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## Funding Categories and Expenditures

**AY July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING CATEGORY</th>
<th>FY 2006/07</th>
<th>FY 2007/08</th>
<th>GAINS +/(-)</th>
<th>% CHANGE +/(-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Budget Total</td>
<td>$16,365,769</td>
<td>$19,060,820</td>
<td>+$2,695,051</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated General Fund</td>
<td>$16,154,104</td>
<td>$18,855,788</td>
<td>+$2,701,684</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Lottery</td>
<td>$211,665</td>
<td>$205,032</td>
<td>-$6,633</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES Target</td>
<td>5,028</td>
<td>5,321</td>
<td>+ 293</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES Achieved</td>
<td>5,329</td>
<td>5,556</td>
<td>+ 227</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES Developmental Target</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES Developmental Achieved</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Undergraduate Majors</td>
<td>5,032</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>+ 276</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Graduate Students</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>+ 139</td>
<td>+33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE Allocated to Departments by College</td>
<td>$400,169</td>
<td>$439,956</td>
<td>+$39,787</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding to departments (supplies, labs, equipment)</td>
<td>$420,819</td>
<td>$334,069</td>
<td>-$86,750</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Program support</td>
<td>$22,466</td>
<td>$21,853</td>
<td>-$613</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Supported Travel</td>
<td>$122,441</td>
<td>$150,795</td>
<td>+$28,354</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Supported Travel</td>
<td>$13,699</td>
<td>$6,841</td>
<td>-$6,858</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student support</td>
<td>$36,160</td>
<td>$41,892</td>
<td>+$5,732</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Hires (full time + lecturers)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Resignations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Retirements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Hired</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Regular: 2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temp/Emergency: 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Resigned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Support Costs (stipends etc)</td>
<td>$252,550</td>
<td>$428,889</td>
<td>+$176,339</td>
<td>+70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassigned Time Costs Total</td>
<td>$569,963</td>
<td>$579,768</td>
<td>+$9,805</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instructionally related</td>
<td>$522,255</td>
<td>$506,703</td>
<td>-$15,522</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research Support</td>
<td>$58,708</td>
<td>$73,065</td>
<td>+$14,357</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING CATEGORY</td>
<td>FY 2006/07</td>
<td>FY 2007/08</td>
<td>GAINS +/(-)</td>
<td>% CHANGE +/(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # of Journal Articles</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>+58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # of Books</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # of Chapters</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>+94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # of Technical reports</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # of Book Reviews</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other (encyclopedia/opinion</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cost per Publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Previous Year Expenditure</td>
<td>$2,679</td>
<td>$2,117</td>
<td>-562</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Faculty Research Support Cost</td>
<td>$2,855</td>
<td>$3,414</td>
<td>+559</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Conferences/Invited</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Costs per Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>$624</td>
<td>$814</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Total</td>
<td>$1,066,824</td>
<td>$340,959</td>
<td>-$725,865</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty External Grant/Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissions</td>
<td>$3,596,077</td>
<td>$6,038,070</td>
<td>+$2,441,993</td>
<td>+68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty External Grants/Contracts Awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total</td>
<td>$2,330,387</td>
<td>$2,295,387</td>
<td>-$35,000</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grants</td>
<td>$1,192,780</td>
<td>$532,689</td>
<td>-$660,091</td>
<td>-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contracts</td>
<td>$1,137,607</td>
<td>$1,762,698</td>
<td>+$625,091</td>
<td>-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Grants (Awarded from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Outside College)</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$132,466</td>
<td>+$68,466</td>
<td>+107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue ($ received by College)</td>
<td>$42,873</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>-$21,873</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Compensation from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Learning Special</td>
<td>$86,255</td>
<td>$159,026</td>
<td>+72,771</td>
<td>+84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Events Held Open to</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University, Community &amp; Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Conferences/Presentations</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>+61</td>
<td>+91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students Receiving External</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>+706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Awards, Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Authoring Published</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students Supported by</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+30</td>
<td>+273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Research Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students supported by Dept</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>+59</td>
<td>+144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/ Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students accepted into</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>+56</td>
<td>+151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional or PhD programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Related</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Student Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>9,744</td>
<td>4,872</td>
<td>14,616</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG</td>
<td>14,618</td>
<td>9,742</td>
<td>24,350</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>48,724</td>
<td>19,484</td>
<td>68,208</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS</td>
<td>9,746</td>
<td>9,742</td>
<td>19,488</td>
<td>4,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>29,234</td>
<td>9,742</td>
<td>38,976</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY</td>
<td>63,338</td>
<td>9,742</td>
<td>73,080</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>258,216</td>
<td>4,872</td>
<td>263,088</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRK</td>
<td>14,616</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,616</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URB8</td>
<td>19,488</td>
<td>4,872</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>11,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for SCS</td>
<td>19,488</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,488</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>9,744</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,744</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSMP</td>
<td>9,744</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,744</td>
<td>5,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC/EOP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>506,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,068</strong></td>
<td><strong>579,768</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,892</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>Repair/Maint Supplies/Classroom/Lab Materials</td>
<td>Computers/Software/Furniture/Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>15,307</td>
<td>1,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,072</td>
<td>128,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>8,903</td>
<td>14,875</td>
<td>3,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS</td>
<td>4,985</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>7,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,576</td>
<td>41,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC(1)</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>46,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRK(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,553</td>
<td>16,216</td>
<td>3,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBS</td>
<td>11,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,528</td>
<td>19,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for SCS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCBA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSMP</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC/EOP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>41,892</td>
<td>21,853</td>
<td>122,603</td>
<td>254,363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Large Class Support

**Includes Reassigned Time awarded in College Research Competition

(1) Reassigned Time includes augmentation to department part-time salary budget for social work depletion

(2) Includes accreditation costs
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Status of Department Assessment Plans

**Anthropology:** augmented its Assessment Plan in 2007-08. SLO-based evidence collected in 2006-07 and changes in employment prospects for students have prompted the addition of a 'skills and knowledge'-based strand (Strand 2.) Strand 2 complements the yearly measurement of SLOS (Strand 1) and investigates how and whether students are acquiring the kinds of skills and knowledge that are needed to succeed in post-graduate work. In 2007-08 we have used student and faculty surveys to elicit baseline information and held a series of assessment-based discussions with the faculty, for the purpose of setting benchmarks and finding ways to align existing curriculum with Strand 2 data collection.

**Geography:** continued to use the capstone course and papers as primary assessment instrument. Some areas have demonstrable improvement since the re-introduction of Geography 300. Students are more capable of finding data sources, construct bibliographies better and seem to have widened their choice of topical matter. On the other hand, instruction in Geography 300 has not rectified the serious shortcomings students demonstrate in problem conceptualization, argument, and written presentation. We continue to build a roster of students with online portfolios. Still too few of them had been far enough through the program to do authentic assessment with their portfolios. Several students have completed very instructive portfolios, though others had added little to their portfolio in two years. The department has to encourage faculty to remind or insist that students place relevant projects in their portfolio as fundamental components of course responsibilities. We also pioneered a large scale, imbedded assessment with Geography 150. It was a success in terms of the degree and level of participation by faculty and students. It will be repeated in future semesters and expanded to include other introductory level courses. The most compelling finding thus far is the significant degree of geographic ignorance among students of even the most basic building blocks of spatial understanding. The odd exception to the rule appears to be geographic knowledge that may be highly tied to history instruction at the high school level. It appears, for example, that students have a relatively better knowledge of Southeast Asia for example, which may be a product of an increased emphasis on this area in high school history courses.

**History:** rewrote SLOs and changed direction of plan felt that it was a more efficient and better plan to simply assess final papers from History 301:Historical Methods in spring and final papers from History 497:Proseminar in fall. Makes it easier to then assess most of the new SLOs since the bulk of them deal with the kind of written work done in these classes. Since 301 is a course students take early in their career with us and 497 is usually one of the last classes students take with us, this set up would allow us to have a baseline assessment and a final assessment. In Spring read and assessed randomly selected history 301 papers. Faculty readers were asked to rank the degree to which each paper demonstrated proficiency in each of the relevant SLOs. (SLO 4 was not included since it is primarily oral.) On the basis of a 0-3 point scale (0 being not at all and 3 being proficient). Then had a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of students based on reading of these papers. Most of the essays that we read seemed to do relatively well at selecting a research topic and finding relevant sources (SLO #6). In general we also felt that they wrote relatively well. There were some grammatical problems, but in general the writing was readable. In general, the papers that we read had footnotes and a bibliography. We felt that they usually had a thesis (although several of the papers did not do a good job of arguing it!) (SLO#7).

From there we moved on to the problems. The biggest issue for most of us was that the papers lacked consistent argumentation.(SLOs#1 and 5) The choice of sources was also a problem in some of the paper, and for some of us the issue of analyzing secondary sources seemed to be a problem.(SLOs #
and 5) It was pointed out that there is a tendency among our students to introduce large, splashy, controversial theses which they cannot possibly prove. We felt that it was important to stress small, incremental provable theses. We finished by debating the virtues of teaching 301 once a week versus three times a week. We also found that some of our new SLOs were ambiguous and that different faculty interpreted them differently. However, we felt that we should live with them awhile before trying to change them again. In comparison to spring 2006’s analysis of 301 and 497 papers (documented in our 2005-06 annual report), it is clear that some progress has been made. While some students still have trouble constructing an argument, the fact that most of them have a clear topic, relevant sources, and a thesis marks a departure from what we found in our earlier review. While this is incremental progress and not a great leap forward, it does represent an improvement. Therefore, it can cautiously be said that history’s work on 301 over the last two years has had some success.

**PAS:** PAS 100 was assessed this academic year. Preliminary investigation reveals concerns regarding standardization of material used for this introductory level course. Currently seeking input from faculty on how to address this issue. The complete report is due July 13, 2008.

**Political Science:** continued the dialogue about student learning and to encourage greater faculty participation. All faculty asked to include the relevant SLOs in their syllabi and provide clear instructions for papers and/or exams. Had almost 100% participation in assessment related activities. Nearly every faculty member contributed to the process, whether through serving on the assessment committee, providing materials to be assessed, developing assessment rubrics for specific classes, giving feedback on the SLOs, and/or supporting faculty research on assessment. We also dedicate time at each department meeting to discuss assessment activities, share experiences, and exchange ideas. Using a direct assessment model which we call Progressive Direct Assessment (PDA) which is designed to involve all faculty in the department, be an integrated component of the existing educational process, and provide information about student learning outcomes from students’ introduction to Political Science research methods to their final courses as majors in the department. In previous years, collected assignments from a variety of core courses. In order to better align the process with the other departments in the college, we decided in 2007-2008 to request materials from only gateway and capstone courses. Allowed gathering of information about each of the SLOs. Used copies of final exams or papers from the following courses from Spring 2007 and Fall 2007: Political Science 372, Political Science 471A, Political Science 471B, Political Science 471C, and Political Science 471F. Instructors were asked to provide the exam questions or essay prompts given to the students in order to provide context for the scoring. A sample of ten works per course were randomly chosen. Assessment teams of two faculty members per course then read the exams or final works individually, scored them according to the SLO rubrics applicable to each course. The assessment committee members then met to determine final scores on the exams/works and reported the results to the assessment coordinator. The results were synthesized into charts (see attached) that show the percentages of works meeting the ‘below satisfaction’, ‘satisfactory’ and ‘exemplary’ designations. These were then distributed to the department.

**Psychology:** proposed a curriculum change for the undergrad major which places focus on outlining specific measurable SLOs, deciding as a group standards that will remain consistent across courses or course-levels, and discussing how we will assess student learning in the new curriculum. Some core required course-work will remain the same and therefore, this year, department continued assessment of those courses only. In Fall part-time and full-time faculty who teach PSY 321 met and discussed core contents of the course. Assessment results from the previous assessment were shared and served as impetus for suggested changes. Based upon findings changes were proposed (e.g., having each student
turn-in an independent research paper instead of co-authored research papers) and the department adopted as department standards or core content expected to be taught in the course. Also department approved group standards for PSY 320 as well based upon evidence from previous year's assessment.

**Social Work**: assessed 12 generalist year objectives and 5 concentration year objectives through the following survey instruments: A pre/posttest self-efficacy survey asking students to rate their knowledge of each objective at program entry, one year into the program, and upon program completion. Mean change will be assessed and objectives with lower mean changes will be examined for improvement; Field assessments completed by field instructors concerning our student interns and the support of the field liaisons. Both quantitative data and qualitative data were collected. Students were also asked to rate their learning in the field through several quantitative questions; A self-report from students in each course asking them to rate how well they learned each objective on a 1 to 5 scale. Each student was then asked to choose two objectives and explain how they learned about this objective during the semester (e.g., readings, lecture/discussions, assignments, etc.). Results will be presented within our core areas: practice, human behavior, research, policy, field seminars, and electives; A focus group was held with graduating students asking them to articulate strengths and weaknesses of the program; The first outcome assessment was conducted for the research course sequence. 10 final papers were randomly selected from the generalist research course. Two papers were read by all three research instructors (tenure-track faculty) and rated on an 11-item question survey. Interrater reliability was established and the remaining papers were read by one faculty each. Questions were based on operationalization of the objectives covered by this course. A separate evaluation tool was utilized for rating the final projects. All faculty acted as raters. All results will be summarized at the faculty retreat in August and small groups will be asked to discuss needed changes as well as strong areas. Changes will be made in coursework as well as field work for further assessment in 2008-2009.

**Sociology**: revised, administered, and created a SPSS file, and trained a student to input data for the SPSS knowledge instrument. Additionally, revised the SLO’s for simplification, begun searching for an appropriate alumni survey, researched the ETS instrument for Sociology and devised a plan to implement the document.

**Urban Planning**: Consistent with URBS 5-Year Assessment Plan developed in Fall 2007, seven sections of URBS 310 were administered pre and post test to assess SLO #1: “Students are expected to know the key forces responsible for urban development in the U.S. and elsewhere in the world.” Faculty developed the 20-Question item test during the Spring 08 semester. Assessment Liaison is currently entering and analyzing data. A summary of the findings will be available for faculty review and discussion by Fall 2008.
Anthropology

Cathy L. Costin

Christina Von Mayrhauser


Michael W. Love

Michael Love and Julia Guernsey


Sabina Magliocco and John M. Bishop
“Oss Tales.” Media Generation Productions, June 2007. [documentary film]

Sabina Magliocco


Suzanne Scheld
Evidence of the Impact of Pre-Service Preparation on Secondary Education Math Teachers with Christina von Mayrhoiser, Julie Gainsburg, Michael Spagna and Carrie Rothstein-Fish. Report for Teachers for a New Era Initiative at California State University, Northridge.


**Geography**

**Amalie Orme**


**Douglas Fischer**


**Edward Jackiewicz**


**Eugene Turner**


Helen Cox
“El Niño” and “Stratospheric Ozone Depletion,” chapters for a new Laboratory Manual for
Geog. 311L: The Atmosphere Lab, Pearson Custom Publishing.

James Craine
“Virtualizing the cinematic map” Cartographic Journal (forthcoming 2008); “Virtualizing Los
Angeles: Pierre Levy” The Shield (http://theshieldrap.proboards45.com/) and GeoJournal
(forthcoming 2008); “Today’s Inspiration” Visual Culture (forthcoming 2008; with C. Dando);

“The emotional life of maps and other visual geographies” in M. Dodge and C. Perkins


Ronald Davidson
“Recalcitrant Space: Modeling Variation in Humanistic Geography” Journal of Cultural
Geography (forthcoming June 2008).

Shawna Dark
“The Modifiable Areal Unit Problem (MAUP) in Physical Geography” Progress in Physical

Steven Graves
"Usury Law and the Christian Right: Faith Based Political Power and the Geography of

Created maps for Department of Defense study, regarding the effects of the Military
Protection Act, 2007; Data Analysis and Map Production submitted to the Federal Reserve
Bank of St. Louis as part of a study on the spatial distribution of payday lenders in Missouri
and Arkansas, 2007; Data Analysis and Map Production submitted to Consumer Federation of
American as part of a study on the spatial distribution of Refund Anticipation Loan Office near

Yifei Sun
2007 (with Maximilian von Zedtwitz and Denis Fred Simon); “Uncertainties, Imitating
behaviors and Foreign R&D Locations: Explaining the Over-concentration of Foreign R&D in
Beijing and Shanghai within China” Asia Pacific Business Review 13(3): 405-424 2007 (with Ke
Wen); “A Spatial Strategy for High-Quality Labor in Rural Development: A Case Study of

(with Max von Zedtwitz and Denis Fred Simon) Guest Editors
“Special Issue on Global R&D in China” Asia Pacific Business Review 13(3) 2007 (The special
issue has been published as a book by Routledge as well, carrying a title Global R&D in China
2007).
History

Christopher Magra


David Parker


Donal O’Sullivan


James E. Sefton


Jeffrey Auerbach

Josh Sides
"Renewal Through Retail? The Impact of Corporate Retail Investment in South Los Angeles," Center for Southern California Studies, California State University Northridge, 2008.


Joyce Broussard

Katherine Strange Burke


Patricia Juarez-Dappe


Richard Horowitz

Susan Fitzpatrick-Behrens

Thomas R. Maddux

H-Diplo Roundtable Editor for online roundtable reviews and introductions that are circulated online to H-Diplo members and posted on the H-Diplo website at [http://www.h-net.org/~diplo/roundtables/](http://www.h-net.org/~diplo/roundtables/). Twenty three books were reviewed.

**Tom Devine**  

**PAS**

**Adilifu Nama**  

**Karin Stanford**  

**Tom Spencer-Walter, Chair**  

**Shubha Venugopal**  
*My story has been singled out for specific mention in positive book reviews by Library Journal, Booklist, and Feminist Review.*


**Political Science**

**Alexandra Cole**  


**Christopher Shortell**  
James Mitchell


Jane Bayes

Jennifer DeMaio

De Maio, Jennifer L. Book Contract from Lexington Books for manuscript Confronting Ethnic Conflict: The Role of Third Parties in Managing Africa’s Civil Wars.

Keiko Hirata


**Kristy Michaud**


**Lawrence Becker**


**Nicholas Dungey**


**Tom Hogen-Esch**


**Psychology**

**Andrew Ainsworth**


**August Hoffman**


**Brad McAuliff**


McAuliff, B. D. & Kovera, M. B. “Estimating the effects of misleading information on witness accuracy: Can experts tell jurors something they don’t already know?” *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 21, 849-870. 2007.


Carrie Saetermoe

Saetermoe, C. L., Quevedo, M., & Magdaleno, L. “Rehabilitation therapists in Guatemala: A qualitative enquiry.” Disability and Rehabilitation. (under review).

Debra Sheets

Erica Wohldmann


Howard Lee


Janet Oh

Jill Razani

John Holden

Luciana Lagana


Mark Sergi


Max Fuhrmann


Michele Wittig

Michele Wittig and Andrew Ainsworth


Robert Youmans

Sun-Mee Kang


Tonyan, H. A. “Autonomy and coordination during distress episodes from 14 to 24 months among Latino mother-child dyads – Special case or cause for reconsideration?” Manuscript under revisions. 2008.

Social Work
Amy Levin
Beth Halaas

Eli Bartle


James Decker

Susan Love


Sociology

Alex Bierman

Amy Denissen
“The Right Tools for the Job: Constructing Gender Meanings and Identities in the Male-Dominated Building Trades.” Revised and resubmitted to Human Relations.

“The Right Tools for the Job: Constructing Gender Meanings and Identities in the Male-Dominated Building Trades.” Revised and resubmitted to Human Relations.

David Boyns


Herman L. DeBose

James David Ballard


“Assessment of Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) developed by DOE.” This report provided the state of Nevada with an evaluation of the terrorism threat assessment procedures used by this agency for Yucca Mountain and in direct response to DOE’s SEIS contentions. Agency paper. Nevada’s Agency for Nuclear Projects. December 2007.

Karren Olson


Kristyan Kouri

Laura Desfor Edles


Loretta Winters

Melanie Klein

Scott Appelrouth

Sociological Theory in the Contemporary Era, with Laura Edles. Pine Forge Press. 2007

Tracie Gardner

Vickie Jensen


Victor Shaw

Wendy Wang


Urban Planning

Kenya Covington


Peter Nwosu


Teresa Vazquez


Ward Thomas

