

2014-2015 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: [Sociology_____]

B2. Report author(s): [Ellen Berg, Jackie Carrigan, and Bohsiu Wu_____]

B3. Fall 2014 enrollment: [865_____]

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Credential
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Master's degree
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2014-2015 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2014-2015?** [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
x	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
x	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
X	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

* One of the WASC’s new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

Sociology undergraduate program has developed four program-learning outcomes. The Sociology Department learning outcomes are explicitly aligned with the university learning goals. To note, we connect both Sacramento State Learning Goals I and II with our first learning objective because competency in the discipline of sociology directly contributes to the overall learning goal of knowledge of human cultures (See Appendix I). For the 2014-15 Academic Year, we have assessed “integrative learning” by examining students’ completed work in Sociology 102 (Research Methods). The specific learning outcome assessed was that students are able to “Design a research study to analyze a social experience or problem, using evidence and quantitative and qualitative research methods from sociology.” This taps into quantitative literacy as well as inquiry and analysis.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don’t know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)** to develop your PLO(s)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed **in 2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2014-15.
X	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2014-15.
	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2014-2015 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]**

We expected students who completed Sociology 102 (Research Methods in Sociology) will exhibit the ability to frame a research question, compare and contrast relevant literature, formulate research hypotheses, gather relevant data, analyze data, apply accurate statistics in data analysis, interpret research findings, and formulate conclusions. The level of performance expected was that each student's paper would meet a 2.5 or higher on the 4-point rubric scale on at least 4 items out of 9.

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2014-2015?** (PLOs are published, but not the specific rubric we used – can be published in future)

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

x	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
x	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university’s strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university’s budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for 2014-2015?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don’t know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for 2014-2015?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don’t know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2014-2015? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

We randomly gathered 10 student research papers from a section of Sociology 102 taught in Spring 2015 (a total of four sections were taught). Students in this class have to develop a thorough research project involving statement of the research question, review of the past literature, framing of research hypotheses, development of research methodology, data gathering, data analysis, interpretation of results, and discussions. Two expert evaluators were deployed to conduct the assessment with a 4-point scale formulated according to the rubric included as appendix in this report. Average scores from both evaluators are used to assess students' achievements and proficiency levels in seven different areas specified in the rubric. The results show that most of the sampled student papers are able to meet the 2.5 threshold (see Appendix III).

As in any class, there are always strong and weak students. The ten papers chosen reflect different degree of ability and commitment students have in Soc 102. The score sheet included in Appendix III shows that in most part, students are able to meet the expectations from the instructor in Soc 102. A couple of them are weak in various areas. For example, the students who submitted paper # 2 and #4 did not do as well compared others in reviewing previous literature, adopting an appropriate research method, and drawing and discussing conclusions. The results of the assessment demonstrate the need to emphasize the importance of directing students toward a correct path of completing a semester-long research right from the beginning instead of letting students continue to err throughout the semester. In other words, an earlier intervention is preferred to a later one.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [Integrative and Applied Learning (2014-15)]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2014-2015.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: []

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2014-2015 academic year? [1]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2014-15, YOU CAN

SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2014-2015.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
x	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
x	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
x	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
X	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The key assignment used was an empirical study. Students used variables from the General Social Survey (GSS) as the basis for developing a research question of their choosing. The project was developed in stages throughout the course, resulting in a full length (approx. 10-15 page) empirical research paper. Students submitted their research papers in stages, so that the instructor could have the chance to review and make suggestions. Students were required to submit rewrites before they could move on to the next stage of their projects.

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
x	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
X	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

We randomly selected 10 papers from a section of Soc 102.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No

	3. Don't know
--	---------------

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate? *Other Measures*

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

A rubric developed by the department (see Appendix II) has been used to assess 10 student papers randomly selected from a section of Sociology 102, which is a core class for the major. Two faculty members, Ellen Berg and Jackie Carrigan, independently read all ten papers and assigned scores on student papers in nine different areas. Scores were averaged between the two evaluators in all nine assessed areas (see Appendix III). The assignment is similar in all sections of the course, however, reliability would have been higher had papers been randomly selected from all sections of the course rather than one.

Both evaluators are seasoned instructors in teaching Sociology 102 and their expert opinions in assessing students' levels of proficiency are reliable and accurate.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [__1__]

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2014-2015** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			x		
2. Modifying curriculum			x		
3. Improving advising and mentoring			x		
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals			x		
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations			x		
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	x				
7. Annual assessment reports			x		
8. Program review			x		
9. Prospective student and family information				x	
10. Alumni communication				x	
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)				x	
12. Program accreditation				x	
13. External accountability reporting requirement				x	
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations				x	
15. Strategic planning			x		
16. Institutional benchmarking					x
17. Academic policy development or modification				x	
18. Institutional Improvement				x	
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					x
20. New faculty hiring	x				
21. Professional development for faculty and staff		x			
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

Two specific examples of how the assessment data above has been used to “1. Improve specific courses” are (1) one section of SOC 101 (Intro to Statistics, the prerequisite for Soc 102) in the Fall semester is being offered as a pilot with a hybrid format. The faculty member teaching the hybrid course is also teaching a traditional in-person course, and will be able to do a direct comparison to see if the hybrid

course has higher success rates on exams. There is interactive software for the hybrid course that allows students to repeat learning modules and go at their own pace, so ideally the results for some students (the majority perhaps, depending on individual characteristics such as learning styles) may be better with this approach and the availability of a fairly similar comparison group with the same faculty member teaching the computer labs (in-person in both courses) and creating the assessments will allow for strong evaluation.

(2) Another faculty member, also in SOC 101, is implementing resources from the “Promising Course Redesign” project to partially flip her course. The flipped course will be offered in Spring 2016, and baseline data will be collected from the traditional course in Fall 2015, to allow for assessment of the new approach. Both approaches were developed to try out innovative way to introduce quantitative reasoning to sociology majors, which is essential to be successful in Sociology 102.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

x	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The 2013-14 assessment was focused on quantitative literacy. Results indicated that students were meeting some but not all learning outcomes at an adequate level. Changes based on these findings are highlighted above (Q 5.1.1). Moving forward, the immediate goal for the Program, based on our most recent assessments (2013-14 as well as 2014-15), is to create an assessment plan that is as cohesive as possible given our staffing limitations. Currently over half of our core courses are taught by lecturers and ensuring that the Program Learning Outcomes are communicated adequately to all faculty and implemented in a consistent manner remains a challenge. Likewise, collecting meaningful assessment data that accurately reflects the multiple sections of a particular course, for example, remains challenging. As we hire more full-time faculty (happily beginning with two searches, one in Theory and one in Methods, during the 2015-16 academic year), the department will continue to move toward a unified, student-centered, and learning outcome focused curriculum.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. b. c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

x	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

x	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

	1. Yes
x	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

	1. Yes
x	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [_____]

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

	1. Yes
x	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: [___ SSIS ___]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [_Sociology_]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [_Bohsiu Wu_]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [1]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
x	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [1]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [SOC]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [0]

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [1]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [SOC]

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [0]

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [0]

A14.1. List all the names: []

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [0]

A15.1. List the name(s): []

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
x	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____