

PROFESSIONAL STAFF EVALUATION FORM

1. Evaluation for: Kristi Brownfield, Ph.D.
 - a. Annual Review ☒
 - b. Promotion
 - c. Tenure
 - d. Promotion and Tenure
2. Covering the academic year: 2019-2020
3. Attach your applicable Professional Development Plan (PDP)
 - 3 Years
 - 6 Years
 - ☒ Not Applicable

PART A TO BE COMPLETED BY FACULTY UNIT MEMBER

4. Background Information

Name: Kristi Brownfield, Ph.D.
Department: History and Social Sciences
Date: 09/09/2019
Academic Rank: Assistant Professor (commenced position Fall 2015)

Degrees (in reverse chronological order):

Ph.D.	Sociology, 2015, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
M.A.	Sociology, 2009, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
B.A.	Sociology, 2006, Eastern Illinois University
B.A.	English, 2001, Eastern Illinois University

Professional Experience (in reverse chronological order):

2015-present, Assistant Professor, Northern State University
2014-2015, Instructor, Hendrix College
2010-2014, Graduate Instructor, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale

Responses for items 5-11 must be reflective of the approved professional development plan, if applicable.

5. Expectations, consistent with institutional policies and subject to the concurrence of the dean and vice president, for faculty unit member performance with respect to teaching and academic advising; research, scholarship or creative activity; and service during the evaluation period.
6. Major Assigned Responsibilities:

A. Teaching

- (a) Teaching a minimum of eight courses per semester, four of which should be general education Sociology courses such Introduction to Sociology (SOC 100) and Social Problems (SOC 150)
- (b) Contribute to the teaching of Sociology core classes SOC 281 (Socio-Cultural Theory), CJUS 380 (Research and Data Analysis in Criminal Justice), and SOC/CJUS 485 (Social Science Capstone)

B. Advising

- (a) Introduce myself to the students I had not met personally when they are assigned to me as advisees
- (b) Inform the students that I do have in classes that I am now part of their advising circle,
- (c) Offer any assistance they might need when choosing classes within the department.
- (d) Work with Justin Bartel to assist with his work advising Sociology majors and minors and Social Work minors

C. Research/Scholarship

- (a) Remain active in scholarship by submitting manuscripts for publication or presenting at conferences in my discipline

D. Service

- (a) Attend all required department, college, and university meetings throughout the 2019-2020 academic year
- (b) Work to publicize the Sociology department and Sociology faculty as Marketing Director
- (c) Perform program assessment as Sociology's Assessment Coordinator
- (d) Other departmental or university service as assigned
- (e) Service to the profession through work as a reviewer

Summary and breakdown of my unit member performance:

Teaching & Advising	80%
Research/Scholarship	5%
Service	15%

7. Performance Objectives:

In Teaching:

- (a) Continue to revise and updating my teaching methods and materials each semester
 - a. This is particularly important in SOC 100 courses as these courses serve as the introduction to the Sociology major and our are most important recruitment tool
- (b) Continue to meet both institutional and personal objectives in terms of content in each class I teach as lined out by the syllabus
- (c) Strive to maintain or improve scores across the year on my Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) evaluations

In Research:

- (a) Submit at least one manuscript for review during the academic year
- (b) Present at a minimum of one academic conference during the academic year
- (c) Take advantage of opportunities to submit works for book chapters or encyclopedia entries as they become available

In Service:

- (a) Perform duties as assigned

8. Significant Contributions to Teaching and Advising:

A. Teaching

Within My Classrooms:

- (a) Taught 13 class sections over the course of the 2019-2020 academic year following the guidelines laid out within my teaching statement (see pages 9-10 for full teaching statement and analysis of my 2019-2020 teaching)
 - a. SOC 100: Introduction to Sociology (face-to-face)
 - i. 1 section in Fall 2019 taught using a modified flipped classroom approach
 - ii. 1 section in Spring 2020 taught using a modified flipped classroom approach that was later changed to fully online due to the COVID-19 pandemic
 - b. SOC 100: 5 online sections
 - i. 2 Fall 2019
 - ii. 2 Spring 2020
 - iii. 1 Summer 2020
 - c. SOC 281: Socio-Cultural Theory; Fall 2019
 - i. SOC 281 is the designated writing intensive course for Sociology and required of all majors
 - d. SOC 400: Social Policy, Spring 2020
 - i. This course is a Sociology elective under the “Social Institutions” course selection and a required course within the Social Work minor. It was a new course preparation that was taught originally with discussion and was transferred to fully online due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
 - e. SOC 483: Sociology of Gender Roles, Fall 2019
 - i. This course is an elective within Sociology under the “Stratification and Inequality” course selections
 - f. SOC 489: Capstone, Spring 2020
 - i. This is a required course within the Sociology and Criminal Justice majors and was taught as a student-led seminar with an emphasis on original research and reflection before transitioning to fully online methods during the COVID-19 pandemic.
 - g. SOC 491: Independent Study for Capstone, Summer 2020
 - i. Independent study with Nicole Wanttie
 - h. SOC 591: Graduate Independent Study for Social Deviance, Fall 2019
 - i. Independent study with counseling MA student Danielle Johnson

Graduate Committees and Defenses:

- a. Zachary Holka, Spring 2020
- b. Jacob Pommerer, Spring 2020

Professional Development in Teaching:

- (b) Attended on campus Instructional Design trainings when available
 - a. This included attending the HyFlex training offered Dr. Jenni Hayman on June 22, 2020 and participation in the Summer 2020 reading groups that studied Kevin M. Gannon's *Radical Hope: A Teaching Manifesto*.
- (c) Attended the outside following webinars and trainings:
 - a. Alpha Kappa Delta Sociology Honor Society Teaching and Learning Workshop, Summer 2020
 - b. A 12-Step Program for Decolonizing the University: A Conversation with Dr. Rodney Coates, Summer 2020
 - c. Policing Black Bodies: How Black Lives are Surveilled & How to Work for Change, a virtual discussion with sociologists Angela Hattery and Earl Smith, co-authors of *Policing Black Bodies*, Summer 2020

Curriculum Assessment:

- a. Served as the Sociology Assessment Director

Overall I believe my contributions to teaching and advising, according to the standards document, **exceeds expectations**.

9. Significant Contributions in Research

- (a) Published the following items:
 - a. Congly, Stephen E. and Kristi A. Brownfield. 2020. "Distinguishing between Sex and Gender Is Critical for Research in Transplantation." *Transplantation* 104(2):e57. doi: 10.1097/tp.0000000000002945
 - i. https://journals.lww.com/transplantjournal/Fulltext/2020/02000/Distinguishing_Between_Sex_and_Gender_Is_Critical.36.aspx
 - b. This is a letter to the editor on which [Dr. Stephen Congly](#) and I collaborated for the medical journal *Transplantation*. Dr. Congly reached out to me in summer 2019 to request assistance with the letter due to my expertise in gender following the publishing of an article that conflated sex and gender in ways that could potential be harmful to research participants. *Transplantation* is a peer-reviewed medical journal According to the [Journal Citation Reports](#), the journal has a 2020 impact factor of 4.743, ranking it 41 out of 158 journals in the category "Immunology," 10 out of 203 journals in the category "Surgery," and 3 out of 25 journals in the category "Transplantation." Dr. Congly and I made plans to build on this initial collaboration to do a content analysis of gender and its use in the literature in liver disease as well as some areas of GI to begin in spring 2020, though those plans have been delayed by the COVID-19 pandemic.
- (b) Presented at the following conferences:
 - a. "A/B/O, Sentinels, and Sex Pollen: Narratives of Consent in Fanfiction." Kristi Brownfield and Courtney Waid-Lindberg. Great Plains Sociological Association Annual Meeting. November 2019.
 - i. ABSTRACT: Fanfiction is largely a female and queer dominated space, especially online. "Alpha/beta/omega" universes, (A/B/O),

Sentinel universes, and stories in which characters are magically, environmentally, or mechanically forced into sexual encounters (“sex pollen” or “fuck or die” narratives) have been extremely popular within both off- and online fandom for years. All three of these tropes are heavily centered on ideas of instant sexual connection, gender and sexuality hierarchies, and biological imperatives surrounding sexual activity. This indicates that the individuals which are participating within fandom spaces are highly interested in negotiating cultural narratives of consent and sexuality. This paper is a pilot study that looks at the occurrences of stories that are predicated on questions of consent. We looked at a sample of fanfic from the Marvel Cinematic Universe (MCU) on the popular fanwork website Archive of Our Own (AO3) that had been tagged with these tropes to analyze and understand the ways in which gender, sexuality, and consent are being renegotiated within fan spaces.

- ii. This presentation took place at the 2019 Great Plains Sociological Association annual meeting from November 6-7, 2019 in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. The research presented here was largely exploratory but soon I plan on expanding this into a full content analysis. This research fits nicely with my earlier dissertation work looking at sexualized violence in narrative.
- (c) “Hegemonic Masculinity, Disability, and Restorative Violence Within Video Games.” Kristi Brownfield. Midwest Sociological Society Annual Meeting. Scheduled for April 2020.
 - a. **ABSTRACT:** This paper explores the representations of disability in video games as they are linked specifically to masculinity. Representation, broadly defined as the ability to see ourselves in the culture surrounding us, within video games, has largely centered on three categories of concern to media scholars: whiteness, masculinity, and heterosexuality. In this paper, I will explore themes underlying the representation of the intersections of masculinity and ability within video games. Looking at a sample of video games produced from 2010-2019, I will be exploring how disabled male characters engage in masculinity. Specifically, I will be looking at: (a) how masculinity is “done” for male characters, (b) how disability is represented within video games, (c) how hegemonic masculinity and restorative violence are framed within these narratives.
 - b. The annual meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society, scheduled for April 2-5, 2020 in Omaha, Nebraska, was cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This research is the second piece of my research on disability in video games. In my 2019 presentation, “Heal Plz,” I looked strictly at the presentations of disability within video games. Within this work, I extended that earlier research to look at the intersections of masculinity, violence, and disability. Essentially, how the predominantly masculine characters in video games responded to injury or permanent disability, largely through violence, to restore their sense of masculinity.

- (d) “Surviving the Gig Economy: Adjuncting in Higher Education” Session Presider. Midwest Sociological Society Annual Meeting. Scheduled for April 2020.
 - a. ABSTRACT: The Women in Profession (WIP) committee is sponsoring a panel to discuss the changes in the higher education workforce structure as higher education has moved from stable, full-time employment reliant on a tenure system to a just-in-time adjunct workforce with weakened tenure protections. Panelists will discuss both structures and the choices that lead individuals into the gig economy, the commitments and responsibilities faculty feel to teaching, research, and service faculty in a gig economy, issues of faculty governance as an adjunct, what it means to work alongside people who have better pay, employment protections and promotion opportunities than you do, and suggestions for how tenured and tenure-track faculty can be better allies to adjuncts.
 - b. This is a thematic panel organized by the Midwest Sociological Society’s WIP committee. As part of the WIP committee, I took charge in organizing the panel. The annual meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society, scheduled for April 2-5, 2020 in Omaha, Nebraska, was cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- (e) Toward Sustaining Women in Academia: Understanding their Invisible Labor.” Panel Discussant. Midwest Sociological Society Annual Meeting. Scheduled for April 2020.
 - a. ABSTRACT: In a panel sponsored by the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession, panelists will discuss the invisible labor that women are often expected to engage in. Invisible labor includes the emotional labor and other, often hidden work, that women do (and are expected to do, with special attention to women of color) including informal mentoring and nurturing of colleagues, students, and relationships; behind the scenes service work; public speaking; and managing classrooms and the emotions of students and oneself in and outside the classroom around sensitive topics. Panelists include graduate instructors, assistant thru full professors, and those with administrative experiences located in teaching and research universities as different forms of invisible labor manifest accordingly. After presenting their experiences, panelists will engage in discussion with audience members to brainstorm additional forms of invisible labor, challenges for women in statuses not represented, and solutions and strategies for reducing it and getting credit for it.
 - b. This is a thematic panel organized by the Midwest Sociological Society’s WIP committee. I was invited as a panel discussant by the session presider, Dr. Rachel Whaley. The annual meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society, scheduled for April 2-5, 2020 in Omaha, Nebraska, was cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

I believe my contributions to research/scholarship, according to the standards document, **meets expectations**.

10. Significant Contributions in Service

Service to the Department:

- a. In my capacity as marketing director, I worked to expand the presence of the Sociology online both through social media and by providing the IT/web design people with new and updated content to include on our department website
- b. Assisted in student recruitment

Service to the College and University:

- c. Served on the Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice search committee which concluded with the successful hiring of Dr. Christopher Near
- d. Served on the Diversity Advisory/Action Committee
- e. Serving on the Academic Technology Advisory Committee
- f. Serving on the BOR system Social Science Discipline council
- g. Served on the CAS Teaching Committee
- h. Served on the Center for Teaching and Learning (CETL) Director search committee which concluded with the successful hire of Dr. Ben Harley
- i. Served on the Center for CETL Advisory Committee)
- j. Served on the Assessment Committee
- k. Along with Dr. Karyl Meister and Dr. Courtney Waid-Lindberg offered Ally Training on campus during Fall 2019 in-service
 - a. Dr. Meister and I have also guest lectured on the topic in Dr. Kristi Bockornoy and Dr. Amber Henderson's Diversity in Management (BADM 462) course in February 2020.
- l. Served on the Strategic Doing Teaching Pillar Team
- m. Due to my work with curriculum development and assessment, I was asked to co-chair Criterion 3 Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support for our Higher Learning Commission four-year assurance argument. We began in March 2020 and by August 31, 2020, our team had created a complete rough draft of our argument.

Service to the Profession:

- n. Serving as the New Media Coordinator for Great Plains Sociological Association (GPSA) and as a member of the Audit and Ethics committee
- o. Book Review Editor for Great Plains Sociologist journal
- p. Acted as a Session Organizer for the Midwest Sociological Society's (MSS) annual meeting and provided peer review of papers submitted related to culture and organized accepted papers into final papers for the program
- q. Serving on the MSS Committee for Women in the Profession

I believe my contributions to service, according to the standards document, **exceeds expectations.**

11. Proposed Major Objectives for the Next Review Period

In Teaching:

- (a) Teach the following courses over the 2020-2021 academic year:
 - a. All courses in Fall 2020 will be taught online due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic
 - b. 2 sections of SOC 100 in Fall 2020 and 1 section of SOC 100 Honors in Fall 2020; 1 online section of SOC 100 in Spring 2021
 - c. 1 section of Socio-Cultural Theory (SOC 281), Fall 2020

- i. This class is a writing intensive course and required for all majors
- d. 1 section of IDL 190 on Technology and Society in Fall 2020
 - i. This is a new course preparation
- e. 1 section of Social Deviance (SOC 402/502) online, Spring 2021
- f. 1 section of Social Science Capstone (SOC/CJUS 485), Spring 2021
- (b) Work to begin prepping for courses that will begin in the 2021-2022 academic year
- (c) Continue to update and assess new content materials for current and future courses
- (d) Find opportunities for professional development of my teaching skills through additional workshops
- (e) Continue to work with current and new advisees as needed

In Research:

- (a) Continue to submit papers for publications
- (b) Present at the GPSA virtual annual meeting in 2021
- (c) Present at the MSS virtual annual meeting in 2021

In Service:

- (a) Continue to attend recruiting events such as Northern Bound Days when possible to represent our department
- (b) Continue to meet with individual prospective students where possible
- (c) Continue to act as Assessment Director for the Sociology Department
- (d) Continue and maintain marketing efforts for the department, primarily through social media and other resources where possible
- (e) Continue to participate in existing standing committees on campus and in professional organizations

12. Proposed Amendments to Professional Development Plan

Not applicable

My commitment at NSU is to provide a quality learning experience for my students which provides ample preparation for future careers in fields related to Sociology. Each academic year (AY), I use my Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) surveys results and results from the Sociology program assessment to make substantive changes in many classes. In AY 2019-2020, due to those results, I retained two main goals within my courses from AY2018-2019: (a) effectively deliver content in new course preparations and (b) increase the amount of rigor in both content and assignments. In addition to this, I added a third goal of providing quality educational engagement during the online pivot made necessary due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

In AY2019-2020, I only had one new course preparation: Social Policy (SOC 400). This course is an elective in the Sociology major and a required course within the Social Work minor. Social Policy is a “review of social welfare legislation; current trends and issues in, and implementation and administration of, social policy in a variety of practice areas.” This course is a fundamental look at the social structures that govern and support our lives. I designed this class with four main objectives: Students will be able to: (a) explain key demographic and economic trends underway in the U.S. as they effect the poor, the elderly, the disabled, and other vulnerable groups, (b) explain the history and evolution of various social policies in the U.S. as well as the structure of programs and responsibilities among levels of government and the private sector, (3) use social science methodology to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of key U.S. social programs and future challenges, and (d) develop policy advocacy strategies and tactics grounded in accurate understanding of legislative processes and legislators’ political and personal interests and perspectives. As an upper division (UD) class, I focused specifically of student ownership of the material and having the students gain skills in in program implementation and evaluation. I emphasized these two things through three projects within the classroom. First, I was requested by the Green Aberdeen community group to complete a community survey around green practices and recycling. I involved my students in this by asking them to attend a Green Aberdeen meeting, write and plan the distribution of a survey, and we had planned to compile and deliver the results to Green Aberdeen at the end of the semester. Prior to COVID-19, the class had managed to write and pilot the survey, but the rest of the project was put on hold after the March 2020 closures. Students in the course were also asked to complete a term paper where they evaluate a social policy or program of their choice. This skill is especially important for any student that will want to work in social services or social welfare agencies that will require reporting to justify their funding. While students were able to complete their term papers, their data collect efforts did suffer due to the pandemic. Finally, I approached student ownership of the material through asking students to pair up and lead discussion for various weeks throughout the semester. The students would be responsible for providing information about the topic, assigning any additional readings, leading discussion or activities, and essentially being the instructor for a day (typically Wednesday or Friday) of that week. After the pandemic closure, this was the most difficult assignment in the class to rework, especially after students overwhelmingly voted to move the class to a completely asynchronous format. Students also preferred not to receive lecture through video, and I had to create written lecture notes for students to read that would cover the comprehensive information I would be giving them during class (samples provided on pages 12-20). This was especially important as students were not assigned a textbook that provides a comprehensive examination of several different types of policies.

In the courses that are not new, I largely focused on updating my content, increasing rigor, and maintaining the continuity of instruction as much as possible following the closure in Spring. Within SOC 100, I have slowly been making changes to both my online and face-to-face sections. In my online sections, I have been assigning more opportunities for students to interact and work together. Interaction is required on the discussion boards for graded replies given to other students. I have also modified the three group projects I introduced to my online classes and reworked the group sizes based on student suggestions in AY18-19. While students still disliked the group projects in the SOIs, I did have less students failing for non-participation or not following directions for the assignment. I have also adjusted my “flipped classroom” approach in my face-to-face classes. I was finding that, especially in Fall 2018, students were skipping classes frequently since there were no formal lecture days; this meant that many students were dramatically losing points on in-class activities and falling behind on other assignments as well. In Fall 2019, I transitioned from a fully flipped classroom to partially flipped; I engaged in formal lecture/discussion for one day of the week and spend the rest of the time in class engaging in application activities. This seems to have helped student engagement and participation in Fall and early Spring 2020. After the COVID-19 closure, these in-class assignments were redesigned to be completed by individuals asynchronously rather than in the collaborative environment I prefer to use in a face-to-face classroom (sample assignment provided on page 21).

In my 200-level and above courses, I have attempted to increase rigor by emphasizing one of Sociology’s student learning outcome of “students will be able to identify the characteristics of high-quality data and methods in sociological research and be able to effectively explain the results of sociological research to others.” To try and meet this goal, I have incorporated some aspect of either completing original research (SOC 400, SOC 483, SOC 489) or getting students to think about research and the research process critically in preparation for their own efforts (SOC 281, SOC 483). In SOC 400 and 483, students were required to complete a 15-to-20-page policy or program evaluation. I demonstrated the skills required by program evaluations several times throughout the class, provided policy and program analyses for students to use as models, and structured the paper so build up to the final goal through several smaller assignments. In Socio-Cultural Theory (SOC 281), students engage in a semester-long project in which they refine their own research questions and complete a presentation that explains how theory can help us understand their topic or questions. Theory and concept development are important parts of sociological research and this assignment, as well as the four group projects that ask students to visually “translate” theoretical concepts for the public, give students a chance to make theory their own by teaching it and using it in ways that matter to them. Finally, SOC 489 provides students the opportunity to fully complete the research they had been thinking about in previous classes. Given the importance of research, especially evaluation research, to understanding social problems, I am making a commitment to continue including some piece of evaluation research in as many UD classes as possible in the future. Like SOC 400, SOC 489 also included a student discussion leadership as a primary activity throughout the semester and this needed to be reworked for an online setting (online instructions provide on pages 22-24).

Overall in AY 2019-2020, I have attempted to increase the rigor of the material presented and assignments given at all instructional levels, provide opportunities for interdisciplinary, active, and high-impact learning to increase not only sociological content knowledge but also “soft”

skills such as analytical, communication, and critical thinking skills. I have also sought out opportunities for professional development in teaching through numerous sources, such as attending teaching-related panels at all conferences I have attended, to better myself in the classroom and meet both my personal and our programmatic goals.

Lecture Note Example:

SOC 400

Education Policy

04-08-2020

Background:

Education, especially public education, fulfills many of the nation's basic goals and has done so since the country's founding. First, according to the beliefs of Thomas Jefferson, it provides an avenue to ensure the continuation of U.S. democracy (Mayo 1942). How can people be active, engaged participants in democratic processes if they lack the ability to read and understand the issues? Second, education helps to assimilate large numbers of immigrants. Finally, it is the primary mechanism for social mobility in the United States, as the educated are better able to secure jobs that raise their economic and social status. This goal fits nicely with the American ideal of upward mobility and rewarding those who work hard. An educated population has a better chance of being productive and taking care of itself. Such people are less likely to need government assistance.

Government took it upon itself to provide education for both moral and political reasons. Morally, education was a way to help individuals and groups in the population understand the nation's ideals and to give them a chance to better themselves. Politically, education not only informed people about the U.S. system of government but also imparted the nation's political culture. In addition, it served the needs of certain political parties and helped those running for office to get elected. Public education also has been a response to market failure in that it is an example of a positive externality. Society benefits from a well-educated population, which justifies the government's involvement and support. The reasons for providing public education that existed years ago are still relevant as government policymakers deal with education policy today.

Traditionally, public education has been in the hands of state and local government. Policymakers at these levels have guarded this responsibility throughout the years and raised concerns whenever the federal government has attempted to interfere in education policy, especially in primary and secondary schools. State governments have the major responsibilities in education policy with respect to curriculum, teacher training and certification, and—to a greater degree than before—funding public schools. And a great deal of education policy remains under local control. Schoolteachers employed by local government comprise the largest category of public workers. There are over thirteen thousand local school boards across the United States, all shaping education policy to some degree within their districts.⁷

This is not to say that the federal government has been completely absent from public education, but its involvement is relatively recent, and growing. Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), its first major education legislation, in 1965. That law raised the amount of federal funding for primary and secondary education (N. Thomas 1975). According to the Department of Education, the federal government provided about 8 percent of all funding for levels K–12 in 2012–2013.⁸ Multiple agencies within the government are the sources for these funds, and they do not all come from ESEA.⁹ With federal funding came a

variety of contentious issues, including whether the federal government could dictate what was taught and whether parochial schools should receive funding. ESEA also signaled the beginning of increased federal interest in public education. In fact, many elected officials and candidates for office from both political parties regard education as a high-priority issue and want to enact programs designed to improve it.

Historically, however, the federal government has demonstrated a greater interest in higher education than in primary or secondary education. Because education is associated with positive externalities, policymakers want to encourage individuals to attend college and to help defray the cost of doing so; in the end, the better-educated population stimulates economic growth. The national government also provides billions of dollars in research grants that cover nearly all disciplines to universities every year. These grants support basic research in the biomedical and other sciences through the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF). Grants from the NSF and other agencies fund applied research in support of space exploration, national defense, and environmental protection, among other goals.

Among the early programs in support of higher education was the Morrill Act, approved in 1862. It helped to develop the nation's land-grant college system, which in turn contributed significantly to economic development during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Land-grant colleges focused initially on practical fields such as agriculture and engineering, but they eventually broadened their scope to include the full range of arts and sciences. Institutions such as Cornell University, Rutgers University, and the University of Wisconsin were first established to foster research, development, and training to improve the practice and productivity of agriculture. These schools, and many others with similar backgrounds, have since blossomed into major centers of higher education. In addition, the federal government fully funds the service academies, such as the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, New York, and the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland. This support is not cheap; it costs the government over \$97,000 per year for each student attending the naval academy.

The federal government also assists the general student population and specific categories of individuals by making money available through direct payments, subsidized loans, and tax breaks. Programs such as the GI Bill and the Pell Grant provide money directly to eligible students to make attending college more affordable. The GI Bill, originally the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, was instrumental in the decision of tens of thousands of veterans to attend college after World War II. Congress continues to update the law to help fund higher education programs for eligible veterans, and many veterans today rely on these funds to pay for their college education. The Pell Grant program offers awards—not loans—of as much as \$5,815 (the 2016–2017 amount) to eligible undergraduates, depending on financial need and costs of attending college. Many other students benefit from guaranteed student loan programs. With federal guarantees for the loans, private financial institutions agree to lend money to students at a reduced interest rate, making college more accessible.

As even this brief introduction indicates, the federal government typically pays more attention to higher education than to elementary and secondary education, which state and local governments traditionally control. In recent years, however, the federal government has begun to respond to the problems in public education at all levels. For example, student performance statistics show

wide variation in the quality of education from state to state, and the government has attempted to impose higher standards where needed. The federal government's participation has raised not only suspicion on the part of policymakers who oppose it but also questions about equity and freedom. Does increased federal involvement represent a genuine concern about the quality of education for all students? Or is it an unwarranted intrusion by federal policymakers into an area of public policy where state and local government officials are better able to determine public needs?

The federal government's role in primary and secondary education brings up many issues relating to the goals of education policy and the government's obligations in ensuring an educated public. In today's world, what are, or should be, the goals and objectives of education policy regardless of the level of government with primary responsibility? It would be easy to say that the goals of education policy are to provide a high-quality education to all students, but that statement raises many additional questions, the most basic of which is, what constitutes "high quality"? The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has its own perspectives regarding what a high-quality education should entail.

To provide the means for elementary and secondary schools (K-12) to do the best they can for each student, policy analysts and policymakers need to address several problems and issues. Among them are funding for public schools, the separation of church and state, the quality of education, school vouchers, and the merit of a host of proposals—such as teacher standards and testing requirements—for improving the performance of public schools. This document will only look briefly at the issue of K-12 school funding before moving onto higher education issues, but you should be aware of the broader policy debates surrounding K-12 education.

K-12 Education Funding:

Traditionally, a significant portion of funding for public schools in the United States comes from local property taxes. In fact, it is this characteristic of education policy that has ensured that state and local governments maintain a large measure of control over school curriculums in their jurisdictions. This form of financing, however, has run into problems. First, in general, the property tax does not keep pace with the inflationary costs of providing an education. So, while teacher salaries, textbooks, school supplies, and other costs continue to increase, the amount of money provided through property taxes remains unchanged. Schools find themselves having to provide more services with fewer resources. This can be particularly problematic with increasing costs and an unwillingness of local or state government to increase revenue by raising property or state taxes.

The second problem is equity. Property tax revenue directed to public schools varies considerably among the fifty states and within states. For example, in 2014, New York spent \$20,610 per student on public education, while Utah spent only about \$6,500.¹² The result is that students from some states or poor areas within a state may be receiving a lower-quality education. Many believe that financing education with local property taxes is inequitable and should be replaced with a system of state or federal funding to ensure greater equality. Education funding is a topic ripe for policy analysis.

School funding has a direct bearing on the quality of education. School districts must deal with growing costs and flat budget resources; some must face the low end of unequal funding. Without adequate resources, schools cannot hire well-qualified teachers and other staff, provide the needed books and supplies, make use of computers and other technological resources, or even give students a clean and safe building in which to learn. This document will only look briefly at

Higher Education Issues:

Unlike primary and secondary education, attending college is not a requirement; rather, it is a student's personal choice. But it is becoming increasingly clear that a higher education may be necessary for a wider range of careers and jobs than before. Perhaps this is one reason why governments get involved by encouraging students in many ways to continue their education. President Obama made higher education a policy priority. In his first speech to Congress as president, he stated his goal of having the highest proportion of college graduates in the world by 2020; he also emphasized the necessity of providing a range of postsecondary educational opportunities for students other than a traditional four-year college degree. The achievement of that goal is directly affected by one of the issues discussed below—the cost of going to college. The other issue concerns doing a better job in making higher education a goal for a wider diversity of people in the United States.

Affirmative Action

For years, many colleges and universities, in the name of promoting diversity in their student bodies, have given admissions preferences to certain demographic groups such as African Americans and Hispanic Americans. Many administrators and faculty members argued that a more diverse student body adds value to the education of all the students at a college or university. For that reason, they believed it was justifiable, indeed essential, to admit some students whose academic work or test scores may not have been at the same level as others but whose other qualities enriched the campus community.

Several states have moved to eliminate these kinds of preference programs from their state institutions. Many college administrators believe that racial diversity is critical to the goals of education. At most schools, the effect of eliminating these programs is likely to be minor. It is at the more selective institutions—the elite schools—where they currently have the greatest effect.⁴⁷ Do declines in minority admissions, especially at elite schools, pose a significant problem? Some worry about fostering even greater inequalities between elite and nonelite universities than have existed for some time. Those who favor the abolition of affirmative action programs, however, see nonaffirmative action admissions practices as more equitable to all the applicants. The students who score lower on SATs and other admissions criteria are not being denied a higher education, but they may have to choose a less competitive institution.

From a policy analysis perspective, how might one examine the issue of affirmative action programs in higher education? There are obvious ethical and fairness issues associated with affirmative action, but naturally, proponents and opponents of affirmative action programs both defend their positions in terms of equity. Proponents of affirmative action might point out that in the past minorities were excluded from many institutions of higher learning. In addition, many minorities have faced discrimination and inadequate preparation to attend elite schools, and

affirmative action programs help to level the playing field. Opponents argue that it is unfair to give preferences just because of racial characteristics. They strongly defend the position that admission to college should be based on individual abilities rather than demographic characteristics. Any other method, they say, is unfair.

Have affirmative action programs been effective? That depends on one's definition of the problem. More minorities are attending college than ever before, and these increases are across the board in terms of the quality of the institution. A study by William G. Bowen and Derek C. Bok (1998) found that affirmative action programs in highly selective institutions have been successful in educating and promoting the students who benefited from the admissions policy. This study, however, is somewhat limited because it concentrates on selective institutions rather than a broader range of schools. Many institutions assert that affirmative action programs are effective because they reach the goal of diversified student bodies. But are the programs effective if they also deny admission to qualified students?⁴⁸

College admissions are partially a zero-sum game. In any given year or program, each university has only so many openings, and competition can be fierce for the highly selective schools. One person's admission results in another's denial. In June 2003, the Supreme Court ruled on two University of Michigan cases dealing with affirmative action admission procedures. The ruling was somewhat complex: it stated that minorities could be given an edge for admissions but limited the extent that race could play as a factor in selecting students. Subsequent years have found that schools such as the University of Michigan and The Ohio State University saw only slight decreases in the number of minority students accepted, but that they spent considerably more time on the applicant evaluation process. The Court heard the case of *Fisher v. University of Texas* twice and in 2016 upheld the legality of such procedures but put the burden on schools to show that "race-neutral alternatives do not suffice" to ensure a diverse student population.⁵⁰ In April 2014, the Court ruled on yet another affirmative action case. In *Schuette v. Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action*, the Court upheld the right of Michigan's citizens to ban race-conscious admissions at their state colleges and universities.

Costs of Higher Education

Most of you need no reminder that the costs of college education are substantial and continue to rise. For much of the past several decades, they have been rising faster than the rate of inflation. In a thirty-year period between 1986 and 2016, the inflation-adjusted tuition and fees for public schools increased 310 percent. For private institutions, the increase was 229 percent. There are regional variations for these increases. In the previous decade, the Middle States region has seen increases of 27 percent, but during that same period, the Western region has increased 66 percent. Because a college education is regarded as essential for a competitive and productive workforce and for maintaining economic growth, the ever-higher price tag for a college degree is alarming. The cost of attending a private college or university can be prohibitive. For example, at Princeton University, the 2016–2017 comprehensive fee (tuition, room, board, and expenses) was nearly \$64,000—although, as with other private institutions, scholarships often lower the cost. Many students who might have considered private institutions have turned instead to public colleges and universities, which almost always cost less. Attending the University of Wisconsin in 2017–2018, for example, has an estimated cost of more than \$25,000 for tuition and room and board for in-state residents, and more than \$48,000 for out-of-state residents.

Given the costs, one of the most important issues in higher education is the level of state support provided to students, especially those attending state institutions. Students may consider such support to be unexceptional, much as they expect the public to pay for the cost of elementary and secondary education, but public support for higher education raises important questions of equity. Should state governments be providing such subsidies for individuals to attend college? Or should individuals be responsible for paying their own college costs on the grounds that they are getting the benefits, such as enhanced social and economic status, that a college education usually provides?

<https://sheeomain.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Table4.jpg> <-- please look at this comparative chart that tracks state funding of public higher education over time (most recently updated in 2018)

How we as a nation finance a college education partially gets at the issue of what type of good higher education is. In other words, is it a private good or a public good? If it is a private good, meaning that most of the benefits of higher education are bestowed upon the individual and he or she receives a higher wage as a result, then pushing more cost to that individual may make sense. But if higher education is seen as a public good, since the additional education will make society better through better citizenship, more economic development, and less need for social services, then public support for education is appropriate. Both the individual and the greater society are the beneficiaries, which then raises the question of what the appropriate level of public support is.

Political Issues

The political issues surrounding public support of higher education are not as straightforward as some of the other content areas that we have discussed. One reason may be that the service being provided is not necessarily controversial. Most would agree that more education is generally better for individuals and society. As noted earlier, there is a strong recognition that higher levels of education can promote economic development, encourage citizen engagement, and provide other benefits. How can one not support these ideas? At the state government level, the conflict likely comes from a decision regarding priorities. Should higher education be funded at a level instead of some other public policy option? This is where the politics of higher education funding occurs.

In a democratic society where politicians rely upon the vote to keep their jobs, one expects members of a state legislature, for example, to pay attention to who is affected by their decisions. Support for higher education has decreased dramatically over the past thirty years, and many state colleges and universities have had to turn to higher tuition to make up for lost revenue and continue to operate as they did before. As such, students (and their parents) have felt the brunt of this decreased state support in their wallets. One then might ask what type of political pressure can be placed upon state policymakers.

In the fall of 2014, undergraduate enrollment was over 17 million students, and over 13 million of these were attending public institutions. Let's look at a few state examples. According to data provided by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, the fall 2014 total enrollment

for all public four- and two-year schools in California was over 2.1 million students; in New York, this number was over 725,000; and in Texas, the number was over 1.3 million. These are quite large numbers, even within the context of individual states. One might expect that with this many people affected, it would represent a large voting block or even a potential interest group that could provide political pressure on government to adequately fund higher education. Add to this parents and those who work within the higher education field, and these numbers increase quite a bit. And yet, funding has decreased, and in many ways, the potential political power of this group has never been realized. Why is that? One reason may be that the traditional-age student (eighteen to twenty-four) is a demographic having one of the lowest voting turnout rates. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, only 16 percent of this age group reported voting in the November 2014 elections, over 10 percent less than the next group (twenty-five to forty-four), and 35 percent below the group with the highest reporting (sixty-five to seventy-four). With voting turnout statistics such as these, is it any wonder that state politicians may not see this as a priority?

As noted earlier, many higher education institutions, particularly those in the public sector, do their own lobbying to protect their public financing. This often is done by providing data regarding the economic or financial benefit that a school provides to the local or state economy, or by linking the need for a well-educated workforce to promote economic growth and provide a well-prepared workforce. A report regarding the economic impacts of the University of California, for example, found that it generated \$46.3 billion in economic activity for California and, for every \$1 in taxpayer support, generated \$13.80 in economic output. It is important to note that such studies are not just for large university systems such as the University of California or the State University of New York (SUNY). Many individual campuses, both public and private, are conducting similar studies of economic effect, partially to provide the political argument for increased or continued support.

<https://www.northern.edu/news/nsu-has-major-impact-economy-aberdeen-region-state-south-dakota> <-- NSU's 2017 public release about economic impact

<https://www.sdbor.edu/mediapubs/Documents/EconImpact2016.pdf> <-- SD Board of Regents' (covering all SD public higher education institutions) 2016 statement of economic impact

The other side of the political argument for continued public support for higher education will raise the issue of priorities, or why public dollars should support what is a private benefit. We noted earlier that typically more education will lead to higher salaries for individuals. If that is the case, then those higher earnings could pay the additional cost necessary for college. In an era when it seems that the answer to every public policy question is to cut taxes, many might ask why their taxes should be used to support these endeavors. The other part of the political argument has to do with the ever-increasing cost of higher education and a question by some if the college industry's appetite can ever be satiated. They see ever more elaborate student-life facilities, high salaries for administrators, and exorbitant costs for college sports, and question if this is the best use of public tax dollars.

The political debate surrounding the issue of funding higher education has several different elements. What is clear, though, is that the rich will always be able to afford to go to college and

be able and willing to pay a premium for this service. But what about the poor and middle class? We now turn to the equity and ethics questions associated with public financing.

Equity and Ethics in Funding

One of the major arguments for supporting education generally is the belief that it is the great equalizer within U.S. society. Education provides a mechanism for success. This is also true for higher education, but the major difference is that there are significant individual costs associated with higher education that must be paid by the recipient. How do we ensure equity in access to students who may not have the means to afford the tuition and other costs associated with a university education?

Federal Pell Grants are one program that addresses the needs of low-income individuals. As noted above, these grants provide up to \$6,195 (for 2019–2020) based on need, cost of attendance, and your student status. There is concern, though, that these grants do not provide the same purchasing power as they used to, and that more people are turning to loan programs to help meet their college costs and hence all the concerns about student debt. The percentage of students taking out loans has increased over the ten-year period; there has also been an increase in the average loan level. While federal loans are capped by legislation, students can turn to other sources, including private loans, to finance their education. As you can see, the average loan debt has increased by 35 percent during this period. It is also important to note that private loans generally charge higher interest rates and are not as forgiving as federal student loans. The point is that more and more students are finding themselves with a significant level of debt upon graduation, and this is going to affect the low- to middle-income student to a greater degree. The issue of the ever-increasing student debt raises significant issues because it could hamstring students to the point where they have a difficult time making ends meet.

Some have argued for a system that provides for free or significantly reduced college. President Obama argued for free community college. Both Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders, the two major Democratic candidates for the 2016 election, proposed free tuition at public institutions, particularly for certain income levels, or in Clinton's words "having no-debt tuition."

There have been other kinds of programs implemented to help alleviate college costs, such as the HOPE (Helping Outstanding Pupils Educationally) Scholarship program in Georgia. Under the program, students must maintain a B average in high school and keep this average in college to qualify for state grants to pay for college. SD's Board of Regents, covering all SD public higher education institutions, has repeatedly tried to establish the Dakota Promise Scholarship for a similar program.

<https://www.keloland.com/news/capitol-news-bureau/regents-plan-a-second-try-at-dakota-promise-scholarships/> ← prior to the legislative session

<https://brookingsregister.com/article/dakotas-promise-top-priority-for-regents> <-- during the legislative session

http://sdlegislature.gov/Legislative_Session/Bills/Bill.aspx?Bill=72&Session=2020 ← SB72 legislative tracking and history

Given state financial issues, many of these types of programs have had to decrease funding. Like other forms of state aid, though, critics may bemoan these programs because they are redistributing tax dollars to beneficiaries. These merit-based programs may have other equity concerns related to the quality of the schools the students are attending as well as their socioeconomic status. Which students are more likely to achieve a B average or higher, and thus qualify for the HOPE Scholarship program? Students from a middle- or upper-middle-class background or from a working-class or blue-collar background? Students from cash-strapped inner-city schools or from well-supported suburban high schools? Given a perceived interest to make college accessible, can such programs be justified based on equity or fairness?

So, the issue of equity in the financing of higher education really comes down to a couple of different perspectives. One is whether one considers higher education to be a public or a private good. If public, then perhaps public support is appropriate and a good use of taxpayer dollars. If private, then one might consider such support unnecessary. The other perspective to consider relates to how the country ensures enough education to low- and middle-income students who may not be able to afford the costs of higher education. If education is an equalizer and a way for people to better themselves, then perhaps supporting this system makes sense. In this case, the question may come down to what the appropriate level of public investment is to ensure such access, and whether these needs rise above other public policy issues and problems.

SOC 100-N03 Sample Assignment (Week 13: Population, Urbanization, and the Environment)

For this assignment, please watch the documentary *Race: The Power of an Illusion - Part Three: The House We Live In*. The documentary is available on Kanopy [<https://northern.kanopy.com/video/race-power-illusion-0>] and you will need to log in with your NSU username and password. If you are having issues with streaming or bandwidth, please let me know ASAP.

Once you have watched the documentary, please answer the following questions in a **minimum of 200 words total** (not per question):

1. What drives people to move to urban and suburban areas? How are minorities disadvantaged by these movements?
2. What influences people to move to rural areas or stay in rural areas if that is where they group up?
3. Briefly discuss any inequalities you see between rural and urban areas and how those inequalities affect residents -- especially ones from disadvantaged groups?
4. How do you think COVID-19 and all the pandemic's effects will change how we live and organize our cities?

Your answers are due **Friday April 24, 9am**.

Capstone (SOC 489) Online Instructions

Dates (as of 03/17/2020): we will be online for classes from 03/23/2020 through 04/03/2020 – face-to-face classes are currently set to resume Monday April 6 – *this note will be updated if this changes*

Drop-in/Office Hours: will *only* be virtual during this time and possibly even longer. Many of you already know that I currently have a multiple sclerosis (MS). MS is an auto-immune disease in which my body attacks itself and those center around my central nervous system (i.e., brain and spinal cord). This means I am more vulnerable to infection and, once sick, it often takes longer for me to recover. I am part of the vulnerable population so in the middle of a pandemic I must take extra caution with my health. If you need to contact me, you may:

Email (any time but I will likely only answer between the hours of 7am and 7pm):

Kristi.brownfield@northern.edu

Online video chat through Zoom: this option will be available during my “normal” office hours when classes resume on Monday March 23. You can find the link to download the Zoom client in D2L (Under “Communications” and then “Zoom – NSU”). The link to the personal meeting room I use for my virtual office hours can be find under the D2L module “Drop-in Hours.” You are also welcomed to request individual meetings with me through Zoom!

Call/text my cell: 217-218-9493. If you text me, please make sure to identify yourself in your message! I also ask that you please use this option only as a last resort, in an emergency, and only between the hours of 9am and 5pm.

Class sessions:

Here is the new schedule, including the class leadership, reflecting the loss of a week:

Week 9: Student Topic

March 23: Ikey

March 25: Miranda

March 27: individual meetings with Josh (10am), Walker (10:10), Chris (10:20) and Ash (10:30) through Zoom

Week 10: Standing With Standing Rock, Prologue-CH15:

March 30: individual meetings with Kenny (10am), Hannah (10:10), Amanda (10:20), and Ikey (10:30) through Zoom

April 1: Walker

April 3: Ikey

Week 11: Standing With Standing Rock, CH16-29:

April 6: Chris

April 8: individual meetings

April 10: No class (Good Friday)

Week 12: Student Topic:

Monday April 13 (no class, Easter holiday)
Wednesday April 15: Chris
Friday April 17: Amanda

Week 13: Student Topic
Monday April 20: In-class peer review
Wednesday April 22: Josh
Friday April 24: Kenny

Week 14: Student Topic
Monday April 27: Suzanne
Wednesday April 29: Walker
Friday May 1: Hannah

All assignments during the two weeks we are online will be asynchronous. Here is how class will work:

Students Leading Class:

Students who are scheduled to present need to get me **by email a minimum of 2 days (no later than 12pm) prior to their scheduled day** 4 items. So, for example, if you are scheduled to present on Friday email me your items on Wednesday by 12pm. You need to send me:

1. At least 1 academic article of interest to their topic (use the library's website to find this!)
2. At least 3 news articles from *different sources* related to the topic
3. One piece of media (text document, podcast, PowerPoint, video, etc.) **you created** that provides general information about your topic
4. 2 discussion questions for the class

Once the presentation materials have been sent to me, I'll post everything for the class in D2L. The discussion questions will be posted in a newly created discussion forum. I will be demonstrating this when class opens again on Monday March 23 with information on Environmental Policy.

Students Participating in Class:

You are expected to read all the resources provided for that week/day, whether those resources are provided by me or your fellow students. You are then expected to answer in a minimum of 200 words:

1. Answer one of the two discussion questions (you get to pick which one!)
2. Reply to another student's answer

Your discussion posts will be due by the following Monday by 9am. If there are multiple presenters (or me and student presenters) in the same week, you are expected to engage with *all* the potential discussion questions; for example, if there are four discussion questions for the week, you should be engaging directly with two of them and with two of your classmates' responses. However, only one answer and one reply need to have the 200-word minimum.

Individual Meetings:

Your individual meetings will be conducted digitally through Zoom. You can download the client in advance by going to D2L under “Communications” and then “Zoom – NSU.” You will receive a link through email to the meeting room the day prior and I expect you to join me at your scheduled time. Please have video and audio enabled for these meetings.

Deadlines:

Due to the extended spring break, deadlines have been slightly adjusted for class. Here are the important dates to know for upcoming assignments (dates that have been changed are italicized):

Paper rough draft: Friday March 27

Capstone portfolio draft: Friday March 27

Capstone reflective essay draft: Friday March 27

Book review 2 (When They Call You A Terrorist): Friday April 3

Drafts for peer review due: Friday April 10

Peer review due: Friday April 24

Final draft: Friday May 1

Career services workshop: Friday May 1 – due to the pandemic, I will allow webinars or digital “participation” for these events so long as you clear your professional development activity with me prior to engaging

Final capstone portfolio with completed capstone paper and essay: Wednesday May 6

Research presentation: Wednesday May 6, 2:15-4:15pm