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**Department:** **LCS - 0387 - Sociology / 0383 - Geography**

Year of Last Program Review: FY 2014-2015
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**Section II: Progress Since the Most Recent Review**

Below are the goals from Section IV part E of your last Program Review Self-Study. Describe progress or changes made toward meeting each goal over the last year. Responses from the previous year’s Annual Update are included, if there have been no changes to report then no changes to the response are necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **GOALS** | **Status** | **Progress or Rationale for No Longer Applicable** |
| Develop and implement a plan to transition from course to program assessment in each of the discipline areas. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | Each of the three program areas, Sociology, Geography, Social Work have made significant progress in developing a plan for program assessments. See Program Curriculum Mapping-Appendix 1A, 1B 1C & 1D  2016/17  Each of our discipline continues to make progress in developing a Plan for Program Assessment. Each discipline area must decide which exhibits and which courses to collect exhibits in at the refined and mastery level levels of outcome achievement. The goal is to complete the Plan and begin implementation in fall 2017. |
|  |  | 2017/18  A first draft of the Plan for Program Assessment for Sociology, Geographic & Social Work can be found in the Appendix XXX. The Plan for Geographic Information Systems AAS Degree is still being developed. |
| Establish an *e Syllabus* for each of the core courses in the three discipline areas as a means of insuring consistency & quality of instruction. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | Jennifer McDermott in Social Work has piloted the e-Syllabus. There were several challenges with it. We met with Jared Cutler and Archna Jindal to discuss the issues. Jennifer will facilitate a departmental training on implementing the e-Syllabus in e-learn this spring, 2016.  2016/17  In fall 2016, the Online Teaching and Learning Committee surveyed the faculty and documented several issues with the e Syllabi. As a result a sub-committee was created to review the issues and make recommendations for improvements. Jennifer McDermott will serve on the sub-committee. The department has postponed this action until the issues have been resolved.  2017/18  According to acting head of ELearn Technology, faculty feedback on the E-Syllabus was given to IT in 2017. IT is in the process of incorporating the requested changes. Jennifer McDermott was confirmed as one of the faculty members that will test and provide feedback on the changes, once they have been made. No date has been established for the review of the improvements at this time. |
| Implement an annual adjunct faculty departmental development workshop. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | Sociology/Social Work/Geography will conduct and adjunct workshop/training session in summer 2016. The goal of the workshop will be to bring faculty onboard with 2016/17 curriculum, and program assessment changes.  2016/17  Sociology conducted an adjunct retreat at the end of fall 2016. Sociology is planning another adjunct retreat in the summer 2017. Social Work and Geography have small adjunct populations and hold one on one orientations as appropriate each semester.  2017/18  Sociology conducted an adjunct retreat in the summer of 2017.  Adjunct faculty teaching Introduction to Sociology, SOC. 1101, were introduced to the Flipped Course Design and the Open Educational Resource text adopted for the course. The next retreat for faculty is planned in the summer of 2018..The faculty leads for Cultural Anthropology, Social Work and Geography conduct in person orientation sessions addressing textbook changes, online resources and assessment tools and updates each semester as needed. |
| Expand success strategies such as the Flipped Classroom model in Sociology and team based learning in Geography to other courses in the curriculum. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | Sociology: Sociology 1101 is in the 2nd year of piloting the flipped course design and the first year of piloting OER resources to support the flipped course design. The goal is to assess the effectiveness of the models at the end of spring, 2016. If successful we plan to expand the Flipped and/or OER models to all main campus course sections Sociology 1101 in fall 2016 and to satellite campuses in the spring of 2017.  Geography: Team base learning is currently being implemented in all GIS (Geographic Information Systems) related courses. Team based learning will be expanded to all in class sections of Human Geography in the fall 2016.  Social Work will flip SWK 1213.    2016-17  In fall 2016 & spring 2017 the tenure track faculty continued to pilot the flipped course design in Sociology 1101, Introduction to Sociology with the use of OER resources. The expansion of the pilot was used to update the master shell that supports the course in an effort to make it more user friendly. The expansion of the flipped mode and OER resources to all in class sections of Sociology 1101 will take place in the fall 2017.    Geography: Team base learning continues to be utilized in all GIS (Geographic Information Systems) related courses. Collaborative learning activities have been implemented in Human Geography on campus sections.  Social Work: The decision was made to move to the hybrid model of SWK 1213 in the fall 2016 & spring 2017 instead of the Flipped course design.  2017-2018  There have been several new developments in the flipped course design for Sociology 1101. A master course shell was created to support the course. The shell contains activities, assessments, the OER text and other faculty resources.in class sections of. The shell has made it possible for adjuncts to adopt the flipped mode of learning facilitation. Kathy Rowell has adopted the format for Cultural Anthropology Soc. 1145 & Social Problems, Soc. 2205. holds an orientation each semester addressing textbook updates |
| Develop hybrid courses in Geographic Information Systems and Social Work. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | Geographic Information Systems (GIS) ran the second hybrid course section in spring of 2016. The plan is to continue it.  Social Work 1213 will pilot a hybrid section in fall 2016  2016/17  Geographic Information Systems GEO 1107 has successfully continued the hybrid model.  Social Work: The hybrid model was piloted in SWK 1213 in fall 2016 & spring 2017. Based on student feedback the decision has been made to discontinue the hybrid model and revert back to the two day a week class starting fall 2017.  2017/18  Geography converted Geo 1209 Introduction to Cartography, and 2210 Advanced Spatial Analysis to a hybrid model |
| Develop a plan to align CASI with the changes in learning strategies in each of each discipline area. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | As part of the program assessment development plan in each of the three disciplines, we will conduct a complete review of the activities and resources in CASI to make sure that they support and align with the goals of our curriculum.  2016/17  A sub-committee with a representative from each of the discipline areas has been formed to align CASI with the changes in learning & assessment strategies.  2017/18  A sub-committee lead by Amaha Sellassie has met to generate ideas to convert the CASI lab into an active learning research center that would engage students in doing community research. A prototype of the design was piloted in the fall 2017 Sociology of Cities Course and in the 2018 Public Sociology special topic course developed by Kathy Rowell & Amaha Sellassie. Students gathered maps and statiscal data related to evictions in the city of Dayton. They also conducted surveys of Sinclair students who had experiences homelessness that might be related to evictions. In Spring of 2018 students asked to continue their research in an effort to draw light on the issue and seek potential solutions. The course facilitators applied and received an IRB for the research. Dr. Rowell connected the students through skype with Matthew Desmond, the author of *Evicted, Poverty & Profit in American Cities* to share their research findings*.* Mr. Desmondwas very impressed by the work of the students.  The department has drafted an Applied Sociology Degree Program. As part of the program students will be required to do a capstone. The capstone would require a research project connected to the community. |
| Create aSocial Work Advisory Board to assure the program is in touch with the needs of the job market in the region and to assist with practicum placements. | In progress  Completed X  No longer applicable | The first Social Work Advisory Board Meeting was held in October 2015, the second one is scheduled for April 2016.  At the spring meeting Deb Downing requested an opportunity to come and talk to our students about the many different job openings that the Ohio Dept. of Job & Family Services offers. She also offered to bring someone from their HR department to discuss the application process with students. Michele Cason of Miami Valley Child Development Center said that they offer many Sinclair SWK students jobs after they have completed their practicums.  2016/17  The SWK Advisory Committee met in March 2017. Social Work students shared their experiences visiting U.S. Mexico Border in February, 2017. All notes from the Advisory Committee Meetings are a part of college records.  2017/18  The SWK Advisory Board did not convene in 20-17-18. The next meeting will be held in fall semester 2018. |
| Market the value of all three programs internally & externally. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | The department finalized the web page and the marketing template in fall 2015.  Jacquie Housel frequently attends Tech Prep Student Fair to market GIS. The department will participate in the LAS Student Showcase Event 4/18. A member of the department presented Careers in Sociology at a high school in Greene County. The department will co-host a Sinclair Talks on Economic Inequality on 4/12. The department will continue to make every effort to support Sinclair sponsored Career Events and seek other opportunities to promote our programs an increase enrollment.  2016/17  We continue to look for avenues to market each program area. We have revised the marketing flyers to add the curriculum in each discipline area. As part of the Pathways Grant Program the department sponsored a Career Event in Sociology & Geography/GIS, spring 2017. In partnership with the Career Communities of LCS & CJS the department co-hosted an Interdisciplinary Colloquium on *Race, Police and Trust*. The event highlighted the analytical skills that Sociology brings to understanding the social issues of the day. The department has hosted four campus dialogues for administration, faculty, staff and students.  2017/18  Spring 2017-18 Geography hosted a spring Career Events. There was a speaker on the application of Geographic Skills in the field of Geography. Advisors from Sinclair, & The Ohio State shared transfer opportunities. Former Students shared their experiences since leaving Sinclair.  Spring 2017-18, Sociology piloted a new strategy, **Sociology Student Outreach.** A number of sociology students who had taken or who were currently engaged in sociology courses, Sociology Student Ambassadors, made presentations to students in other sociology classes. The Sociology Ambassadors shared their experiences in the courses they had taken and the value of those experiences to their professional development. This effort was coordinated by Kathy Rowell & Amaha Sellassie. Over a hundred students were reached. We are currently assessing the value of this strategy versus a formal Career Program Event.  Social Work consistently invites professionals from a wide variety of fields within Social Work to speak to classes. Students network with career professionals and about the employment and service opportunities that exists in the community. |

Below are the Recommendations for Action made by the review team. Describe the progress or changes made toward meeting each recommendation over the last year. Responses from the previous year’s Annual Update are included, if there have been no changes to report then no changes to the response are necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RECOMMENDATIONS** | **Status** | **Progress or Rationale for No Longer Applicable** |
| The department is strongly encouraged to expand its work with the “flipped classroom” model. The department has gathered compelling data demonstrating that this approach increases student success rates considerably, and the Review Team recommends that all SOC 1101 sections adopt this approach and continuously monitor the impact on course success rates. Since standardized activities are being developed as part of the “flipped classroom” effort, this presents an excellent opportunity for the collection of standardized data across all sections of SOC 1101 – the department should design these activities with the goal of collection and analysis of assessment data across different sections of the course. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | As previously mentioned the department is expanding the flipped course design to all on campus in class sections of Sociology 1101 in fall 2016 and to off campus sites in spring 2017. We are currently piloting the flipped design in Sociology 1145 and will expand it in fall of 2016. We continue to refine our course and program assessment strategies.  2016/17  As previously mentioned the tenure track faculty continued to pilot the flipped course mode with the use of OER resources in fall 2016 & spring 2017. The time was used to update the master shell that supports the course and make it more user friendly for faculty and students. The handoff to adjuncts will take place in fall 2017.    2017/18  As previously mentioned in the fall 2017 adjuncts were invited to pilot aspects of the flipped model they were comfortable with. Feedback sessions with the adjuncts were then held at the end of fall, 2017. Efforts were made to address their concerns. A retreat will be held in the Summer of 2018 to bring them up to date on recent developments in the course. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Similarly, the Review Team strongly encourages the department to continue development of Open Educational Resources, and document in its Annual Update submissions the savings to student that are achieved. This is important work, and should be a priority in the department’s improvement efforts. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | This spring is the second semester of piloting OER resources in Sociology 1101 flipped sections. We are also piloting OER resources in GEO 1107, Introduction to GIS hybrid sections. At the end of spring semester we will assess the effectiveness of the OER resources in supporting students in achieving learning outcomes for the course.  2016/17  The department will adopt OER resources for all in class Sociology 1101 flipped sections in the fall of 2017. Geography 1107 Introduction to GIS has formally adopted OER resources for all course sections. Sociology 2205, Social Problems is currently reviewing an OER textbook for possible adoption in the fall 2017.  2017/18  In fall if 2017 the decision was made to adopt a new OER textbook*, Introduction to Sociology Understanding the Changing Social World* for fall 2018. Spring 2018 faculty updated the master shell resources to reflect the new adoption. The decision was also made to adopt the new OER text in the online version of the course.  In fall of 2018, Sociology 2205 will move to an OER textbook.  All GIS related courses in the Geography degree have converted to OER textbooks. |
| The Review Team was strongly impressed with the pre-post assessment approach, and with the department’s plans to expand this approach in the modules of its “flipped classroom” work. The department is encouraged to continue in this direction. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | The department plans to continue to the pre-post outcome assessment of the flipped course design.  2016/17  The department continued the use of the pre and post outcome assessment tests in all sections of Sociology 1101 including the flipped.  2017/18  The department continued the use of the pre and post outcome assessment tests in all sections of Sociology 1101 including the flipped  Geography continues to use a pre and post test in human and physical geography  Social Work uses a pre and post test in SWK 2206, 2207 & 2213 |
| This department is doing so many impressive things – these should be shared with other departments so that they can following this department’s example. Presentations through the CTL and at Fall Professional Development Day should be used to spread the word about the good work that is being done. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | The department will seek opportunities with the CTL to share our innovations with the rest of the college. Dona Fletcher & Sean Frost assisted in developing and facilitation of Diversity Inclusion Track for the CTL in the summer, fall and spring of 2015 & 2016.  2016/17  Faculty continued to facilitate workshops on diversity and international education through the CTL.  2017/18  Members of the Sociology/Geography & Social Work Department continue to offer a vast array of workshops and presentations through the CTL & Sinclair Talks focused on diversity & globalism. Recent examples:  Sinclair Talks: Voices of Immigrants  How to Teach about Palestine  Diversity Dialogue Series |
| The expansion of the “flipped classroom”, the introduction of the OER materials, and other initiatives that the department has underway will require continued monitoring of data. The department may want to consider inviting a representative from Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR) to come demonstrate some of the new SAS Visual Analytics reports that allow more rapid access to data. The Performance Based Funding tool in particular would be of value to the department in monitoring the impact of its initiatives on course success rates. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | Immediately following the program review in spring of 2015, Chad Atkinson was invited to a department meeting to explain Performance Based Funding. We will invite him back in the fall, 2016.  2016/17  Chad Atkinson was not invited back in the fall 16. Instead as a first step in our commitment to examine the achievement gap among different demographic groups in our courses and programs, Bruce Clayton (RAR) has been invited to assist the department in reviewing the disaggregated success data in each of the three discipline areas. Follow up meetings to discuss strategies to eliminate the gap are planned.  2017-2018  This effort has been postponed until the next school year. |
| The emphasis on completion, along with the current budget challenges that Sinclair faces, combine to create an urgent need for all departments to carefully examine their curriculum and reduce course offerings where appropriate. Many departments have courses that may be in some measure beneficial for students, but are ultimately superfluous to students’ ability to complete their programs, and in some cases may involve content that they will encounter subsequent to transferring to four year institutions. In some cases a lack of transferability may render the course less useful in the long run for student completion. It may be that superfluous courses are spreading our students across too many sections and negatively impacting average class size and instructional costs. The department is asked to prepare an analysis in the next year of all of the courses it offers, and rank them in terms of most essential to least essential in terms of importance to helping students complete - and particularly in terms of transferability. Special attention should be given to electives in this analysis, determining which would be the most beneficial to the most students and which might be deactivated with minimal impact. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | As part of the process of creating a plan for program assessment in each of the three discipline areas we are reviewing our curriculum and seeking opportunities to become more efficient in our course offerings.  2016/17  As we finalize the Plan for Program Assessment we are reviewing the curriculum for alignment in each of the discipline areas.  2017/18  In 2017/18 the department worked to align courses with the ODC Pathways initiatives. Dana Johnson participated in the Sociology state discussion and Jennifer McDermott participated in the Social work state wide discussion. Geography gave feedback on the Geography pathway. |
| The challenges associated with encouraging students to complete programs prior to transfer were noted during the meeting with the Review Team – the department is encouraged to consider ways to increase the number of students who complete prior to transfer. It may be that restructuring the sequence of courses in the curriculum and judicious use of prerequisites may have some impact in this regard. Discussions with four-year institutions should be part of this effort. Analysis of students who came close to completing, examination of courses they completed and those they didn’t, and perhaps surveys of students who transferred before completing may yield suggestions of how completion could be increased. Also, reverse transfer may increase the number of completers for the department, although it is acknowledged that there are challenges to encouraging students to transfer credits back to Sinclair after moving on to a four-year institution. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | In fall of 2015 we worked with RAR to obtain a list of Sociology/ Social Work majors. We used the list to establish a SGS e-Learn Student Community. Through the community we communicate information on graduation and transfer. We consistently encourage completion in each of the program areas. (Geography was not a program until spring 2016).    Peter Bolmida is currently working with the advisors and chair of the department of Social Work at Wright State University to promote reverse transfer in the area of Social Work.  2016/17  The department was granted a Pathways 2.0 grant. The goal of the grant is to enhance completion rates. As a result of our participation in the grant each discipline held an Orientation in fall 16 and a Career Event, spring 17. The career events featured representatives from the transfer institutions of Wright State and the University of Dayton. We look forward to working with Kimberly Collins, the new Director of University Partnerships to enhance student opportunities for reverse transfer in each of the three disciplines.  2017/18  Wright State Social Work Department continues to survey each of their grads and if they had any classes at Sinclair and would like to get their AA. We plan to have Kimberly Collins, the Director of Community Partners visit a department meeting in 2018 to discuss potential arrangements with other universities in each of our discipline areas. |
| The challenges of tracking students who leave the program and transfer to four-year institutions were noted – the department is encouraged to work with RAR to obtain National Student Clearinghouse Data to get better information regarding transfer outcomes for its students. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | Starting spring of 2016 the department will capture the names of Geography, Sociology and Social Work students who graduate from Sinclair. We will then work with RAR to track their transfer  outcomes through the National Clearing House.  The chair of Social Work Department at WSU has agreed to assist us in tracking Sinclair students that enter the SWK program.  Geography just became a program in spring of 2016. We will begin to track the Geography graduates in the spring of 2017.  2016/17  In Spring 2017 the department discovered, Data Analytics, a tool that provides contact information on previous grads. The department will utilize the tool to contact and engage our grads in the coming year.  2017/18  Sociology/Geography/Social Work faculty attended workshops to familiarize with the tools that available to track student success, Illume and Civitas Lift, and Data Analytics. |
| The Review Team was very impressed by the “flipped classroom” data that was shared during the meeting with the department in tabular form – and would have liked to have seen more data shared in a similar format in the self-study. The department is encouraged to share more data in a similar manner in future Annual Update and Program Review submissions, utilizing tables and graphs with clear labels and accompanying contextual information. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | With Angel the department was able to easily collect assessment data for the flipped pilot. With the transition to e-Learn we lost the ability to capture assessment data in fall 2016 or spring 2017. The department was forced to use pre and post paper tests and scantrons. The results did not generate the type of data necessary to recreate the tables and graphs we used for the program review. In fall of 2016 we will have access to the assessment tools in e-Learn and will again be able to generate the information as requested.  2016/17  Although the pre and post outcome assessment tests were implemented in all sections of Introductory Sociology including the flipped sections. Data was not available for the flipped sections at the writing of this report.  2017/18  This current annual report should reflect the latest data for the flipped sections of Sociology 1101. |
| The department has a well-written mission statement, but the Review Team felt that perhaps it should be expanded to include more distinct mission and vision statements for each of the three components of the department. The Review Team suggests one overall mission statement for the department that highlights the connections and commonalities between the three component areas, but embedded within it a distinct section with a specific mission statement for each. | In progress X  Completed  No longer applicable | The department has begun work on a shared mission statement that includes a more distinct mission and vision statement for each of the three discipline areas. We hope to finalize it in a Departmental Assessment Retreat, summer 2016.  2016/17  The department will return to a discussion of one overall mission statement for the department that highlights the connections and commonalities between the three component areas, but embedded within it a distinct section with a specific mission statement for each in 2017-18.  2017-18  The focus for this year was on the development of a Plan for Program Review. Next year we will review and revise the departmental mission statements in view of the committee’s recommendations. |

**Section II: Assessment of General Education & Degree Program Outcomes**

For the FY 2016-17 Annual Update, departments are asked to provide assessment results for **Information Literacy**.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General Education Outcomes** | Year assessed or to be assessed. | Course identified by the department where this outcome could be assessed | Assessment Methods  Used | What were the assessment results?  (Please provide brief summary data) |
| **THIS YEAR’S ASSESSMENT RESULTS** | | | | |
| Computer Literacy | **2017-2018** | **NO COURSE PROVIDED** |  | This was piloted in spring 2018, the results are not yet available Soc. 2205 Social Problems also piloted the Information Literacy Rubric. |
| **LAST YEAR’S ASSESSMENT RESULTS** | | | | |
| Information Literacy | **2016-2017** | NO COURSES PROVIDED |  |  |

The Program Outcomes for the degrees are listed below. Responses from previous years are provided below. **All program outcomes must be assessed at least once during the 5 year Program Review cycle, and assessment of program outcomes must occur each year**.

**SOCIOLOGY**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcomes** | To which course(s) is this program outcome related? | Year assessed or to be assessed. | Assessment Methods  Used | What were the assessment results?  (Please provide brief summary data) |
| **1)** Demonstrate the ability to apply the sociological perspective is defined as a) concern with the totality of social life, b) emphasis on the context (setting) in which behavior takes place c) recognition that meaning is a social product, arbitrarily agreed upon d) focus on the group and social interaction. | General Sociology/Introduction to Sociology  (SOC 1101) | 2009-2013 | Pre & Post quantitative test  With semester conversion the department continued to assess Introduction to Sociology (Soc. 1101) as the foundational course in our curriculum. | 2009-2010- SOC 111, 112 in the area of the sociological perspectives student increased their learning by 11%.  2010-2011- SOC 111 & SOC 112 in area of the sociological perspective students increased their learning by 15%.  2011-2012- SOC 111, 112 in the area of the sociological perspectives student increased their learning by 10%.  2012-2013- SOC 1101 in area of the sociological perspective students increased their learning by 14%.  2013-2014- SOC 1101 in the area of the sociological perspectives students increased their learning by 13%.  Fall 2014- SOC 1101in the area of the sociological perspectives student increased their learning by 10%. The pretest n= 810 Posttest n= 549  Spring 2015- SOC 1101 in area of the sociological perspective students increased their learning by 18%. The pretest n=764 and the posttest n=509.  Fall 2015 – SOC 1101 in area of the sociological perspective student increased their learning by 11% increase. The pretest n = 694 and the posttest n = 436  Spring 2016 – SOC 1101 in the area of the sociological perspective student increased their learning by 11.9% increase. The pretest n – 491 and the posttest n = 305.  Note: All 2015-16 SOC 1101 data is in Appendix 2A  Fall 2016  SOC 1101 in the area of the sociological perspective student increased their learning by 10% . The pretest n – 702 and the posttest n = 513  Spring 2017  Students increased their learning by 11 %. The N was 597 for the pretest and 488 for the Post Test.  Note:  Spring 1101 Data for Fall 16 & Spring 17 is in Appendix #1, 2017-2018  In addition there is an update on the Flipped Success Rates. |
| **2)** Understand scientific research methods used to study society. Interpret statistical tables, graphs, charts as they apply to an understanding of the human behavior and social life. | General Sociology/  Introduction to Sociology  (SOC 1101) | 2009-13 | Pre & Post quantitative test  This category was operationalized to include sociological theory, paradigms, integrating data analysis IDA and the scientific method | 2009-2010- Theory rate of growth was 11%. IDA demonstrated a 4% increase.  2010-2011- Theory rate of growth was 14% increase, IDA 4% increase.  2011-2012- Theory rate of growth was 12% increase, IDA 3% increase.  2012-2013- Theory rate of growth was 8% increase, IDA 7% increase.  2013-2014- Theory rate of growth was 3% increase, IDA 6% increase.  Fall 2014- Theory rate of growth was 6%. IDA demonstrated an 8% increase.  2015 Spring - Theory rate of growth was 11% increase, IDA 13% increase.  2015 Fall – Theory rate of growth was 10% increase, IDA 5% increase.  2016 Spring – Theory rate of growth was 8% increase, IDA 7% increase.  Note: All 2015-16 SOC 1101 data is in Appendix 2A  Fall 2016 Theory rate of growth was 11% and IDA was 6% increase  Spring 17 Theory rate of increase was 8% and IDA was 6%.  Note: Data for fall 2016 and spring 2017 can be found in Appendix 1 |
| **3)** Demonstrate professional effectiveness and teamwork by exhibiting leadership, cooperation, and making productive contributions to group written & oral assignments. Students must also demonstrate a respect for diverse view points within the group. |  | 2009-2013 |  | 2009-2013- All students in General Sociology/Introduction to Sociology were required to complete a pre and post writing assignment on the sociological perspective and engage in an oral presentation.  All faculty reported the writing rubric provided guideline and structure for students, and the quality of student work dramatically improved for the post writing assignment. Periodically pre and post writing samples are pulled from a variety of General Sociology sections and evaluated by full time faculty. This was last done in 2013. Faculty also reported that the use of the speech rubric greatly enhanced the quality of the oral presentations because it provided a structure for the preparation and execution of the speech.  2014- No writing assessment was completed. However faculty continued to utilize the departmental writing and speech rubric.  Spring 2015- No writing assessment was completed. However faculty continued to utilize the departmental writing and speech rubric.  Fall 2015 & Spring 2016 – Faculty continued to utilize writing and speech rubric. No departmental writing assessment was conducted.  Fall 2016 & Spring 2017 – Faculty continued to utilize writing and speech rubric. No departmental writing assessment was conducted. |
| **4)** Examine diversity in society and the impact of social stratification hierarchies (the inequalities) of gender, race/ethnicity, and age. | Introduction to Sociology  (SOC 1101)  Cultural Anthropology  (SOC 1145) | 2012-2013 | Pre & Post quantitative test | 2012-2013-In the area of stratification and social structure student performance increased by 7%.  2013-2014- The areas of stratification and social structure student performance increased to 12%.  2014 Spring- Cultural Anthropology An anthropology core concept exam and a self - assessment cultural competence instrument was piloted. There was difficulty in retrieving the data from ANGEL. It is estimated that the percent of increase was between 16 and 32%. The test was revised and offered in Fall 2014.  Cultural Anthropology  Content Analysis  Spring 2015 54% increase  Fall 2016 43% increase  Results from Cultural Assessment Self-Test- are still in progress. We are working with RAR to interpret the likert scale results using scantrons.  2015 Fall – In the area of stratification and social structure student performance increased by 12%.  2016 Spring - In the area of stratification and social structure student performance increased by 13%.  Cultural Anthropology:  2016 Spring – Content Assessment quiz F2F problematic Online 58% increase.  2016 Fall – In the area of content assessment quiz  F2F – 30% increase  Online – 48% increase  Results from Cultural Assessment Self-Test- are still in progress. We are working with RAR to interpret the likert scale results using scantrons.  2016 Fall –  F2F 3.7% increase  Online No change  Note: All 2015-16 SOC 1145 data is in Appendix B  2017 Spring – Cultural assessment self-test have been problematic. We will discontinue use of this assessment in 2018/19.  In the area of Content assessment F2F 42% increase in learning.  2017 Summer – In the area of content assessment F2F and online 48% increase in learning.  2017 Fall – 51% increase in learning (The greatest percentage of students completing the post-test were online.)  Appendix 2 2017-2018 |
| **5)** Demonstrate social responsibility and an ethic of service: attitudes and understandings needed to live in a society as responsible citizens and to contribute to building a caring and just society. |  |  |  | Service learning opportunities are consistently offered in several courses: SOC 1101, SOC 1145, and SOC. 2205. The Sociology Club offers community service options. This outcome has not been formally assessed.  Service Learning opportunities are consistently offered in SOC 1101, SOC 1145, and SOC. 2205. This outcome has not been formally assessed.  2016-17  Service Learning opportunities continue to be offered in SOC 1101, SOC 1145, and SOC. 2205. This outcome has not been formally assessed.  2017-18  Service Learning opportunities continue to be offered in SOC 1101, SOC 1145, and SOC. 2205. This outcome has not been formally assessed. |
|  |  | | | |
| **Are changes planned as a result of the assessment of program outcomes? If so, what are those changes?** | At the start of this review period the department was classified as an Area of Emphasis. Areas of Emphasis were charged with assessing the core courses in their curriculum. This review reflects the assessment strategies and data as it relates to the core courses in the program. The department has initiated the process of developing and implementing program assessment.  Changes for 2015-16: The department is developing a plan for Program Assessment which will be implemented in the Fall, 2016. The department successfully piloted the General Education Rubric for Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship in: Soc. 1145, Cultural Anthropology, Soc. 1219, Global Poverty & Soc. 2215, and Race & Ethnicity in fall 2015, spring 2016.  Changes for 2016-17: No plans have been made to change the Soc. 1101 outcome assessment at this time. Sociology 1101 provides outcome achievement data at the introductory level of program assessment. The main focus is on development of a Plan for Program Assessment at the refined and mastery level that could be implemented in the Fall, 2017.  New Program Outcomes: Sociology has revised their program outcomes for starting fall 2018.  Program outcomes. .   1. Demonstrate the ability to apply the sociological perspective is defined as a) concern with the totality of social life, b) emphasis on the context (setting) in which behavior takes place c) recognition that meaning is a social product, arbitrarily agreed upon d) focus on the group and social interaction. 2. Understand the social scientific importance of data analysis used to study society. Interpret, evaluate, and develop data as they apply to an understanding of the human behavior and social life. 3. Demonstrate professional effectiveness and teamwork by exhibiting leadership, cooperation, and making productive contributions to group written & oral assignments. Students must also demonstrate a respect for diverse view points within the group. 4. Examine the impact of culture in shaping the way people behave and perceive the world. Examine the impact of social change on culture. 5. Examine diversity in society and the impact of local and global structural inequalities, such as social class, gender, race, ethnicity, religion and sexuality. 6. Demonstrate social responsibility and an ethic of service: attitudes and understandings needed to live in a society as responsible citizens and to contribute to building a caring and just society. | | | |
| **How will you determine whether those changes had an impact?** | The department will implement Program formative and summative assessment strategies that provide feedback regarding the achievement of program outcomes in Sociology. The department will utilize this data to make changes to the curriculum as appropriate.  2017/18  Sociology developed a plan for program assessment as follows:  All program outcomes are introduced in SOC 1101 and SOC 1145 and are assessment through pre and post test  All program outcomes are refined in courses with pre-requisites 1115, 1160, 2130, 2205 2215, 2226  All program outcomes are mastered in SOC 2205, 2215 with the exception of outcome #6, Demonstrate social responsibility and an ethic for service; attitudes and understands needed to live in a society as responsible citizens and to contribute building a caring and just society.  Outcome #6 will be assessed in SOC 1115, 1160, 1209 and 2208 through service learning | | | |

**SOCIAL WORK**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcomes**  **2016/17** | To which course(s) is this program outcome related? | Year assessed or to be assessed. | Assessment Methods  Used | What were the assessment results?  (Please provide brief summary data) |
| Achieve group goals in a variety of social contexts. |  |  |  |  |
| Communicate effectively in a variety of ways with varied audiences through writing skills, oral communication skills, listening skills, reading skills, computer literacy and information literacy. | SWK 1213 | 2015-2019 | Practicum Experience  NOTE: 2/2016 - Beginning Fall 2016, students will complete an Advocacy Project which will be used for assessment of this outcome.  NOTE: Assignment being revised for Spring 2016. | Students have completed practicums as part of SWK 1213, however no formal assessment has been completed.  NOTE: 2/2016 - Students have completed practicums as part of SWK 1213, however the only form of assessment has been their evaluations which will be used to assess a separate outcome beginning in Fall, 2016.  NOTE: 3/2017 - SWK 1213  SWK 1213 Advocacy Project - Pass (Above 70%)/Fail Data  **Fall, 2016 - 68% Pass Rate**  N = 22  Pass = 15  Fail = 7 |
| Demonstrate ability to think logically and solve problems using analysis, synthesis and evaluation. | SWK 1206  SWK 1213 | 2015-2019 | **Pre-Test/Post-Test**  **(SWK 1206)**  **NOTE: 2/2016 -**  **Beginning Fall 2016, students will be assessed in both 1206 and 1213 for this outcome by two methods - Suicide Awareness and Prevention Project (1206), and Social Policy Analysis (1213), both incorporating all aspects of this revised outcome**  **NOTE: 2/2017 - As planned, students in 1213 were assessed for this outmode using the Social Policy Analysis. It was decided not to use the Suicide Awareness and Prevention Project for SWK 1206. Data continues to be gathered in SWK 1206 by way of a 20 question pre/post test. This tool was revised Spring 2017.**  **NOTE: Detailed Analysis included in Addendum 2D** | Spring 2014 Data gathered - Students scored lowest in the Theory category both on their pre-test and post-test, however the improvement was more substantial than two out of the other four categories. Students improved by at least an average of .59 points, which was the increase in knowledge of Function and Roles. The average increase in total score was 5.67%.  SWK 1206 Pre-Post Test Data (Average Scores)  **Spring 2014 -**  N = 27 Pre = 49.4% Post = 77.8% **Fall 2014 -**  N = 37 Pre = 59.3% Post = 64% **Spring 2015 -**  N = 48 Pre = 56.4% Post = 66.1% **Fall 2015 -**  N = 26 Pre = 49.4% Post = 58.4% **Spring 2016 -**  N = 41 Pre = 51.3% Post = 65.5% **Fall 2016 -**  N = 35 Pre = 51% Post = 50%  NOTE 3/2017 - Detailed data including categorical analysis can be provided.  SWK 1213 Policy Analysis Paper - Pass (Above 70%)/Fail Data  **Fall 2016 - 68% Pass Rate** N = 22 Pass = 15 Fail = 7 |
| Demonstrate professional ethics, attitudes and behaviors when interacting with clients in practicum settings. | SWK 1213 | 2015-2019 | **Practicum Evaluation**  **(SWK 1213)**  **NOTE: This tool was revised for Fall 2015 and is graded on a Pass/Fail (Complete or Incomplete) basis.** | **Fall 2015 – 89% Pass Rate**  N = 28  Pass = 25  Fail = 3  **Spring 2016 - 94% Pass Rate**  N = 18  Pass = 17  Fail = 1  **Fall 2016 - 77% Pass Rate**  N = 22  Pass = 17  Fail = 5  For all 2015-2016 data for SWK 1206, 1213 see appendix 2C) |
| Demonstrate the knowledge and skills that a person must possess in order to be effective with multicultural clients in cross-cultural situations. | SWK 2207 | 2015-2019 | **Cultural Competence Pre and Post Assessment (SWK 2207)**  **NOTE: Detailed Analysis included in Addendum 2E** | **Fall 2014 –**  N = 28  Avg. Total Score Increase = 27.46  Avg. Level Increase = .95  **Spring 2015 =**  N = 38  Avg. Total Score Increase = 25.17  Avg. Level Increase = .85  **Fall 2015 =**  N = 12  Avg. Total Score Increase = 32.5  Avg. Level Increase = .83  **Spring 2016 =**  N = 28  Avg. Total Score Increase = 26.7  Avg. Level Increase = .75  **Fall 2016 =**  N = 12  Avg. Total Score Increase = 29.33  Avg. Level Increase = .75  Note all SWK 2207 is in Appendix 2C |
| **Are changes planned as a result of the assessment of program outcomes? If so, what are those changes?** | Data has been gathered for SWK 1206, therefore changes are proposed: It is reasonable to suggest a goal for students would be to increase by 7 points between pre-test and post-test. It would also seem reasonable to suggest that students should increase their knowledge in each category by at least one point. In this case, the Department is struggling in their explanation of Function and Roles within the profession. To address this concern, instructors will spend an increased time in class providing case examples for students to discuss in groups where they decide upon the roles and functions of the social worker. The case examples will be discussed in class.  NOTE: Pre/Post Assessment Tool was revised in Spring of 2017.  Data has been gathered for SWK 2207, therefore changes are proposed: Though the Social Work Department appears to have exceeded expectations in terms of students increasing knowledge, expectations could be higher. A new goal is proposed to see students increase by at least 33 points in total score. This denotes the largest gap in Levels according to Dr. Lum. It is also recommended as stated above that instructors spend time during the beginning of the term helping students understand their own cultural awareness, perhaps using small group discussion.  **Changes for Spring 2015 & Fall 2016**  The following new Social Work Program outcomes have been introduced:   1. Engage in policy practice to advance social responsibility and ethic of service. 2. Demonstrate knowledge of cultural diversity locally and globally and difference in practice. 3. Communicate effectively with groups and individuals in a variety of ways through writing skills, oral communication, listening, and information literacy. 4. Demonstrate the ability to critically think and solve problems using guided discussion, research, and class participation. 5. Demonstrate professional ethics, attitudes and behaviors when interacting with clients in practicum settings. 6. Demonstrate knowledge of the Social Work profession including history, functions and roles, and ethics.   SWK 2207 successfully piloted the Cultural Diversity/Global Citizenship General Education Rubric, fall ‘15 & spring ‘16**.**  A plan has been proposed for program assessment for each of the above program outcomes and it awaiting.  Note: All data related to assessment of SWK 1206, 1213, 2207 can be located in the following appendices: 3, 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 3E, 3F, 3G | | | |
| **How will you determine whether those changes had an impact?** | The department will implement Program formative and summative assessment strategies that provide feedback regarding the achievement of program outcomes in Social Work. The department will utilize this data to make changes to the curriculum as appropriate. | | | |

**SOCIAL WORK**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcomes**  **2017/18 “New”** | To which course(s) is this program outcome related? | Year assessed or to be assessed. | Assessment Methods  Used | What were the assessment results?  (Please provide brief summary data) |
| Engage in policy practice to advance social responsibility and ethic of service. | SWK 1213 | 2016-2019 | Advocacy Project | **SWK 1213 Advocacy Project - Pass (Above 70%)/Fail Data**  **Fall 2016 - 68% Pass Rate**  N = 22  Pass = 15  Fail = 7  **Spring 2017 – 91% Pass Rate**  N = 33  Pass = 30  Fail = 3  **Fall 2017 – 82% Pass Rate**  N = 17  Pass = 14  Fail = 3 |
| Demonstrate knowledge of the Social Work profession including history, functions and roles. | SWK 1206 | 2017-2019 | Post-Test | **SWK 1206 Post-Test – Pass (Above 70%)/Fail Data**  **Spring 2017 – 50% Pass Rate (NOTE: Low N Due to Missing Data)**  N = 4  Pass = 2  Fail = 2  **Fall 2017 – 35% Pass Rate**  N = 31  Pass = 11  Fail = 20 |
| Communicate effectively with groups and individuals in a variety of ways with varied audiences through writing skills, oral communication, listening and information literacy. | Fall, 2016 - SWK 1213  Beginning Spring 2017, the related course is SWK 2207. | 2015-2019 | **Fall 2016** - Advocacy Project  **Beginning Spring 2017** - Group Research/Immersion Project | **SWK 1213 Advocacy Project - Pass (Above 70%)/Fail Data**  **Fall 2016 - 68% Pass Rate**  N = 22  Pass = 15  Fail = 7  **SWK 2207 Group Research/Immersion Project – Pass (Above 70%)/Fail Data**  **Spring 2017 – 87 % Pass Rate**  N = 23  Pass = 20  Fail = 3  **Fall 2017 – 80% Pass Rate**  N = 20  Pass = 16  Fail = 4 |
| Demonstrate the ability to critically think and solve problems using guided discussion, research, and class participation. | SWK 1213 | 2015-2019 | **Beginning in Spring 2017, SWK 1206 will no longer be measured on this outcome.**  **Beginning Fall, 2016 - Social Policy Research Project** | **SWK 1206 Pre-Post Test Data (Average Scores)**  **Spring 2014 -**  N = 27 Pre = 49.4% Post = 77.8% **Fall 2014 -**  N = 37 Pre = 59.3% Post = 64% **Spring 2015 -**  N = 48 Pre = 56.4% Post = 66.1% **Fall 2015 -**  N = 26 Pre = 49.4% Post = 58.4% **Spring 2016 -**  N = 41 Pre = 51.3% Post = 65.5% **Fall 2016 -**  N = 35 Pre = 51% Post = 50%  **SWK 1213 Policy Analysis Paper - Pass (Above 70%)/Fail Data**  **Fall 2016 - 68% Pass Rate** N = 22 Pass = 15 Fail = 7  **Spring 2017 – 82% Pass Rate**  N = 33  Pass = 27  Fail = 6  **Fall 2017 – 29%**  N = 17  Pass = 5  Fail = 12 |
| Demonstrate professional ethics, attitudes and behaviors when interacting with clients in practicum settings. | SWK 1213 | 2015-2019 | **Practicum Evaluation**  **(SWK 1213)**  **Beginning Spring 2017 the Practicum Evaluation was Combined with Successful Presentation of Completion for Student to Receive Full Credit.** | **Practicum Evaluation and Presentation (Must Complete Both to Pass):**  **Fall 2015 – 89% Pass Rate**  N = 28  Pass = 25  Fail = 3  **Spring 2016 - 94% Pass Rate**  N = 18  Pass = 17  Fail = 1  **Fall 2016 - 77% Pass Rate**  N = 22  Pass = 17  Fail = 5  **Spring 2017 – 85% Pass Rate**  N = 33  Pass = 28  Fail = 5  **Fall 2017 – 94% Pass Rate**  N = 17  Pass = 16  Fail = 1 |
| Demonstrate knowledge of cultural diversity locally and globally and difference in practice. | SWK 2207 | 2015-2019 | **Cultural Competence Pre and Post Assessment (SWK 2207)**  **Beginning in Spring 2017 this outcome will be measured by a passing grade on SL#5 – Self-Improvement Plan in combination as well as successful completion of Post Self-Assessment.** | **Cultural Competence Post Self-Assessment:**  **Fall 2014 –**  N = 28  Avg. Total Score Increase = 27.46  Avg. Level Increase = .95  **Spring 2015 =**  N = 38  Avg. Total Score Increase = 25.17  Avg. Level Increase = .85  **Fall 2015 =**  N = 12  Avg. Total Score Increase = 32.5  Avg. Level Increase = .83  **Spring 2016 =**  N = 28  Avg. Total Score Increase = 26.7  Avg. Level Increase = .75  **Fall 2016 =**  N = 12  Avg. Total Score Increase = 29.33  Avg. Level Increase = .75  **Spring 2017 –**  N = 13  Avg. Total Score Increase = 31.46  Avg. Level Increase = .92  **Fall 2017 –**  N = 19  Avg. Total Score Increase = 26.38  Avg. Level Increase = .69  **SL #5 – Personal Self-Improvement Plan:**  **Spring 2017 – 74% Pass Rate**  N = 23  Pass = 17  Fail = 6  **Fall 2017 – 75% Pass Rate**  N = 20  Pass = 15  Fail = 5 |
| **Are changes planned as a result of the assessment of program outcomes? If so, what are those changes?** | Data has been gathered for SWK 1206, therefore changes are proposed: It is reasonable to suggest a goal for students would be to increase by 7 points between pre-test and post-test. It would also seem reasonable to suggest that students should increase their knowledge in each category by at least one point. In this case, the Department is struggling in their explanation of Function and Roles within the profession. To address this concern, instructors will spend an increased time in class providing case examples for students to discuss in groups where they decide upon the roles and functions of the social worker. The case examples will be discussed in class.  NOTE: Pre/Post Assessment Tool was revised in Spring of 2017.  Data has been gathered for SWK 2207, therefore changes are proposed: Though the Social Work Department appears to have exceeded expectations in terms of students increasing knowledge, expectations could be higher. A new goal is proposed to see students increase by at least 33 points in total score. This denotes the largest gap in Levels according to Dr. Lum. It is also recommended as stated above that instructors spend time during the beginning of the term helping students understand their own cultural awareness, perhaps using small group discussion.  Changes for Spring 2016 & Fall 2016  The following new Social Work Program outcomes have been introduced:   1. Engage in policy practice to advance social responsibility and ethic of service. 2. Demonstrate knowledge of cultural diversity locally and globally and difference in practice. 3. Communicate effectively with groups and individuals in a variety of ways through writing skills, oral communication, listening, and information literacy. 4. Demonstrate the ability to critically think and solve problems using guided discussion, research, and class participation. 5. Demonstrate professional ethics, attitudes and behaviors when interacting with clients in practicum settings. 6. Demonstrate knowledge of the Social Work profession including history, functions and roles, and ethics.   A plan has been created for assessment of each of the above outcomes and is attached.  Additionally:  Social Work 2207 is piloting the Cultural Diversity/Global Citizenship General Education Rubric, spring 2016.  2/1/18 Update- After piloting the Cultural Diversity/Global Citizenship General Education Rubric, changes were proposed to the tool to better evaluate these skills in our students. The Rubric is currently being re-tried in SWK 2207 as a tool to assess the Group Research/Immersion Project. This newest update includes the new Program Assessment Plan for Social Work which as a result changed some of the artifacts that had previously been used. Outcomes were updated to reflect the newest information. I am working on rubrics for all artifact assignments so that adjunct faculty can also submit data to increase the “N”. | | | |
| **How will you determine whether those changes had an impact?** | The department will implement formative and summative assessment strategies that provide feedback regarding the achievement of program outcomes in Social Work. The department will utilize this data to make changes to the curriculum as appropriate.  2017/18  A plan has been created for assessment of each of the above outcomes and is attached. | | | |

The Program Outcomes for the degrees are listed below. **All program outcomes must be assessed at least once during the 5 year Program Review cycle, and assessment of program outcomes must occur each year**.

**GEOGRAPHY**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcomes** | To which course(s) is this program outcome related? | Year assessed or to be assessed. | Assessment Methods  Used | What were the assessment results?  (Please provide brief summary data) |
| 1) Demonstrate knowledge and skills related to geospatial technologies, including: coordinate systems, projections, scale, temporal and spatial relationships, data models, data types, and map reading | GEO 1101  GEO 1102  GEO 1107 | Fall 2012 – Spring 2014 | Multiple Choice pre and post assessment | GEO 1101- 2012-2013, a multiple choice pre and post assessment test was piloted. In Fall 2013, we modified the assessment based on a remapping of the assessment to course outcomes. The cumulative results for percent correct by semester:  F2012 pre 40% and post 57%  S2013 pre 38% and post 49%  F2013 pre 49% and post 80%  S2014 pre 54% and post 72%  S2015 pre 56% and post 77%  The assessment has helped us to focus on specific geographical knowledge and skills that students should demonstrate after completing the course.  GEO 1101 100–  Face to Face:  F2016 pre 53% and post 69%  S2016 pre 55% and post 77%  GEO 1101-102  F2016 pre 56% and post 84%  (See 2015-16 GEO 1101 data see appendix 2D)  GEO 1101-H51  S2016 pre 48% and post 76%  GEO 1101-100  F2F  S2017 In class quizzes increase in leaning from pre to post test was 35%.  GEO 1101-100  F2F Map quizzes  Increase learning by 53.3%  GEO 1102-102  F2F  S2017 Percentage increase from pre to post test was 75%  GEO 1101-100  F2F  F2017 Percentage increase from per to post test was 75%  GEO 1101-100  F2F Map quizzes  Increase learning by 77%  GEO 1101-102  F2017 In class quizzes increase in leaning from pre to post test was 71%.  GEO 1101-102  F2F Map quizzes  Increase learning by 75%  GEO1102-101  F2016 pre 41% and post 61%  GEO 1102-102  F2016 pre 43% and post 80%  The cumulative results for percent correct by semester:  Percent of increase from pre to post was 39% in the mean score.  The average is 43% mean score  GEO 1102 – S2014 & F2014  Similar to GEO 1101 a multiple choice test covering all outcomes was piloted in the spring and fall of 2014. The results were:  S 14 15.67% increase  F 14 30.0% increase  Indications from the pilot are that better coordination between all sections is needed and the test should be revised to focus on specific learning outcomes.  S15 48.74 % increase  F15 43.01% increase  GEO 1101-101  F2016 pre 41% and post 61%  GEO 1102-101  F2016 pre 43% and post 80%  The cumulative results for percent correct by semester:  Percent of increase from pre to post was 39% in the mean score.  The average is 43% mean score  Note: for 2015-16 GEO 1101 & 1102 data see appendix 2D |
| 2) Demonstrate responsibility and accountability in accomplishing individual and group goals in a variety of social contexts. | GEO 1101 GEO 1102 GEO 1107  GEO 1201 GEO 1209 GEO 2210 | Group projects, grading, Rubric |  |
| 3) Demonstrate the ability to think logically and problem solve using analysis, synthesis, and evaluation through the study of the science of place and space | GEO 1101  GEO 1102 | Fall 2012 – Spring 2014  Group presentation | Multiple Choice pre and post assessment  **NOTE: In June 2015, we shifted from Angel to e-Learn which caused a bit of a problem. Results from Angel in F2014 courses were not received in the proper format for a t-test evaluation.** |
| 4) Demonstrate the ability to present geographic concepts, approaches, methodologies, and applications in oral, written, cartographic, and other visual forms. | GEO 1102 | Fall 2012 – Spring 2014 | Multiple Choice pre and post assessment |
| 5) Demonstrate the ability to identify, characterize, and explain spatial patterns and structures, the interaction between environment and society, and recognize the increasing interdependence of world cultures, environments, and their consequences. | GEO 1102 | Spring 15 –Fall 15 |  |
| Are changes planned as a result of the assessment of program outcomes? If so, what are those changes?  How will you determine whether those changes had an impact? | **Changes for 2014/15**  Current results offer a picture of how we are doing overall. The next step is to report assessments by learning outcome. For the 2014-2015 school year, the Geography Department is focusing on student improvement in learning on “How to analyze the spatial organization of people and place on the earth's surface." This focus requires that instructors make sure to focus on concepts, such as site/situation, space-time compression, primate city rule, central place theory.   1. The geography department is in the process of piloting a change to reporting results. The change will use t-statistics to report pre and post test results. 2. In fall 2014, we are piloting a survey that measures ‘cultural awareness’ in two sections. This is a tested survey being used in the introduction to Anthropology classes. 3. We are also considering how to incorporate assessments in GEO1107 Introduction to GIS course**.** 4. Current results offer a picture of how we are doing overall. The next step is to report assessments by learning outcome. For the 2015-2016 school year, the Geography Department is focusing on student improvement in learning on “How to analyze the spatial organization of people and place on the earth's surface." This focus requires that instructors make sure to focus on concepts, such as site/situation, space-time compression, primate city rule, central place theory. 5. Following a pilot, the geography department is using t-statistics to report pre and post test results for GEO1101 Human Geography. In physical geography (GEO1102) smaller enrollments and variations in numbers between pre and post testing makes the reporting of t-statistic problematic. We are in the process of considering other ways to evaluate results. 6. Geography is participating in the department-wide survey that measures ‘cultural awareness’ in two sections. This is a tested survey being used in the introduction to Anthropology classes.   **Changes for 2015-2016**  **1) We are piloting a portfolio based assessment in GEO1107 Introduction to GIS course.**  2) Geography continues to participate in the department-wide survey that measures ‘cultural awareness’ in two sections. This is a tested survey being used in the introduction to Anthropology classes.  3) A portfolio based assessment was successfully piloted in GEO1107 Introduction to GIS course. fall 16, spring of 17n  4) Geo 1101 Human Geography successfully piloted the Cultural Diversity/Global Citizenship General Education Rubric, fall ‘15 & spring ‘16**.**  5) As we end 2016/17 the plan is to develop a plan for program assessment beyond the introductory level that can be implemented in 2017-18**.**  **Changes for 2016-2017**  1. We are piloting an assessment in GEO 2210  2. We are piloting the Information Literacy Rubric in GEO 1107  The department will implement Program formative and summative assessment strategies that provide feedback regarding the achievement of program outcomes in Geography/GIS. The department will utilize this data to make changes to the curriculum as appropriate. | | | |

**GEOSPATIAL TECHNOLOGY**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcomes** | To which course(s) is this program outcome related? | Year assessed or to be assessed. | Assessment Methods  Used | What were the assessment results?  (Please provide brief summary data) |
| Demonstrate knowledge of foundational concepts and applications of geospatial technology. | GEO 1107 | 2016-2017 | Map Portfolio | Fall 2016:  12/23 Students completed with >80%  13/23 Students completed >70%  (5 not submitted)  Spring 2017:  15/22 Students completed >80%  16/22 Students completed >70%  (3 did not submit) |
| Demonstrate professional effectiveness and teamwork by exhibiting leadership, cooperation, and making productive contributions to group written and oral assignments. Students must also demonstrate a respect for diverse view points within the group. | GEO 2210 | 2017-2018 | Final Project | Evaluating in 2018/19 |
| Demonstrate the ability to apply the geographical perspective, including: analyzing and explaining the spatial organization of people, places, and environments on the Earthâ€™s surface; recognizing applications of geography in everyday life, understanding of the increasing interdependence of economic, political, and social/cultural processes; and considering problems from alternative points of view (global awareness). | See GEO 1101 (Human  Geography) or  GEO 1102 (Physical Geography | On going | Multiple Choice |  |
| Demonstrate the ability to use maps and other geographic representations, geospatial technologies and spatial thinking to coordinate multiple geographic representations, evaluate the quality of geospatial data, and analyze geographic questions and communicate information. | GEO 1209 Cartography | 2018-2019 | Final Project | Evaluating in 2018/19 |
| Demonstrate the broad range of skills required to plan and organize a geographic research project, including; managing the workflow of a project, systematically gathering and evaluating geographic information from primary and secondary resources; selecting, designing, and organizing maps and other graphical representations; and evaluating and interpreting geographical information. | GEO 1107 | 2016-2017 | End of Term Project Report | Fall 2016:  17/23 Students completed with >80% (5 not submitted)  Spring 2017:  13/22 Students completed >80%  17/22 Students completed >70%  (2 did not submit) |
| Are changes planned as a result of the assessment of program outcomes? If so, what are those changes? | This is a new program that has not been fully implemented. Plans for Program formative and summative assessment will be developed over the next year.  **2017: No changes** | | | |
| How will you determine whether those changes had an impact? | On-going review of projects from year to year. | | | |

**OPTIONAL:**

Please use the space below to keep track of any annual data that your department wishes to maintain. This section is completely optional and will not be reviewed by the Division Assessment Coordinators.

**Appendix 1 Sociology 1101 2017-2018 Report**

**Overview:**

The Sociology, Geography and Social Work SGS department continued to thoroughly assess student learning during the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 terms. Specifically, Sociology 1101 continued to assess course outcomes that focused on four key areas, such as sociological perspective, paradigms or theory, research methods and stratification. The strategy for capturing assessment included a pre and posttest that were administered to students by both full time and adjunct faculty. The pretest assessment was given to students during the first two weeks of the semester. The same (post) assessment was given to students during the final week of the semester. The pre and post scores were analyzed to capture student learning in specific focal areas of the Sociology 1101 course. In general, the department is pleased to see a consistent pattern of learning growth- between pre and post assessments- among students across sections of Sociology 1101during a 16- week term.

**Data Analysis**:

The N for pretests in Fall 2016 was 702 and the N for posttest in was 513 There was an overall 13.3% increase (Mean score 14.2 = pre and 18.9 = post) between pre and post course assessments. More specifically:

**Sociological perspective** area 10% increase

**Theory (Paradigms)** was a 11% increase

**Research Methods** area there was a 6% increase

**Stratification** area there was a 12% increase

Although the N is smaller for Spring 17, the data indicated a similar trend of increased learning among the core areas of Sociology 1101. The N = 597 for pretest assessments and N= 488 (Mean Pretest score= 14.1 and Post score= 16.7 for an overall average increase of 9.4%

More specifically:

**Sociological Perspective** area demonstrated an increase of 11%

**Theory (Paradigms)** was an 8% increase

**Research Methods (IDA)** was a 6% increase

**Stratification** was a 12% increase

**Flipped Summary:**

In addition, data was also evaluated for specific sections of Sociology 1101 that were delivering course materials using the flipped curriculum that the department established several years ago. The department is encouraged by the overall increases experienced across the department, but is also pleased to see that those sections (9-fall and 13-spring) who offered a flipped course the learning increase was larger than the general classroom experience. For example, during the Fall 16 term, the mean pretest score was 13.6 (N=293) and the mean posttest score 20.2 for N= (265), and the Spring 17 term N=386 and pretest mean score of 13.9; while the posttest N= 327 and the posttest mean score was 18.4.

**Appendix 2 Sociology 1145 2017-2018 Report**

Sociology 1145 Assessment Report 2017

Submitted by Katherine R. Rowell, Ph.D.

February 9, 2018

Summary

Overall, the assessment reports for 2017 do show gains in learning on the 32 item content assessment test. However, the cross-cultural self-assessment tool is proving to be problematic. Unfortunately, most students enrolled in Sociology 1145 rate themselves as very cross-culturally aware on the pre-test. This means that there are minimum gains in learning when they take the post-test. We are also experiencing lack of follow through in the face to face classes with completing the post-assessment with our adjunct faculty. Although numerous reminders are given, the majority of adjunct faculty did not have students complete the post test. Based on the assessment findings for the 2017 year, the following recommendations are being made:

1. We have already changed the 32 item content assessment test to a 20 item item pre/post-test beginning Spring 2018.
2. We would recommend no longer using the cross-cultural self-assessment test given that most students are not able to self-assess their own cultural awareness.
3. Work with department chair to make sure face to face classes are following through with the pre ad post assessment quizzes.

**SPRING 2017 Assessment Report**

**Assessment Report for Pre/Post 32 Content Assessment Quiz over Course Outcomes**

**Pre-test**

Out of a total of 229 students, only 121 completed both pre and post assessment (due to face to face classes not completing post-assessment)

Mean of 32 item test: 13.44 out of 32

**Post- test**

Mean of 32 item test: 19.2 out of 32

**42% increase in learning in Spring of 2017**

**Summer 2017 Assessment Report**

**Assessment Report for Pre/Post 32 Content Assessment Quiz over Course Outcomes**

**Pre-test**

Out of a total of 69 students, 48 students completed both pre and post (most students took course online)

Mean of 32 item test: 14.7 out of 32

**Post- test**

Mean of 32 item test: 23.04 out of 32

**48% increase in learning in Spring of 2017**

**Fall 2017 Assessment Report**

**Assessment Report for Pre/Post 32 Content Assessment Quiz over Course Outcomes**

**Pre-test**

Out of a total of 261 students, 130 students completed both pre and post (due to face to face classes not completing post- assessment )

Mean of 32 item test: 13.76 out of 32

**Post- test**

Mean of 32 item test: 20.48 out of 32

**51% increase in learning in Spring of 2017**

**Part 2: Assessment Report for Pre/Post 10 Item Cultural Awareness Self-Assessment Quiz**

We used 10 item cultural awareness self-assessment test in all sections of Sociology 1145.

**Here are the ten statements (likert scale) that make up the assessment test:**

1. **I can enjoy relating to all kinds of people.**
2. **I believe all cultures have something worthwhile to offer.**
3. **I am good at understanding people who are different from me.**
4. **When I am with people who are different from me, I interpret behavior in the context of culture.**
5. **I respect and value all cultures.**
6. **I have asked people if I have offended them by things that I have done or said and have apologized when necessary.**
7. **I believe other cultures have an impact on my life in my own country.**
8. **I like interacting with people from different cultures.**
9. **Lifestyles in other cultures are just as valid as those in my own culture.**
10. **I can simultaneously consider my worldview and another person’s worldview.**

**Overall, for all three semesters students scored on average 85.5% on the Pre-Test. In other words, most students felt they were very culturally aware before taking this course. Thus, the current self-awareness tool is not measuring cultural self-awareness at a level needed in the course. The average on the post-assessment for all three sections is higher with students scoring on average an 89.5% but the learning gains are minimal. It is recommend that we no longer use this tool as a measure in the course and instead look for a different tool to measure this and/or questions.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix 3 SWK 2017-18 Report**  **Fall 2017 Pre and Post Test Data - SWK 1206** | | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Pre-Test Data** | | | | | | |  | **Post-Test Data** | | | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Student** | **1-4 (Purpose)** | **5-8 (Function & Roles** | **9-12 (Values & Ethics)** | **13-16 (History)** | **17-20 (Theory)** | **Total Score** |  | **Student** | **1-4 (Purpose)** | **5-8 (Function & Roles** | **9-12 (Values & Ethics)** | **13-16 (History)** | **17-20 (Theory)** | **Total Score** | **Total Score %** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adriannah Greyson | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 8 |  | Adriannah Greyson | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alicia Heeter | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 |  | Alicia Heeter | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aliyah Baker | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 |  | Aliyah Baker | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ayana Crosby | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 10 |  | Ayana Crosby | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Courtney Mackey | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 10 |  | Courtney Mackey | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demi Strader | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 |  | Demi Strader | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Destiny Arthur | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 11 |  | Destiny Arthur | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jacob Jones | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 |  | Jacob Jones |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jolene Huacuja | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 12 |  | Jolene Huacuja | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Khrissa Bergman | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 13 |  | Khrissa Bergman |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lisa Hulbert | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 11 |  | Lisa Hulbert | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mackenzie Wuebben | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 9 |  | Mackenzie Wuebben | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Magalia Frazier | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 |  | Magalia Frazier | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samantha Faris | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 |  | Samantha Faris |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samantha Jeckering | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 10 |  | Samantha Jeckering | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samantha Sanclers | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 10 |  | Samantha Sanclers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sanah Alnassir | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 |  | Sanah Alnassir | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sonya Cain | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 14 |  | Sonya Cain | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tashyra Wilson | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 12 |  | Tashyra Wilson | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alexander Gruber | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 10 |  | Alexander Gruber | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ashley Vaughan | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |  | Ashley Vaughan | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brittney Stubnar | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 |  | Brittney Stubnar | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bryanna Veege | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 |  | Bryana Seege | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cassandra Stevenson | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 |  | Cassandra Stevenson | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Destine Gurtis | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 11 |  | Destiny Curtis | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominique Figures | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 |  | Dominique Figures | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jestina Elder | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 |  | Jestina Elder | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jen Hamloton | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 |  | Jen Hampton | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elizabeth Buschur | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 12 |  | Elizabeth Buschur | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kayla Workman | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 13 |  | Kayla Workman | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kaitlyn Dunham | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |  | Kaitlyn Dunham |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kriston Parsans | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 12 |  | Kirsten Parsons | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Layia Branscomb-setters | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 13 |  | Layia Branscomb-setters | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lexie Rutledge | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 |  | Lexie Rutledge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rachel Olga Ford | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 14 |  | Rachel Olga Ford | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sara Lung | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 15 |  | Sara Lung |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sydney Mayrer | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 |  | Sydney Mayrer | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Savannah Hamlin | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 |  | Savannah Hamlin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kierra Taylor | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 11 |  | Kierra Taylor | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Marqueta Mills | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Analysis** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Student** | **1-4 (Increase/Decrease Purpose)** | **5-8 (Increase/Decrease Function & Roles** | **9-12 (Increaes/Decrease Values & Ethics)** | **13-16 (Increase/Decrease History)** | **17-20 (Increase/Decrease Theory)** | **Increase/Decrease Total Score** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adriannah Greyson | 3 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alicia Heeter | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aliyah Baker | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ayana Crosby | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Courtney Mackey | 0 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demi Strader | 0 | 1 | 2 | -1 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Destiny Arthur | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jacob Jones |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jolene Huacuja | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Khrissa Bergman |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lisa Hulbert | -1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mackenzie Wuebben | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Magalia Frazier | 1 | -2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samantha Faris |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samantha Jeckering | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samantha Sanclers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sanah Alnassir | 1 | 1 | -2 | -1 | -2 | -3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sonya Cain | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tashyra Wilson | 0 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 1 | -2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alexander Gruber | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ashley Vaughan | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | -1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brittney Stubnar | -1 | 2 | 1 | -1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bryanna Veege | -1 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cassandra Stevenson | 1 | -1 | 0 | -1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Destine Gurtis | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominique Figures | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jestina Elder | -1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jen Hamloton | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elizabeth Buschur | 0 | 2 | 1 | -3 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kayla Workman | 1 | 0 | 0 | -2 | -1 | -2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kaitlyn Dunham |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kriston Parsans | 0 | -1 | 0 | -1 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Layia Branscomb-setters | 0 | -1 | -2 | 0 | 0 | -3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lexie Rutledge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rachel Olga Ford | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sara Lung |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sydney Mayrer | 1 | 2 | 3 | -1 | 1 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Savannah Hamlin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kierra Taylor | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Average** | 0.32258065 | 0.74193548 | 0.4516129 | 0.22580645 | 0.67741935 | 2.516129 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix 3A – SWK 2207 2017 – 2018 Report**  **Spring 2017 Group Research and Immersion Project Data** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Last Name** | **Group Presentation on Diverse Culture Points Grade** | **Percentage** | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Gay | 100 | 100% | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Tinsley | 74 | 74 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Jones | 96 | 96 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Riley | 89 | 89 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Perez | 100 | 100 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Valerio | 82 | 82 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Roustio | 96 | 96 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Violet | 0 | 0 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Cook | 100 | 100 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Long | 85 | 85 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Thompkins | 0 | 0 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Carmona | 96 | 96 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Wolf | 90 | 90 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Long | 80 | 80 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Pearson | 94 | 94 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Wells | 96 | 96 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Gray | 90 | 90 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Sebert | 96 | 96 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Meyer | 92 | 92 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Selman | 0 | 0 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Warsitz | 100 | 100 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Williams | 100 | 100 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| Hess | 100 | 100 | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Appendix 3B SWK 1213 2017 – 2018 Report**  **Spring 2017 Practicum Eval/Pres Data** | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| **Last Name** | **Completion of Hours** | | **Presentation** | | **Presentation %** | |  | |
| Gay | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Bradford | Pass | | 0 | | 0.00% | |  | |
| Lyons | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Carmona | Pass | | 0 | | 0.00% | |  | |
| Holliday | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Carter | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Khamis | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Brandon | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Orcutt | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Manning | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Hicks | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Gray | Pass | | 0 | | 0.00% | |  | |
| Amburgy | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Meyer | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Johnson | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Henderson | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Martin | Incomplete Project | | 0 | | 0.00% | |  | |
| Cain | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Williams | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Nichols | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Williams | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Speyrer | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Jones | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Lake | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Parson | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Hoover | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Slade | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Short | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Walker | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Moore | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Moss | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Hamilton | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
| Gillispie | Pass | | 20 | | 100.00% | |  | |
|  |  | |  | |  | |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix 3C SWK 1213 2017 – 2018 ReportFall 2017 - Social Policy Data** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Last Name** | **Social Policy Paper Points** | **Percentage** |  |  |
| Davis | 32 | 64% |  |  |
| Gunn | 30 | 60% |  |  |
| Ferryman | 30 | 60% |  |  |
| Cook | 37.5 | 75% |  |  |
| Ogden | 30 | 60% |  |  |
| Lake | 50 | 100% |  |  |
| Hess | 40 | 80% |  |  |
| Reich | 31 | 62% |  |  |
| Deng | 0 | 0% |  |  |
| Panfilo | 40 | 80% |  |  |
| Bobbitt | 32.5 | 65% |  |  |
| Watt | 0 | 0% |  |  |
| Turner | 0 | 0% |  |  |
| Ali | 40 | 80% |  |  |
| McPherson | 0 | 0% |  |  |
| Spitzer | 34 | 68% |  |  |
| Henry | 0 | 0% |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix 3D SWK 1213 2017-2018 Report**  **Spring 2017 Advocacy Project Data** | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Last Name** | **Advocacy Training Session 1 Points Grade** | **Advocacy Training Session 2 Points Grade** | **Advocacy Day Points Grade** | **Advocacy Letter Points Grade** | **Advocacy Project %** |
| Gay | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Bradford | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Lyons | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Carmona | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Holliday | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Carter | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Khamis | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Brandon | 0 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 80.00% |
| Orcutt | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Manning | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Hicks | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Gray | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Amburgy | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Meyer | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Johnson | 20 | 20 | 30 | 25 | 95.00% |
| Henderson | 20 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 80.00% |
| Martin | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20.00% |
| Cain | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Williams | 0 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 80.00% |
| Nichols | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Williams | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Speyrer | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 30.00% |
| Jones | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Lake | 20 | 20 | 30 | 0 | 100.00% |
| Parson | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Hoover | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Slade | 20 | 20 | 30 | 20 | 100.00% |
| Short | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Walker | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Moore | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Moss | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Hamilton | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |
| Gillispie | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix 3E SWK 1213 2017 – 2018 Report**  **Fall 2017 Advocacy Project Data** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Last Name** | **Points Grade** | **Percentage** |  |  |  |
| Davis | 70 | 70% |  |  |  |
| Gunn | 63 | 63% |  |  |  |
| Ferryman | 60 | 60% |  |  |  |
| Cook | 87 | 87% |  |  |  |
| Ogden | 83 | 83% |  |  |  |
| Lake | 100 | 100% |  |  |  |
| Hess | 80 | 80% |  |  |  |
| Reich | 90 | 90% |  |  |  |
| Deng | 94 | 94% |  |  |  |
| Panfilo | 86 | 86% |  |  |  |
| Bobbitt | 80 | 80% |  |  |  |
| Watt | 93 | 93% |  |  |  |
| Turner | 90 | 90% |  |  |  |
| Ali | 91 | 91% |  |  |  |
| McPherson | 90 | 90% |  |  |  |
| Spitzer | 87 | 87% |  |  |  |
| Henry | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix 3F SWK 1213 2017 – 2018 Report**  **Spring 2017 - Social Policy Data** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Last Name** | **Social Policy Paper Points** | **Percentage** |  |  |  |
| Gay | 41 | 82% |  |  |  |
| Bradford | 38 | 76% |  |  |  |
| Lyons | 42 | 84% |  |  |  |
| Carmona | 34 | 68% |  |  |  |
| Holliday | 48 | 96% |  |  |  |
| Carter | 47 | 94% |  |  |  |
| Khamis | 46 | 92% |  |  |  |
| Brandon | 45 | 90% |  |  |  |
| Orcutt | 35 | 70% |  |  |  |
| Manning | 42 | 84% |  |  |  |
| Hicks | 46 | 92% |  |  |  |
| Gray | 49 | 98% |  |  |  |
| Amburgy | 41 | 82% |  |  |  |
| Meyer | 49 | 98% |  |  |  |
| Johnson | 48 | 96% |  |  |  |
| Henderson | 37 | 74% |  |  |  |
| Martin | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |
| Cain | 48 | 96% |  |  |  |
| Williams | 35 | 70% |  |  |  |
| Nichols | 50 | 100% |  |  |  |
| Williams | 50 | 100% |  |  |  |
| Speyrer | 43 | 86% |  |  |  |
| Jones | 22 | 44% |  |  |  |
| Lake | 38 | 76% |  |  |  |
| Parson | 50 | 100% |  |  |  |
| Hoover | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |
| Slade | 50 | 100% |  |  |  |
| Short | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |
| Walker | 49.5 | 99% |  |  |  |
| Moore | 39 | 78% |  |  |  |
| Moss | 47 | 94% |  |  |  |
| Hamilton | 49 | 98% |  |  |  |
| Gillispie | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix 3G SWK 2207 2017 – 2018 Report**  **Cultural Competence Pre Post Assessment Data Fall 2017** | | | | | | | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Last Name** | **SL #5** | **%** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cain | 20 | 100% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pernell | 20 | 100% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wilson | 18 | 90% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lyons | 20 | 100% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peaso | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nohacs | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Koverman | 16 | 80% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hicks | 20 | 100% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pastrana | 19 | 95% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frey | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cook | 18 | 90% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Johnson | 20 | 100% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lawrence | 17 | 85% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turner | 18 | 90% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collene | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ali | 20 | 100% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| McPherson | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greyson | 19 | 95% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spitzer | 19 | 95% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hall | 20 | 100% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWK 2207 Pre-Assessment Data | | |  |  |  |  | SWK 2207 Post-Assessment Data | | | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student | Pre-Test Total Score | **Cultural Awareness** | **Knowledge Acquisition** | **Skill Development** | **Level** |  | **Student** | Post-Test Total Score | **Cultural Awareness** | **Knowledge Acquisition** | **Skill Development** | **Level** |
| Sadia Ali | 76 | 26 | 16 | 34 | 2 |  | Sadia Ali | 93 | 26 | 19 | 48 | 2 |
| David Leigh | 95 | 25 | 15 | 55 | 3 |  | David Leigh | |  |  |  |  |
| Samantha Pastrana | 109 | 23 | 15 | 71 | 3 |  | Samantha Pastrana | 113 | 26 | 16 | 71 | 3 |
| Samantha Hall | 86 | 22 | 11 | 53 | 2 |  | Samantha Hall | 129 | 30 | 20 | 79 | 4 |
| Johnathan N Nohacs | 85 | 20 | 13 | 52 | 2 |  | Johnathan N Nohacs | | |  |  |  |
| Sonya Cain | 102 | 27 | 13 | 62 | 3 |  | Sonya Cain | 114 | 29 | 17 | 68 | 3 |
| Cassidy J | 90 | 25 | 11 | 54 | 2 |  | Cassidy J |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lenai McPherson | 102 | 26 | 15 | 61 | 3 |  | Lenai McPherson | 128 | 28 | 20 | 80 | 3 |
| Aeriona Lawrence | 81 | 21 | 12 | 48 | 2 |  | Aeriona Lawrence | 92 | 24 | 12 | 56 | 2 |
| Adriannah Greyson | 101 | 27 | 15 | 59 | 3 |  | Adriannah Greyson | 130 | 31 | 18 | 81 | 4 |
| Jordan Johnson | 88 | 20 | 11 | 57 | 2 |  | Jordan Johnson | 125 | 29 | 18 | 78 | 3 |
| Tristan Pernell | 75 | 17 | 13 | 45 | 2 |  | Tristan Pernell | 129 | 30 | 19 | 80 | 4 |
| Erynn Cook | 103 | 29 | 14 | 60 | 3 |  | Erynn Cook | |  |  |  |  |
| Ashley Koverman | 92 | 23 | 11 | 58 | 2 |  | Ashley Koverman | 116 | 27 | 18 | 71 | 3 |
| Cassidy Spitzer | 76 | **23** | 11 | 42 | 2 |  | Cassidy Spitzer | 126 | **29** | 20 | 77 | 3 |
| Da'von Hicks | 109 | 26 | 16 | 67 | 3 |  | Da'von Hicks | 115 | 29 | 16 | 70 | 3 |
| Jenna Peaso | 99 | **26** | **16** | **57** | **3** |  | Jenna Peaso | |  |  |  |  |
| Tashyra Wilson | 102 | 25 | 14 | 63 | 3 |  | Tashyra Wilson | 132 | 30 | 20 | 82 | 4 |
| Autumn Lyons | 88 | **27** | **14** | **47** | **2** |  | **Autumn Lyons** | 117 | 29 | 17 | 71 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average | 92.57895 | 24.1052632 | 13.47368 | 55 | 2.473684 |  | Average | 118.5 | 28.35714 | 17.85714 | 72.28571 | 3.142857 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SWK 2207 Analysis | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student | Increase/Decrease (Score) | Increase/Decrease (Cultural Awareness) | Increase /Decrease (Knowledge Acquisition) | Increase/Decrease (Skill Development) | Increase/Decrease (Level) | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sadia Ali | 17 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| David Leigh | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samantha Pastrana | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Samantha Hall | 43 | 8 | 9 | 26 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Johnathan N Nohacs | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sonya Cain | 12 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cassidy J |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lenai McPherson | 26 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Aeriona Lawrence** | 11 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adriannah Greyson | 29 | 400% | 3 | 22 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jordan Johnson | 37 | 900% | 7 | 21 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tristan Pernell | 54 | 1300% | 6 | 35 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Erynn Cook | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ashley Koverman | 24 | 400% | 7 | 13 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cassidy Spitzer | 50 | 600% | 9 | 35 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Da'von Hicks | 6 | 300% | 0 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jenna Peaso | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tashyra Wilson | 30 | 500% | 6 | 19 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average | 26.38462 | 477% | 4.615385 | 17 | 0.692308 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix 4 GEO 1101 and 1102 2017 – 2018 Report**

**Assessment report for human and physical geography for spring and fall of 2017.**

**This is the assessment report for all geography 1101 (human geography) and geography 1102 (physical geography) for spring and fall of 2017**

**For Geo 1101 or human geography, the test is comprised of a content part which consists of 25 questions and a map location part which is also comprised of 25 questions. While the first part focuses on the content of the course, the second part is the base and foundation of human geography understanding the location of various places on Earth.**

**For Geo 1102 or physical geography, the test is comprised of 25 questions which consisting of content questions as well as spatial analysis questions.**

**SPRING 2017**

**Geo 1101-100**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statistics** | **Pre-test** | **Post-test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N | 14 | 11 |  |
| Mean | 14.71 | 19.91 | 35.3% |
| Median | 15 | 20.33 | 35.5% |

* The mean score rose form 14.71 in the pre-test to a mean score of 19.91 in the post-test indicating an increase of over 35%.
* For the Median, the score also rose by over 35% from a score of 60% in the pre-test to a score of over 81%.

**Map Quiz**

Pre-test mean score was 11 while the post-test results had a mean score of 21. That is an increase of 91%. Students take 8 map quizzes throughout the semester between the pre and post assessment.

**Geo 1101-100**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statistics** | **Pre-test** | **Post-test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N | 18 | 13 |  |
| Mean | 13.67 | 19.92 | 45.7% |
| Median | 13.50 | 20.25 | 50% |

* As shown above, the mean score rose form 13.67 in the pre-test to a score of 19.92 in the post-test indicating almost a 46% increase.
* The median score rose from a score of 13.50 in the pre-test to a score of 20.25 in the post-test indicating a 50% increase.

**Map Quiz**

* Map Quiz increased from a mean score of 12 or 48% to a post mean score of 19 or 76% which translates in to an increase of 58.3%.

**Geo 1102-102**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statistics** | **Pre-test** | **Post-test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N | 16 | 9 |  |
| Mean | 12.69 | 19.56 | 54.13% |
| Median | 12 | 21 | 75% |

* In this class, the mean score rose from 12.69 in the pre-test to a score of 19.56 in the post-test indicating an increase of over 54%.
* The median score showed a rise from 12 in the pre-test to a score of 21 in the post test or a 75% increase.

**FALL 2017**

**Geo 1101-100**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statistics** | **Pre-test** | **Post-test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N | 21 | 14 |  |
| Mean | 12.67 | 19.50 | 53.9% |
| Median | 12.38 | 20 | 61.55% |

* The mean score showed a rise in the mean score from 12.67 in the pre-test to a score of 19.5 in the post-test which indicates an increase of almost 54%.
* The Median score showed a rise in score from 12.38 in the pre-test to a score of 20 in the post test translating to an increase of almost 62%

**Map Quiz**

* The map quiz showed a rise in mean score from 11 in the pre-test to a mean score of 19.5 in the post-test indicating an increase of 77%

**Geo 1101-102**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statistics** | **Pre Test** | **Post Test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N | 21 | 15 |  |
| Mean | 11.71 | 20 | 70.79% |
| Median | 11.67 | 21 | 79.9% |

* The mean score for showed a rise in score from 11.71 in the pre-test to a score of 20 in the post-test indicating an increase of almost 71%
* The Median score rose form a score of 11.67 in the pre-test to a score of 21 in the post-test which is an increase of almost 80%.

**Map Quiz**

* The map quiz showed a rise in the mean score from 11 in the pre-test to a score of 19.2 which indicates an increase of almost 75%

**LAST YEAR**

**Appendix 1A**

**Program Curriculum Mapping – Sociology**

Key: “I” = Introduced “R*”* = Reinforced “M” = Mastery “A” = Assessment Evidence Collected

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students who successful complete this major will be able to: | Introduction to Sociology Courses | Appalachian Families | Sociology of Marriage & Family | Popular Culture | Sociological Aspects of Deafness | Introduction to Cultural Anthropology | Sociology of Aging | Sociology of Human Sexuality | Global Poverty | Sociology of family Violence | Social Problems | Sociology of American Cities | Applied Populations Demography | Race & Ethnicity | Criminology |
| **1)** Demonstrate the ability to apply the sociological perspective is defined as a) concern with the totality of social life, b) emphasis on the context (setting) in which behavior takes place c) recognition that meaning is a social product, arbitrarily agreed upon d) focus on the group and social interaction. | 2IA |  | 2R | 2I |  | 2IA | 2R | 2I | 2IR | 2R | 2RM | 2R | 2IR | 2RM | 2R |
| **2)** Understand scientific research methods used to study society. Interpret statistical tables, graphs, charts as they apply to an understanding of the human behavior and social life. | 5IA | 5I | 5R |  |  | 5I | 5R | 5I | 5IR | 5R | 5RM | 5R | 5IR | 5RM | 5R |
| **3)** Demonstrate professional effectiveness and teamwork by exhibiting leadership, cooperation, and making productive contributions to group written & oral assignments. Students must also demonstrate a respect for diverse view points within the group. | 3I |  | 3R |  |  | 3I A | 3R |  | 3IR | 3R | 3RM | 3R | 3IR | 3RM | 3R |
| **4)** Examine diversity in society and the impact of local and global social stratification hierarchies (the inequalities) of gender, race/ethnicity, and age. | 1IA | 1I | 1R | 1I | 1I | 1IA | 1R | 1I | 1IR | 1R | 1RM | 1R | 1IR | 1RM | 1R |
| **5)** Demonstrate social responsibility and an ethic of service: attitudes and understandings needed to live in a society as responsible citizens and to contribute to building a caring and just society. | 4I |  | 4R |  |  | 4I | 4R |  | 4IR | 4R | 4RM | 4R | 4IR | 4RM | 4R |

<http://workarea:word:annualupdate>: annual update 2016-2017: Sociology curriculum mapping

**Appendix 1B**

**Program Curriculum Mapping – Social Work**

Key: “I” = Introduced “R*”* = Reinforced “M” = Mastery “A” = Assessment Evidence Collected

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students who successful complete this major will be able to: | Introduction to Social Work | Introduction to Social Welfare | Cultural Competence in a Diverse World |
| **1)** Engage in policy practice to advance social responsibility and ethic of service. | Introduced | Reinforced, Mastery | Introduced |
| **2)** Demonstrate knowledge of cultural diversity locally and globally and difference in practice. | Introduced | Reinforced | Introduced |
| **3**) Communicate effectively with groups and individuals in a variety of ways through writing skills, oral communication, listening, and information literacy. | Introduced | Introduced | Reinforced, Mastery |
| **4)** Demonstrate the ability to critically think and solve problems using guided discussion, research, and class participation. | Introduced | Reinforced | Introduced |
| **5)** Demonstrate professional ethics, attitudes, and behaviors when interacting with clients in practicum settings. | Introduced | Reinforced | Introduced |
| **6)** Demonstrate knowledge of the NASW Code of Ethics and professional attitudes and behaviors. | I | I.R | I |

<http://workarea:word:annual> update: annual update 2016-2017: SOC GEO SWK curriculum mapping

10/22/15 SWK changed

**Appendix 1C**

**Program Curriculum Mapping - Geography**

Key: “I” = Introduced “R*”* = Reinforced “M” = Mastery “A” = Assessment Evidence Collected

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students who successful complete this major will be able to: | Human Geography | Physical Geography | Introduction to Geographic Information Systems | World Regional Geography | Appalachian Environment | Geography of the Middle East | Introduction to Cartography | Advanced Spatial Analysis |
| Identify, characterize, and explain spatial patterns and structures, environment-society interactions, global interconnectedness as well as increase understanding of cultural diversity locally and globally. | I, R | I, R | I | I, R, M |  | I, R, M | I | I |
| Demonstrate ability to think logically and problem solve using analysis, synthesis, and evaluation through the study of science of place and space. Students must also demonstrate research skills. | I, R | I, R | I, R | I, R, M |  | I, R, M | I, R | I, R, M |
| Demonstrate knowledge of foundational concepts and applications of geospatial technologies. | I, R | I, R | I, R | I, R, |  | I, R, | I, R, M | I, R, M |
| Demonstrate professional effectiveness and teamwork by exhibiting leadership, cooperation, and make productive contributions to group written and oral communication.  Students must also demonstrate a respect for diverse viewpoints within the group. | I, R | I, R | I, R | I, R, M |  | I, R, M | I, R, M | I, R, M |
| Demonstrate social responsibility and an ethic of service:  attitudes and understandings needed to live in a society as responsible citizens and to contribute to building a caring and just society. | I, R | I, R | I, R | I, R, M |  | I, R, M | I, R, M | I, R, M |

[http://workarea:word:](http://workarea:word:program)annualupdate: annual update 2016-2017: Geography curriculum mapping

**Appendix 2A**

**SOC 1101 Data**

**Overview:**

Fall 2015 Sociology 1101 continued to assess course outcomes that focused on the sociological perspective, paradigms or theory, research methods and stratification. Both Full time and adjunct faculty administered pre- assessments to students during the 1st week of the semester. The same assessment was given to students during the final week of the semester. The pre and post scores were analyzed to view student learning in the focal areas of the Sociology 1101 course. Overall, the students demonstrated an overall growth in learning between pre assessments given in August and also administered in late April or early May.

**Data Analysis**:

The N for pretests in Fall 2015 was 694 and the N for posttest in was 436. There was an overall 12.2% increase (Mean score 13.8 = pre and 16.9 = post) between pre and post course assessments. More specifically:

**Sociological perspective** area 11% increase

**Theory (Paradigms)** was a 10% increase

**Research Methods** area there was a 5% increase

**Stratification** area there was a 12% increase

The results for Spring 16, followed a similar pattern of increased learning among students based upon the results that analyzed the pre and post assessment data. The N = 491 for the pretest and N= 305. Mean Pretest score= 14.1 and Post score= 16.7 for an overall average increase of 11.9%

More specifically:

**Sociological Perspective** area demonstrated an increase of 13%

**Theory (Paradigms)** was an 8% increase

**Research Methods (IDA)** was a 7% increase

**Stratification** was a 13% increase

**Appendix 2B**

Sociology 1145 Assessment Report

Submitted by Katherine R. Rowell, Ph.D.

February 12, 2017

**Spring 2016 and Fall 2016**

**Executive Summary:**

* Spring 2016 was the first semester that adjunct faculty were asked to participate. Unfortunately, there were problems with scantron sheets not being completed correctly and the assessment data seems problematic compared to past years. Based on experience, both the content assessment and the cultural self-assessment for Sociology 1145 were moved to elearn for Fall 2016 to prevent problems with incomplete and incorrect reporting.
* The Fall 2016 assessment data is more user friendly and accurate. Students who did not take both the pre and post test were removed from the data thus making data more valid. Data do indicate increases in learning in both face to face and online courses with highest increases in learning in the online sections (see next bullet point).
* Based on Fall 2016 experiences, a face to face course shell will be developed for all faculty teaching the face to face course in Fall 2017. The shell will include all the assessment quizzes as well as practice quizzes that are available in the online course. Some faculty are using these materials and others are not. The assessment data from Fall 2016 indicates that online students had higher scores on the post-assessment content quiz compared to face to face students. Other study aids will be made available in the master shell for face to face classes (we are doing this in Sociology 1101).
* The 32 item content analysis test will be reduced to 25 items for Fall 2017 (based on item analysis).
* The cross-cultural self-assessment shows little to no change due to the fact that students seem to rate themselves at a higher than normal level for this type of assessment.
* Pilot a cross-cultural self-assessment quiz that includes a neutral category to see to what extent this might offer a more valid measure. Depending on results, may adapt self-assessment for Fall 2017.

**SPRING 2016 Assessment Report**

**Part I. Assessment Report for Pre/Post 32 Content Assessment Quiz over Course Outcomes**

**Content Assessment (Face to Face Classes only)**

In comparison to Spring of 2015, the assessment data collected in Spring 2016 seems to be problematic. Last Spring, we saw significant gains in learning with the mean for the post test at 19 out of 32. Unfortunately, there seemed to be some problems with scantrons not being completed correctly. This is also the first time where adjunct faculty were asked to participate.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre** | **Post Test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N=111 | N=79 | Problematic |
| Mean=12.04 | Mean=13 | N/A |
| Median: 11.82 | Median=12.60 | N/A |

**Content Assessment (Online Only)**

We piloted the online assessment test in one section of Sociology 1145 (16 week course)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre** | **Post Test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N=21 | N=12 |  |
| Mean=12.2/38% | Mean=19.2/60% | 58% increase |
| Median=N/A | N/A |  |

**Part 2: Assessment Report for Pre/Post 10 Item Cultural Awareness Self-Assessment Quiz**

We piloted a 10 item cultural awareness self-assessment test in face to face sections of Sociology 1145. We also had a section of Human Geography and World Geography included in the data. Overall results, do show increased cultural awareness with the majority of all students **strongly agreeing** with all statements on the post test except for statements 3, 4, 6 and 10 where students moved from **strongly agree to agree.**

**Here are the ten statements (likert scale) that make up the assessment test:**

1. **I can enjoy relating to all kinds of people.**
2. **I believe all cultures have something worthwhile to offer.**
3. **I am good at understanding people who are different from me.**
4. **When I am with people who are different from me, I interpret behavior in the context of culture.**
5. **I respect and value all cultures.**
6. **I have asked people if I have offended them by things that I have done or said and have apologized when necessary.**
7. **I believe other cultures have an impact on my life in my own country.**
8. **I like interacting with people from different cultures.**
9. **Lifestyles in other cultures are just as valid as those in my own culture.**
10. **I can simultaneously consider my worldview and another person’s worldview.**

Students choosing strongly agree on each question would be indicating the highest degree of cultural self-awareness. Overall, students in both the pre-test and post-test indicated high levels of cultural self-awareness. After completing the post test (and the course), the majority of students answered strong agree to all of the statements above (moved from agree, disagree, etc to strongly agree except for questions 3, 4, 6, and 10. For statements 3, 4, 6, and 10 students moved from strongly agree to agree . For example for the pre-test, 56.20% of students strongly agreed with statement 4 but after completing the course, only 37.3% of students indicated strongly agree. Although they no longer strongly agreed, 64% did agree. This pattern was similar for statements 3, 6 and 10. Thus, the course may also have helped students reevaluate their own understanding of culture. It would seem that for statements 3, 4, 6, and 10 students may have assessed themselves to be highly culturally aware to only find out they may be less aware than they thought when they took the pre-test. In other words, results from the post-test would indicate that students may have developed a more realistic self-awareness. Based on these results, the Cultural Self-Awareness assessment was developed into an online version to be used in all sections of the course.

**FALL 2016 Assessment Report**

This is the first time that all sections of Sociology 1145 were required to use the assessment quizzes. All assessment quizzes were developed to be given online in all courses. In the online sections, the course settings were conditionally adjusted to require students to take both the pre-test and post-test thus more students completed both the pre and post test. Unfortunately, faculty teaching face to face classes seemed to not encourage students enough to take the post test. However, the data now reflects only students that have taken both the pre and post test meaning the data is much more accurate than previous assessment data. Face to Face faculty will receive training and reminders about the assessment process for Spring 2017 and Fall 2017 based on this experience. Also, a master face to face course shell will be developed with all the assessment quizzes and practices quizzes in the shell . Faculty will be required to include practice quizzes and assessment quizzes in all courses (these are already pre-loaded into online courses). Data for all courses is available in excel format at the section level and were shared with department chair.

**Part I. Assessment Report for Pre/Post 32 Content Assessment Quiz over Course Outcomes**

**Content Assessment (Face to Face Classes only) 4 sections**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre** | **Post Test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N=45 | N=45 |  |
| Mean=40% /32 | Mean=52%/32 | 30% increase |
|  |  |  |

**Content Assessment (Online Only) 5 sections**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre** | **Post Test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N=90 | N=90 |  |
| Mean=44%/32 | Mean=65%/32 | 48% increase |
|  |  |  |

**Part 2: Assessment Report for Pre/Post 10 Item Cultural Awareness Self-Assessment Quiz**

**The 10 item likert scale self-assessment quiz was adjusted to enable score of cultural self-awareness. A score of 40 would indicate the highest level of cultural self-awareness.**

**Here are the ten statements (likert scale) that make up the assessment test:**

1. **I can enjoy relating to all kinds of people.**
2. **I believe all cultures have something worthwhile to offer.**
3. **I am good at understanding people who are different from me.**
4. **When I am with people who are different from me, I interpret behavior in the context of culture.**
5. **I respect and value all cultures.**
6. **I have asked people if I have offended them by things that I have done or said and have apologized when necessary.**
7. **I believe other cultures have an impact on my life in my own country.**
8. **I like interacting with people from different cultures.**
9. **Lifestyles in other cultures are just as valid as those in my own culture.**
10. **I can simultaneously consider my worldview and another person’s worldview.**

**Cross-Cultural Self Assessment (Face to Face Classes only) 2 sections (only 2 sections had valid data)**

**Many students in the face to face classes did not complete both pre and post (plan to require this Fall 2017).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre** | **Post Test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N=34 | N=34 |  |
| Mean= 82.5%/40 | Mean=85.5%/40 | 3.7% |
|  |  |  |

**Cross-Cultural Self –Assessment Online (Assessment is set up as a requirement in online courses) 5 sections**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre** | **Post Test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N=90 | N=90 |  |
| Mean=85%/40 | Mean=85% | No change |
|  |  |  |

Discussion: Assessment data from the Cross-cultural Self-Assessment indicates that students tend to rate themselves highly on this assessment quiz. Some students end up with a lower score on the post-test because they often realize they had rated themselves too highly. Currently, the cross-cultural self-assessment test does not have a neutral or I don’t know category. Students are forced to choose between strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree. In order to examine to what extent this self-assessment is useful (given the high self-assessment ratings on the pre-test), we will pilot a self-assessment test that includes a neutral category in two sections of the course in the summer to see to what extent this may be a more valid self-assessment.

**Appendix 2C**

**SWK 2207 Pre/Post Assessment Data Breakdown**

Analysis by Category

**Fall 2014 -**   
N = 28

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Increase (Awareness)** | **Average Increase (Knowledge)** | **Average Increase (Skills)** | **Average Increase**  **(Score)** | **Average Increase**  **(Level)** |
| **1.3** | **5.06** | **19.49** | **27.46** | **0.96** |

**Spring 2015 -**   
N = 38

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Increase (Awareness)** | **Average Increase (Knowledge)** | **Average Increase (Skills)** | **Average Increase**  **(Score)** | **Average Increase**  **(Level)** |
| **3.37** | **4.36** | **17.48** | **25.8** | **0.85** |

**Fall 2015 -**   
N = 12

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Increase (Awareness)** | **Average Increase (Knowledge)** | **Average Increase (Skills)** | **Average Increase**  **(Score)** | **Average Increase**  **(Level)** |
| **5.83** | **5.92** | **20.75** | **32.5** | **0.83** |

**Spring 2016 -**   
N = 28

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Increase (Awareness)** | **Average Increase (Knowledge)** | **Average Increase (Skills)** | **Average Increase**  **(Score)** | **Average Increase**  **(Level)** |
| **4.29** | **4.74** | **17.85** | **26.7** | **0.75** |

**Fall 2016 -**   
N = 12

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Increase (Awareness)** | **Average Increase (Knowledge)** | **Average Increase (Skills)** | **Average Increase**  **(Score)** | **Average Increase**  **(Level)** |
| **4.3** | **6.25** | **18.75** | **29.33** |  |

**Appendix 2D**

**Assessment report for human and physical geography for spring and fall of 2016.**

**This is the assessment report for all geography 1101 (human geography) and geography 1102 (physical geography) for spring and fall of 2016**

**For Geo 1101 or human geography, the test is comprised of a content part which consists of 25 questions and a map location part which is also comprised of 25 questions. While the first part focuses on the content of the course, the second part is the base and foundation of human geography understanding the location of various places on Earth.**

**For Geo 1102 or physical geography, the test is comprised of 25 questions which consisting of content questions as well as spatial analysis questions.**

**SPRING 2016**

**Geo 1101-100**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Pre-test | Post-test | Percentage Increase |
| N=12 | N=11 |  |
| Mean=13.83 | 19.18 | 38.7% |
| Median13.5 | 19.25 | 42.6% |

* As indicated above there was an almost a 39% rise in the mean score from the pre to the post exam. This means the average score rose from an average of 55% in the pre-test to a post-test average of 77%.

**Map Quiz**

* Pretest Mean was 13.36 or 53%, rising a post-test mean score 19.4 or a 78% average. This indicates an increase of 45.2%.

**Geo 1101-H51**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Pre-test | Post-test | Percentage Increase |
| N=15 | N=11 |  |
| Mean=11.27 | 18.73 | 66.2% |
| Median10.38 | 20.00 | 92.7% |

* Map Quiz increased from a mean score of 12 or 48% to a post mean score of 19 or 76% which translates in to an increase of 58.3%.

**Geo 1102-102**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre-test** | **Post-test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N=13 | N=11 |  |
| Mean=10.85 | 20 | 84.3% |
| Median=11.75 | 20 | 70.2% |

* In this class, the scores rose from a pre-test mean of 10.85 or 43% to a post-test score of 20 or 80% indicating an increase of 84%.

**FALL 2016**

**Geo 1101-100**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre-test** | **Post Test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N=14 | N=9 |  |
| Mean=13.21 | Mean=17.22 | 30.36% |
| Median=13.50 | Median=18 | 33.33% |

* For the above section, there was an increase of 30.36% from the pre to the post test. While the mean for the class for the pre-test was 13.21 or approximately 53%, that mean rose to 17.22 or 69% in the post exam. In all the scores, there was only one student in the post test that scored a lower score than the pre-test. This resulted in the lowering of the mean for the entire class. If that one score is taken out, the mean will rise to 74%.
* The mean rose from 13.36 or 53% in the pretest to a mean of 19.4 or approximately 78%.

**Geo 1101-102**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre Test** | **Post Test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N=22 | N=18 |  |
| Mean=13.91 | Mean=21.06 | 51.4% |
| Median=14.5 | Median=22.50 | 55.17% |

* For the section above, the post-test indicated a much higher post test scores than the 100 section previously. In this class, the pre-test mean was 56% and rose to over 84% in the post-test.

**Fall 2016**

**Geo 1102-101**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Pre Test** | **Post Test** | **Percentage Increase** |
| N=11 | N=9 |  |
| Mean=10.36 | Mean=15.22 | 46.91% |
| Median=10.67 | Median=15 | 40.58% |

* For the physical geography course above, the post-test showed an increase of 46.91% in the mean scores from pre-test while the median indicated an increase of 40.58% from pre to post test. Of all the classes in both semesters, this is the only class in which the average in the post-test did not show an average of 70%.

As the data clearly indicates above, there is a significant increase in scores from the pre to the post test with the exception of geo 1102-101 for fall of 2016. In all other sections the mean in the post exam is either 70% or higher.

This summer, I will revisit the tests for both courses and make revisions to the exam where it is necessary.