2016-2017
Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our **website**
or **contact us** for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down. If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

BA Sociology

OR

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.
Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) **did you assess?** [**Check all that apply**]

- [ ] 1. **Critical Thinking**
- [ ] 2. **Information Literacy**
- [ ] 3. **Written Communication**
- [ ] 4. **Oral Communication**
- [ ] 5. Quantitative Literacy
- [ ] 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- [ ] 7. Creative Thinking
- [ ] 8. Reading
- [ ] 9. Team Work
- [ ] 10. Problem Solving
- [ ] 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- [ ] 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- [ ] 13. Ethical Reasoning
- [ ] 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- [ ] 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- [x] 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- [ ] 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- [ ] 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- [ ] 19. **Professionalism**
- [ ] 20. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a.
b.
c.

Q1.2.
Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs/GLGs**:

The program learning outcome assessed for 2016-17 was the same as the previous year, "Integrative learning." The goal states: "The sociology major at CSU Sacramento will be expected to analyze a social experience or solve a social problem through a sociological lens." The specific outcome assessed was that Students will be able to "Design a research study to analyze a social experience or problem, using evidence and quantiative and qualitative research methods from sociology."

Q1.2.1.
Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

○ 1. Yes, for all PLOs

◉ 2. Yes, but for some PLOs

○ 3. No rubrics for PLOs

○ 4. N/A

○ 5. Other, specify: [ ]

Q1.3.
Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q1.4.
Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1.
If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q1.5.
Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* ("DQP", see http://degreeprofile.org) to develop your PLO(s)?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No, but I know what the DQP is

○ 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is

○ 4. Don't know

Q1.6.
Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.

Select **OR** type in **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Integrative and Applied Learning

If your PLO is **not listed, please enter it here**:

Q2.1.1.

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

This PLO was also assessed last year. This year we tried to use a more efficient method of assessment by accessing existing data that had been collected and assessed by a team of faculty members (and 2 graduate students) for an on-going evaluation of the required Research Methods course (SOC 102). One item from the post-test assessment for the project was used for our assessment. It is this item we will be referring to throughout the assessment. This was a pilot effort, and was focused on trying to find a sustainable, and more feasible, way to conduct our program assessment. We determined this was not successful, but as we are completing our Program Self Study next year, we are currently developing a new approach to program assessment that we hope will be sustainable and dedicated to the purpose of program assessment.

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

- ◉ 1. Yes
- ○ 2. No
- ○ 3. Don't know
- ○ 4. N/A

Q2.3.

Please **provide the rubric(s)** and **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

The standard of performance was the same one used last year, and was based on feedback from the 2014-15 assessment report. The goal is for 80% of the sample students to <u>be rated at a score of 1.5 or higher</u> on a 0 to 3 scale (this is the scale used for the project that provided our data this year). This is converted from 2.5 on a 1-4 scale. In reality, there was a much more finely-measured scale, as quarter points were possible, therefore, the scale had a total of 13 possible scores (0, .25, .5, .75, 1, etc. up to 3) and 1.5 is the mid-point. Using the mid-point is consistent with the standard previously determined by department faculty and was stated in our most recent department assessment plan.

The Rubric used was the following:

0=nothing is right/completely wrong

1=There are a few things that can be right (for instance, the students remember some things that are important in designing a study).

2= Almost there, but not complete (for instance, the students understands and applies the steps of research processes and have explained important concepts in the process, but either the sequence was mixed up somehow or the concept was not explained correctly or not explained fully).

3= Every important steps of the research is explained in correct sequence, and important concepts are explained in each of the step.

A norming process was used and negotiation among raters determined the scores of 1.25, 1.5, etc.

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the **PLO**, the **standard** of performance, and the **rubric** that was used to measure the PLO:
☑	☐	☐	1. In **SOME** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
☐	☐	☐	2. In **ALL** course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
☑	☐	☐	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
☐	☐	☐	4. In the university catalogue
☑	☐	☐	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
☑	☑	☑	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
☑	☐	☐	7. In 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. Other, specify:

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1.
Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

◉ 1. Yes

◯ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)

◯ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)

○ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.
How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

| 1 |

Q3.2.
Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)

○ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2.1.
Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

> This year we tried to use a more efficient method of assessment by accessing existing data that had been collected and assessed by a team of faculty members (and 2 graduate students) for an on-going evaluation of the required Research Methods course (SOC 102). This course is typically taken by graduating seniors, so is an appropriate course in which to contact students as they complete the program. One item from the post-test assessment for the project was used for our assessment. The post-test was given to two sections of the class (n=52), near the end of the semester.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.
Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1.
Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used?
[**Check all that apply**]

☐ 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences

☐ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program

☐ 3. Key assignments from elective classes

☑ 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques

☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects

☐ 6. E-Portfolios

☐ 7. Other Portfolios

☐ 8. Other, specify: [   ]

Q3.3.2.
Please **provide** the direct measure (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, THEN **explain** how it assesses the PLO:

The item used to assess the PLO was a short answer essay item, contained within a longer comprehensive assessment. The item stated: "A group of researchers are interested in the benefits of faculty-student mentoring relationships. Describe how you would study this topic. Be as specific as possible at each stage of research methods (from a research question to data analysis)."

Students described the stages of the research process, including the type of data analysis to use. This item was a rough proxy, but we felt it measured the initial part of the PLO - "Design a research study to analyze a social experience or problem" - and then addressed what type of data analysis students would use. Students did not actually "use evidence and quantitative and qualitative research methods," so it was not a good fit for that portion of the PLO.

📎 **No file attached**   📎 **No file attached**

Q3.4.
What tool was used to evaluate the data?

○ 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

○ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

◉ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)

○ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.
If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

☐ 4. Other, specify: _____ (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.
Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

○ 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

○ 4. N/A

Q3.4.4.
Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

○ 4. N/A

Q3.5.
How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

> five

Q3.5.1.
How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

> Five

Q3.5.2.
If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

○ 4. N/A

Q3.6.
How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

> The two sections worth of students from SOC 102 were being assessed for an on-going research project comparing a redesigned version of the SOC 102 course to a traditional lecture course. The difference in teaching styles was not relevant to the assessment of the PLO, since it was not the course material that was of interest, but rather the students' overall mastery of the PLO after their time in the program.

Q3.6.1.
How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

> These were the data available from the project, and 52 students was more than we have previously assessed. While the method we used did not turn out to be particularly effective, and we will be working on a different method for our next assessment plan, the number of students was adequate

Q3.6.2.
How many students were in the class or program?

> 60 total in the 2 sections.

Q3.6.3.

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

52 samples of studnet work.
There were 8 students with
missing data.

Q3.6.4.
Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7.
Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)

○ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

Q3.7.1.
Which of the following indirect measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

☐ 1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)

☐ 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)

☐ 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups

☐ 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews

☐ 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews

☐ 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews

☐ 7. Other, specify:

Q3.7.1.1.
Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q3.7.2.
If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

[ ]

Q3.7.3.
If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

[ ]

Q3.7.4.
If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

[ ]

Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.
Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

○ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.
Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams

☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)

☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)

☐ 4. Other, specify: [ ]

Q3.8.2.
Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.
If other measures were used, please specify:

[blank box]

| 📎 No file attached | 📎 No file attached |

(Remember: Save your progress)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.

Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1**:

As shown in Table 1 (attached) **61.5% of the 52 students evaluated earned a score of 1.5 or higher**. While this was a pilot effort with the goal of finding a feasible and sustainable program assessment protocol and we do not plan to use the same approach in the future, our conclusion from this year was that our PLO student performance goals were partially met. *The goal had been for 80% of students to earn a score of 1.5 or higher, and the actual percentage fell short of this goal.*

| 📎 Table 1_Percentages for scores on assessed item_sociology.docx 15.36 KB | 📎 No file attached |

Q4.2.

Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

The program standard was only partially met. We did not feel this particular approach to measurement was successful, so we will be working to improve our assessment approach and when we are satisfied that we are measuring student performance as best we can, then we will develop a plan to improve in any areas that fall short.

| 📎 No file attached | 📎 No file attached |

Q4.3.

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

○ 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard

○ 2. **Met** expectation/standard

○ 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard

○ 4. Did not meet expectation/standard

○ 5. No expectation/standard has been specified

○ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.
Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q4.5.
Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

○ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1.
As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate *making any changes* for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)

○ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

Q5.1.1.
Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes.

The first program change we plan to make is related to faculty communication. We have several new tenure-track faculty, but even more new adjunct faculty, many of whom are teaching upper-division courses, including required core courses. The department does not have adequate channels for communicating among faculty and feel that the assessment process each year, and especially this year, has highlighted this issue. We need to develop a plan for adequate communication among faculty (for example, for communicating PLOs, as well as MANY other key elements of the curriculum and courses), and then we can move on to student learning.

Q5.1.2.
Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

◉ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

○ 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

Since your last assessment report, **how have the assessment data from then been used** so far?	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	○	◉	○	○	○
2. Modifying curriculum	○	○	○	◉	○
3. Improving advising and mentoring	○	○	◉	○	○
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	○	○	○	◉	○
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	○	○	◉	○	○
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	◉	○	○	○	○
7. Annual assessment reports	◉	○	○	○	○
8. Program review	◉	○	○	○	○
9. Prospective student and family information	○	○	○	○	◉
10. Alumni communication	○	○	○	○	◉
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	○	○	○	○	◉
12. Program accreditation	○	○	○	○	◉
13. External accountability reporting requirement	○	○	○	○	◉
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	○	○	○	○	◉
15. Strategic planning	○	○	○	○	◉
16. Institutional benchmarking	○	○	○	○	◉
17. Academic policy development or modifications	○	○	◉	○	○
18. Institutional improvement	○	○	◉	○	○
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	○	○	○	◉	○
20. New faculty hiring	○	○	◉	○	○
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	○	◉	○	○	○
22. Recruitment of new students	○	○	○	◉	○

23. Other, specify: Assessment is being used as an opportunity to highlight areas where faculty communication is p…

Q5.2.1.
Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

We are currently working on preparing a plan for our self study for next year, and we are using the assessment data and feedback from the assessment office in developing this plan.

Q5.3.
To what extent did you apply **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	○	○	○	○	◉
2. Standards of Performance	○	○	○	○	◉

3. Measures	○	◉	○	○	○
4. Rubrics	○	◉	○	○	○
5. Alignment	○	◉	○	○	○
6. Data Collection	○	○	○	○	◉
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	○	○	○	○	◉
8. Use of Assessment Data	○	○	○	○	◉
9. Other, please specify:	○	○	○	○	○

Q5.3.1.
Please share with us an example of how you applied **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:

Last year, we received feedback that the two assignments we used from SOC 102 sections were very different, and the prompts provided to students by the professors were quite different. This issue makes using the culminating project for the SOC 102 course as our evaluation data difficult, because the department does not typically dictate how individual instructors teach their courses, beyond providing the course learning outcomes and department level PLOs. It would be difficult to find more than one section worth of students who are doing assignments similar enough to use in the way we have in the past (unless one professor were teaching two sections, which is rare in SOC 102 because of the high WTUs). We used this feedback to move forward with finding a way of assessing the PLOs in a way that was (a) more universal across the department, rather than in 1 course, and (b) could continue to be used from year to year. While this pilot idea of using existing data from an on-going project was not successful in our estimation, the goal of a more universal assessment protocol will be integrated into our upcoming Program Self Study. We will be using a pre-test and post-test design - with the pre-test administered to all in-coming students in summer orientations and the post-test administered at end of semester in SOC 102 (typically last semester of students' program). Pre- and post-test performance will be matched.

(Remember: Save your progress)

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6.
Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspect of their program *that are not related to the PLOs* (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on program *elements*, please briefly report your results here:

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q7.
What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**Check all that apply**]

☐ 1. **Critical Thinking**

☐ 2. **Information Literacy**

☐ 3. **Written Communication**

☐ 4. **Oral Communication**

☑ 5. Quantitative Literacy

☐ 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**

☐ 7. Creative Thinking

☐ 8. Reading

☐ 9. Team Work

☐ 10. Problem Solving

☐ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement

☐ 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**

☐ 13. Ethical Reasoning

☐ 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning

☐ 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**

☐ 16. Integrative and Applied Learning

☐ 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge

☐ 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**

☐ 19. **Professionalism**

☐ 20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

a. [   ]

b. [   ]

c. [   ]

Q8. Please attach any additional files here:

📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached   📎 No file attached

Q8.1.
Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

The Program assessment plan (from 2011-12) is attached. We are creating a new plan to go with our upcoming self-study.

Table 1: Percentages of scores on assessed item

Note: The department did develop a curriculum map, but I am not sure where it is. It used to be posted on our website. As part of the up-coming self study, we will definitely track down the current map, or develop a new one, and post it on-line.

Program Information (**Required**)

Program:

[   ]

(If you typed your program name at the beginning, please skip to Q10)

Q9.
Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name appears above]

BA Sociology

Q10.
Report Author(s):

Ellen Berg

Q10.1.
Department Chair/Program Director:

Bohsiu Wu

Q10.2.
Assessment Coordinator:

Ellen Berg

Q11.
Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Sociology

Q12.
College:

College of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies

Q13.
Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

753

Q14.
Program Type:

- ⦿ 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major

- ◯ 2. Credential

- ◯ 3. Master's Degree

- ◯ 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)

- ◯ 5. Other, specify:

Q15. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

Q15.1. List all the names:

BA Sociology

Q15.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

0

Q16. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

Q16.1. List all the names:

MA Sociology

Q16.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

0

Q17. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q17.1. List all the names:

Q18. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

Q18.1. List all the names:

When was your **assessment plan**...	1. Before 2011-12	2. 2012-13	3. 2013-14	4. 2014-15	5. 2015-16	6. 2016-17	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
Q19. developed?	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Q19.1. last updated?	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q19.2. (REQUIRED)
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:

ASSESSMENT PLAN 2011-12.pdf
49.44 KB

Q20.
Has your program developed a **curriculum map?**

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

◉ 3. Don't know

Q20.1.
Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:

No file attached

Q21.
Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

○ 1. Yes

○ 2. No

◉ 3. Don't know

Q22.
Does your program have a capstone class?

◯ 1. Yes, indicate: [_____]

◉ 2. No

◯ 3. Don't know

Q22.1.
Does your program have **any** capstone project?

◯ 1. Yes

◉ 2. No

◯ 3. Don't know

(**Remember**: Save your progress)

ver. 5.15/17

Department of Sociology

ASSESSMENT PLAN – from 2011-12 Program Self Study document

1. Evaluate assessment program; develop department assessment plan for the next 5 years

   Based on discussions, we have established a plan for assessment in the coming years. Before being implemented, however, we intend to use the assessment this year as a pilot study to determine the utility and appropriateness of the plan, since the direct assessment that is being conducted this year may be used for two other learning goals in future years.

   The plan is to assess one learning goal each year:
   2011-2012: Learning Goal 3: Writing
   2012-2013: Learning Goal 1: Competency in the Discipline
   2013-2014: Learning Goal 2: Critical Thinking
   2014-2015: Learning Goal 4: Intercultural Knowledge and Competence
   2015-2016: Learning Goal 5: Integrative Learning

   For direct assessment of student work, we decided to do the following:

   This year we are completing the writing assessment (described below), establishing a baseline for our writing. We want our students to average a score of 2.5 or higher as a benchmark on the writing rubric. In fact, we felt that the 2.5 or higher, which is a commonly used benchmark, would be applicable for our evaluation of students on the other learning goals.

   For both learning goal 2: *Critical thinking* and learning goal 4: *Develop intercultural knowledge and competence about cultures*, we decided to use the same plan, possibly article, and likely a version of the prompt that is being used for writing. We chose to do this in lieu of using already established assignments as we wanted to insure that the assessment tool would directly evaluate the goal and indicators we desired to assess. Assignments can often measure several ideas or goals, which can take away from being able to assess student learning in a specific goal. Regardless, prior to implementing this assessment in future years, we will evaluate the assessment this year to determine usefulness and efficiency of this assessment procedure. To assess the level of students, we will use the VALUE rubrics for critical thinking and intercultural knowledge and competency (2.5 benchmark as identified above). Prior to using them, however, we will evaluate each rubric with the intent of modifying them to better meet the assessment goals of our program.

   For learning goal 1: *Competency in the Discipline*, we are going to utilize ETS Major Fields Tests that our graduating seniors complete. The questions will be reviewed by all faculty in the department as they identify important information and ideas students who graduate from our program should know. We established a benchmark of 70% passing for our students (both overall and within each area). We will continue to develop a more concrete plan to increase response rates by our students.

For learning goal 5: *Integrative learning* we will draw a random sample of 30 papers from all of the sections of our research methods course (Soc 102) over the course of the year (half from fall, half from Spring), which requires students to conduct a research project on their own, drawing on theory, methods of inquiry, data gathering, analysis, etc. to complete the project. We will, as with the others, evaluate and potentially modify both the Integrative Learning and Inquiry and Analysis VALUE rubrics, with a benchmark of 2.5.

For indirect assessment, we intend to continue to utilize the graduating senior survey that is administered each semester to all graduating seniors. It will continue to be administered online. We have adjusted the survey to better measure the newly designed department learning goals.

We recently established a department undergraduate Sacct 9.1 course that allows us, among other activities, to contact and submit surveys to graduating seniors directly. We will also remind students in classes to complete the survey, including giving time in Soc 102 to complete the surveys. We feel this will increase response rate. We will evaluate the new process each year.

We will continue to use the entrance survey for all new majors to note changes in experiences for students, as well as to understand why our students become Sociology majors, since the majority change from other majors. We recently asked for students to create an ID that only they will know but will allow us to match entrance and exit surveys to note changes while in our program. We also altered the entrance survey to match both the newly designed Department Learning Goals and the Exit Survey.

Finally, we are considering using focus groups of randomly selected graduating seniors to get a better sense of key issues that are of concern to the department. Likely two members of the assessment committee will meet with 8-10 students to discuss their experiences as Sociology majors. There is presently a plan to conduct two focus groups, but this can be altered, depending upon the issues faculty are interested in discussing with students. We will conduct this at the end of this year to assess the appropriateness of it as an assessment tool.

All of the findings and review of the assessment tools will be introduced at the faculty retreat to be discussed for further implementation or possible changes. Findings will be reviewed to determine response by the department.

Table 1: Percentages of students with each possible score on item assessing Integrative Learning PLO (n=52).

		Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	1	1.9	1.9
	.25	2	3.8	5.8
	.50	4	7.7	13.5
	.75	7	13.5	26.9
	1.00	2	3.8	30.8
	1.25	4	7.7	38.5
	1.50	7	13.5	51.9
	1.75	5	9.6	61.5
	2.00	5	9.6	71.2
	2.25	6	11.5	82.7
	2.50	5	9.6	92.3
	2.75	3	5.8	98.1
	3.00	1	1.9	100.0
	Total	52	100.0	