

ANNUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

(For AY 2013-2014 through 2018-2019)

CURRENT YEAR - AY 2017-2018 (Year 5)

UNIT	COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
Department (if applicable)	SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
Degree/Program	Bachelor of Arts/Sociology
Prepared By:	
Name	Cheryl Childers
Email	cheryl.childers@washburn.edu
Ext.	2103

Annually, complete a separate report for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Reports are to be sent electronically to assessment@washburn.edu by **June 30** each year.

Use size 10 font or larger.

SECTION I

2017-2018 Academic Year
Describe your program's assessment accomplishments since your last report. <i>Cell will expand to accommodate your text.</i>
AY2017-2018 has been a transition year for us after losing three faculty members in Fall 2016 and Spring 2017. Our focus this year has been on hiring two new faculty (one sociology and one anthropologist). Consequently, we have not made as much progress as we would have hoped. We did, however, create a Major Map that we are using for advising. We will post the map on our web site and have it available in the office for any potential student. We are determined to proceed with Curriculum Review and a review of our Assessment Plan during this academic year. As mentioned in last year's report, we are very likely to go back to the very beginning in terms of reevaluating Program Learning Outcomes and restructure our program.
Discuss ways in which you have responded to the Assessment Committee comments on last year's report and what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed. <i>Cell will expand to accommodate your text.</i>
The one comment that the Assessment Committee made last year was about communicating better with external constituents. We have discussed additional mechanisms to help external constituents be more aware of our assessment results. We are hoping that we can use the redesigned web site as means to more easily communicate with them.
Have there been any changes to your Program Assessment Plan (including calendar and curriculum map) since last year's report? <i>Cell will expand to accommodate your text.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe what and why below) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

However, we have continued the “unofficial” changes on the Curriculum Map discussed in last year’s report. We will make these official when we submit a revised Assessment Plan, hopefully next spring.

2016-2017 Academic Year

Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

A mentioned in last year’s report, we had planned to finish Curriculum Review in AY2016-17 by the end of Spring 2017 and have thoroughly reviewed our curriculum map and assessment plan by now. Unfortunately, over the winter break, we lost two faculty members (one sociologist through resignation and one anthropologist through leave of absence). Needless to say, all of our plans to finish Curriculum Review had to be put on hold. In addition, at the end of the Spring 2017 semester, we lost an additional faculty member. We are now down three faculty (one-third of our full-time faculty) and will be searching to fill those position in AY2017-2018. We are all frustrated that we have not made more progress on Curriculum Review. There are things that we need to do to revise Program Assessment. In discussions over the last year or so, we have realized that we need to go back to the beginning, namely re-evaluating our Program Learning Outcomes. Even though our focus was diverted to staffing issues in Spring 2017, we did have chances to informally discuss some of the matters. We have learned over the last few years how program assessment can help us improve our program to a more structured, logical sequence of courses in which we can create, with students’ assistance, a degree that will help our graduates with whatever their future plans may be.

Discuss ways in which you have responded to the Assessment Committee comments on last year’s report and what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

Two areas were mentioned by the Assessment Committee in their evaluation of our AY2016 report, and we have discussed ways to address these. First, faculty are informing students more about the assessment process and are providing rubrics to students. We are also discussing the possibility of creating an Advisory Board, comprised of faculty and students, that will continually review the P-SLOs, the assignments used to assess both the program as well as General Education. In addition, we are discussing conducting focus groups with majors to get their input on the assessment process and keep them informed. Second, we are discussing ways to keep external stakeholders more aware of the assessment process. In Fall 2016, we created an Alumni Network. We plan to keep alumni informed about our Program Assessment process, including the P-SLOs, how we measure them, etc. Every five years or so, we also conduct an Alumni Survey with recent graduates in which we ask alumni questions about our program that we use in the evaluation process.

Have there been any changes to your Program Assessment Plan (including calendar and curriculum map) since last year’s report? *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

Yes (describe what and why below) No

We have made a couple of (unofficial) changes on the Curriculum Map, primarily in deleting or adding a specific course from one of the P-SLOs.. In last year’s report, we indicated that SO309 was not a good fit for assessing P-SLO #5 and did not include it in that assessment. This year, we are making one other change. SO305 is listed on the Curriculum Map as assessing two P-SLOS -- #3 and #4. We believe, however, that SO305 is most useful for assessing P-SLO #2. We are including it as such in this year’s report.

2015-2016 Academic Year

Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

As mentioned in last year's report, our department planned to undergo Curriculum Review of the Sociology curriculum during AY2015-2016 that could possibly change our assessment plan and curriculum map. The review (and comments from Assessment Committee on the AY2013-2014 report) has been very helpful in helping us (1) simplify our P-SLOs, (2) create course-embedded assignments for our upper-division required courses, and (3) potentially get students involved more in the assessment process. We do now have course-embedded assignments for all required courses, although we are still tweaking a few of them after evaluating their first use. Our Curriculum Review should be completed, and paperwork in the processing pipeline, in early fall, so we will have new P-SLOs and revised Curriculum map and Assessment Plan.

Discuss ways in which you have responded to the Assessment Committee comments on last year's report and what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

There were three areas on last year's report that we addressed. First, we are moving assessment away from focus on classes toward a focus on curriculum. As we developed course-embedded assignments this year, we did focus on how that assessment fit into the curriculum assessment process, and that has clarified a lot of things for us as a faculty. Second, we are informing students more now about the assessment process (and its importance) and sharing grading rubrics with them. Third, we are going to put some of the assessment findings on our departmental website so external constituents can be kept apprised.

Have there been any changes to your Program Assessment Plan (including calendar and curriculum map) since last year's report? Cell will expand to accommodate your test

Yes (describe what and why below) No

As mentioned in last year's report, we will finish Curriculum Review in early fall, that will change P-SLOs, our curriculum map, and assessment plan. We will officially file a new Assessment Plan at that time. However, in planning for this report, we have made one change that will affect this report. Right now, SO09 Deviance is listed as being used to assess P-SLO #2 and P-SLO #5. We believe that this course is not a good assessment of P-SLO #5 and are not including it in this year's report. One change we are making this year involves thresholds (and it will be part of the revised Assessment Plan we file this fall). We are changing the measure "Course Grades" threshold of "75% of majors receive grades of B or better" to 70%. We are also changing the measure "Course-Embedded Assignment" threshold of "75% of majors score Target or above" to 70%. While we would certainly like 75% of majors to reach those thresholds, we have to acknowledge that some students don't particularly care if they earn Bs or As, as long as they earn Cs and can graduate. We will evaluate these each year.

2014-2015 Academic Year

Describe your program's assessment accomplishments since your last report. *Cell will expand to accommodate your text.*

We have been able to accomplish some of things we planned to do this year, but not as many as we hoped. As mentioned at the end of last year's report, we expected to undergo a complete Curriculum Review of the Sociology curriculum that possibly would change the assessment plan, the curriculum map, etc. We also needed to create more course-embedded assignments for our required courses. We do now have course-embedded assignments for all our required courses. We did begin a Curriculum Review. However, we are a combined department, and there were some decisions that would affect both programs. Faculty spent most of AY2014-2015 discussing the important issues that needed to be resolved before faculty from each major focused on their specific program. We are creating a vision for our department and our programs, and want to make sure that we take do it correctly. One accomplishment upon which faculty have commented is that we are thinking more about program assessment now, and that will certainly be part of our Curriculum review next year.

Discuss ways in which you have responded to the Assessment Committee comments on last year's report and what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed. <i>Cell will expand to accommodate your text.</i>
The primary comment made by the committee on last year's report was that most of our PSLOs seemed to be complex and "traverse multiple levels." As part of the Curriculum Review, we have noticed that we do need to simply some of the SLOs.
Have there been any changes to your Program Assessment Plan (including calendar and curriculum map) since last year's report? Cell will expand to accommodate your test
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe what and why below) <input type="checkbox"/> No
We have not filed an official change in our Assessment Plan, primarily because we want to wait until after Curriculum Review and implement all the changes at once. However, as we began to create course-embedded assignments for our remaining required courses, two issues in the Curriculum Map emerged. SLO#4 currently contains three courses: SO305, SO315, and SO362. It became apparent that SO315 is not a good assessment of SLO#4. As we are reporting assessment of SLO#4 this year, we are not including assignments from SO315. We will address this issue next year in Curriculum Review and file a revised Assessment Plan at that time.

2013-2014 Academic Year
Describe your program's assessment accomplishments since your last report. <i>Cell will expand to accommodate your text.</i>
During AY2013-2014, our faculty began identifying and/or creating assignments to be used for program assessment in the required upper-division courses. While we are not completely finished with that task, we have made significant progress. We hope to have course-embedded assignments in all required courses by the end of AY 2014-2015. In this process, we are thinking much more about program assessment, and that will be part of our Curriculum Review process in the upcoming academic year.
When creating our Assessment Curriculum Map this spring, we raised the thresholds for course grades from "75% of majors will earn grades of C or higher" to "75% will earn grades of B or higher." We increased course-embedded assignments from "50% of majors will score 'Target' or higher" on rubrics to "75% will score 'Target' or higher." As part of our Curriculum Review next academic year, we will re-evaluate these increased thresholds.
Discuss ways in which you have responded to the Assessment Committee comments on last year's report and what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed. <i>Cell will expand to accommodate your text.</i>
The primary comment from the committee on last year's report was concerning communicating results with faculty, students, and stakeholders. Faculty are discussing the results more often, and program assessment has become a large part of how we design our courses. We also are communicating more with students and getting their feedback on our programs. We are doing this through our Exit Questionnaire that graduating seniors complete, as well as periodic alumni surveys. We value students' comments and plan to take them into consideration as we complete Curriculum Review. We might explore the possibility of including some of the accomplishments on our departmental web page for current and prospective students.
Have there been any changes to your Program Assessment Plan (including calendar and curriculum map) since last year's report?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe what and why below) <input type="checkbox"/> No

When the Assessment Committee informed us that the format of the report, the assessment calendar, and curriculum map would be changing, we took the opportunity to evaluate all aspects of our assessment plan. We had rewritten our Mission Statement and our P-SLOs the previous year, and we needed to make sure that the curriculum map reflected those changes. We also decided not to assess every P-SLO every year, as we had done in the past, and our new calendar reflects those changes.

SECTION II

Delete rows that are not needed. Copy and paste to add rows. Cells will expand to accommodate your text.

2017-2018 Academic Year			
Program Student Learning Outcomes Analyzed and Reported for Current Year	List the Assessment Measure(s) for each PSLO – if rubrics are used, a copy of each should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe the results for PSLOs analyzed (assessed) this year – a copy of summary data should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe how results are shared with faculty, students, university-wide entities, and stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.)
<p>PSLO #1. Critically analyze the role of culture and social structure in shaping the lives of members of society.</p>	<p>Direct: Course Grades – 70% of majors will earn grades of B or higher</p> <p>Course-Embedded Assignments – 70% of majors will score “Target” or higher</p>	<p>Course grades: We met the threshold in SO100, with 100% of majors earning grades of B or better. We also met the threshold in two out of the four “Institution” courses (SO314=100%, SO315=100%). We were just under the threshold in SO318=66.7%) and did not meet the threshold in SO304 (61.4%).</p> <p>Course Assignments: We met the threshold in SO100 (80%). We also meet the threshold in the two “Institution” courses (SO304=85.7%; SO314=100%) in which we collected data.</p>	See section later in the report.
	<p>Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.</p>	<p>We collected data from only one graduate (see “Data Tables” file for details).</p> <p>The student did meet the threshold for this SLO, marking “Much” on Q#12.</p>	
<p>PSLO #3. Explain the effects of race, class, gender, and other forms of diversity on life chances at the individual, institutional, and/or societal levels.</p>	<p>Direct: Course Grades – 70% of majors will earn grades of B or higher</p> <p>Course-Embedded Assignments – 70% of majors will score “Target” or higher</p>	<p>Course Grades – We met the threshold in SO100 with 100% of majors earning grades of B or better. We also met the threshold in SO310 (75%) and SO305 (100%).</p>	

		<p>Course Assignments: We met the threshold in SO310 (87.5%). We were not able to collect data from the other two courses designated for this PSLO because of higher use of adjuncts for courses as well as faculty teaching different courses because of being one faculty member short: (1) SO207 was not taught in Fall 2017 and (2) SO305 was taught by the faculty member who left at end of Spring 2018, before we could get data from him.</p>	
	<p>Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.</p>	<p>We collected data from only one graduate (see “Data Tables” file for details).</p> <p>The student did meet the threshold for this SLO, marking “Much” on Q#8 and Q#13, both relevant areas for this SLO, meeting our expectations.</p>	
<p>PSLO #5. Demonstrate analytical reasoning skills by interpreting numerical, textual, and ethnographic information.</p>	<p>Direct: Course Grades – 70% of majors will earn grades of B or higher</p> <p>Course-Embedded Assignments – 70% of majors will score “Target” or higher</p>	<p>Course grades: We met the threshold in SO100, with 100% of majors earning grades of B or better. We did not meet the threshold in SO362 (45.4%)</p> <p>Course assignments: We met the threshold in SO100, with 100% of majors scoring Target or above. We also met the threshold in SO362 (73.7%)</p>	
	<p>Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.</p>	<p>We collected data from only one graduate (see “Data Tables” file for details).</p> <p>The student did meet the threshold for this SLO, marking “Much” on Q#4 and Q#16, both relevant for this SLO, meeting our expectations.</p>	

Discuss the implications of the results reported above and how faculty members are involved in using assessment data to improve student learning.

We are pleased that, overall our majors are doing well. With one exception, even when we did not meet the threshold, we were just below it. We are concerned that less than 50% of the majors in SO362 earned grades of B. According to the instructor, the primary reason was that some students did not submit all the required assignments; most of them earned at least Bs on assignments they did submit. We are also concerned that a few things “slipped through the cracks” during the multiple chair transitions specifically not collecting data through indirect measures. Finally, we are disappointed that we were not able to collect data from all relevant courses. With a more stable department in the upcoming year, we hope to remedy that situation.

Full-time faculty meet three times a year to discuss assessment, both GenEd and Program SLOs. We discuss techniques to improve student learning and understanding of the SLOs.

This is the third year that we have course-embedded assignments in all required upper-division courses. We now have enough data to evaluate that we may need to make small revisions to some of them. We want to continue our focus on curriculum-based assessment rather than course-based assessment. We are still planning to restructure our curriculum; we should then be able to create benchmark points within the curriculum on which to assess.

Describe how students and external stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.) are made aware of PSLOs and measures.

As mentioned in the section above, full-time faculty meet three times a year to discuss assessment. At our next meeting in August, we will specifically evaluate the areas where we did not meet thresholds this year. In the process of conducting our Curriculum Review, we are changing how we are doing the Capstone experience. In those discussions, we are really beginning to hone in on assessment in a holistic manner. We are definitely shifting away from focusing on course-based assessment toward curriculum-based assessment. Yes, we use assignments in courses as part of that process, but our focus has shifted. We believe this will benefit students. In addition, we are planning to put more structure into the sequencing of courses for our curriculum and are exploring the questions of what we want students to know at different points in their academic journey. Interestingly, it has helped in how we structure the curriculum and the kinds of assignments we will use to assess.

We share the results with adjunct faculty, and they are always invited to the August meeting. In addition, we solicit their input again, usually at the end of the academic year, on any suggestions they may have about the assignments.

Our Sociology Liaison keeps faculty apprised of information from the Assessment Committee, as well as sharing information with the Assessment Committee of assessment activities in the department.

Students are more aware of assessment, now than a few years ago especially GenEd assessment. As we move forward, we plan to share more information about program assessment with students; the faculty have discussed the possibility of conducting focus groups with students to get their input into the process. We value student input into our programs and take it seriously. In fact, several issues discussed in the Curriculum Review were spurred by student comments (on exit questionnaires and/or periodic alumni surveys). In terms of outside constituents, we plan to put more of the results on our departmental website to keep people apprised of our curriculum, and the results could also be used as part of recruiting or marketing campaigns.

2016-2017 Academic Year			
Program Student Learning Outcomes Analyzed and Reported for Current Year	List the Assessment Measure(s) for each PSLO – if rubrics are used, a copy of each should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe the results for PSLOs analyzed (assessed) this year – a copy of summary data should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe how results are shared with faculty, students, university-wide entities, and stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.).
<p>PSLO #2 Identify, describe, and apply core sociological theories/perspectives to social phenomena at the micro and/or macro levels.</p>	<p>Direct: Course Grades – 70% of majors will earn grades of B or higher</p> <p>Course-Embedded Assignments – 70% of majors will score “Target” or higher</p>	<p>Course grades: We met the threshold in SO101, with 75% of majors earning grades of B or better. We also met the threshold in both Criminal Justice courses – SO305 (92.9%) and SO309 (100%) – and in SO360 (88.9%).</p> <p>Course Assignments: We met the threshold in all the courses, with 94.5% of majors in SO101 scoring “Target” or higher; 100% in SO305; 75% in SO309, and 100% in SO360.</p>	See section later in the report.
	<p>Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.</p>	<p>We met the threshold on the exit questionnaire with 100% of majors marking “Much” on Q#12.</p>	
<p>PSLO #4 Frame sociological questions of significance, outline processes by which they might be empirically answered, and evaluate the major ethical issues involved.</p>	<p>Direct: Course Grades – 70% of majors will earn grades of B or higher</p> <p>Course-Embedded Assignments – 70% of majors will score “Target” or higher</p>	<p>Course Grades: We met the threshold in SO362 (75%).</p> <p>Course Assignments: We met the threshold in SO360 (86.7%).</p>	
	<p>Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.</p>	<p>We had varied results on the exit questionnaire. We were pleased that 100% of the eight graduating students who completed the survey marked “Much” on Q#3. We were just below the threshold (62.5%) on Q#14, although 100% did mark either “Some” or “Much.”</p>	

Discuss the implications of the results reported above and how faculty members are involved in using assessment data to improve student learning.

We are pleased that, with one exception, our majors are doing well. Even when we didn't meet the threshold, we were just below it. Full-time faculty usually meet three times a year to evaluate assessment results (both GenEd and Program SLOs). We discuss techniques that we might use to improve student learning and understanding of our SLOs.

As mentioned in the section above, full-time faculty meet three times a year to discuss assessment. This is the second year that we have had course-embedded assignments in all required upper-division courses. In our evaluation of them at the end of the spring semester, it is apparent that we need to make some small revisions to some of them for next year, especially the ones we created last year. We want to continue our focus on curriculum-based assessment rather than course-based assessment. As mentioned in last year's report, we are also discussing sequencing of courses as part of Curriculum Review so we can create benchmark points within the structure of the curriculum. This will affect the way that we assess the curriculum. We really hope to have this mostly in place by next year.

Describe how students and external stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.) are made aware of PSLOs and measures.

As mentioned above, full-time faculty usually meet three times a year to evaluate assessment results. We share the results with adjunct faculty, and they are always invited to the August meeting. In addition, we solicit their input again, usually at the end of the academic year, on any suggestions they may have about the assignments.

Our Sociology Liaison keeps faculty apprised of information from the Assessment Committee, as well as sharing information with the Assessment Committee of assessment activities in the department.

Students are being informed more about the assessment process. As mentioned in the beginning of the report, we are discussing have students become more directly involved in the process, either through a Student Advisory Board in which students have input into assessment or through focus groups with students, or maybe both. We use the Alumni Survey (every five years) to get input from alumni who have insight into how we might improve the program.

Concerning outside stakeholders, (1) we plan to share results with alumni through our newly-created Alumni Network and solicit their input; (2) we include information on Program Assessment on our departmental website that is available to the public. We have also discussed the possibility of using the results as part of marketing or recruiting campaigns.

2015-2016 Academic Year

Program Student Learning Outcomes Analyzed and Reported for Current Year	List the Assessment Measure(s) for each PSLO – if rubrics are used, a copy of each should be in your department's assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe the results for PSLOs analyzed (assessed) this year – a copy of summary data should be in your department's assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe how results are shared with faculty, students, university-wide entities, and stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.)
PSLO #1. Critically analyze the role of culture and social structure in shaping the	Direct: Course Grades – 70% of majors will earn grades of B or higher	Course grades: We met the threshold in SO100, with 100% of majors earning grades of B or better. We also met the threshold in three out of the four "Institution" courses	See section later in the report.

lives of members of society.	Course-Embedded Assignments – 70% of majors will score “Target” or higher	(SO304=75%, SO314=100%, SO315=87%). We did not meet the threshold in SO318 (55.6%), the fourth “Institution” course. Course Assignments: We met the threshold in SO100 (80%). We also meet the threshold in three of the four “Institution” courses (SO304=75%, SO314=100%, and SO315=89%). We were just under the threshold in SO318 (66.6%).
	Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.	We met the threshold for this SLO, with 75% of graduating seniors marking “Much” on Q#12.
PSLO #3. Explain the effects of race, class, gender, and other forms of diversity on life chances at the individual, institutional, and/or societal levels.	Direct: Course Grades – 70% of majors will earn grades of B or higher Course-Embedded Assignments – 70% of majors will score “Target” or higher	Course Grades – We met the threshold in SO100 with 100% of majors earning grades of B or better. Of the three other courses assessed, we met the expectations in SO305 (78.5%), SO207 (66.7%), and SO310 (88%). Course Assignments: We met the threshold in SO100, with 70% of majors scoring Target or above. We also met expectations for majors in SO207 (100%) and in SO310 (88.8%).
	Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.	All four seniors who completed the exit questionnaire marked “much” on Q#8 and Q#13, both relevant areas for this SLO, meeting our expectations.
PSLO #5. Demonstrate analytical reasoning skills by interpreting numerical,	Direct: Course Grades – 70% of majors will earn grades of B or higher Course-Embedded Assignments – 70% of majors will score “Target” or higher	Course grades: We met the threshold in SO100, with 100% of majors earning grades of B or better. We also met the threshold in SO362 (84.6%)

textual, and ethnographic information.		Course assignments: We met the threshold in SO100, with 70% of majors scoring Target or above. We did not meet the threshold in SO362, with only 50% scoring Target or above.	
	Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.	The results were varied. 75% of the four seniors who completed the questionnaire marked “much” for Q#4, which met expectations. However, only 50% scored “much” on Q#16, although the other 50% did mark “some.”	

Discuss the implications of the results reported above and how faculty members are involved in using assessment data to improve student learning.

We are pleased that, with three exceptions, our majors are doing well. Even when we didn’t meet the threshold, over 50% of majors on SO318 earned grades of B or above, at least 50% of students in SO362 scored Target or above, and 50% of the seniors that completed the Exit Questionnaire scored at Target on Q#12. All of this is an improvement from last year, especially in terms of the Exit Questionnaire answers.

Full-time faculty usually meet three times a year to evaluate assessment results (both GenEd and Program SLOs). We discuss techniques that we might use to improve student learning and understanding of our SLOs.

Describe how students and external stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.) are made aware of PSLOs and measures.

As mentioned in the section above, full-time faculty meet three times a year to discuss assessment. At our next meeting in August, we will specifically evaluate the areas where we did not meet thresholds this year. This is also the first year that we have had course-embedded assignments for ALL upper-division required courses. We will evaluate those and make any needed revisions for next year. In the process of conducting our Curriculum Review, we are changing how we are doing the Capstone experience. In those discussions, we are really beginning to hone in on assessment in a holistic manner. We are definitely shifting away from focusing on course-based assessment toward curriculum-based assessment. Yes, we use assignments in courses as part of that process, but our focus has shifted. We believe this will benefit students. In addition, we are putting more structure into the sequencing of courses for our curriculum and are exploring the questions of what do we want students to know at different points in their academic journey. Interestingly, it has helped in how we structure the curriculum and the kinds of assignments we will use to assess.

We share the results with adjunct faculty, and they are always invited to the August meeting. In addition, we solicit their input again, usually at the end of the academic year, on any suggestions they may have about the assignments.

Our Sociology Liaison keeps faculty apprised of information from the Assessment Committee, as well as sharing information with the Assessment Committee of assessment activities in the department.

Students are aware of assessment, especially GenEd assessment. As we move forward, we plan to share information about program assessment with students; the faculty have discussed the possibility of conducting focus groups with students to get their input into the process. We value student input into our programs, and take it seriously. In fact, several issues discussed in the Curriculum Review were spurred by student comments (on exit questionnaires and/or periodic alumni surveys). In terms of outside constituents, we plan to put some of the results on our departmental website to keep people apprised of our curriculum, and the results could also be used as part of recruiting or marketing campaigns.

Delete rows that are not needed. Copy and paste to add rows. Cells will expand to accommodate your text.

2014-2015 Academic Year			
Program Student Learning Outcomes Analyzed and Reported for Current Year	List the Assessment Measure(s) for each PSLO – if rubrics are used, a copy of each should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe the results for PSLOs analyzed (assessed) this year – a copy of summary data should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe how results are shared with faculty, students, university-wide entities, and stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.).
PSLO #2 Identify, describe, and apply core sociological theories/perspectives to social phenomena at the micro and/or macro levels.	Direct: Course Grades – 75% of majors will earn grades of B or higher Course-Embedded Assignments – 75% of majors will score “Target” or higher	Course grades: We met the threshold in SO101, with 83.3% of majors earning grades of B or better. We did not meet the threshold in SO309 (71.4%) or SO360 (66.7%). Course Assignments: We were just below the threshold for majors in SO101, with 70% scoring “Target” or higher. However, we did meet the threshold in SO309 (100%) and SO360 (76.5%).	See section later in the report.
	Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.	We were below expectations on the area relevant for this SLO, with 50% of graduating seniors marking “Much” on Q#12. We were pleased, though, that no students marked “Little or None.”	
PSLO #4 Frame sociological questions of significance, outline processes by which they might be empirically answered, and evaluate the major ethical issues involved.	Direct: Course Grades – 75% of majors will earn grades of B or higher Course-Embedded Assignments – 75% of majors will score “Target” or higher	Course Grades: We met the threshold in both SO305 (100%) and SO362 (76.9%). Course Assignments: We met the threshold in both SO305 (100%) and SO360 (92.3%).	

	<p>Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.</p>	<p>We had varied results on the exit questionnaire. We were pleased that 100% of the eight graduating students who completed the survey marked “Much” on Q#3,. Conversely, we did not meet the threshold for Qs #14 or #15. While 50% marked “much” on Q #14, only 37.5% did so on Q #15.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Discuss the implications of the results reported above and how faculty members are involved in using assessment data to improve student learning.

While we are not meeting the threshold 100% of the time in the direct measures, we are very pleased that we are consistently over 50%, and usually over 66% (2/3 of students meeting threshold). As mentioned in last year’s report, we are going to re-evaluate these in the coming academic year to discuss whether a threshold of 75% of majors earning a grade of B or higher is realistic. While faculty do have control of content and how they present that content to students, we have no control over any student’s effort or motivation to earn a high grade. We are very concerned about some of the results from the exit questionnaire. After the results came in for the Fall 2014 graduates, faculty did begin to discuss how to address the issues, in terms of how we present that content, the timing of it in the program, whether we need to reword the questions (simplify them to be less complicated), etc. The results were a bit better in Spring 2015. We do plan to continue work on this in the coming year.

Full-time faculty usually meet three times a year to evaluate assessment results (both GenEd and Program SLOs). We discuss techniques that we might use to improve student learning and understanding of our SLOs.

Describe how students and external stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.) are made aware of PSLOs and measures.

As mentioned in the section above, full-time faculty meet three times a year, usually in August, January, and late April, to discuss assessment. At our next meeting in August, we will begin to evaluate the course-embedded assignments from the required courses (non-GenEd assignments), as well as our usual evaluation of the GenEd assignments (many of which we also use for Program Assessment). In our Curriculum Review, we plan to use the assessment results to evaluate not only assignments, but courses as well, as we move forward to a revised curriculum. We share the results with adjunct faculty, and they are always invited to the August meeting. In addition, we solicit their input again, usually at the end of the academic year, on any suggestions they may have about the assignments.

Our Sociology Liaison keeps faculty apprised of information from the Assessment Committee, as well as sharing information with the Assessment Committee of assessment activities in the department.

Students are becoming much more aware of assessment, especially GenEd assessment. As we move forward, we will also begin sharing information about program assessment with students. We value student input into our programs, and take it seriously. In fact, several issues to be discussed in the Curriculum Review this coming year are spurred by student comments (on exit questionnaires and/or periodic alumni surveys). As we rework our departmental web site, we also plan to include some of the results.

2013-2014 Academic Year

Program Student Learning Outcomes Analyzed and Reported for Current Year	List the Assessment Measure(s) for each PSLO – if rubrics are used, a copy of each should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe the results for PSLOs analyzed (assessed) this year – a copy of summary data should be in your department’s assessment subfolder on the shared drive	Describe how results are shared with faculty, students, university-wide entities, and stakeholders (advisory boards, employers, community, alumni, etc.)
<p>PSLO # <u>1</u> Critically analyze the role of culture and social structure in shaping the lives of members of society.</p>	<p>Direct: Course Grades – 75% of majors will earn grades of B or higher Course-Embedded Assignments – 75% of majors will score “Target” or higher</p>	<p>Course grades: Since there were no majors in SO100, we included all students. We did meet the threshold, with 87% of students earning grades of B or higher. We did not meet the expectations in SO304 (66.7%) or SO314 (50%). Course Assignments: For all students in SO100 who completed the assignment, we did not meet the expectation (56.6%). 75% of majors scored “Target” or higher in SO304, but we did not meet the expectation in SO314 (60%).</p>	See section later in the report.
	<p>Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.</p>	<p>All four graduating seniors completing the exit questionnaire marked “much” on Q#1, the relevant area for this SLO, meeting out expectation.</p>	
<p>PSLO # <u>3</u> Explain the effects of race, class, gender, and other forms of diversity on life chances at the individual, institutional, and/or societal levels.</p>	<p>Direct: Course Grades – 75% of majors will earn grades of B or higher Course-Embedded Assignments – 75% of majors will score “Target” or higher</p>	<p>Course Grades – There were no majors in SO100, so we included all students. As noted in P-SLO#1, we did meet the expectation (87%). Of the three other courses assessed, we met the expectations in only SO310. We did not meet the expectation in SO207 (33.3%) or SO305 (40%). Course Assignments: For all students in SO100 who completed the assignment, we did not meet the expectation (57.8%). We met expectations for majors in SO207 (80%), but not in SO310 (66.7%).</p>	

	<p>Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.</p>	<p>All four graduating seniors completing the exit questionnaire marked “much” on Q#8 and Q#13, both relevant areas for this SLO, meeting our expectations.</p>	
<p>PSLO # 5 Demonstrate analytical reasoning skills by interpreting numerical, textual, and ethnographic information.</p>	<p>Direct: Course Grades – 75% of majors will earn grades of B or higher Course-Embedded Assignments – 75% of majors will score “Target” or higher</p>	<p>Course Grades: There were no majors in SO100, so we included all students. As noted in P-SLO#1, we did meet the expectation (87%). SO309 was not offered this academic year. Of the third course we use for this SLO, 60% of majors earned grades of B or higher, which does not meet expectations.</p> <p>Course Assignments: For all students in SO100 who completed the assignment, we did not meet the expectation (60.4%). We did not meet expectations in SO362, with 60% of majors scoring “Target” or higher.</p>	<p>See section later in the report. We are very much concerned with the results of Q#16 on the Exit Questionnaire. This is only the second year that we have used this specific question. It is very possible that we need to clarify the wording, as well as add more content in this area to more of our courses.</p>
	<p>Indirect: Exit Surveys of Graduating Seniors – 66% of students will mark “much” on relevant questions.</p>	<p>The results were varied. 75% of the four graduating seniors completing the questionnaire marked “much” for Q#4, which met expectations. However, only 25% scored “much” on Q#16, although the other 75% did mark “some.”</p>	
<p>Describe how faculty members were involved in using assessment data to improve student learning.</p>			
<p>Full-time faculty have been meeting at least three times a year for over two years now in evaluating GenEd assessments. We simply added program assessment to the discussion. Faculty evaluate the results of the assessment, and make decisions about where we need to make adjustments in our teaching. We have made revisions to timing of the assignments, wording of assignments, changing take-home assignments to in-class exercises, etc. This year, we will pay special attention to the results because of our revised P-SLOs. We need to ensure that we are teaching content directed to those SLOs. Since we have more assignments used in upper-division courses this year, it gives us an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of all required courses in more depth than in previous years.</p>			
<p>Describe how stakeholders are engaged in your assessment plan and process.</p>			
<p>Full-time Sociology faculty meet at least three times a year, usually in August, January, and late April, to discuss assessment. Our August meeting is usually a discussion of the most current results. We evaluate the results and the assignments being used, and discuss whether revisions need to be</p>			

made in timing of the assignments and/or wording of the assignments. We use the results to discuss how we teach the content of the courses. We also share the results with adjunct faculty, and solicit their reactions and suggestions.

Our Sociology Assessment Liaison keeps faculty apprised of information from the Assessment Committee, as well as keeping the committee abreast of what is happening in the department in relation to assessment.

Our students are becoming more aware of assessment. In the GenEd courses, students are very aware that some of the assignments are directly tied to assessment., and instructors are beginning to share results of the assignments with their students We use some of those assessments for Program Assessment. We get student input in program assessment through the exit questionnaire, as well as periodic alumni surveys.

SECTION III

2017-2018 Academic Year

During this year, if any PSLO was addressed through new or unique experiences outside the classroom, explain where and how the opportunities were provided to students in your program (i.e. internships, field experiences, visiting lectures, collaborative projects, and other creative ideas you have employed).

N/A

2016-2017 Academic Year

During this year, if any PSLO was addressed through new or unique experiences outside the classroom, explain where and how the opportunities were provided to students in your program (i.e. internships, field experiences, visiting lectures, collaborative projects, and other creative ideas you have employed).

N/A

2015-2016 Academic Year

During this year, if any PSLO was addressed through new or unique experiences outside the classroom, explain where and how the opportunities were provided to students in your program (i.e. internships, field experiences, visiting lectures, collaborative projects, and other creative ideas you have employed).

N/A

2014-2015 Academic Year

During this year, if any PSLO was addressed through new or unique experiences outside the classroom, explain where and how the opportunities were provided to students in your program (i.e. internships, field experiences, visiting lectures, collaborative projects, and other creative ideas you have employed).

N/A

2013-2014 Academic Year

During this year, if any PSLO was addressed through new or unique experiences outside the classroom, explain where and how the opportunities were provided to students in your program (i.e. internships, field experiences, visiting lectures, collaborative projects, and other creative ideas you have employed).

N/A

SECTION IV

2017-2018 Academic Year

In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the next academic year?

We want to continue Curriculum Review, likely necessitating revisions in our P-SLOs and Curriculum map. We want to evaluate the assignments used in the upper-division required courses. Finally, we want to create a better sequence of courses to help produce graduates who are ready for a dynamic and global world.

2016-2017 Academic Year

In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year, what are your plans for the next academic year?

2015-2016 Academic Year

In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the next academic year?

We plan to finish Curriculum Review, which may necessitate revisions in our P-SLOs and Curriculum map. We also plan to make sure we have assignments in all of our upper-division required courses. Finally, we plan to create a structure sequence of courses designed to help produce graduates who are prepared for a dynamic world.

2014-2015 Academic Year

In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the next academic year?

As mentioned several times in this, and last year's report, our priority for the upcoming year is to continue Curriculum Review. We have already identified a couple of possible new courses that we are going to offer as Special Topics courses to get student reaction / input. We also want to include in our revised curriculum a more robust capstone experience for graduates, so they can demonstrate (to us and to themselves) that they have met the PSLOs. By Spring 2016, we hope to have a structured sequence of courses, possibly new PSLOs (simplified), and a revised curriculum that will help us produce graduates who are prepared for the future. Assessment will be a vital factor in helping us understand what we are doing well and what we need to change.

2013-2014 Academic Year

In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the next academic year?

It has been apparent for some time that our curriculum, while still robust, is becoming outdated. We have learned this both from exploring current trends in the field, as well as surveying our alumni. Over the last few years, we have made small changes such as adding new, more relevant, courses, but it is a stop-gap at best. A lot of our focus the last two years has been on our General Education assessment plan. We can now concentrate on our program.

Full-Time faculty will undertake a complete Curriculum Review of the Sociology program during AY2014-2015. Consequently, we expect a lot of things to change, including the curriculum map, assessment calendar, and possibly one or more P-SLOs. Once the Review is complete, we will revise the curriculum map to reflect our revised curriculum. We will also continue to evaluate the assignments and, especially, the new thresholds, which may be a bit ambitious and unrealistic.

Supporting documents (rubrics, summary data tables/charts, etc.) should be in your department's assessment subfolder on the shared drive in the correct academic year subfolder.