has no facilities for data collection but substantial data archives are available to us through the University's membership in ICPSR and other consortia, e.g., the Roper Center. However, we have no staff trained and available to help faculty obtain or manage data, in the event they want to collect data or use large data sets for their research, although the Center for Demography and Population Health has a staff person in this role presently (as noted earlier).

Space Allocation & Use. Sociology faculty are located on three floors in the Bellamy Building and on Call Street in the Claude Pepper Building. Our departmental office is on fifth floor Bellamy. We have faculty on fifth, fourth and sixth floors (nine on sixth, in association with the Center for Demography and Population Health). Four faculty are located in the Pepper Building. Graduate students have carrels on fifth floor Bellamy and some advanced students share offices in Pepper, and on fourth, fifth and sixth floors in Bellamy. We assign offices to advanced students after they pass prelims and teach on their own, when space is available.) All graduate students have an assigned 'space' to do their work and, if need be, hold office hours. We would prefer to have all faculty on one floor of one building but this is most likely a pipe dream.

When Bellamy was remodeled, we changed the layout of our department and reduced the size of our conference room in 519 Bellamy. The room is large enough for small seminars but not large enough to accommodate all faculty and graduate students. When we need everyone to attend, we use the DeVoe Moore Conference Room on first floor Bellamy.

We have requested several alterations to our existing space. For instance, we have asked for insulation to be installed between offices and the conference room and library on fifth floor so conversations cannot be overhead three and four doors away. We have had to move faculty members out of offices near our Conference Room because they could not work due to sound pollution. We are told that insulating is expensive but we requested it nevertheless. We additionally requested glass "windows" to be installed inserted in the hallway wall of our "library" (Room 517 Bellamy) to give the room light and prevent it from feeling like a cave.

Dr. Jesse Taintor serves the computer needs for four units in the College--Sociology, Political Science, Public Administration, and Center for Demography and Population Health. Taintor is located in sociology and he and his equipment take up three sociology offices: (a) His personal office and (b) two other offices where he stores College equipment, e.g., old computers, monitors, keyboards, etc., as well as new computers that have just arrived. While we appreciate having him on our floor and closely associated with our Department (his PhD is in sociology), other units may want to help us provide offices for storing the equipment he manages.

Comment on the availability and sources of external funding and on the department's goals and success in this regard.

As noted earlier, our department has dramatically improved its level of external funding, as Table 9.2 shows (see also **Table 3.5**, on overhead funds returned to the Department between FYs 2002 and 2006).

Table 9.2. FSU Sociology Department Federal Funding Data for FYs 2002-2005

Fiscal Year	Total Award*	National rank in 100 PhD institutions	Re. to PS at FSU	Re. to Econ at FSU
2002	\$11,139,000	7	\$4,491,000	\$495,000
2003	2,455,000	22	725,000	228,000
2004	2,201,000	24	1,922,000	186,000
2005	3,158,477	unknown	unknown	unknown

*Data for FYs 2002-2004 are from the National Science Foundation. The data for FY 2005 were provided by FSU's Office of Institutional Research.

As was noted in Section 2 earlier, FSU ranked 24th of 100 institutions in federally financed R&D expenditures in FY 2004 (by comparison, sociology at the University of Florida's ranked 52nd with \$413,000.) This total and ranking were lower than for fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2005. FSU Sociology ranked 7th nationally among 100 PhD sociology departments in FY 2002, with \$11,139,000 (an amount over twice that of FSU's department of political science and 20 times that of economics.) and 22nd in FY 2003, with a total of \$2,455,000 (which was half of the FSU total of \$5,143,000 for all social sciences in that year). We do not know our comparative rank for FY 2005 but data in Table 9.2 suggest we'll fare well when the data come out.

In FY 2006 (7/1/05-6/30/06) Sociology faculty submitted nine proposals and had six funded. The total amount awarded during the period was \$6,584,913 [QE1], with \$3,017,334 of this figure from federal grants [QE3A]. During 2006, faculty submitted two federal grant proposals and six were funded; having more proposals funded than submitted likely reflects a lag between submitting in 2005 and funding in 2006. Between Fall 2001-Spring 2005, faculty submitted 87 proposals with 59 funded, for a total dollar amount of \$16,478,935 [QE5]. Relative to our priorities, we intend to continue applying for federal and other external funds, e.g., from non-federal agencies, if and when they support our departmental mission.

What is the college's policy on the use of dollars related to vacant E&G positions? On carryforward?

Following the Provost's policy, the College of Social Science requires a new vacant line to revert to a beginning assistant professor salary. The Dean retains half of the salary and gives us use of the other half to support graduate students and/or adjuncts and visiting (teaching) faculty. The College policy on the use of carry-forward funds is excellent. Dean Rasmussen allows us to retain and use unspent funds for critical departmental purposes. For instance, we could not otherwise support as many graduate students or adjunct/visiting faculty as we do.

Section 10. Self-Assessment/Outside Assessment

We have engaged in self-assessment relative to Program and Student Learning Outcomes during the past three years and shall continue doing so. This effort has revealed weaknesses in our undergraduate program that we are working to address, e.g., uneven instruction across sections. The review process has reassured us regarding the viability of our PhD program and highlighted problems with our Applied Social Research program. As already noted in Sections 4 and 5, we are working on the latter issue.

Our last outside assessment was conducted in 1999/2000 by the Graduate Policy Committee, Dr. Teresa Sullivan (formerly Graduate Dean at The University of Texas, now Provost at the University of Michigan), and the State of Florida Board of Regents. The results of that assessment are reviewed and commented on below.

Does the department have a statement of self-assessment, including what the department determines are its accomplishments and needs for the future?

No. However, discussions relevant to these issues are routinely addressed by our faculty, particularly our Personnel Committee, as we prepare for and deliberate on recruiting. The assistant professors alert their mentors to problems that they see and offer suggestions that are passed on to the chair who passes them on to the Personnel Committee and senior faculty.

How does the assessment fit with the mission, goals, and objectives of the department? Give specific examples of unit strategies for improvement.

We believe we are doing what we should do in the manner we view as professional, productive, and proper. Our primary needs, as we envision them, are noted earlier and below.

Does the department survey its students and/or the employers of its students?

No, with the exception of graduates of our Applied Social Research program. We have been able to contact most (but not all) employers of the graduates of our Applied program who tell us they are pleased with their performance.

Has this organization been reviewed by outside consultants in the last 5 years, such as the SUS Program Reviews and Graduate Policy Council (GPC)?

No. The last GPC and SUS Program Reviews were conducted in 1999 and 2000.

Discuss major findings/issues for any of the above.

The last major GPC Review made the following recommendations.

1) Review and possibly remove **Doctoral Directive Status** from two faculty members. Both of the two in question have since retired. Our current policy is to give Masters

Directive status to a tenure track faculty member with a PhD when she or he joins our faculty. For senior people (e.g., full professors) with proven records, we immediately award Doctoral Directive Status (DDS). For assistant professors, we follow this policy. In their fourth year, if they have (a) published a minimum of two articles (or equivalent) since coming to FSU as faculty members and (b) served on a PhD committee, the Chair asks the elected Personnel Committee for advice in awarding DDS. Unless they dissent, the Chair appoints the faculty member to Doctoral Directive Status. Of our ten assistant professors, four have DDS currently. The current chair (Patricia Martin) has requested and received “Co-Masters” Directive Status for our non-tenure-track faculty member, Annette Schwabe. She has been awarded this status which means she can help to supervise masters level students thesis work and can teach certain graduate courses, as warranted by her qualifications and recommendations of the Department Chair and Area Committee Chairs.

2) **Placements of Doctoral Students.** In the years from 1995 to 1999, three of the 19 PhD graduates secured placements at Research I universities. We were urged to improve on that result. Data from 2001-2006 show that we did. (GPC Table 1.1, later in this document, lists our graduates and their employment.) Of 22 students completing a PhD between 2001 and 2006, six hold tenure track positions at Research I institutions, two hold post-doctoral positions, and three hold non-tenure track positions at Research I institutions. Furthermore, eight graduates had or now hold a post-doctoral fellowship. Six others hold academic jobs at non-Research I institutions and four hold non-academic positions. While we value having our graduates obtain tenure track lines at Research I institutions, we do not judge those who choose other employment harshly. We support them to do whatever they deem is right for their interests and skills.

3) **Recruitment and Enrollments.** The GPC urged us to increase the number of applicants to and enrollment of our Ph. D. program pool. We have done the latter but not the former. We had a graduate student body of 37 in Fall 2001 and we have 56 today. We were advised to improve the quality of our website, which we did (in accord with the University’s new ‘branding’ initiative; see <http://www.fsu.edu/~soc/>). We were told to streamline our graduate curriculum to allow students entering with a sociology masters degree to progress more expeditiously. We did this by making the process of exempting courses more transparent and navigable. We made other changes also to facilitate completion of the program in a timely manner, e.g., eliminated a required Doctoral Review Paper and eliminated the requirement to complete three Advanced Research Seminars.

4) **Increase Number and Diversity of Students** matriculating without decreasing quality. We increased in numbers overall but only modestly in terms of graduate student enrollment of race/ethnic minorities. As already noted, our graduate student-body is 66 percent women and 34 percent men, a pattern consistent with national data on sociology. Dr. Quadagno (and before her, Dr. Harry Dahms) has been highly successful at helping our race/ethnic minority PhD students obtain prestigious fellowships from the American Sociological Association, the McKnight Foundation, and internal FSU sources (e.g., Leslie Wilson Fellowship). We hope our recruitment of Dr. Verna Keith will help us attract more African American students and we hope to attract more Hispanic students,

given Florida's substantial Latino/a/Hispanic population. For the first time in years, we have four non-US graduate students--three women (from India, Korea, and Israel) and one man (from Japan). We value national as well as racial diversity in light of globalization and the opportunities to learn and grow that ethnic diversity confers.

5 & 6. Professional Preparation of Graduate Students & Quality and Mentoring of Graduate Students. We were advised to improve our efforts to prepare students for work as professional sociologists. We have done this. Of our seven most recent PhD graduates, 6 of 7 had published and in every instance, faculty members had co-authored with them. In the past year, ten of our PhD students published articles in refereed journals and two published book chapters. Our "MA writing seminars" (a two-semester manuscript/research project course) stress the goals and skills of scholarly publication. We offer Advanced Research Seminars, where students and faculty work collaboratively to develop publishable research on an occasional basis (although they pose a dilemma regarding graduate student FTEs, since we normally restrict them to six or seven students). With pressures from administration to maximize graduate enrollment, classes of five to seven students are difficult to justify. Yet, we value them. In the past year, two papers that were co-authored by faculty and students let six students publish in the *American Journal of Sociology* and *Social Problems*, two leading sociology journals. An additional three students co-authored a forthcoming paper in *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, one of sociology's leading specialty journals (that is published by the American Sociological Association). Our faculty organize two brown bag series—one on Population/Health and one on Inequality—where faculty and graduate students meet (while some eat their lunch) and present work in progress. In the current year, presenters tend to alternate between faculty and doctoral students, giving the students practice in presenting their work and also helping them through the feedback they receive.

Additionally, we support graduate students to attend and present papers at professional meetings, subsidizing travel similarly to how we do faculty but at a lower rate. FSU graduate students can also request funding for professional meeting participation from the Congress of Graduate Students, or COGS, that distributes support on a first-come, first served basis. Our students regularly receive funding from this source in addition to the Department.

Our Graduate Program Director assigns a faculty mentor and graduate student mentor to each incoming graduate student to assist them through their first year. Thereafter, students are encouraged to seek out their own mentors, both among faculty and advanced doctoral students (which they do). Additionally, one of our senior faculty members (James Orcutt) supervises the sociology teaching assistants and assists our Program in Instructional Excellence teaching assistant in planning and delivering workshops on teaching throughout the academic year. He also reviews syllabi, examinations, and grade distributions and advises and assists students who have problems with their classes. Finally, we require all sociology graduate assistants to attend a minimum of four workshops on teaching each year as part of their agreement relative to funding.

7. Curricular Adjustments. We were advised to (a) allow students the freedom to take more courses outside the Department; (b) offer a non-credit internship program for

Applied students; and (c) increase offerings in race in the inequality track. We have made excellent progress on the third issue and are working on the second, although we intend to have credit-based internships. We added a graduate seminar in “Race and Gender in Organizations and one in “Race/Ethnicity and Health.” We also created an undergraduate course, “African Americans in U. S. Society” (officially approved in December 2006). Dr. George Luke is developing an internship program for Applied students. The issue of courses outside the Department continues to nag us. The College does not encourage students to go outside COSS for coursework but it also does not forbid it. Since we fund PhD students for only four years, they rush to complete their required coursework before funding expires thus discouraging enrolling in courses that they do not “need.” We regret that our students take so few courses outside the Department but, under present circumstances, we view major change as unlikely.

8. Recommendations of Dr. Teresa Sullivan. Professor Sullivan made five recommendations, as follows: (1) sociology should generate more external funds and reward faculty who obtain grants; (2) COSS should develop a social science data lab to provide technical assistance to faculty who use public databases; (3) the Provost should be clearer about expectations for promotion and tenure; (4) the department should develop a strategic plan; and (5) the department and College should institute a professional development program for faculty. Our department has generated more external funds but has not developed an explicit way to reward faculty who obtain grants. However, faculty who obtain grants receive a portion of SRAD overhead funds as well as direct costs that allow to buy-out of teaching, support skilled graduate assistants, and fund their own travel and other research needs. The Provost acted on point 3, as witnessed by his website that makes the criteria clear. COSS has not made progress on points 3 or 5, except that the Dean is partially funding a data archivist in the Center for Demography and Population Health, with the Center paying one-half of Mr. Minxing Chen’s salary. However, the Dean’s support expires after AY 2006-2007, with the expectation that Center faculty grants will cover his full salary at that time.

Regarding our **undergraduate program**, Sullivan praised us for being involved in distance learning. She had few recommendations about our undergraduate program, except to note that our number of majors and offerings are typical of sociology departments nationwide.

As to the **graduate program**, Sullivan regretted the COSS proscription on courses outside the College and urged us to change this policy. Students may petition our Graduate Program Director to take courses outside the department and College and, as a rule, their request is granted. Yet, we do not explicitly encourage courses outside the department. She urged us to increase our graduate student applicant pool, e.g., by activating our alumni around the nation. We have not succeeded in this regard. She also urged us to appoint more students to research assistantships rather than teaching assistantships, an area where we have made modest progress. She questioned our graduate stipend level which we promptly raised from \$9000 to \$12000. She praised our mentoring of graduate teaching assistants and we still do well in this regard. The recommendations she emphasized were: Raise graduate student stipends and diversify student assistantship assignments (meaning, more research, less teaching).

Regarding faculty accomplishments, she made several points. Our faculty workload is too heavy to attract nationally known senior faculty to FSU, she alleged. We have done nothing on this issue. We give a reduced course assignment to incoming faculty, but more at senior than at junior ranks (e.g., one course in the first two years for assistants; with the number of courses off for senior faculty negotiated, person by person). Sullivan urged us to generate more external funding which we have done. She urged the formation of a College “lab” to assist faculty with their research; we have not done this nor do we sense that our faculty want or need such a lab. One example of new support for some of our faculty—that occurred in AYs 2005-06 and 2006-07--was the hiring of Mr. Minxing Chen as an archivist in the Center for Demography and Population Health. To date, his service has been available only to Center faculty, however, not all sociology faculty. When the Dean agreed to help fund the position, he envisioned the occupant as serving all sociology faculty, not just those in the Center for Demography and Population Health. If Mr. Chen remains at FSU, we should identify how he can might assist non-Center as well as Center-associated faculty.

In 2000, Sullivan surmised that FSU’s sociology department is better than its national reputation, as indicated by the 1990s’ NRC results. She believes a faculty as small as ours will not be able to “break into the top 25” departments nationally, since departments in that tier are larger than we are. If we aspire to move up in the way she urged in 2000, we shall need more tenure track faculty. We endorse this view in 2006.

Section 11. Problems Over the Next Five Years

What are the greatest problems facing the unit over the next five years?

We view two general areas as problematic, one concerning faculty, the other our graduate program. We need concrete plans to move forward on both.

Faculty

1. Perhaps our greatest challenge is **recruiting, rewarding and retaining excellent faculty**. Other than compression problems, and the inability to give “real” raises based on merit, we face a challenge regarding service within and beyond the Department. With one-half of the faculty at the Assistant Professor rank, it is a struggle to balance protecting assistants’ time and energy with accomplishing essential service work. This poses a burden for associate and full professors and has prompted letting some issues go unaddressed, e.g., a thorough review of our undergraduate curriculum and program; development of our Applied program, including internships; recruiting graduate students; providing advanced PhD students with fellowships (e.g., during their dissertation-writing year). Our Associate professors must teach two courses per term, often without graduate student teaching assistance, while publishing and obtaining grants in order to be promoted to Full Professor. Thus, they too are less than eager to perform extensive service.

Finding creative ways to reward productive faculty for excellence in scholarship, teaching, and citizenship is challenging. Given the minimal *merit* funds assigned to the Department, some of our most highly productive faculty feel (and are) under-rewarded. We would like to devise internal programs and policies that reward faculty in meaningful ways. Some departments in Arts and Sciences are supporting their associate professors for early promotion, in part to obtain pay raises for them. Perhaps we should too. We must find ways to reward productive faculty, particularly those who obtain external grants and publish excellent work. We need to assist Associate Professors who need graduate assistant support and research time to advance to the Full Professor rank.

2. **Equity among assistant professors.** There is some concern in the department over the diversity in assignments among our assistant professors who ultimately will face the same broad criteria for tenure and promotion. Some assistant professors will spend the majority of their time to tenure with reduced teaching loads from grant buy-outs and do relatively less instruction and/or, for some, teaching primarily graduate level courses. It is clear that a great deal of time spend on grant-related tasks does not lead directly to publications or presentations, in light of the fact that considerable effort is required to collect data, clean raw data sets, and generate usable data files. Nonetheless, a significant portion of time bought out by externally funded grants typically is spent preparing conference papers and publishable articles. In this way, our department benefits from the additional time such faculty are able to spend on the production of peer-reviewed journal articles as a result of grant-related course releases. And yet, we are cognizant of the potential inequity that this arrangement introduces among our assistant professors going through a third-year review or preparing their tenure binders. That is, some of our faculty

are concerned that those who have continuously taught two courses per term, and often different courses with substantial numbers of undergraduates, will be at a disadvantage when judged on their tenure prospects relative to those who have taught 30 to 50 percent fewer courses and/or only small classes and/or primarily graduate courses.

As noted, we have instituted some policies to address perceived inequity issues. One is to assign two undergraduate sections of the same course, when feasible to an assistant professor; another is to discourage too many new preparations during the assistant professor period; a third is to avoid assigning assistant professors to large sections until after tenure (or close to tenure). We can also provide modest financial support to untenured faculty (as noted above, using the Department's limited SRAD fund) to support their research. A major boon to our assistant professors would be a reduced teaching load (e.g., a three-course load in years one through three rather than a four-course load), perhaps including a research semester in their third year of full-time employment (e.g., in Spring of their third year). Rationale: The first year of being a new faculty member is a learning time in many ways. A course off in the first year may not help much; for this reason, we allow new assistants to take their course-off in their first or second year. By the third year, a new assistant professor should have developed a few new courses and settled into the routines of academic life. A research semester in the second part of their third year would allow eight months of uninterrupted research to write and submit articles for publication. Something along these lines could immensely help our junior faculty.

3. Need to continue recruiting. The never-ending need to recruit taxes faculty time and energy. We would like to stabilize our faculty so we can recruit only every other year. Two new senior retirements are looming in December 2007 (Martin and Orcutt will retire) thus the need to recruit and the need for more senior faculty will continue.

Graduate Program

1. Applied Program. We need to decide if our Applied Social Research masters program can work. To assure its viability, we must do a better job of recruiting and establishing an internship program. We need good students for placement in applied settings in order to build a favorable reputation. This will require time and commitment from our entire faculty, not just one or two.

2. Increasing Size of Applicant Pool. We must find ways to increase our applicant pool for our doctoral and applied programs. While we are gratified with the quality of PhD students in recent years, our applicant pool is too small. Also, we have almost no applicants for the Applied program and must do something about this, as noted.

3. Stipends and fellowships. Our stipends are low compared to the institutions we aspire to emulate and, perhaps more importantly, with only four years of support, our students suffer from a lack of support in their last year(s) of work on their dissertations. We know from our national meetings that the winners of our discipline's national dissertation awards have had fellowship support (often for multiple years) during the dissertation writing stage. As noted earlier in this document, sociological research is labor intensive

and the gap between inception of problems and published product is lengthy and arduous. An endowment to help us with this goal would be great.

Section 12. Attainment of Goals, Increased Success and Recognition.

What do the department, the college and/or the university have to do to achieve the department's goals, the college's or university's?

Department

Against the background of comments in Section 11 and related to those in Section 3 (on Priorities and Accomplishments), our Department must do several things to realize our goals. (a) We must find ways to recruit, reward, and retain excellent faculty, while preserving equity among current faculty so as not to advantage or disadvantage particular categories of faculty. (b) We must recruit more senior faculty and more minority faculty. (c) We must find ways to increase the applicant pool for our graduate programs, both PhD and Applied. (d) We need a non-tenure track faculty member to have responsibility for developing and delivering our Applied Social Research masters program. This faculty member would ideally teach two courses per AY term for the program and arrange and monitor field internships. (e) We need an endowment to support dissertation fellowships for advanced graduate students. (f) We need an Eminent Scholar chair in the Department to use in recruiting senior faculty with a sterling record of research and publication, teaching, and professional service.

College of Social Sciences

To realize our goals, the following forms of support from the Dean and the College of Social Sciences would be helpful: (a) Support to hire more faculty, more senior faculty and more minority faculty. (b) Support to increase our graduate student stipends. (c) Help with creating an endowment to support dissertation fellowships and an Eminent Scholar faculty chair. (d) Establishment of a college-level infrastructure to help faculty apply for and manage external grants (currently a problem for faculty who must learn technical skills that they forget due to discontinuous use). (e) Help the Department create/develop and implement alternative ways to reward highly productive faculty (e.g., varied teaching loads, "research semesters," etc.). (f) Continue to allocate SRAD funds to faculty who do meritorious research without support from a Center or other sources within the University. (g) Allocate additional tenure track lines to hire more faculty who can contribute to our department, College, and University by helping supervise PhD students and obtain external grants. (h) Allocate to sociology a second non-tenure-track teaching faculty line for someone to develop and manage the Applied Social Research program; (i) Publicize our department's accomplishments and promise within and beyond the College of Social Sciences and University; and (j) Provide tuition waivers to help attract outstanding FSU undergraduates into our Applied program.

We suspect that the differential success of COSS departments at increasing graduate program enrollments, particularly at the masters level, may have more to do with national trends than the particular efforts of those departments. Internal comparisons make sociology's graduate enrollments look relatively stagnant next to some other departments (e.g., political science). Yet, viewed in the context of national trends, our department's enrollments are just as much in line with national trends as any other COSS unit. We

encourage the administration to judge our achievements relative to peer and aspirational sociology departments rather than comparing us to COSS departments that face different national trajectories in demand or desirability.

University

We would benefit from the adoption of the following policies and practices by the University administration. (a) **Constancy of goals and rewards** for departments. We urge FSU's senior Administration to provide clear goals for departments that will lead to rewards if they are achieved. We have heard much in the past two years about FSU's AAU initiative goals of: More external funds, more articles per faculty member, more PhD students/faster completion of the PhD, and higher citation rates. These goals are consistent with our interests and efforts and as a matter of fact, we are aggressively (and successfully) pursuing them. Of late, we have learned (to some puzzlement) that the number of students is paramount. We understand that external events beyond FSU's control must be responded to but more constancy of *internal goals* would be very helpful. Although we are relatively small in faculty size, we are an outstanding department. Two of our colleagues, Drs. Jill Quadagno and James Orcutt, have recently served as presidents of our national professional associations (the American Sociological Association and the Society for the Study of Social Problems), distinctions that show the regard in which they and our department are held. Acknowledgement of our past accomplishments and ongoing successes is highly warranted.

(b) **Allocating greater resources to Merit and Market Equity salary pools.** It would be extremely helpful if departments could allocate raises to productive faculty without forcing the faculty member to obtain a counter-offer. Compression remains a problem for us (and all departments with long-time members) and senior administrative support for addressing it would be helpful. Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, the ability to reward exceptional accomplishments by faculty in our department with a merit or market equity increase would be a great boon to morale and to a sense of appreciation among faculty.

(c) **Continued support for research and teaching.** FSU's Research division is excellent. We strongly support its faculty-friendly policies and programs. When we try to recruit senior faculty, they are favorably impressed with the generous sharing of SRAD funds with the faculty member's home unit and, indeed, with the PI. We also applaud the competitive programs that our Office of Research and Grants offers, including the First Year Assistant Professor program, COFRS summer funding, planning grant support, and the SSPEG program. Also, we applaud FSU for providing faculty (and teaching assistants) with Blackboard resources and support and the technology upgrades in our classrooms and libraries, and so on. We outshine nearly all U. S. universities on these counts. Thanks to our Administration in these regards.

Section 13. Future Contribution and Resources

Can the department increase its instructional contribution (i.e., teach 10% additional hours/ course), or increase research activities, with existing resources, within current mission? If not, what changes or additional resources would be required?

No. We are stretched to the limit. We are doing our best to respond to the Registrar's requests for more classes and/or more seats in our undergraduate courses. Of late, we literally have no one to teach an additional course. That is, we have few qualified adjunct sociology faculty in this area. As noted, we need more faculty, more OPS funds, and more Expense support, as things now stand.

We shall continue encouraging faculty to apply for external grants because doing so lets them support their research and buy out of teaching and helps them support graduate students. We appreciate this very much. Yet, we offer little technical support to assist faculty with this endeavor. As noted earlier, support from the College to help faculty apply for and/or manage grants would be a helpful.

Our faculty represent the very best of Florida State University. We are excellent teachers (several sociology faculty members have won multiple University Teaching Awards), esteemed scholars, and good citizens, here and beyond FSU.

GPC 1: Doctoral Graduates

Comment on the number and quality of doctoral graduates for the past five years.

See earlier Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 on these issues. To summarize, since the Department's GPC review in 1999/2000, we have done the following:

Increased the number of doctoral students from the mid-30s to 56;

Improved the quality (as measured by the GRE) of doctoral students (from 998 to 1242);

Increased the number of doctoral students who receive funding (from 22 in Fall 2001 to 37 in Fall 2006)

In AY 2004-2005, 9 doctoral students published their research and 8 presented their work at professional meetings. Figures for 2005-2006 are even better--with 11 published and 13 presenting at professional meetings. As with our other indicators of improvements in quality, these data show improved productivity and effectiveness. They also suggest that our encouragement of doctoral students to conduct and publish their research is working; &

We have failed to substantially increase the number of minority doctoral students but are working on this goal

GPC Table 1.1 lists 22 students who successfully completed a PhD in sociology between the Summer of 2001 and December 2006. Eleven (11) faculty members directed dissertations in the period, with Quadagno leading the group (with 6), followed by Sly (with 3) and the remaining faculty directing one or two. Ten (10) dissertations were completed in the area of Inequality: Gender (5), politics (3), race (1), work (1); eight in the area of Health & Aging: Health (3), aging (5); and four (4) in Demography. (Three faculty on the major professor list are no longer at FSU; two left for other positions and one retired.) We recently reinstated Social Psychology as a graduate program area and no students have completed a dissertation in this area yet.

GPC Table 1.1. Major Professor, Doctoral Graduates, and Dissertation Title, AY 2001-02 to Dec. 06

Major Professor	Student	Dissertation Title
Elwood Carlson	Azizah Linjawi	Exploring Reproductive Roles and Attitudes in Saudi Arabia
Isaac Eberstien	Naomi Spence	Reproductive Patterns and Women's Later Life Health
Melissa Hardy	Kim Shuey	Couples Approaching Retirement: The Organization of Pension Behavior Within the Family
"	Andrea Willson	Women's Income Security in Later Life: Trajectories Over the Life Course
Larry Isaac	Paul Lipold	Laying it All on the Line: The Configuration and Courses of Strike Fatalities within the United States, 1877-1947
Patricia Martin	Noella Dietz	Gender and Violence: Women's Responses to Being Stalked
"	George Luke	State Sponsored Advocacy: The Case of Students Working Against Tobacco
James Orcutt	Brenda Hughes	Viewing Race in the Comfort Zone: Acceptance and Rejection of the African American in Prime Time Television Programming
Irene Padavic	Anastasia Prokos	The Sex Pay Gap in Science and Engineering: An Analysis of Cohort Membership and Glass Ceiling Explanations
Jill Quadagno	Jennifer Keene	Beyond the Role Models: Workers' Family-Work Life Adjustments and Perceptions of Work-Family Balance
"	Lori Parham	Contrasts in Care Work: Hospice Care in Nursing Homes
"	Steve McDonald	Non-Searching for Jobs: Patterns and Payoffs to Non-Searching Across the Work Force
"	Tina DeShotels	Engaging a Debate: An Exploration of Depression, Engagement, Stress and Gender in the Nursing Home
"	Brandy Harris	Determinants of Resident Mental Health in Florida's Assisted Living Communities
"	Cynthia Davis	Welfare Reforms Misdiagnosis of What Ails the Poor: The Consequences for Income, Employment and Family Structure
John Reynolds	Stephanie Burge	Gendered Pathways in Higher Education: Change and Stability in Pursuit of a College Degree
"	Chardie Baird	Women's Early Career Goals and Attainments at Midlife
David Sly	Hosanna Soler	Breast Cancer Self-Protective Behaviors Among Low-Income Women: The Role of Ethnicity, Psychosocial Factors, and Contextual Barriers
"	Melanie Simmons	Problem Behaviors Versus the Risk Amplification Approach: HIV Risk Behaviors Among Youth in Fort Lauderdale
"	Trent Moore	A Construct Validation of Partner Awareness Risk among Seronegative Heterosexual Couples
R. Jay Turner	Ryan MacDonald	Social Context and Mental Health: The Role and Significance of Neighborhood and Family Context
"	A. Henry Eliassen	Religiosity, Physical Disability, and the Social Distribution of Problematic Drinking in an Aging Population

GPC 2: Placement (Graduate and Undergraduate)

Report on the placement of doctoral graduates for the past five years.

The placement of our graduates in the past five years is testimony to our Department's national standing. We graduated 22 PhD students between 2001 and 2006, eight of whom obtained post-doctoral fellowships and six of whom hold tenure track positions at Research I institutions. GPCTable 2.1 lists the position obtained immediately after graduation or the one presently held. Our graduates obtained post-doctoral fellowships at Yale, UC-Berkeley, UNC-Chapel Hill, and Johns Hopkins University and five graduates currently holding a tenure track position at a Research I institution were previous post-doctoral fellows (McDonald, Prokos, Shuey, Soler, and Willson). Another former post-doctoral fellow occupies a non-tenure track position in a medical school (Dietz), and two recent graduates hold post-doctoral positions now.

GPC Table 2.1. PhD Students' Year of Completion, Major Professor, & Employment Status

Year Graduated	Student	Major Professor	Position
2006 (Sum+Fall)	Harris, Brandy	Quadagno	Research Analyst, Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (Office of Health Services)
	<i>Spence, Naomi</i>	Eberstein	UNC Chapel Hill, Post-Doc
	Davis, Cynthia	Quadagno	FAMU, Sociology
	Eliassen, Henry	Turner	Arkansas State University, Sociology
	<i>MacDonald, Ryan</i>	Turner	Johns Hopkins U., Post-Doc
AY 2005-2006	Baird, Chardie	Reynolds	UT-Arlington, Sociology
	Moore, Trent	Sly	Scientific Data Analyst, Northrup-Grumman/CDC
	Burge, Stephanie	Reynolds	U Oklahoma, Sociology
	Linjawi, Azizah	Carlson	Assistant Professor of Sociology, King Abdulaziz University in Jeddah, Saudia Arabia
AY 2004-2005	Deshotels, Tina	Quadagno	Jacksonville State U (AL)
	Luke, George	Martin	Florida St U, Sociology
	McDonald, Steve	Quadagno	NC State, Sociology
AY 2002-2003	<i>Dietz, Noella</i>	Martin	U. Miami Med. School
	Lipold, Paul	Isaac	Adjunct instructor (Cleveland State U.)
	Hughes, Brenda	Orcutt	FAMU, Sociology
	Simmons, Melanie	Sly	Founder & Owner: Healthy Development Inc.
	Parham, Lori	Quadagno	Florida Organization of American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)
AY 2001-2002	Soler, Hosanna*	Sly	U. Miami, Medical School
	Keene, Jennifer Reid	Quadagno	UNLV, Sociology
	Prokos, Anastasia	Padavic	UNLV, Sociology
	Shuey, Kim	Hardy	Western Ontario U., Sociology
	Willson, Andrea	Hardy	Western Ontario U., Sociology

AY 2000-2001	Harrison, Dan	Hazelrigg	Lander Univ., Sociology
	Shader, Michael	Orcutt	Social Science Specialist at the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)
	Grieco, Elizabeth	Boyd	Data Manager, MPI Migration Information Source
AY 1999-2000	Johnson, Swen	Eberstein	Manager, Counter Intelligence Planning, The Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive
	Stepnick, Andrea	Martin	Belmont Univ., Sociology
AY 1998-1999	Christiansen, Larry	Isaac	Augsburg College, Sociology
	Fobes, Catherine	Martin	Alma College, Sociology
	Riehman, Kara	Sly	Research Analyst, RTI International
AY 1997-1998	Hyon-Sook, Yoo	Padavic	Assistant Professor, La Rabida Children's Hospital, Univ. of Chicago

Bold: In tenure-track sociology jobs at Research I institutions

Italics: Holds or previously held a post-doctoral position.

*Soler is in a tenure track position in a medical school.

GPC 3: Recruitment and Enrollments

Indicate recruitment plan for graduate students with particular attention to doctoral students

We attribute our drop in our applicant pool to raising our standards for admission (from 1000 on the GRE or a 3.0 GPA for the last two years; to 1000 and a 3.0 GPA). Otherwise, we are puzzled. We have done many things to boost our applications, including renting a table at our national meetings where we spent hours talking with perhaps a half-dozen students, most of whom never applied. Drs. Jay Turner and Jill Quadagno developed a flyer and letter in 2002 about our new (and improved) Health & Aging focus which was mailed to over 1000 colleges and universities. We have regularly emailed and written all COSS sociology majors with GPAs of 3.5 or higher, inviting them to consider applying to our program. We participate in Graduate School Fairs on both FSU's and FAMU's campuses annually. We routinely bring our top applicants to campus for a two-day visit and, in every instance, find our faculty willing to meet with them and encourage their interest in us.

Given these efforts, we propose several means of boosting applicants to our graduate programs.

- Action Step 1:** Keep our webpage current, interesting, and helpful to potential applicants (and current students). Our current students tell us our webpage was critical to their decision to apply.
- Action Step 2:** Recruit outstanding FSU social science undergraduates into our graduate programs, both Applied and doctoral.
- Action Step 3:** Identify and recruit alumni to help us recruit graduate students.
- Action Step 4:** Survey current students to find out what attracted them to FSU and use the results to reach out to others.
- Action Step 5:** Advertise our Applied program in the local media, both on and beyond campus (and on our webpage).
- Action Step 6:** Continue emailing sociology majors with a 3.5 or higher GPA to invite them to consider our program.
- Action Step 7:** Continue participating in graduate school information "fairs."
- Action Step 8:** Ask our current students to contact students from their undergraduate institutions who may have an interest in our programs.
- Action Step 9:** Produce and mail a Departmental Newsletter to every sociology department in the U.S., graduate and undergraduate (which we have done every year or so since 2000)
- Action Step 10:** Regularly submit news of faculty and graduate student accomplishments to national and regional newsletters to capture the attention of potential students and faculty who may recommend them.
- Action Step 11:** Encourage faculty to reach out to outstanding students in their classes and at professional meetings.
- Action Step 12:** Respond immediately and in a friendly way to enquiries from students about our graduate programs (which Dr. Quadagno and Ms. Jamie Yeargan already do).

Will distance learning play a role in your enrollment planning at either the undergraduate or graduate level?

Yes. We'll consider developing specific courses for our Applied Program and investigate ways to allow students in the program to enroll in undergraduate courses with additional work for graduate credit. We will assess whether to encourage development of additional courses. The problem is that once a course is developed, someone must teach it and our faculty are stretched thin now teaching the in-person courses needed to meet our obligations associated with Liberal Studies, our undergraduate majors, and our applied and doctoral program students.

These tables are repeated from Section 3, above.

Table 3.1. Graduate Ph. D. Entering Cohorts by In-Out-of-State/Non-national Status & Funding, 2001-2006

Starting Year	In-state	Out of state	Foreign	Funded (of total entering)	# new grad students
2001	0	6	0	6	6
2002	9	4	1	6.5	14
2003	5	5	3	5	13
2004	11	3	0	7	12
2005	9	7	0	8	14
2006	4	4	4	10	12

Table 3.2. Sources of Funding for Sociology Graduate Students, 2006, 2005 & 2004 (figures are for Fall & Spring; an additional 3.5 FTEs were funded by DL in summer 2006)

Source	2001-2002	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007
OPS funds	14	19	19	20
Distance learning	0	6 FTE	10 FTE	10.5 FTE
Research grants	6	6 FTE	6 FTE	4.5 FTE
Fellowships/Scholarships	0	3***	3**	2*
Total	20	35	38	37

*FSU Presidential Fellowship & American Sociological Association (ASA) Minority Fellowship; another ASA Minority Fellow graduated in 2006.

**Two ASA Minority Fellowships; one Pepper Institute Dissertation Fellowship

***Two ASA Minority Fellowships; one McKnight Foundation Fellowship

Table 3.4. Ph. D. Program Applicants, Acceptances, GRE Scores, and Enrolled by AY

Year	Number of Applicants	Number Accepted	GRE total for those accepted	Number Enrolled	GRE total for Enrolled	Total # students enrolled in Fall
2001-02	30	23	1014	6	998	37 (4, 33)**
2004-05	64	37	1219	12	1057	56 (10,46)
2006-07	36	33	1135	12	1242*	56 (3,53)

*Excludes foreign students who were admitted based on TOEFL and other academic criteria.

**The first number in parentheses is the number of MS degree students, the second is PhD students.

GPC 4: Professional Preparation of Graduate Students

Provide a statement on professional preparation of students for academic or non-academic roles.

In February 2002, our Director of Graduate Studies reported to Dean Dianne Harrison on steps we were taking to assure that our graduate students were professionally prepared. We review our progress up to the present.

1. We **support graduate students on grants** with the duties of doing research. We supported 8 students on external grants in Fall 2000, 6 in Fall 2005, and 4.5 in Fall 2006. The total depends on the ups and down of grant success.
2. We provide a departmental **Teaching Manual** (currently under revision) to our Graduate Teaching Assistants. We participate in the FSU Program in Instructional Excellence (PIE) and hold workshops for students (and faculty) on teaching issues. We require all students funded by the Department to attend at least four PIE workshops annually and all new students must participate in PIE orientation and workshops during Fall Orientation. One of our senior faculty members serves as the Departmental Teaching Associate Supervisor (Dr. James Orcutt) and, in this capacity, reviews the teaching assistants' syllabi, examinations, and SUSSAI/SPOT results and assists the graduate director and chair with any problems that arise among the TAs. The Department participates in the Preparing Future Faculty Program where students travel to other campuses to shadow faculty members and get a glimpse of their work lives.
3. **Mentoring.** We aggressively mentor our graduate students. Each incoming student is assigned a faculty advisor and a graduate student/peer mentor with responsibility to keep up with and assist the new student in any and every way. We hold a half-day departmental orientation meeting before the start of fall term where the Graduate Director and Graduate Program Assistant meet with students to orient them to our department and university. The morning begins with coffee where all faculty and graduate students welcome the new cohort. In the sessions that follow, faculty who teach in the coming year describe their courses to the new students. Advanced graduate students present on various issues about classes, managing the first year in graduate school, our Sociology Graduate Student organization, and so on. Our computer lab manager informs students of the rules and procedures for our department's graduate computer lab including how to use them and the printer, scanner, and copy machine. Our Graduate Program Assistant helps students register for Fall courses.
4. **Proseminar.** We require a 3-hour proseminar in the fall and spring semesters in the first year. In this seminar, faculty guests describe their research and invite students' interest. Advanced graduate students also describe their experiences. Sessions on writing and revising papers for publication are offered. The proseminar is led by the Graduate Program Director, thus assuring contact between the students and the person who makes decisions about their assignments and funding and who can assess their adjustment, problems, and success.

5. Curricular Issues. We have improved our graduate curriculum and program since our last review in the following ways. (1) We eliminated a requirement to write a Doctoral Review Paper prior to defending a dissertation prospectus. (2) We dropped a requirement that every student had to complete three Advanced Research Seminars prior to graduation (two in their major area, one in their minor area). (3) We regularized the assignment of faculty to teach in both core and programmatic areas. (4) We began offering a minimum of one graduate seminar in each regular AY semester in each programmatic area, to accommodate student progress. (5) We instituted a requirement for a qualitative methods course (not a particular course but one that analyzes non-numeric data) to prepare students relative to “multi-method” skills. (6) Most of our graduate seminars require students to present their papers at the end of term in a professional meeting format (15 minutes, using Power Point or other AV materials, etc.), thus preparing them for their future participation in professional meetings. (7) Several of our courses require students to develop a grant proposal as part of the course requirement. (8) We require students to take a comprehensive preliminary exam only in their core area (not as formerly, in theory, methods, and/or research in addition to their specialty area).

6. Use of Webpage. We post our syllabi on our webpage so students can learn about any courses they may want to take. We post current reading guides for students to use in preparing for their comprehensive exams. Finally, we post copies of the forms we utilize during their program so students can have access to them and see what is entailed.

7. Participation in PIE and PFF programs. To help students prepare for college/university teaching, our department participates in FSU’s Program in Instructional Excellence and Preparing Future Faculty Program. For over a decade, we have had a PIE representative in sociology and in three different years, one of our graduate students has been recognized as a University Teaching Assistant Awardee, the most recent recipient being Emily Boyd in 2005. As noted, a senior faculty member supervises our graduate teaching assistants, reviews their syllabi, assists with seminars on teaching issues, and reviews their exams and grading practices. We regularly invite staff of the Center for Instruction (e.g., Walt Wager) to make presentations to our students and faculty. One of our senior faculty members serves as our Graduate TA Supervisor. He meets with students to help them plan courses as well as make up tests, evaluate their performance, and address problems that develop in their classes.

8. Seminar in College Teaching. We offer a graduate seminar in the summer in Teaching Sociology at the College Level. Students take the course in summer after their first year of study in anticipation of teaching a course on their own after finishing their master’s degree. (We require them to teach on their own at least once, as a PhD requirement.) If a student enters our program with a master’s degree and has had teaching assistantship experience, she or he may be allowed to teach earlier.

9. Co-authoring with Faculty. We urge faculty to collaborate on research and publish with our graduate students, which they do. As noted earlier, ten of our doctoral students published articles in refereed journals and two published book chapters in the past year.

10. Year-long Writing Seminar & Advanced Research Seminars. Our writing seminar entails a two-semester manuscript/research project course that stresses the goals and skills of scholarly publication. It is not unusual for students to produce a publishable paper from this effort (although many subsequent revisions are typically required.) We also offer Advanced Research Seminars, where students and faculty work collaboratively to develop publishable research. In the recent past, several articles that were developed in these seminars have been published.

11. Co-authoring with Graduate Students. Related to the foregoing, papers co-authored with faculty have allowed six of our doctoral students (or recent graduates) to publish in the *American Journal of Sociology* and *Social Problems*, two of our leading journals. An additional three students are co-authors on a forthcoming paper in *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, one of sociology's leading specialty journals (that is published by the American Sociological Association).

12. Brown Bag Series. Faculty in the Department organize two brown bag series that run all year long—one focused on Population/Health and one on Inequality—where faculty and graduate students meet (while some eat their lunch) and present their research in an informal setting. As a rule, presenters alternate between faculty and doctoral students, giving students practice in presenting their work and offering them feedback and support.

13. Travel Support to Professional Meetings. We support graduate students to attend and present papers at professional meetings (subsidizing travel similarly to how we do for faculty but at a lower rate). Our students also request funding for professional meeting participation from the Congress of Graduate Students, or COGS, that distributes support on a first-come, first served basis. They regularly receive funding from this source in addition to the Department.

14. Recognizing Excellent Teaching. We regularly nominate our outstanding Teaching Assistants for the Graduate School's *Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award*. In the past decade, three sociology students have won this award (Fobes, Stepnick, and Boyd). As noted earlier, we give an annual *Best Teacher Award* in the Department to an outstanding graduate teaching assistant. Our commitment to excellent teaching is reinforced by the fact that we give a faculty member a comparable award. We post the names of our Teaching Award winners in our main Conference Room. Also, our Best Teacher Award carries a cash prize of \$300.00, in addition to the honor. In the past, we have also invited outstanding sociology instructors from around the U. S. to visit our department, address our students and faculty, and meet individually with students about their teaching interests, aspirations, and plans.

15. Best Paper Award. To encourage graduate students to do excellent scholarly work, we give an annual research paper award which we call the *Best Paper Award* and which also carries a cash prize of \$300.00. The name of this annual winner is also posted in our Conference Room.

16. Invite Outstanding Sociologists to Speak and Meet with Students. To help our students meet outstanding sociologists, we have an annual colloquium series that invites

national leaders to FSU to talk and meet with our students. This year, we have been visited by Dr. Brian Powell (Indiana University) and in Spring, 2007, Dr. Michael Messner (University of Southern California) is coming. We also invite FSU faculty from other departments to present to us (e.g., from Criminology, Social Work, Human Sciences), when their interests and research relates to that of our students and faculty.

GPC 5: Library and Other Resources

Library. In the past few years, we feel Strozier Library has let our department down. Strozier Library is a critical resource for our faculty and students yet we have been disappointed in recent policies and practices. In former years, Strozier ordered all new research monographs in sociology without being prompted to do so and then this policy ended, although do not know when. We encountered it recently in 2005 when Jill Quadagno and Patricia Martin had new research monographs published and Strozier failed to order them. When students tried to obtain the books, Strozier informed them they did not have copies nor had they ordered them. (Fortunately, they eventually ordered them and have them now.)

Strozier's policy of assigning an annual budget to the department and asking us to submit book (and video resource) requests is problematic partly because our faculty and students unevenly respond when asked to suggest them. If the library staff can devise ways to make it easier for faculty to submit orders for books and other needed resources, that would be helpful. On a positive note, the recent policy that allows for purchase of videos and CDs for classroom use is much appreciated.

A failure we feel keenly concerns journals. Many of us, faculty and students, have had to extensively rely upon "interlibrary loan" to obtain critical materials for our research due to the policy of not purchasing new journals. This has created a handicap for faculty and students alike. At Strozier's initiative, however, we recently submitted a list of journals from faculty and students requesting that they be purchased and, happily, were told in December 2006 that every journal we requested is on order. Good news--and thanks. The list we submitted (and is on order) is shown in GPC Table 5.1.

GPC Table 5.1--Journals Requested from Strozier in 2006

Bodies and Society
 Community, Work, and Family
 Contemporary Jewry
 Ethnicity and Health
 Gender, Work & Organization
 Journal of Aging and Health
 Journal of Homosexuality
 Masculinities
 Mobilization
 Organization
 Sexualities
 Social Movement Studies
 Sociology of Health and Illness
 Studies in Symbolic Interaction
 Violence Against Women

A service that would be particularly helpful concerns purchasing the right to have printed journals available also in electronic form. For instance, it would be helpful if all of our journals were like the *American Journal of Sociology* (University of Chicago Press) which is available both in print and electronically. Many of our key journals are published by the American Sociological Association (e.g., *American Sociological*

Review, Social Psychology Quarterly, Journal of Health and Social Behavior, etc.) and Strozier now subscribes to their printed version. As we understand, Strozier must pay an extra charge to make them available electronically. We urge Strozier to take this step.

Another helpful service that we would like to see expanded involves help from Strozier staff to teach our graduate students, faculty, and undergraduates about databases and reference management systems that are available. Many of us do not know how to use or access these invaluable resources. In September 2006, Mr. James Rhoades helped Drs. Kathryn Tillman and Patricia Martin lead a workshop for a graduate course in the Strozier Computer Lab on databases that sociologists use. Rhoades allowed us to lead the workshop but he participated to support and expand on what we knew. This way, we focused on our students' primary needs and had benefit of his expert knowledge and skills. He volunteered then to teach other faculty and students about data management resources and services. In the event, he taught a special session for six of our faculty and six graduate students. Mr. Rhoades came to the Chair's office in Bellamy to show her how to use RefWorks. We appreciate such commitment and thank him and Strozier it. The instructional room on the first floor of Strozier Library is impressive and we urge library staff to invite our faculty to use it for specialized instruction on databases, reference management programs, and methods for finding resources that are available online.

Software. With the help of the COSS Dean's Office, we have purchased the software that our graduate faculty and students need, with the exception of programs for analyzing qualitative data. Eight of our 13 Graduate Computer Lab machines have STATA on them and all have SPSS and WORD OFFICE, among other programs that our students need. In December 2006, Dean Rasmussen agreed to purchase STATA for 32 computers in the computer classroom in the new classroom building (and ACNS/User Services agreed to cover the costs of upgrading when the time comes). We appreciate this kind of commitment and the opportunity to teach our statistics courses in the new building in Spring 2007.

Student Travel. As noted earlier, we support doctoral student travel to professional meetings but our level of support is modest, typically \$150-200/trip. Students also obtain funds from COGS to combine with the support we give. Given our students' success in meeting participation, we want to offer more support than we currently do. To qualify for departmental support, students must present a paper on their research at the meeting.

GPC 6: Curriculum

Comment on currency of graduate curriculum/distinction between masters and doctoral programs.

See earlier comments, particularly **Section 6** of the QER document and **Point 4** of the GPC portion. We have not developed courses and other instructional experiences for students in our Applied Program and, as noted, we are considering ways to improve offerings in this program, including an internship option. Our traditional MS degree is going well and we view it and our PhD program as linked in productive, helpful ways. As noted earlier (GPC item 4), we revised our PhD curriculum with an eye to improvement in several ways.

GPC 7: Additional Student Data

Comment on data specific to graduate education. What particular strengths, weaknesses, concerns do these data indicate? For example, what do admission rates, and the demographics and goals of the admitted students indicate about the strength of the program?

As noted throughout, we have made great strides since our last GPC review. A primary need for improvement at the PhD level is to increase our applicant pool. And, as noted (in QER Sections 4, 5, and 6), our Applied program needs improvement in terms of curriculum and recruitment. It is possible that access to three or four tuition waivers to support a core of highly qualified undergraduates into our Applied program would help it stabilize and grow. (See **Section 12**, for details.)

Data reported in this document indicate that our PhD student admission rates are high, relative to the number of applicants, but our admission standards are also high, indicating success in recruiting promising students. Our program's overall greatest strength is our faculty. We have a highly qualified and productive faculty who enjoy working with graduate students and go out of their way to help students by mentoring and co-authoring with them. Our faculty support students' interests to study whatever concerns them. They sponsor our students for fellowships, honors/awards, and post-docs. Data on "time to completion" indicate that, with some exceptions, sociology students complete their PhDs in a reasonable period of time. As to concerns, we need to increase student race/ethnic diversity and find ways to support our advanced students during the dissertation writing stage. We need to improve our applied program. We also need to provide PhD students with more research assistantships during their four years of funded work.

FBOG 1: Identify the last and next specialized accreditation review. What degrees are covered?

Sociology has no professional accrediting body although the American Sociological Association offers to accredit Applied (called Clinical) Sociology Programs if the program requests it. We have no interest in this regard. However, we are learning about how applied masters programs are organized and function to come up with ideas for improving our own. (See **Section 5** of the QER material.)

The last reviews to which we were subjected occurred in 1999/2000 in accord with the GPC and visit by Dr. Teresa Sullivan. We have reported on those results in the QER portion of this report, showing where we have made progress and we have fallen short.

Sociology has three degree programs and offers four degrees. (We encourage our PhD students who do not come in with a masters degree to obtain an MS along the way, although we do not require it.)

Bachelors in Sociology

Masters in Sociology

Applied Social Research Masters

Doctorate of Philosophy

FBOG 2: Identify instructional outcome measures you are currently using or planning to use.

In accord with the SACS review and the Academic Learning Compacts, the Department of Sociology developed program and student learning outcomes for each of our degree programs: Bachelors, Applied Social Research masters, and Doctorate. We discussed these outcomes in Sections 4 and 5 above; and we attach a copy of our SACS/SMALCS assessments and plans for improvement for 2005-2006 in the Appendix to this document.

We also address these issues in Sections 4 and 5.

FBOG 3: Describe ways in which past evaluations of departmental performance have led to *improvements* and any plans to use current and *future measures to improve the program*.

Our most recent reviews were conducted in 1999 by the Graduate Policy Committee and in 2000 by Dr. Teresa Sullivan (sociologist from the University of Texas, now Provost at the University of Michigan). We improved in response to their suggestions. Both evaluations helped us identify measures of performance and fostered improvements such as monitoring graduate student quality and growth, monitoring external funding, and monitoring PhD production and placement. We'll employ these same measures along with those associated with our SACS/SMALCS reviews to monitor future improvements.

Key accomplishments:

- Increased quality and quantity of doctoral students
- Strengthened graduate curriculum and improved graduate student mentoring
- Increased success with external funding
- Assembled a stellar group of faculty
- Published research that addresses key societal problems and dynamics
- Implemented innovative teaching methods at undergrad level that serve undergrads and contribute ~\$200,000 to our doctoral program in a typical year (e.g., \$150,000 for 10 FTE AY students with stipends of \$12,750 and instate waivers of \$6,000 AY plus one-quarter of these sums in summer)

Future measures relative to improvements:

- Document graduate student enrollments and qualifications
- Document external funding patterns
- Document placement and time to degree of PhD students
- Document success of Applied program graduates (including their employment)
- Document retention success of assistant professors
- Document record on creatively rewarding faculty
- Document record on recruitment of faculty
- Document whether our programmatic areas are strengthened and how
- Use SACS/SMALCS standards to assure effective instructional programs

FBOG 4: Provide statement of goals and objectives in areas of teaching, research, and public service.

The general mission of our Department is as follows: The mission of the Department of Sociology consists of “excellence in undergraduate and graduate teaching, in research and scholarly publication, and in public service to the community and discipline.”

Material in Sections 3 (Priorities and Accomplishments), 4 (Program Outcomes) and 12 (Attainment of Goals, Increased Success, and Recognition) address the topic of this section so we do not repeat it here. However, a summary of our goals and objectives is as follows:

Research:

- Become a top quartile U. S. sociology department
- Create innovative ways to retain & reward productive faculty
- Recruit outstanding faculty in our four areas (Health & Aging, Inequality, Demography, and Social Psychology)
- Help faculty apply for and manage external grants
- Work with COSS Dean to establish an infrastructure to support faculty grant application and management
- Work with COSS Dean to create ways to award excellent faculty (other than through counter-offer raises)
- Increase faculty publication and citation success rates
- Increase faculty collaboration on research & publication (including with graduate students)
- Reduce faculty teaching loads, particularly those at risk for promotion and tenure
- Develop ways to support the research agenda of faculty not situated in Centers

To repeat, our *aspirational assignment* for faculty is a one and two teaching load; where instruction would be 30 percent and research 65 percent with five percent for service in one term per year. Such an assignment would help faculty do more research and publish more and write more proposals. It would also bring sociology into line with other departments where faculty teach less than two formal courses per semester.

Teaching:

Doctoral

- Increase applicant pool & student body size
- Improve graduate student quality (as measured by GRE scores & undergrad GPA)
- Increase diversity of students
- Offer more Advanced Research Seminars
- Increase stipend level
- Find ways to support students in dissertation writing stage

Applied Social Research Masters

Increase applicant pool and students enrollment

Improve Applied Social Research program, e.g., develop courses & internship program

Develop positive relations with area employers

Maintain high standards for admission

Obtain a non-tenure track position to lead this program (e.g., teach and develop and monitor internships)

Develop or modify distance learning courses to accommodate applied students

Consider aligning with Aging and Demography masters degree programs

Seek a number of tuition waivers to attract good students to the program

Undergraduate

Develop small seminars (e.g., 20-25) for our best majors in their senior year

Sponsor outstanding undergraduates for awards and conference presentations

Develop a structure that allows undergraduates to collaborate with graduate students and their major professors on research projects

Add undergraduate courses in faculty specialty areas

Recruit excellent undergraduate majors into our graduate programs

Service:

Encourage & support senior faculty to hold offices in professional associations at national and regional levels

Encourage senior faculty to hold service positions at FSU (e.g., Graduate Program Committee, CRC, etc.)

Support faculty who serve on national grants panels and editorial boards