

External Review Report

7th Cycle Program Review
Sexuality Studies

Department of Sociology and Sexuality Studies
College of Health and Human Services
San Francisco State University

October 2019

Dr. Marlon Bailey
Department of Women and Gender Studies
Arizona State University

Dr. Michael Borgstrom
Department of English and Comparative Literature
San Diego State University

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Introduction	3
1.0 Overview of the Program (based on self study and campus visit).....	4
2.0 Program Quality	6
2.1 Program Planning.....	6
2.2 Student Learning and Achievement.....	8
2.3 The Curriculum.....	10
2.4 Faculty.....	13
2.5 Resources.....	17
2.6 The Program's Conclusions, Plans, and Goals.....	19
3.0 Commendations of Strengths and Achievements	21
4.0 Recommendations and Strategies for Program Improvement	23

Introduction

On September 19th and 20th 2019, we had the pleasure to visit the SFSU campus and meet with faculty, students, staff, administrators, and other stakeholders in the Sexuality Studies program in the Department of Sociology and Sexuality Studies. This program has a rich and storied history, and it continues to enjoy national prestige. At every moment throughout our visit, the collective investment in the success of the Sexuality Studies program was evident: faculty, students, and administrators believe that the program is valuable to the overall mission of SFSU and to the communities it serves throughout the campus and the City of San Francisco. While the Sexuality Studies program at SFSU remains one the few of its kind in the U.S. academy (and continues to attract prominent faculty and a diverse body of students with a wide array of academic backgrounds and interests), there are a number of challenges it faces that need to be addressed in order for the program to remain viable and realize its full potential.

In this report, we provide an overview of the program, including the structure (in terms of academic location and unit), curriculum, resources, faculty, and students. Throughout the report, we discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the program, including each of the aforementioned areas. Finally, we provide commendations and recommendations for the program based on our review of the mission of SFSU, the Sexuality Studies program self-study, our discussions with stakeholders, and our own expertise in the interdisciplinary field of sexuality studies.

1.0 Overview of the Program

The Sexuality Studies program has been in existence at SFSU since the 1970s. It was one of the first programs in the country to marshal intellectual and scholar/activist interests, research resources, and faculty to create a multidisciplinary approach to the study of sexuality. The Sexuality Studies program was a stand-alone unit until 2012, when it was merged with (and subsumed under) the Department of Sociology. According to the program description—and articulated by the faculty with whom we met—the Sexuality Studies program at SFSU seeks to continue as a model in the larger interdisciplinary field, while at the same time provide students with an undergraduate (two minors) and graduate (MA) experience that is relevant and applicable to current issues and challenges facing communities both in San Francisco and in the larger society.

The mission of the Sexuality Studies program is to “advance multidisciplinary teaching, research, and advocacy in sexuality studies, sexual literacy, well-being and social justice.” Although the program is housed in the Department of Sociology, the program views itself as offering a robust multidisciplinary curriculum that draws from faculty and course offerings in other departments throughout the campus to increase its multidisciplinary depth and scope (in addition to its core offerings within the department). For the undergraduate minor in Sexuality Studies and LGBT Studies, these include courses in the arts, humanities, and biological and natural sciences, most of which are offered by other departments. The social sciences courses, the core of the program, are taught by program and department faculty. In a related vein, The Center for Research and Education on Gender and Sexuality (CREGS) offers important resources from the vantage point of the behavior sciences (an initiative we discuss in various sections of this report).

What is revealed in the self-study's programmatic description (and confirmed in our interviews with the faculty) is that the program has been unsuccessful in maintaining the multidisciplinary foundations of the MA program, since all of the core (teaching) faculty are social scientists. Thus, on the one hand, faculty tout the MA program as a multidisciplinary program, and student cohorts may come to the program expecting breadth. On the other hand, the day-to-day realities of program offerings and advising do not reflect this multidisciplinary. Essentially, the MA program trains students in the sociology of sexuality as opposed to interdisciplinary sexuality studies. When students enroll in the program and want to study sexuality using film or other non-social scientific approaches, the faculty struggles to accommodate the student's programmatic and advising needs. Overall, the program's current academic home and organization at SFSU do not create the adequate conditions for the program's stated aims.

2.0 Program Quality

2.1 Program Planning

The program in Sexuality Studies articulates thoughtful, well-considered goals that frame their Mission Statement. The program's investment in exploring "processes and variations in sexual cultures, sexual identity and gender role formation, and the social, cultural, historical and ethical foundations of sexuality, intimate relationships and sexual health" clearly supports its concomitant commitments to social justice, advocacy, and community building. Moreover, it is clear from conversations with multiple faculty members (both those with a primary appointment in Sexuality Studies and those affiliated with the program) that such values stretch into each of its educational components: the MA in Sexuality Studies, and its two minors (Human Sexuality Studies and LGBT Studies). These are commendable and important goals.

What is less clear, however, is how the program's emphasis on the social and behavioral sciences can support its intent to "advance multidisciplinary teaching [and] research." Such singular emphasis is understandable given the expertise of its core faculty, as well as the fact that the program is housed with the Department of Sociology. Yet because the discipline of Sexuality Studies is itself markedly interdisciplinary, it is notable that SFSU's program does not include any faculty working outside of the social and behavioral sciences. Moreover, it is not clear how the program draws on the expertise of faculty in other units on campus in order to augment the strong curriculum the program currently offers in the social sciences (see also this report's section on The Curriculum). The self-study notes the program's own awareness of this rather skewed disciplinary perspective, but it remains an open question as to whether explicit, detailed plans have been made to address this imbalance. Indeed, such efforts are

primarily couched in the tentative future tense. For example, the program hopes to formalize the process of assessing the needs of the undergraduate program "in an effort to assess the relationship between GE courses offered through SXS and other departments"; it also notes that "a similar and, perhaps, separate assessment is needed for the graduate program."

At this point, then, it is difficult to gauge how such efforts will include student learning and achievement in order to make decisions about programmatic planning. In large measure, this is an issue of capacity. As we note in other sections of this report, the merger between Sexuality Studies and Sociology has stretched faculty resources beyond the limit point; there are simply too few faculty with too many obligations to serve the needs of a properly interdisciplinary program such as Sexuality Studies. That said, we have serious reservations as to whether student needs can be adequately met within the program's current structure. We were glad to meet the members of the incoming graduate student cohort, a group that articulated a wide range of research interests but whose through line was a clear investment in advocacy for socio-sexual difference (a natural complement to the program's own values). We were concerned, however, that the graduate students—to a one—also noted their investment in interdisciplinary frameworks, an expectation that the program will likely find challenging to support. (It is worth noting that we did not have the opportunity to meet with any undergraduate students or with Professor Carrington, one of the key faculty advisors to the undergraduate program.)

In sum, it is not clear how programmatic planning will address this disciplinary lacuna, nor is it clear how such planning might alter the program's learning outcomes. It is our hope that attention to this issue will help the program align its focus with the larger disciplinary field.

2.2 Student Learning and Achievement

The program in Sexuality Studies has seen a notable increase in the numbers of students declaring and completing the minors in Human Sexuality and LGBT Studies. As the self-study indicates, the uptick in enrollments for both minor programs can be traced to revisions approved by SFSU's Academic Senate in 2014 (a process begun in light of significant changes to the University General Education curriculum in 2012, as well as the merger of Sexuality Studies with Sociology). These changes have been demonstrably successful: student enrollment in both programs has grown steadily over the past several years, and completion rates in each of these minors has similarly flourished. Particularly worthy of commendation is the capstone course (SXS 680: Colloquium in Human Sexuality), which maintains a strong focus on student success by virtue of its relatively small class size, allowing for more individualized attention to students as they complete their culminating projects.

In light of this data, it is clear that many of the learning outcomes for the program are well considered: e.g., its commitment to developing students' writing skills; its attention to advancing students' presentation abilities; and its resolution to supporting the University's investment in issues of diversity (and, by extension, in issues of social justice). As we note in the report's section on Program Planning, however, it is not clear within the self-study whether each of the program's learning outcomes are wholly aligned with the larger disciplinary field of Sexuality Studies. For instance, because the introductory courses for both minors are housed within the program—and because the faculty within the program are all social scientists—it would appear that students' introduction to the field is necessarily framed by an emphasis on social-scientific perspectives. While the elective courses within each minor stretches across a variety of programs (and usefully so), it is notable that one of the chief

learning outcomes of the program is its intent for students to "[b]e able to apply knowledge gained from scientific and social-scientific research and integrate such knowledge into public policy recommendations and advocacy efforts to increase sexual health, sexual pleasure and sexual equality for all people."

The specificity of this learning outcome gives us pause, particularly in its emphasis on social-scientific research and public policy. While we admire the cultural goals articulated within the statement's second clause, it is not the case that such aims need only be framed within social-scientific contexts. Indeed, the larger discipline of Sexuality Studies takes a much broader view, operating with an understanding that the arts, humanities, and cultural studies offer complementary (indeed critical) vantage points from which the field draws its interdisciplinary identity. Again, given the location of the Sexuality Studies program on the SFSU campus, it stands to reason that the program will naturally emphasize social-scientific perspectives—but the preeminence of such methodologies tends to compromise any sustained attention to interdisciplinarity. (NB: While this section of the self-study focuses exclusively on the program's undergraduate minors, it is important to note that a comparable emphasis on social-scientific frameworks informs student work within the graduate program.)

Finally, we wish to note that the faculty's strong commitment to student learning is without question. Our concerns with respect to learning goals and impact practices rest, more specifically, with the University's support of the program itself. Absent resources to complement its current disciplinary strengths, Sexuality Studies will by necessity remain focused on the discipline's social-scientific aspects.

2.3 The Curriculum

The curriculum is arguably at the heart of every academic program. It introduces students to a given discipline, shapes intellectual parameters and interests, and directly informs student success. The Sexuality Studies program has clearly devoted a great deal of thought to the relationship between the needs of students and the curriculum it offers through its minors and graduate program. One of its primary strengths in shaping course offerings is the program's focus on advocacy for sexual minorities and on issues of social justice. As noted in the self-study, the curriculum for the Human Sexuality Studies minor and the LGBT minor is framed by a commitment to "contribute to the wellbeing of all students, but particularly the wellbeing of LGBT students" and thereby "remedy [socially exclusionary dynamics] in ways large and small, creating a safe and cherished space for gender and sexual minorities." Given ongoing socio-cultural challenges facing nonnormative populations—even in as ostensibly progressive a location as San Francisco—these are admirable and necessary goals.

It is also clear that the program has worked hard to make its intellectual and cultural resources available to a wide range of students. Its curriculum for the Human Sexualities and LGBT minors provide clear pathways for transfer students, a goal supported by its articulation agreements with community college partners. Moreover, even though the program does not offer a GVAR course (by virtue of the fact that it does not offer a baccalaureate degree), it affirms its long-standing commitment to writing instruction through its capstone course (SXS 680), which follows GVAR criteria (e.g., a focus on writing in the discipline, small class size, sequenced writing assignments, etc.). As noted in this report's section on Student Learning and Achievement, the program's capstone course is a model for the discipline.

Still, the program's ability to respond to diverse student needs and diverse student interests (perhaps especially within the capstone course) is compromised by its strong disciplinary focus on the social sciences. This emphasis does not exist as wholly exclusive to other intellectual fields—since electives within both minors stretch across the campus to courses in Art History, Classics, English Language and Literature, Humanities, Philosophy, Race and Resistance Studies, and Women and Gender Studies (among others)—but it is notable that nearly all of the required courses for the respective minors, as well as all of the courses the program offers that satisfy General Education requirements, are housed within the social and behavioral sciences. The program recognizes that its strengths rest in these areas, and it has thus utilized its current faculty resources to great effect. Yet if the Sexuality Studies program aims to be truly interdisciplinary, its core curriculum should be reexamined in light of the field's own origins and foci. The epistemological foundation for students within a program such as Sexuality Studies, in other words, requires concerted engagement with multiple disciplinary approaches to the field, especially insofar as they intersect and inform one another.

A comparable disciplinary predisposition is evident within foundation courses for the graduate curriculum, which is focused exclusively on methodologies and research practices within the social and behavioral sciences (e.g., quantitative methods; biological and psychological foundations; historical perspectives). The graduate program's learning objectives confirm this intent; as articulated in the self-study, one of its central aims is to "[a]dvocate for social policy on sexuality, sexual health, sexuality education, and human rights," goals that are "shaped by social justice and diversity." As with the undergraduate minors, these are laudable, important goals. But they exist as seemingly independent from the

crucial work in Sexuality Studies performed by other disciplines, particularly those with humanistic foci. In sum, there are significant lacunae in the curriculum with respect to each of the undergraduate minors and the graduate program. We urge the program to devote serious thought to its emphasis on the social and behavioral sciences, especially in light of the program's own stated commitments to multidisciplinary study. We believe such reassessment to be central to the success of the program's students, particularly those that choose to extend their studies into post-baccalaureate and doctoral programs wherein Sexuality Studies, as an area of intellectual inquiry, is understood to be widely interdisciplinary.

We wish to make very clear, however, that this is a responsibility not just of the program in Sexuality Studies but of the University itself. It is quite evident that the resources of the program as it currently stands simply cannot stretch in all of the directions that a program such as Sexuality Studies requires. With the departure of faculty such as Professor Bost, who shored up some of these disciplinary needs, the current faculty is comprised exclusively of experts in the social and behavioral sciences. It thus stands to reason that the program would bend toward these intellectual fields; the faculty cannot (and should not) be expected to cover multiple disciplines and their related perspectives. Still, we are concerned that interdisciplinary coverage, at present, tends to rely almost exclusively on the good will of other campus units. To ensure such commitments to Sexuality Studies by virtue of interpersonal relations, rather than institutional organization, is an untenable situation for any individual faculty member (or group of faculty members); indeed, it is a recipe for burnout, resentment, and flagging morale. To that end, we offer suggestions to address this singular challenge in other sections of this report.

2.4 Faculty

Currently, the faculty who teach in the program's core offerings, particularly the MA, are social scientists and thus they do not have the capacity to train students in the humanities (in fields such as film, performance, cultural studies, and literature). Due in part to the program's move to the Department of Sociology, all but one of the faculty members are sociologists by training, with one faculty member trained as a psychologist. Nearly all of the faculty members in the Department of Sociology teach in the Sexuality Studies program in some capacity. And while areas of faculty expertise and research are diverse and varied, all but one member has a PhD in sociology. Faculty members' research and teaching areas include gender and sexual identities and formations; gay and lesbian identities; family and kinship formations; youth activism and social movements; music cultures and community formations, like Hip Hop; the history of drag in SF; LGBT housing instability and homelessness; the intersections of HIV, substance abuse disorder, and sex work; queer theory; and queer of color critique. Notably, the faculty in this program have particularly well-known strengths in sexual health and HIV/AIDS prevention studies, for which some have secured large-scale federal funding. Although this range of expertise and topics of study is wide, the primary approach and lens through which sexuality studies is undertaken in the program is through the social sciences, even though the program purports to be multidisciplinary.

The Sexuality Studies program in the Department of Sociology is a rather odd pairing and may not be ideal. It was made clear to us that this was, in part, at least, a forced marriage, forged in order to save the Sexuality Studies program. The program had to be subsumed under a department that had strong interests and expertise in sexuality studies. At the same time, however, this forced marriage has caused tension among sexuality scholars in other

departments, as well as interpersonal, programmatic, and structural obstacles to working across units around a shared interest in sexuality studies. To be sure, even though this was a marriage forced by a previous administration, we found this not to be an administrative problem exclusively; the program faculty and the larger Sociology Department share some responsibility for this situation due to programmatic and hiring decisions it has made and to apparent preferences for social science faculty within the program itself.

Notably, the program's current make-up lacks the racial/ethnic diversity and field and methodological interdisciplinarity that is commensurate with the current status of the field in the U.S. Indeed, the larger field of Sexuality Studies, often housed in Women and Gender Studies departments, is fundamentally more diverse in terms of race/ethnicity, genders and sexualities, as well as scholarly foci. What may be an unintended consequence of the program's current make-up is that it cannot support many scholars entering and advancing sexuality studies and related fields (including several scholars on the SFSU campus) who are trained in interdisciplinary studies and the humanities. For example, according to some faculty, Professor Bost, a queer scholar of color, left the program because the department failed to provide the adequate and appropriate support for him as an interdisciplinary scholar. Bost's research and teaching foci are deeply rooted in interdisciplinary sexuality studies, engaging feminist and queer of color critical approaches to gender and sexuality, sexual health, HIV/AIDS, and Black cultural production. That the program and department were unable to create the adequate disciplinary conditions and support for Bost to remain at SFSU is telling, especially given the purported aims of the program. Another example brought to our attention was that of a very prestigious scholar of color, specializing in film and sexuality studies, who was recently recruited to SFSU and who reportedly requested to be located in

Sexuality Studies. The faculty did not want this person to join the program because they are not a social scientist.

In this light, we note that the Sexuality Studies program is currently conducting a search in Transgender Studies/LGBT Studies, and the department is explicitly looking for someone trained and engaged in research and teaching in Transgender Studies from a, mostly, social science perspective. The advertised position notes that the department is also interested in someone trained in interdisciplinary fields such as Women and Gender Studies and Public Health. From our conversations with faculty, most expected that this person would be a social scientist working in Transgender Studies and focusing on social movements, identity formations, and social science methods, primarily to ensure that the person can contribute to the Sociology curriculum. In essence, the faculty seems unable to conceive of a non-social scientist, primarily someone who is not a sociologist, who might be hired for this position despite evidencing strengths in Transgender Studies. This demonstrates a social scientist/sociologist default logic for this program that belies both the program's stated interdisciplinary past and its multidisciplinary present.

The SFSU campus has numerous prominent scholars in sexuality studies on the faculty in other departments and colleges. However, the Sexuality Studies program appears to be siloed within the Department of Sociology, and thus the faculty have been unable to effectively forge intellectual, scholarly, and pedagogical connections with these scholars across the campus. Such faculty need to be brought back into the fold of the program, not only to teach courses and train students but also to provide guidance on its direction. This is crucial for the program to realize its interdisciplinary programmatic goals.

Finally, The Center for Research and Education on Gender and Sexuality (CREGS) is a robust research home for faculty working in sexuality studies and the social sciences. Although the center is founded and directed by Professor Hoff, a psychologist who researches sexual health, the Center operates as an outward-facing research arm of the program. It is funded through Professor Hoff's extensive NIH funding but is not supported by SFSU. As with the Sexuality Studies program, CREGS engages and promotes sexuality studies through social scientific approaches and lenses, and as with Sexuality Studies, it thus falls short of reflecting the breadth and scope of sexuality studies in the larger field, of drawing from the plethora of faculty at SFSU, and of recognizing the rich interdisciplinary community resources throughout San Francisco and the larger Bay Area. Nevertheless, CREGS offers unique strength to both the program and the university, one that provides research and training support for faculty and students and engages the larger San Francisco community. Given its prominence and prestige, it is inconceivable that the program should receive no funding from the university. As we will suggest in more detail below, the university should provide financial support to CREGS.

2.5 Resources

When the Sexuality Studies Program was subsumed within the Department of Sociology in 2012, the program moved from the downtown campus to the main SFSU campus (in the Health and Social Sciences Building) at the direction of former President Corrigan, who requested that all SFSU programs be located at the main campus. According to the faculty, this move negatively impacted the program—primarily the MA program—because its graduate students were enrolled in courses downtown. Even though this move occurred nearly a decade ago, its repercussions continue to be felt. According to the faculty (and confirmed by our observations during the visit), the Sexuality Studies program lacks the needed faculty, space, and resources to effectively meet its stated goals.

Although most of the department faculty teach in the program, only two full-time faculty have primary appointments in Sexuality Studies. It appears that this trend will continue with future hires. Currently, the program is conducting a search for a scholar of Transgender Studies, but the expressed preference is for a faculty member who can teach both in the Sexuality Studies program and in the Department of Sociology. As we suggest in other sections of this report, the program needs an expanded faculty to cover several content areas that are currently lacking within the program. Such faculty could reinvigorate Sexuality Studies by coinciding with the recruitment of faculty in other units via formalized affiliations. Furthermore, as we suggest below, the program needs a senior scholar to serve as director, head, or chair of the program. Whether the program remains within the Department of Sociology or not, it deserves a distinguished scholar to lead it.

In terms of other resource issues: the program has woefully inadequate office space for faculty and students. The Sexuality Studies program and the Department of Sociology share a main office, faculty offices, and one student resource room. All of the faculty share offices, except for the chair (which is a rotating position). The program faculty have effectively outlined why they need more space within the self-study. Sharing offices hinders class preparation for courses, negatively impacts office hours, and above all, makes it nearly impossible to conduct qualitative research. Most concerning, shared offices for T/TT faculty makes it difficult for faculty to advance their research agendas and professional development—a key requirement for tenure and promotion. CREGS has been critical in providing some support for faculty research in the form of space for interviewing research participants. However, as we note above, the university does not provide any funding for CREGS itself.

Finally, the program lacks adequate financial resources, a situation that undermines its ability to recruit and retain faculty and thus provide the best academic experiences for students. The university provides limited to no financial support for programming or faculty development (or, again, for CREGS). The program receives \$2000 to perform a range of activities (including programming and hosting various events for students), but there does not seem to be adequate development funds for faculty to attend conferences and conduct research—necessary resources in order to maintain a scholarly agenda. The current faculty are quite productive, but additional university support for faculty development could enhance their efforts even further (e.g., course releases; credit for thesis advising; mechanisms for team-teaching).

2.6 The Program's Conclusions, Plans, and Goals

Although it is understandable that the Sexuality Studies program wants to strengthen and deepen its relationship to Sociology, such an arrangement does not directly benefit or enhance Sexuality Studies itself. Instead, this goal further instantiates a sociology of sexuality focus/concentration in the department as opposed to an interdisciplinary, autonomous program in sexuality studies; the latter is more in line with the larger field of sexuality studies as opposed to the former. Thus while many of the plans and goals listed in the self-study are valid and necessary, the issue remains as to what ends these plans and goals should be directed.

Three items of need listed in the self-study can serve as representative in this regard: new faculty recruitment; MA program enhancement (including the possibility of an online certificate); and the creation of a BA degree in Sexuality Studies. As we have stated elsewhere in this report, the program needs additional faculty to complement the search currently underway. However, what we learned from the self-study, and during our visit, is that the program has not expressed a need to build and strengthen its relationship with sexuality studies scholars who are already at SFSU. Currently, there is no formal mechanism in place through which faculty across the university might involve themselves not only in teaching and advising for the program, but also in helping to shape its direction. Ultimately, we suggest that the program deepen its outward relations (i.e., to other units at SFSU) rather than solely focusing on deepening them within Sociology.

This issue is also directly connected to potential plans for enhancing the MA program, and specifically to offering an online certificate. Before undertaking these efforts, we urge the MA

program to think carefully about its identity (and about student goals as they relate to that identity). Because many of the program's limitations are linked to its presence in the discipline of Sociology as opposed to an interdisciplinary department, improvements and enhancements need to undergird its intellectual structure. As long as the MA program in Sexuality Studies remains in the Department of Sociology, it will, in essence be an MA in sociology with a concentration in sexuality studies. We see no evidence that this would not be similarly the case for an online certificate, which would be administered and taught by faculty within the department. Although we understand that an online degree would bring to the program much-needed revenue, the structural challenges we have identified with respect to interdisciplinarity should be addressed before proceeding with the online option.

Similarly, although we support the development of a BA in sexuality studies, we anticipate comparable challenges to this proposal due to the current structure of the program.

Elsewhere in this report, we offer some recommendations to help address these issues (ones that might better enable the development of a stand-alone, interdisciplinary BA degree in Sexuality Studies).

3.0 Commendations of Strengths and Achievements

As detailed in other sections of this report, Sexuality Studies has done a fine job in articulating how its programmatic values and goals dovetail with key aspects of the larger cultural mission of SFSU. In particular, the program's dedication to broad issues of social justice and strong advocacy of sexually non-normative populations—especially as they are calibrated through its support of students—demonstrates a clear commitment to student success in diverse forms. It is obvious that the program's faculty care deeply about the students who enroll in its two minors and its graduate program.

The program also possesses incontrovertible strength in its current faculty, who offer an impressive range of socio-scientific and behavioral approaches to the study of sexuality. They are dedicated researchers, innovative thinkers, and pioneering scholars, and we are especially impressed with the ways in which faculty members embed efforts to create a more socially just world within their scholarship and pedagogy. Although we did not have the opportunity to meet each program member, we saw abundant evidence in our conversations that the faculty share an overarching resolution not only to contextualize their research within the social world but also to respond actively to cultural challenges as they arise within the social sphere itself.

The self-study also records the program's important steps toward further strengthening such commitments. It notes that one of its primary goals is to "[make] the MA program more responsive to addressing issues of race and racism" and to "increase diversity in the MA program," key components in augmenting the program's emphasis on social justice. On a logistical level, the department intends to "revise the assessment process to include a more

formal process, as part of our ongoing analysis and revision of our curriculum." In so doing, the program highlights how the correlation between assessment and curriculum helps identify evolving student need and thus sets the stage for future student success. Such self-awareness is crucial for the health and growth of any academic program, but it is perhaps particularly necessary (and welcome) within interdisciplinary fields such as Sexuality Studies.

In this vein, we commend the program's ambitions for the future. In articulating the possibility of an online certificate program and an undergraduate major, the program has begun the important work of identifying how its place on the SFSU campus might strategically evolve and grow. These efforts thus complement the thoughtful work the program has already engaged with respect to its mission and curriculum (and, in particular, how those programmatic elements intersect with its social/ethical commitments). It is our hope that the University will help the program to realize its full potential.

4.0 Recommendations and Strategies for Program Improvement

The ability of any academic unit to build on its existing strengths and to grow in new directions not only requires resources (e.g., faculty hires; increased funding) but also a careful examination of programmatic identity. What might have been operative at one point in a department's history may not be tenable in another era, and thus a close consideration of how a program such as Sexuality Studies might operate at SFSU in the current cultural and historical moment is fundamental to assessing future success. We believe that Sexuality Studies is at a crucial juncture in SFSU's institutional history (and we deliberately emphasize the connection between the University and the program itself).

We see Sexuality Studies as occupying not just an expanded role within the University but a foundational one. Given SFSU's location in one of the most socially progressive locations in the world—and given its stated commitment to issues of social justice—the Program in Sexuality Studies could function as a central component of the University's institutional identity, establishing SFSU as a leader within the CSU system and a model for universities across the nation. To realize this potential, however, the program needs strategic rethinking of its current position within the University: because SFSU has housed Sexuality Studies with the Department of Sociology, the program simply cannot fulfill the interdisciplinary mission that is characteristic of the field itself. For all of the reasons detailed within multiple sections of this report, the program has, by necessity, become almost exclusively focused on the social and behavioral sciences. In order for Sexuality Studies to align its position in relation to the larger discipline of which it is a part, we offer two specific recommendations:

1) SFSU should consider unhooking Sexuality Studies from Sociology in order to create a truly interdisciplinary program. This does not mean that such a revamped commitment would necessarily require that the program be removed from the College of Health and Human Services, only that it be given an identity independent of a specific department. If the program were permitted to exist as a "hub" for various approaches to the study of sexuality, it could then draw from multiple units across campus, consolidating the University's resources within a program that could then function as a significant component of SFSU's institutional identity. (We envision the CREGS initiative as instrumental in this regard, serving as one established branch of a multi-pronged approach to research within Sexuality Studies.) Such a revision would not cannibalize FTEs from participating departments, nor would it necessarily require multiple new hires specific to Sexuality Studies. What it would need, though, is an established Director for the program (who could be affiliated with any academic department on campus). If SFSU were to explore this possibility, we recommend that such a faculty hire be made from outside the University.

2) If Sexuality Studies is to remain housed with Sociology, we recommend that the Department itself revamp its curriculum in order to more fully integrate these institutional identities and thus reflect the interdisciplinary character that Sexuality Studies, as a field, represents. Doing so would require serious reflection on how Sociology understands itself as a specific site within the social sciences at SFSU (and in relation to its own disciplinary perspectives). While we understand that such reflection and re-visioning requires a significant amount of programmatic work, it is clear that such inclinations already exist among the faculty in the department. In truth, we found it somewhat odd that there exist separate departmental websites exist for both Sociology and Sexuality Studies, and that

separate program reviews have occurred for each unit. This split identity (and the institutional efforts to maintain it as such) chafes against the public face the department presents as a joint enterprise. This is not an irremediable dilemma, however: either the department can work to join the programs as a coherent, cohesive unit (with a concomitant commitment to become truly interdisciplinary, with targeted hiring in cultural studies), or it can rebrand itself, more properly, as a program that offers a minor and graduate degree in Human Sexuality (i.e., not Sexuality Studies). It is less clear, however, how LGBT Studies can continue as an academic minor within the department's existing curricular paradigm; like Sexuality Studies, LGBT Studies is a wholly inter- and multidisciplinary intellectual endeavor—not one that is exclusively based within the social and behavioral sciences. If Sexuality Studies is to remain with Sociology, the minor in LGBT Studies should be either relocated to a different academic unit or rethought entirely.

As we hope this report makes clear, there is tremendous potential for the program in Sexuality Studies to assume a more central, path-breaking role on the SFSU campus. To realize those possibilities, however, will require sustained deliberation at all levels of the University: within the unit, within the College, and within the administrative offices charged with the strategic vision of the campus itself.