

2. CHAIRING THE MULTI-DISCIPLINARY DEPARTMENT

- I. Introductions (5-10 minutes)
- A. Name, affiliation, type of department
 - B. Pass around a sheet for name/affiliation/e-mail in case you want additional materials
 - C. Using the worksheet on p. 6, write several sentences about what you'd like to get out of this session.
 - D. My goals--by the end of this hour you will have:
 - 1. made a few connections with colleagues who may be supportive in your role chairing a multi-disciplinary department (networking).
 - 2. been introduced to several concepts, principles, and resources that might be useful in your position as chair.
 - 3. shared some ideas about successful strategies, as well as some pitfalls to avoid, while chairing a multi-disciplinary department.
- II. A few concepts and principles that may be helpful as chair in a multi-disciplinary department (20 min.)
- A. The “continuum of jointness” (Kain, Wagenaar, Howery, 2006) (See page 2)
 - 1. This is taken from a document outlining best practices for joint sociology/anthropology departments. After stand-alone departments, this is the most common location for sociology, with slightly over 20% of all programs nationwide found in this type of structure.
 - 2. Where does your department fall on the continuum of jointness?
 - 3. What are the advantages (and disadvantages) of moving along the continuum?
 - 4. Do you have pressures to move along the continuum?
 - 5. What are some recommendations for joint sociology/anthropology departments?
 - B. National guidelines for the undergraduate sociology major (Pike *et al.* 2017) (See page 3)
 - 1. These guidelines are still critical, even in a joint/multi-disciplinary department.
 - 2. Student learning outcomes are important.
 - C. *Report of the ASA Task Force on Sociology and Criminology Programs* (2010) (See page 4)
- III. Discussion: Strategies for success while chairing a multi-disciplinary department/program. (30 min.)
- A. Using the worksheet on page 6, write down:
 - 1. two central challenges in chairing a multi-disciplinary department,
 - 2. two strategies for success while chairing a multi-disciplinary department, and
 - 3. two major pitfalls to avoid.
 - B. Discussion of our challenges, strategies for success, and pitfalls to avoid.
- IV. Conclusions (5 minutes)

Selected Resources that you May Find Useful:

At the ASA website, under the “Teaching and Learning” tab, then in the subsection for “Department Leaders”, there is a section entitled “Department Leaders’ Toolbox”. Among the resources listed there are:

Kain, Edward L., Theodore C. Wagenaar and Carla B. Howery. 2006. “Models and Best Practices for Joint Sociology-Anthropology Departments. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

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

Report of the ASA Task Force on Sociology and Criminology Programs (2010) As described at the ASA website, this: “Discusses various structural arrangements between sociology, criminology and criminal justice in academia, examines potential benefits and challenges of arrangement types, includes recommendations to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of these arrangements.”

Selected material from these resources:

The “continuum of jointness” and recommendations for joint sociology/anthropology departments (Kain, Wagenaar, Howery, 2006, pp. 7-8, 13-15)

”1) **Parallel play**. In this case, the structure is basically a federation. The two disciplines are administratively in the same department, and this may result in some economies of scale such as sharing of support staff. They do not, however, share a philosophical approach or curriculum, participate in collaborative research or teaching, or think of themselves as having a common enterprise. . . .While it is probably unnecessary to offer examples of this model, some departments that are joint but have little overlap include University of Central Florida, Loyola University (Chicago), Indiana University-Purdue University-Fort Wayne, and Auburn University.

2) **Tokenism**. The two disciplines in this type of joint department have some type of requirement that students are exposed to the other discipline. One or two courses in the other field are required or encouraged, such as taking the intro course in both fields. There is no systematic effort, however, to help students integrate the two disciplines. Examples of this model are Amherst College and University of Louisiana-Lafayette.

3) **Minors or concentrations**. In this type of department/program, students are required/encouraged to select 3-4 courses in the other discipline, and there is a notation of this minor or concentration. Students thus have a major in sociology with a minor/concentration in anthropology, or vice-versa. At Hiram College all students major in sociology but can minor in anthropology. At Spelman College, students may major in either field, but all students take sociology research methods.

4) **Exposure and respect**. In this situation, courses taught in each field contain material from the other discipline as well as encouragement as to how that field looks at the phenomenon in question; courses are still taught separately. To really enact this model, the department must make a collective commitment to include

materials from both fields. Faculty consult about readings before developing their syllabi and talk about points of overlap and complementarity. Southwestern University is an example of this approach.

5) **Cross listing.** In this case, courses in both disciplines are cross-listed. They may be cross-taught or co-taught by faculty in each field, with varying degrees of “monitoring” of course content. Central Michigan University reflects this approach.

6) **Complete cross-listing with no distinctions between disciplines.** At this end of the continuum, there is only a joint, shared major in anthropology and sociology. All courses are listed with only one prefix and there is little administrative distinction made between what is a sociology course and what is an anthropology course. While both intellectual convergences and divergences are made explicit, the curriculum clearly and explicitly integrates the two disciplines. Carleton College exemplifies this model.”

Recommendations from this document:

1. Develop structures that integrate both disciplines into common activities, both academic and non-academic.
2. Hire new faculty who are committed to working together within a joint department.
3. Talk as a group about shared goals. Work at developing a shared department philosophical orientation to the program(s), and to teaching and learning and research.
4. Develop separate activities, support groups, and functions, as well as shared.
5. Promote reward structures that are similar.
6. Talk about curriculum issues on a regular basis.
7. Develop a department culture where faculty honor serious input into and discussion about decisions relating to each discipline, while ultimately deferring to those in the discipline.
8. Require students to take coursework in both disciplines and help them develop skills in comparing and contrasting anthropology and sociology.
9. Once students already have a good idea of the basics of their chosen discipline, in upper level courses include one book or a couple of articles by scholars from the other discipline.
10. Have continued discussions about the nature of the linkages between sociology and anthropology within your program.
11. Build structures that promote a representative voice within the department.”

National guidelines for the undergraduate major from *The Sociology Major in the Changing Landscape of Higher Education: Curriculum, Careers, and Online Learning* (2017, pp 3-5)

“Recommendation 1: Develop distinct mission statements, specific program goals, and measurable learning outcomes that are made public, especially to students.

Recommendation 2: Within the sociology major, include required and elective courses that incorporate essential sociological concepts and competencies, as exemplified in the Sociological Literacy Framework.

Recommendation 3: Include required courses in: introductory-level sociology, sociological theory, research methods, statistical analysis, substantive topic areas, and a capstone experience within the sociology major.

Recommendation 4: Integrate progressive learning structures within the curriculum via course prerequisites that systematically guide students to engage with increasingly advanced content and activities.

Recommendation 5: Provide multiple opportunities within the curriculum for students to engage in empirical inquiry that includes research design, data collection, and qualitative and quantitative analysis.

Recommendation 6: Underscore, at all levels of the curriculum, inequality and difference in local, national, and global contexts.

Recommendation 7: Provide curricular and co-curricular structures to help students gain knowledge and apply skills that support them in their post-baccalaureate careers.

Recommendation 8: Structure the curriculum to recognize explicitly the points of intellectual convergence and divergence between sociology and other fields of inquiry.

Recommendation 9: Incorporate multiple pedagogies across the curriculum, including those that support active learning within and beyond the classroom.

Recommendation 10: Develop and maintain advising and mentoring processes that support students' decision making in achieving their educational goals, engage students in career planning, and offer guidance on further study in sociology and related fields.

Recommendation 11: Support faculty engagement in disciplinary research, the scholarship of teaching and learning, pedagogical innovation, and relevant service.

Recommendation 12: Systematically assess program goals and student learning outcomes, choosing assessment tools that respond to institutional context and specific programmatic needs.”

Recommendations from the *Report of the ASA Task Force on Sociology and Criminology Programs (2010, pp. 5-7)*

”1. Before creating or separating joint programs, consider fully the many issues that will arise. While the immediate gains of a programmatic change may be appealing, the long-term impacts should also be weighed carefully.

2. Be explicit about the nature of the program. Department names should accurately reflect the program(s) offered. This carries through to brochures, course descriptions, and even supporting photos. Part of the curriculum should teach students about the differences between program types. That said, look for ways to create a balance between liberal arts and vocational orientations.

3. Develop student learning goals for methodological, theoretical, and vocational outcomes at the department or college level that apply to students in sociology as well as criminology and/or criminal justice. Begin this process by asking each disciplinary area to create independent learning goals, then come together to examine areas of similarity and difference.

4. When criminology or criminal justice is offered within a sociology department, continue to require all students to take the core sociology courses. The long term interests of the students and the university, as well as the discipline, will be served in doing so.

5. When criminology or criminal justice is offered in a department separate from sociology, consider how the examination of structural factors such as race, class, gender, social context and social process can become bridging points and promising areas for integration and collaboration that will lead to an increasing breadth of vocational preparation.

6. Strengthen the visible ties between the sociology major and employment opportunities. Encourage and facilitate internships for all sociology majors, not just those in criminology or criminal justice. Stress research and data analysis skills throughout the curriculum. Teach majors how to explain and market their skills. This may help reduce the disparity in the number of majors often seen in sociology programs compared to criminology or criminal justice programs. At the same time, pursue the fundamental mission of the discipline and higher education in developing a critical perspective.

7. Track the careers of majors longitudinally. Use the data to measure program performance and to help the program remain vital in the midst of a changing labor market. Moreover, when contact is maintained with program alumni, they can become sources of internship opportunities and provide excellent employment advice for majors.
8. Advising loads should be fairly distributed across the department; disparities inevitably damage morale and have potentially negative impact on retention and promotion of junior faculty. Neither sociology, criminology, or criminal justice faculty should be the only connection between students and real world employment advice. Consider using internship programs and vocational mentorships to foster connections between practitioners and students—for sociology, criminology and criminal justice programs.
9. Departments should weigh carefully the potential benefits and costs of applying for ACJS certification for their criminology or criminal justice programs. The ASA has not engaged in program certification largely because such processes would not respond to the range of accredited institutions of higher education and academic contexts in which sociology is taught. Given the constraints that ACJS certification requirements place on the autonomous decision making of departments and programs, there is a strong possibility that compliance with ACJS standards could erode the social science base of sociology and criminology, and undermine the potential benefits to the programs and students.
10. Promote an interdisciplinary culture. When hiring, be explicit about the interdisciplinary nature of the collaborations between sociology and criminology or criminal justice programs and express interest in research areas that complement both areas. Include faculty from both areas on search committees and include students from both areas as participants in the process.
11. When perceptions of inequity and faculty tensions are emerging, consider how structural conditions may contribute to the problem, or could help ameliorate it. Are there disparities in the distribution of resources or workloads? Are all parts of the department represented in department leadership and governance?
12. Recognize that criminology and criminal justice programs are sometimes seen as revenue-generating opportunities by administrators, especially when the programs are to be primarily staffed by adjuncts or individuals who have not completed a PhD for whom there are low research expectations. Sociology, criminology and criminal justice faculty should work together to educate administrators about the long-term needs of their students and their programs. Drawing on the principle of faculty governance, and working with the faculty senate, they should insist that new programs be given adequate resources to maintain academic integrity.
13. Create structural opportunities for faculty to become more familiar with each others' work. Sponsoring research and practice colloquia (and encouraging all faculty to attend) is one relatively simple, low-cost way to do this. Make sure that part-time and adjunct faculty are welcomed. Another approach involves establishing a department club that includes students and faculty from both programs.
14. Departments should consider ways to ensure research and publication requirements for full-time sociology and criminology or criminal justice faculty are equivalent. Departments should also work to ensure sociology and criminology or criminal justice faculty have basic familiarity with journals and their rankings in their own, and their colleagues,' research areas. It is especially incumbent on those central to tenure and promotion decisions to gain an extensive familiarity with relevant journals and their impact factor scores and be prepared to defend the quality of publications in all departmental decisions to administrative bodies as needed. The ISI Web of Knowledge provides journal citation reports and is a place to start gaining the needed familiarity. Evaluation criteria should be clearly written to apply appropriately to both basic and applied scholarship in all fields.
15. Decisions regarding research resource distribution should be made on a fair and transparent basis to foster both individual scholarship and a synergistic community of scholars.”

WORKSHEET FOR ROUNDTABLE 2: CHAIRING THE MULTI-DISCIPLINARY DEPARTMENT

Goals for this Session: In the space below, write a few sentences about what you'd like to get out of this session. We'll go around the table and you can use these written notes as part of introducing yourself.

Challenges/Issues, Strategies, and Pitfalls:

Two of the biggest challenges/issues involved in chairing a multi-disciplinary department are:

Two strategies that I have found (or have seen others use) helpful while chairing a multi-disciplinary department are:

Two pitfalls to avoid when chairing a multi-disciplinary department are: