School of Humanities and Social Sciences

Assessment Report Summary HSS

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Assessment Report Summary

Each year the HSS Dean and Associate Dean review the findings and share them with HSS chairs and program directors in the Fall. Decreases in enrollments as well as increases are discussed with the program chairs. While data have been collected and tracked over the years at the School level, all changes or modification to the curriculum, or to expectations of the faculty, take place at the program level. The findings are utilized to assess the health of our programs, access to highly personalized education, global experiences, community engagement, and training in the methods of scholarly inquiry and research appropriate to each discipline.

Outcome 1 - HSS students are provided with a highly personalized education enhanced by opportunities for experiential learning.

Over the last 5 years the percentage of students enrolled annually in small capstone courses or independent enrollments has been on the rise. It jumped from 56% to 59% this year. Students enrolled in one-on-one instruction has remained stable at 9%. Tracking the percentage of student who upon graduation have worked one-on-one with a faculty member demonstrates a 3% increase from 15% to 18% this year, while 26% of students take part in internships.

Evidence Based Changes (ie “closing the loop”): Each year data from the past 4 years are used to set new targets for the following year. HSS students are receiving a highly personalized education enhanced by opportunities for experiential learning. HSS would like to increase these offerings in the future. However, personalized learning opportunities are costly. Increasing these opportunities requires additional faculty lines and incentives for current faculty to engage in these experiences above and beyond their standard workload. Given the number of faculty in HSS has been reduced, it is surprising that the one-on-one work with students has not. Programs are doing more with less.

Impact of changes ie: “closing the loop”: While independent enrollments are not yet compensated (we are still advocating), HSS has increased the offerings in “highly personalized educational experiences” in all areas except internships over the last 5 years see data above). 2018-2019 planned change addresses this with trying to raise funds to support student internships. This will be a new measure for 2018-2019.

Outcome 2 - HSS students develop global awareness by participating in study abroad programs.

Over the last 5 years approximately 11% of HSS students study abroad annually. Approximately 33% of students have studied abroad prior to graduation.

Evidence Based Changes (ie “closing the loop”): Each year data from the past 4 years are used to set new targets for the following year. HSS students are developing global awareness by participating in study abroad programs. Over the last 4 years HSS allocated some funds toward summer study abroad scholarships. Without additional scholarships it is difficult to increase participation in the study abroad programs. While ideally students would have a full semester experience abroad, increasing the shorter summer and spring break programs with adjusted tuition rates for out-of-state students should increase opportunities for students to expand their global awareness.

Impact of changes ie: “closing the loop”: While students studying abroad annually have decreased a bit over the last 5 years they are again on the rise for students upon graduation. HSS Faculty are offering additional study abroad courses but more importantly HSS has continued to fund student study abroad. 2018-2019 planned change addresses trying to raise additional funds for study abroad and this will be a new measure in 2018-2019.

Outcome 3 - To help students acquire depth of knowledge and competence in at least one academic discipline.

Over the last 5 years HSS majors have fluctuated annual between 2600 and 2200 with between 800 and 600 students graduating annually. Graduates have declined from 807 to 571 since 2014.

Evidence Based Changes: Each year data from the past 4 years are used to set new targets for the following year. Individual programs have increased their recruiting but, it appears HSS is experiencing a nationwide trend shifting majors to Business Schools.

Outcome 4 - HSS students are trained in the method of scholarly inquiry and research.
Over the last 5 years enrollments in methods training courses has decreased slightly but, generally holds steady at approximately 96% of HSS majors enrolled annually. This is probably high given students may enroll in more than one course per year. A better measure of methods training comes from the graduation data. This has dropped from 94% to 86% over a 5 year period. Most majors require some sort of a methods training course.

Evidence Based Changes (ie "closing the loop"): Each year data from the past 4 years are used to set new targets for the following year. Data from 5 years were used to targets for the following year. Given the high percentage annually and upon graduation of HSS majors receiving methods training appropriate to their discipline, HSS would like to increase the quality not quantity of these offerings. Research methods training is not only limited by faculty availability but, also by access to state of the art lab and computer facilities. Current physical resources will rapidly become inadequate to provide our students with methods training to enter the workforce or continue their education in graduate school if resources continue to be cut.

Impact of changes ie: "closing the loop": HSS faculty are doing more with less. Over the last 3 years graduating HSS majors with a research experience have increased (see data above). While some students receive this experience in a research methods course or lab, others have this experience one-on-one in a highly personalized educational experience. HSS will try to continue this trend of offering students a research experience.

Outcome 5 – To honor the college’s commitment to social responsibilities, the HSS faculty and students engage in collaborations with diverse communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

Over the last 5 years HSS faculty have given of their time and expertise to the community. Students (7%) regularly participate in internships.

Evidence Based Changes (ie "closing the loop"): Each year data from the past 4 years are used to set new targets for the following year. While the target was not met in measure 1 for faculty, given the raw numbers, HSS faculty and students engage in collaborations with diverse communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. No changes are necessary.

Impact of changes ie: "closing the loop": HSS has increased the offerings in "highly personalized educational experiences" in all areas except internships over the last 5 years (see data above outcome 1). 2018-2019 planned change addressees this with trying to raise funds to support student internships.

Communication - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary Communication BA

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):.

This has been a period of change in way assessment has been performed in the Communication Department. Prior to the 2017-2018 Academic Year, the Department assessed the program by looking at how well individual courses met their own learning objectives. These course specific learning objectives were designed to help students achieve the programmatic course objectives. By measuring different courses each year, throughout a cycle of several years student proficiency in all of the Departmental Learning Objectives was achieved.

However, beginning with the 2017-2018 Academic Year the Department decided to change its assessment procedure to examine the course sequences at the beginning and end of the major to determine student proficiency with the learning objectives that apply to the program as a whole. These courses, COMM 281 and COMM 481, represent the end of the introductory sequence into the major and the end of the concluding capstone experience.

As this is the first year of a new type of assessment, changes have not yet been made to the courses and the program that are being measured. However, this data will be discussed with the faculty at faculty meetings and will play a large role in ongoing curricular and course modifications.

English - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary English BA

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):.

The department has collected no data indicating needed changes to the major, although our assessment process is in need of refinement.
The assessment committee has encountered various aspects of our assessment efforts that need refinement or change:

1. student survey questions need to match the language of the rubric for each SLO;
2. the number of graduating seniors completing the survey should be increased to at least 50%.
3. the department needs to discuss SLO 3 and possible changes to the major to make sure that we are collecting appropriate data to measure.

#3 was the most surprising difficulty we encountered. We had expected to be able to collect and score 10% of graduating seniors’ work that demonstrated SLO3, but we had trouble getting these samples since we did not start until the spring semester. Additionally, we discovered that the e-portfolio and the internship are so different that the rubric we used did not really serve both items. We know there are other places in the major where students are demonstrating their ability to apply skills to new contexts, so we need to identify those for next year in consultation with the department. We may also want to think about ways to feature this aspect of our major more prominently in advising and in possible revisions we may make to the major in the next year.

Creative Writing - Minor

Assessment Report Summary Creative Writing

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Because the 2014-2015 assessment of Program Goal 3 revealed a need to improve students’ ability to connect the act of reading contemporary literature to the practice of writing, the program has worked on ways to more closely align writing assignments with reading assignments and emphasize the importance of craft via the examination of contemporary examples of literature at all course levels. In the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, these methods only partially worked resulting in Measure 1 getting lower scores, but Measure 2 shows a 100% success rate. In the 2016-2017 assessment cycle, these methods continued to have mixed results: for Measure 1, the target was not met and the results did not improve, and for Measure 2 the target was met, but the results did not improve from the previous assessment cycle. Last year, the program decided to further modify the cover letter and exit survey to reflect a more nuanced understanding of the various elements of craft; revision strategies and techniques; and contemporary examples of genre. Also, the program decided to implement more active writing assignments that require students to connect assigned readings of published authors with their own writing process in order to further address Program Goal 3: Contemporary Examples of Genres. In addition, the program worked towards ensuring a larger sample size, up from 8 students in 2016-2017 to 95 students assessed (for the cover letter) and 85 students assessed for the survey in 2017-2018. The 2017-2018 results were good overall: students improved in both measures for the Writing Process; both measures for Working Vocabulary; and one measure for Contemporary Examples of Genres. In the future, the program will work to refine the second measure (the survey) so that it doesn’t accidentally repeat the same goals as the cover letter.

History - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary History BA

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

The most important change the undergraduate History program has made in response to the assessment process was to change both what we assessed and how we assessed it. For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, we introduced new student learning outcomes and two new rubrics to assess them, focusing on more sophisticated critical skills.

The results of this alteration in our assessment program, which we have now seen for a second year, has raised more questions than we have yet found answers, but has given us data to ask the right questions. The most important question raised by assessment has been whether students are learning the skills in HIST 299 that will allow them to flourish using the more advanced analytical skills of the discipline. The assessment committee has found that final projects of students in 299 sections that require a full-scale research paper are easier to assess than those of sections that require an extensive research prospectus instead; but does writing only a prospectus translate into poorer performance in more advanced classes? We are working as a department toward a resolution of this question, to decide if it would be in students’ interest to produce a more uniform, regimented HIST 299.

Irish and Irish American Studies - Minor

Assessment Report Summary Irish and Irish American Studies

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Two main areas of improvement are indicated. One is in the teaching of history—not historical methodology but basic historical facts regarding Ireland and Irish America. For the second year in a row, that deficiency will lead to changes in the IIAS 201 course. While disappointing, that result is rather conventional and calls for conventional solution: revision of to the syllabus after consultation with historians.
The second area is more problematic. It regards assessment of the study abroad experience. IIAS is very confident that it has developed a useful self-assessment instrument as one indirect measure; that was one goal for this year. But the other goal was to develop a professional instrument directly measuring intercultural competence; here, research has indicated that a high level of expertise is required—and it is hoped that leadership in CIE would perhaps make such measures available to study abroad programs.

**Philosophy - BA/Minor**

Assessment Report Summary Philosophy BA

7. **Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):**

None of our results, for any of the three outcomes, are quite where we want them to be, but so far we have not had nearly enough evidence to justify any substantive program changes. We have ongoing conversations about the use of supplemental instruction in our symbolic logic course, but symbolic logic is such a standard course for philosophy majors that significant changes would not make sense. We prefer to investigate how broader critical thinking skills are being fostered in the major as a whole.

It is not clear that our exit survey data are giving us enough information to shed light on this or many other questions. We are now in the process of revising that survey and putting it online, to get more and better responses. But we also want to move away from that exit surveys to more informative measures. We are going to start, this coming year, by also assessing an essay (and not just using exam grades) in the history of philosophy classes, and we have developed a new rubric for this purpose. In the longer term, we would like to move to a portfolio model of assessment, where we look at the work of graduating majors from various times in their careers, to see how their skills have developed. To allow access to that work, we will need all faculty to require students to submit essays on OAKS -- which not all faculty currently do. So we will need time to implement the portfolio model.

**Political Science - BA/Minor**

Assessment Report Summary Political Science BA

7. **Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):**

Most of the assessment of student learning that we have done up to this point has focused on students in their senior year, with assessment of capstone papers and the POLI exit survey results. This is the first year we have gathered information of student learning of 100 level classes (that also count for general education, we do not know how many of these students would eventually be majors). All we have gathered in this first go around on assessing student learning in the 100 level classes is a single data point. Until we can compare this to future years it is not clear what our data means. We are meeting expectations and exceeding them in our own assessment of student work, although that learning is less robustly evidenced in the student self assessment in course instructor evaluations.

Our Departmental discussions about the data we have gathered have focused on two areas: first, a concern that we are not capturing the student learning that we would like to measure this discussion includes a reluctance to explore new ways to assess given the need to produce a yearly assessment report. Second, we have had some very productive faculty discussions around our capstone class: what it is and what it should do and what expectations we have for students in that class. While there is nothing in our data to support this claim, it does seem as though we, as a unit, have a more cohesive understanding of our own capstone class. We have also discussed the many ways in which student work from that class may not represent well student learning (other than the learning in the paper in that class).

We have simplified the rubric for capstone assessment in order to capture better what the faculty collectively thinks are the most important aspects of the capstone paper.

**Geography - Minor**

Assessment Report Summary Geography

7. **Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):**

The results here underline that the minor program is largely meeting our goals in terms of student training in the basic ideas, methods and sub-disciplines in geography. There is room for improvement around communicating language that can then be tracked in the methods courses. Most importantly, measures in the 200 and 300 level courses were used for the first time in 2017-18 and so, as with all of the tools used here, it will be interesting to gather data over coming academic years to get a fuller picture of how the minor program is performing. We do not anticipate wholesale changes in light of the need to gather data over coming years, although there will be small modifications in terms of communicating course goals in the methods courses, for example.

The results also show that Geography is in line with the College’s strategic plan.
psychology - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary Psychology BA

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

For the B.A. major in Psychology, four SLOs were assessed and analyzed for student proficiency in the areas of (1) communication effectiveness, (2) application of research methodology, and (3) application of psychological principles. This was accomplished via the use of SLO1, SLO2A, SLO2B, and SLO3.

SLO1: Communication Effectiveness:

Assessment of SLO1 was accomplished by analyzing student understanding of American Psychological Association (APA) formatting requirements (measure #1) and written communication effectiveness (measure #2) in upper-elective Psychology courses (PSYC351 and above). This was accomplished by assessing student research proposals on topics of the student’s choosing using a newly-created assessment rubric. This assessment was conducted in the Spring 2017 semester. Minimum target performance was set at 70%.

Measure #1: Student research proposals were evaluated based upon APA style formatting requirements. This included proper formatting of: Title Page (6 points), Abstract (4 points), Introduction (2 points), Method (3 points), Discussion (2 points), and References (11 points).

Performance Target: Minimum target performance was set at (or above) 70%.

Spring 2017: Three (3) PSYC351+ courses met the requirements for the SLO1 measure #1 assessment. Overall performance of students (N = 47) was 71% (19.9 out of 28 possible points). The performance on this measure exceeded our target performance of 70% for B.A. majors.

Measure #2: Student research proposals were evaluated based upon clarity of writing and logical thought. This assessment was based on a rating scale between 0 – 3 (0 = Absent, 1 = Some discussion present, 2 = Discussion mostly present, and 3 = Discussion complete).

Performance Target: Minimum target performance was set at (or above) 70%.

Spring 2017: Three (3) PSYC351+ courses met the requirements for the SLO1 measure #2 assessment. Overall performance of students (N = 47) was 65% (13.75 out of 21 possible points). The overall performance on this measure did not exceed our target performance of 70% for B.A. majors.

SLO1 Conclusions:

Our target (70%) was met for Measure #1 (71%; N=47), but not met for Measure #2 (65%; N=47).

While we were unable to meet our target performance levels of >70% for both measures (Measure #1 = 71%; Measure #2 = 65%), it should be noted that the data are based on a single sample of PSYC351+ courses and the small sample could be misleading.

Strategy for 2018-2019: A departmental decision was made for the Assessment Committee to (1) re-evaluate the PSYC351+ assessment rubric and (2) collect more data throughout 2018-2019 to increase the sample size. A decision regarding any needed changes will be made following the 2018-2019 assessment.

SLO2A: Application of Research Methodology

Assessment of SLO2A was accomplished by analyzing student responses on a newly-developed Research Experience Questionnaire (measure #1) and student understanding of research methodology and results from assigned empirical journal articles (measure #2). This assessment was conducted in the Fall 2017 semester.

Measure #1: PSYC103 students took a newly developed Research Experience Questionnaire that was designed to assess student participation and interpretation of their research experience (which included participation in empirical research conducted at the College of Charleston, evaluation of assigned empirical research articles, or a combination of both), their confidence in understanding research methodology and statistical analyses, and their likelihood of wanting to work in a psychology research lab in the future.

Performance Target: Minimum target performance for the reported level of research understanding and confidence was set at or above the midpoint (4) on the scale.

The data for Measure #1 for PSYC majors and/or minors (N = 15) were as follows:

Fall 2017: Approximately 10% of students were randomly sampled from all Fall 2017 PSYC103 courses. The data were analyzed separately for PSYC majors/minors (N=15) and non-majors (N=13).

PSYC Majors/Minors (N=15)
Usefulness of empirical research participation = 4.0 (out of 7)
Understanding of research methodology following empirical research participation = 4.75 (out of 7)
Understanding of statistics following empirical research participation = 4.5 (out of 7)
Usefulness of empirical journal article review = 3.93 (out of 7)
Understanding of research methodology following empirical journal article review = 4.57 (out of 7)
Understanding of statistics following empirical journal article review = 4.21 (out of 7)
Likelihood in participating in a psychology research lab in the future = 6.20 (out of 7)

For psychology majors and minors, we set our performance target of 4 (out of 7) for six out of seven measures. Furthermore, the measure that did not meet our performance target (usefulness of journal article review) was not significantly different from our performance target.

Non-Majors (N=13)

Usefulness of empirical research participation = 4.4 (out of 7)
Understanding of research methodology following empirical research participation = 3.80 (out of 7)
Understanding of statistics following empirical research participation = 2.60 (out of 7)
Usefulness of empirical journal article review = 4.0 (out of 7)
Understanding of research methodology following empirical journal article review = 4.54 (out of 7)
Understanding of statistics following empirical journal article review = 4.08 (out of 7)
Likelihood in participating in a psychology research lab in the future = 3.25 (out of 7)

For non-majors, we met our performance target of 4 (out of 7) for four out of seven measures.

Since this assessment was implemented in the current assessment period, no previous data existed to compare our results. This assessment will continue in 2018-2019.

**Measure #2:** PSYC103 instructors were asked to randomly select 10 journal review article response sheets (N = 77) for evaluation by the assessment committee in terms of 1) the accuracy of their reporting of research methodology, and 2) their accuracy of reporting research findings on a scale of 0 - 2 (0 = incorrect/missing, 1 = mostly correct, 2 = answer is complete and correct).

**Performance Target:** A performance target at or above 70 percent on average for each question was established for Measure #2. Information regarding majors/minors and non-majors was not available.

The data for Measure #2 was taken in the Fall 2017 (N = 77) semester and were as follows:

Overall understanding of research methods:

42% of the artifacts achieved a score of 2 (complete and correct) on the research methods assessment portion. However, when one includes artifacts that were scored as either a 1 (mostly correct) or 2 (complete and correct), then 96% of the artifacts accomplished this.

Overall understanding of research findings:

Similarly, for measure #2 only 45% of the artifacts achieved a score of 2 (complete and correct) on the research findings assessment portion. However, when one includes artifacts that were scored as either a 1 (mostly correct) or 2 (complete and correct), then 94% of the artifacts accomplished this.

Since this assessment was implemented in the current assessment period, no previous data exists to which we can compare our results. This assessment will continue in 2018.

**SLO2A Conclusions:**

We were only able to meet our target performance levels for most of Measure #1 (6 out of 7 targets met for majors/minors) and, as a department, we were pleased with this outcome. For Measure #2, our performance targets were not met.

**Strategy for 2018-2019:** It was speculated that the journal article review forms were not specific enough regarding the expectations for the assignment. Changes have been made to the journal article review forms to make them more detailed so that students are prompted for more complete answers. It is hoped that this change will result in a greater percentage of artifacts being scored as a 2 (complete and correct). The Assessment Committee will collect more data throughout 2018 to determine if any other changes are needed to this (Measure #2) assessment.

**SLO2B: Application of Research Methodology**

Assessment of SLO2B was accomplished by analyzing student responses on a standardized General Education Assessment question on research methodology. This assessment was conducted in the Fall 2017 semester.
**Measure #1:** Students’ ability to identify or justify relevant theories/models/concepts was assessed using the following three questions from the standardized metric:

1. Identify whether these data represent a positive or negative correlation.
2. Identify which variable could be manipulated and describe how you might manipulate this variable.
3. Identify the dependent variable in your experimental study and describe how you might operationally define this variable so that it could be measured.

**Performance Target:** The performance target for students’ average performance was set at or above 70 percent.

The data for Measure #1 were as follows:

**Fall 2017:** Nineteen (19) PSYC103 courses were offered during the fall 2017 semester. Across the nineteen (19) courses, the population size was 512 students, but the final compilation of student artifacts submitted for assessment was approximately 360. As such, the sample size for this measure is 32 (N = 32).

The average score from the student artifacts (N=32) was 2.78 (out of 4.0) yielding a 70% performance criterion. This level of performance met our performance criteria of 70%.

**Measure #2:** Students’ ability to describe/explain and apply relevant theories/models/concepts was assessed using the following four questions from the standardized metric:

**Describe/Explain**

1. Explain the relationship between children’s viewing of violent television programming and aggressive behavior that is represented by this figure.
2. We cannot make causal inferences about relationships between variables from a non-experimental (or correlational) study. Describe several reasons why, in general, we cannot determine why one variable causes the other variable with data of this type.

**Apply**

3. Based on this figure, can we predict a child’s aggressive behavior with perfect accuracy if we know how many hours of violent TV he or she watched? Why or why not?
4. How would you design an experiment on this topic involving two groups of children to determine cause and effect? Specifically describe any necessary procedures to follow in the creation of groups.

**Performance Target:** The performance target for students’ average performance was set at or above 70 percent.

The data for Measure #2 were as follows:

**Fall 2017:** The sample size for this measure is 32 (N = 32).

For the explanation component, the average score was 2.95 (out of 4.0) yielding a 74% performance criterion. This level of performance exceeded our performance criteria of 70%.

For the application component, the average score was 2.84 (out of 4.0) yielding a 71% performance level. This level of performance exceeded our performance criteria of 70%.

**SLO2B Conclusions:**

The consistency in performance across the two measures (Measure #1 = identify; Measure #2 = explain and apply) was somewhat unexpected given that explaining and applying the concepts require a deeper level of understanding than identification of concepts. While Measure #1 did not improve relative to previous years, it still met our performance target. Additionally, Measure #2 met our performance target but increases in Measure #2 were also observed relative to the previous year (2016-2017). We were pleased with this outcome and will continue to monitor this measure in 2018 to ascertain whether this improvement is maintained in future years.

Strategy for 2018-2019: The assessment committee will continue to monitor this measure in 2018-2019 to ascertain whether this improvement is maintained in future semesters.

**SLO3: Application of Psychological Principles**

Assessment of SLO3 was accomplished by analyzing on-site supervisor evaluations for students enrolled in the Psychology Internship course. Specifically, students were evaluated based upon their ability to successfully apply psychological principles and practices (measure #1) and use their knowledge to actively problem solve, communicate effectively, and successfully work with coworkers and community members (measure #2).
**Measure #1:** Assessment of student's ability to apply psychological principles in a real-world setting and their ability to contribute and problem-solve in a real-world setting as determined by an on-site supervisor evaluation. This will be assessed using the responses to questions 7, 8, 9, and 15 on the on-site supervisor evaluation form.

**Performance Target:** The final performance targets for Measure 1 were determined from the Spring 2017 semester and applied to the Fall 2017 assessment. The performance targets were set at (or above) a rating of 4 (out of 5).

The data for Measure #1 were as follows:

**Spring 2017:** During the spring 2017 semester, the population size of the internship course (PSYC397) was 13 students and the sample size for this assessment was 13 (N=13)
- Student's ability to contribute using standard methods = 3.8 (out of 5)
- Student's ability to contribute in novel ways = 4.0 (out of 5)
- Student's ability to solve problems = 4.0 (out of 5)
- Student's application of psychology education in real-world setting = 3.9 (out of 5)

**Measure #1 Average (Spring 2017) = 3.93**

**Fall 2017:** During the fall 2017 semester, the population size of the internship course (PSYC397) was 12 students and the sample size for this assessment was 12 (N=12)
- Student's ability to contribute using standard methods = 4.8 (out of 5)
- Student's ability to contribute in novel ways = 4.3 (out of 5)
- Student's ability to solve problems = 4.5 (out of 5)
- Student's application of psychology education in real-world setting = 4.9 (out of 5)

**Measure #1 Average (Fall 2017) = 4.60**

**Measure #2:** Assessment of student's ability to communicate, be organized, and relate to other co-workers in a real-world setting as determined by an on-site supervisor evaluation. This will be assessed using the responses to questions 10, 11, 12, 13 on the on-site supervisor evaluation form.

**Performance Target:** The final performance targets for Measure 2 were determined from the Spring 2017 semester and applied to the Fall 2017 assessment. The performance targets were set at (or above) a rating of 4 (out of 5).

The data for Measure #2 were as follows:

**Spring 2017:** During the spring 2017 semester, the population size of the internship course (PSYC397) was 13 students and the sample size for this assessment was 13 (N=13)
- Student's communication skills = 4.2 (out of 5)
- Student's organizational skills = 4.0 (out of 5)
- Student's relations with co-workers = 4.1 (out of 5)
- Student's interpersonal cooperation = 4.2 (out of 5)

**Measure #2 Average (Spring 2017) = 4.15**

**Fall 2017:** During the fall 2017 semester, the population size of the internship course (PSYC397) was 12 students and the sample size for this assessment was 12 (N=12)
- Student's communication skills = 4.6 (out of 5)
- Student's organizational skills = 4.7 (out of 5)
- Student's relations with co-workers = 4.9 (out of 5)
- Student's interpersonal cooperation = 5.0 (out of 5)

**Measure #2 Average (Fall 2017) = 4.79**

**SLO3 Conclusions:**

Based on data collected in spring 2017, we were able to meet our target performance levels of >4.0 for both measures in the fall 2017 section (Measure #1 = 4.80; Measure #2 = 4.79). Overall, the Psychology department was pleased with the results of the supervisor survey and it was concluded that our students are (1) able to apply what they are learning in our curriculum, and (2) are excellent ambassadors of our department.

Strategy for 2018-2019: The Assessment Committee will continue to evaluate the PSYC397 internship course throughout the 2018-2019 assessment period and no changes are proposed to the assessment procedures for this course.
Psychology - BS

Assessment Report Summary Psychology BS

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

For the B.S. major in Psychology, four SLOs were assessed and analyzed for student proficiency in the areas of (1) communication effectiveness, (2) application of research methodology, and (3) application of psychological principles. This was accomplished via the use of SLO1, SLO2A, SLO2B, and SLO3.

**SLO1: Communication Effectiveness:**

Assessment of SLO1 was accomplished by analyzing student understanding of American Psychological Association (APA) formatting requirements (measure #1) and written communication effectiveness (measure #2) in upper-elective Psychology courses (PSYC351 and above). This was accomplished by assessing student research proposals on topics of the student's choosing using a newly-created assessment rubric. This assessment was conducted in the Spring 2017 semester. Minimum target performance was set at 70%.

**Measure #1:** Student research proposals were evaluated based upon APA style formatting requirements. This included proper formatting of: Title Page (6 points), Abstract (4 points), Introduction (2 points), Method (3 points), Discussion (2 points), and References (11 points).

**Performance Target:** Minimum target performance was set at (or above) 70%.

**Spring 2017:** Three (3) PSYC351+ courses met the requirements for the SLO1 measure #1 assessment. Overall performance of students (N = 47) was 71% (19.9 out of 28 possible points). The performance on this measure exceeded our target performance of 70% for B.A. majors.

**Measure #2:** Student research proposals were evaluated based upon clarity of writing and logical thought. This assessment was based on a rating scale between 0 – 3 (0 = Absent, 1 = Some discussion present, 2 = Discussion mostly present, and 3 = Discussion complete).

**Performance Target:** Minimum target performance was set at (or above) 70%.

**Spring 2017:** Three (3) PSYC351+ courses met the requirements for the SLO1 measure #2 assessment. Overall performance of students (N = 47) was 65% (13.75 out of 21 possible points). The overall performance on this measure did not exceed our target performance of 70% for B.A. majors.

**SLO1 Conclusions:**

Our target (70%) was met for Measure #1 (71%; N=47), but not met for Measure #2 (65%; N=47).

While we were unable to meet our target performance levels of 70% for both measures (Measure #1 = 71%; Measure #2 = 65%), it should be noted that the data are based on a single sample of PSYC351+ courses and the small sample could be misleading.

**Strategy for 2018-2019:** A departmental decision was made for the Assessment Committee to (1) re-evaluate the PSYC351+ assessment rubric and (2) collect more data throughout 2018-2019 to increase the sample size. A decision regarding any needed changes will be made following the 2018-2019 assessment.

**SLO2A: Application of Research Methodology**

Assessment of SLO2A was accomplished by analyzing student responses on a newly-developed Research Experience Questionnaire (measure #1) and student understanding of research methodology and results from assigned empirical journal articles (measure #2). This assessment was conducted in the Fall 2017 semester.

**Measure #1:** PSYC103 students took a newly developed Research Experience Questionnaire that was designed to assess student participation and interpretation of their research experience (which included participation in empirical research conducted at the College of Charleston, evaluation of assigned empirical research articles, or a combination of both), their confidence in understanding research methodology and statistical analyses, and their likelihood of wanting to work in a psychology research lab in the future.

**Performance Target:** Minimum target performance for the reported level of research understanding and confidence was set at or above the midpoint (4) on the scale.

The data for Measure #1 for PSYC majors and/or minors (N = 15) were as follows:

**Fall 2017:** Approximately 10% of students were randomly sampled from all Fall 2017 PSYC103 courses. The data were analyzed separately for PSYC majors/minors (N=15) and non-majors (N=13).

**PSYC Majors/Minors (N=15)**
Usefulness of empirical research participation = 4.0 (out of 7)
Understanding of research methodology following empirical research participation = 4.75 (out of 7)
Understanding of statistics following empirical research participation = 4.5 (out of 7)
Usefulness of empirical journal article review = 3.93 (out of 7)
Understanding of research methodology following empirical journal article review = 4.57 (out of 7)
Understanding of statistics following empirical journal article review = 4.21 (out of 7)
Likelihood in participating in a psychology research lab in the future = 6.20 (out of 7)

For psychology majors and minors, we met our performance target of 4 (out of 7) for six out of seven measures. Furthermore, the measure that did not meet our performance target (usefulness of journal article review) was not significantly different from our performance target.

Non-Majors (N=13)

Usefulness of empirical research participation = 4.4 (out of 7)
Understanding of research methodology following empirical research participation = 3.80 (out of 7)
Understanding of statistics following empirical research participation = 2.60 (out of 7)
Usefulness of empirical journal article review = 4.0 (out of 7)
Understanding of research methodology following empirical journal article review = 4.54 (out of 7)
Understanding of statistics following empirical journal article review = 4.08 (out of 7)
Likelihood in participating in a psychology research lab in the future = 3.25 (out of 7)

For non-majors, we met our performance target of 4 (out of 7) for four out of seven measures.

Since this assessment was implemented in the current assessment period, no previous data existed to compare our results. This assessment will continue in 2018-2019.

Measure #2: PSYC103 instructors were asked to randomly select 10 journal review article response sheets (N = 77) for evaluation by the assessment committee in terms of 1) the accuracy of their reporting of research methodology and 2) their accuracy of reporting research findings on a scale of 0 - 2 (0 = incorrect/missing, 1 = mostly correct, 2 = answer is complete and correct).

Performance Target: A performance target at or above 70 percent on average for each question was established for Measure #2. Information regarding majors/minors and non-majors was not available.

The data for Measure #2 was taken in the Fall 2017 (N = 77) semester and were as follows:

Overall understanding of research methods:
42% of the artifacts achieved a score of 2 (complete and correct) on the research methods assessment portion. However, when one includes artifacts that were scored as either a 1 (mostly correct) or 2 (complete and correct), then 96% of the artifacts accomplished this.

Overall understanding of research findings:
Similarly, for measure #2 only 45% of the artifacts achieved a score of 2 (complete and correct) on the research findings assessment portion. However, when one includes artifacts that were scored as either a 1 (mostly correct) or 2 (complete and correct), then 94% of the artifacts accomplished this.

Since this assessment was implemented in the current assessment period, no previous data exists to which we can compare our results. This assessment will continue in 2018.

SLO2A Conclusions:
We were only able to meet our target performance levels for most of Measure #1 (6 out of 7 targets met for majors/minors) and, as a department, we were pleased with this outcome. For Measure #2, our performance targets were not met.

Strategy for 2018-2019: It was speculated that the journal article review forms were not specific enough regarding the expectations for the assignment. Changes have been made to the journal article review forms to make them more detailed so that students are prompted for more complete answers. It is hoped that this change will result in a greater percentage of artifacts being scored as a 2 (complete and correct). The Assessment Committee will collect more data throughout 2018 to determine if any other changes are needed to this (Measure #2) assessment.

SLO2B: Application of Research Methodology

Assessment of SLO2B was accomplished by analyzing student responses on a standardized General Education Assessment question on research methodology. This assessment was conducted in the Fall 2017 semester.
**Measure #1:** Students’ ability to identify or justify relevant theories/models/concepts was assessed using the following three questions from the standardized metric:

1. Identify whether these data represent a positive or negative correlation.
2. Identify which variable could be manipulated and describe how you might manipulate this variable.
3. Identify the dependent variable in your experimental study and describe how you might operationally define this variable so that it could be measured.

**Performance Target:** The performance target for students’ average performance was set at or above 70 percent.

The data for Measure #1 were as follows:

**Fall 2017:** Nineteen (19) PSYC103 courses were offered during the fall 2017 semester. Across the nineteen (19) courses, the population size was 512 students, but the final compilation of student artifacts submitted for assessment was approximately 350. As such, the sample size for this measure is 32 (N = 32).

The average score from the student artifacts (N=32) was 2.78 (out of 4.0) yielding a 70% performance criterion. This level of performance met our performance criteria of 70%.

**Measure #2:** Students’ ability to describe/explain and apply relevant theories/models/concepts was assessed using the following four questions from the standardized metric:

**Describe/Explain**

1. Explain the relationship between children’s viewing of violent television programming and aggressive behavior that is represented by this figure.
2. We cannot make causal inferences about relationships between variables from a non-experimental (or correlational) study. Describe several reasons why, in general, we cannot determine why one variable causes the other variable with data of this type.

**Apply**

3. Based on this figure, can we predict a child’s aggressive behavior with perfect accuracy if we know how many hours of violent TV he or she watched? Why or why not?
4. How would you design an experiment on this topic involving two groups of children to determine cause and effect? Specifically describe any necessary procedures to follow in the creation of groups.

**Performance Target:** The performance target for students’ average performance was set at or above 70 percent.

The data for Measure #2 were as follows:

**Fall 2017:** The sample size for this measure is 32 (N = 32).

For the explanation component, the average score was 2.95 (out of 4.0) yielding a 74% performance criterion. This level of performance exceeded our performance criteria of 70%.

For the application component, the average score was 2.84 (out of 4.0) yielding a 71% performance level. This level of performance exceeded our performance criteria of 70%.

**SLO2B Conclusions:**

The consistency in performance across the two measures (Measure #1 = identify; Measure #2 = explain and apply) was somewhat unexpected given that explaining and applying the concepts require a deeper level of understanding than identification of concepts. While Measure #1 did not improve relative to previous years, it still met our performance target. Additionally, Measure #2 met our performance target but increases in Measure #2 were also observed relative to the previous year (2016-2017). We were pleased with this outcome and will continue to monitor this measure in 2018 to ascertain whether this improvement is maintained in future years.

Strategy for 2018-2019: The assessment committee will continue to monitor this measure in 2018-2019 to ascertain whether this improvement is maintained in future semesters.

**SLO3: Application of Psychological Principles**

Assessment of SLO3 was accomplished by analyzing on-site supervisor evaluations for students enrolled in the Psychology Internship course. Specifically, students were evaluated based upon their ability to successfully apply psychological principles and practices (measure #1) and use their knowledge to actively problem solve, communicate effectively, and successfully work with coworkers and community members (measure #2).
Measure #1: Assessment of student's ability to apply psychological principles in a real world setting and their ability to contribute and problem-solve in a real-world setting as determined by an on-site supervisor evaluation. This will be assessed using the responses to questions 7, 8, 9, and 15 on the on-site supervisor evaluation form.

Performance Target: The final performance targets for Measure 1 was determined from the Spring 2017 semester and applied to the Fall 2017 assessment. The performance targets were set at (or above) a rating of 4 (out of 5).

The data for Measure #1 were as follows:

Spring 2017: During the spring 2017 semester, the population size of the internship course (PSYC397) was 13 students and the sample size for this assessment was 13 (N=13)
Student's ability to contribute using standard methods = 3.8 (out of 5)
Student's ability to contribute in novel ways = 4.0 (out of 5)
Student's ability to solve problems = 4.0 (out of 5)
Student's application of psychology education in real-world setting = 3.9 (out of 5)
Measure #1 Average (Spring 2017) = 3.93

Fall 2017: During the fall 2017 semester, the population size of the internship course (PSYC397) was 12 students and the sample size for this assessment was 12 (N=12)
Student's ability to contribute using standard methods = 4.8 (out of 5)
Student's ability to contribute in novel ways = 4.3 (out of 5)
Student's ability to solve problems = 4.5 (out of 5)
Student's application of psychology education in real-world setting = 4.9 (out of 5)
Measure #1 Average (Fall 2017) = 4.60

Measure #2: Assessment of student's ability to communicate, be organized, and relate to other co-workers in a real world setting as determined by an on-site supervisor evaluation. This will be assessed using the responses to questions 10, 11, 12, 13 on the on-site supervisor evaluation form.

Performance Target: The final performance targets for Measure 2 was determined from the Spring 2017 semester and applied to the Fall 2017 assessment. The performance targets were set at (or above) a rating of 4 (out of 5).

The data for Measure #2 were as follows:

Spring 2017: During the spring 2017 semester, the population size of the internship course (PSYC397) was 13 students and the sample size for this assessment was 13 (N=13)
Student's communication skills = 4.2 (out of 5)
Student's organizational skills = 4.0 (out of 5)
Student's relations with co-workers = 4.1 (out of 5)
Student's interpersonal cooperation = 4.2 (out of 5)
Measure #2 Average (Spring 2017) = 4.15

Fall 2017: During the fall 2017 semester, the population size of the internship course (PSYC397) was 12 students and the sample size for this assessment was 12 (N=12)
Student's communication skills = 4.6 (out of 5)
Student's organizational skills = 4.7 (out of 5)
Student's relations with co-workers = 4.9 (out of 5)
Student's interpersonal cooperation = 5 (out of 5)
Measure #2 Average (Fall 2017) = 4.79

SLO3 Conclusions:
Based on data collected in spring 2017, we were able to meet our target performance levels of >4.0 for both measures in the fall 2017 section (Measure #1 = 4.80; Measure #2 = 4.79). Overall, the Psychology department was pleased with the results of the supervisor survey and it was concluded that our students are (1) able to apply what they are learning in our curriculum, and (2) are excellent ambassadors of our department.

Strategy for 2018-2019: The Assessment Committee will continue to evaluate the PSYC397 internship course throughout the 2018-2019 assessment period and no changes are proposed to the assessment procedures for this course.
Public Health - BA

Assessment Report Summary Public Health BA

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

The primary mission of the interdisciplinary public health program is the academic preparation of students interested in all aspects of public health. This program prepares students for a wide variety of post-graduation options, including but not limited to employment opportunities in health agencies, allied health fields, health administration, or pursuit of a graduate degree.

Given this mission the following goals were assessed in this cycle:

1. Students will be able to explain and apply theories of behavior change to the development of a health communication campaign project.

Overall, results were promising, in that performance expectations were met.

2. Students will be able to identify the theory associated with a mediated health message and determine the likely outcome in terms of behavior change.

Students did very well in identifying the theory and the likely outcome (as predicted by the theory) in the mediated health message provided.

3. Public Health interns will apply public health knowledge, theories, and skills in a work environment in a manner deemed effective by their site supervisors. Supervisors will be willing to host public health interns in the future.

The internship results reported for 2017-2018 applied specifically to the mission, as it dealt with the BA Internship Program, which provides a bridge from academic preparation to post-graduation options. Thus far, the internship seems to be accomplishing its goals. Site supervisors were happy with the students' preparation for their internships and with their performances during the internship period. Students pursued a wide variety of internships, both academic (several interns worked on research projects with faculty at MUSC) and practice-driven. Likewise, site supervisors reported that they were willing to host a public health intern in the future.

Religious Studies - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary RELS BA

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Based on our assessment results for the past four years (2015-2018), the Religious Studies Department has been pleased with our assessment efforts and results. We have paid special attention to the assessment of student writing skills and their ability to write thesis-driven arguments in classes ranging from introductory-level classes, to intermediate surveys, up to the advanced seminars culminating in the Senior Seminar. This year, members of the assessment committee focused on students' reading and interpretation of sacred texts, and the chair conducted extensive 1-1.5 hour exit interviews with graduating seniors. We continue to make minor revisions to our assessment rubrics but overall we are quite satisfied with our assessment results: our majors demonstrate effective writing and reading skills, they can craft arguments, analyze evidence from primary and secondary sources, and understand, interpret, and contextualize primary texts from one or more religious traditions.

Riley Center for Livable Communities

Assessment Report Summary Riley Center

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Outcome 1: Local Government Capacity Building. These are mature programs so there is not a need for major redesign, but changes to be more consistent in evaluation measures and improving programming for SCCCMA are next steps in the evolution of these capacity building efforts. We have developed a standard client satisfaction instrument due to some variation in measures used across the various projects. We will now distribute this to all clients and use similar scaling for conference specific satisfaction surveys, including these capacity building efforts.

Outcome 2: Sustaining Mayor Riley’s Legacy. Developing the Advisory Board and getting 20 or more individuals to agree to participate will energize this effort going forward. Results from the Resiliency Conference also indicate that there is great interest in topics like this and it bodes well for the success of our future training on events and issues so important to Mayor Joe Riley.

Outcome 3: Engage Faculty, Students and Community in Research Projects. This last year (2017/18) was a transformative year for the Riley Center as we engaged more faculty, students and community members in research, especially the YOUth Count, than ever before. Our experience reveals that large numbers of students can be engaged if the topic is meaningful and training is intensive and
well planned. Among the lessons learned are to recruit volunteers using other students as the key recruiters; recruit faculty that already have large numbers of students with whom they are connected; challenge volunteers with intensive training; do not underestimate the enthusiasm and commitment of students and faculty who are committed to social justice issues.

Outcome 4: Community Research. The YOUTH Count likely had its greatest impact as an experiential training program for students. Based on this learning, future research projects will be sure to incorporate students at all levels into projects. We may also try to develop more formal training for students who want/need practical social science field experiences. We can augment and broaden methods training provided by departments with a practicum, providing another experiential growth opportunity especially to our high quality, high performing students.

Anthropology - BS/Minor

Assessment Report Summary ANTH BS

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Anthropology confronts the challenges of understanding biological and cultural variation in time and space. It does this via a holistic approach that both draws from and contributes to a myriad array of disciplines. The field is comprised of four major subfields, anthropological archaeology, biological (or physical) anthropology, ethnology (cultural or socio-cultural anthropology), and linguistic anthropology. A minor subfield, applied (or "activist") anthropology, is gaining increasing recognition. As a result of our August 2017 assessment discussion and a February 2018 meeting to review Fall 2017 results, anthropology faculty administered the assessments differently. Rather than have instructors administer the assessments to their own sections, faculty visited classes that were not their own. While there is only one set of data points, it appears that this may have communicated to students that the program views assessment seriously.

In this year’s assessment efforts, we assessed the following goal using a 15 item inventory:

Goal: Students possess knowledge of and demonstrate the ability to apply key anthropological concepts in the following areas:
• Culture and Cultural Relativism
• Culture and Biological Diversity
• Social Organization
• Cultural and Biological Evolution
• Language & Communication

While there was some variability among sub-areas, the mean correct responses across all measures was 74.66 for students in ANTH 101, which exceeded the performance target of 70% and represents a statistical tie from the previous assessment cycle mean of 74.86%. Baselines for students taking upper level classes were also established. For students in ANTH 491, a course taken mostly by seniors) the mean of correct responses across all measures was 94.5%.

Previous results had been used to establish program benchmarks. The Anthropology program changed prerequisites on a number of courses in 2015, and these changes went into effect in August 2016. Comparison of results over the next few assessment cycles will provide valuable insight into whether the prerequisite changes are successful in terms of student learning as they move through the major.

The second area of evaluation focused on students' knowledge of anthropological theory. Using a 15 item inventory, we assessed the following goal:

Goal: Students will recognize the major theoretical perspectives in the discipline.

This is the first year the program used this inventory. The class mean across all inventory items was a 68%. This will serve as the baseline for continued assessments.

With program improvement in mind, the results were discussed at the August program meeting. The data served as the starting point of a broader conversation about curricular issues. While a preliminary review of the results by the department chair is generally encouraging and provides evidence of continued quality instruction, some variability in performance was evident on specific learning objectives.

Sociology - BS/Minor

Assessment Report Summary Sociology

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):
The Sociology Program seeks to foster the goals of a liberal arts and sciences education by developing in College of Charleston students the ability to understand an increasingly complex, diverse, and ever-changing world through application of the sociological perspective.

During this assessment cycle, we assessed the following program goal: Students will demonstrate competency in understanding the sociological perspective. All students enrolled in SOCY 101 in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 were asked questions to measure their performance on 3 learning outcomes. Overall, student performance was strong for all SLOs, but individual measures may require additional fine-tuning and fine-tuning across sections is likely. These results were shared with program faculty during our August 2018 program meeting. These SLOs will be assessed again in 2018-1019 with an eye on continued improvement and to monitor delivery of core content.

Based on results from 2016-2017 assessment, the core of our developmental theory course (SOCY 260) was reviewed, the course description was changed, and the learning outcomes updated to reflect a core which is not limited to classical theorists. The program will continue to monitor student performance to assess whether the impact on changes made to the theory course on student learning.

Urban Studies - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary Urban Studies

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

The Urban Studies majors performed well on the measures for SLO 1, signaling that no adjustments are need at this time. The Urban Studies majors performed well on the measures for SLO 2, signaling that no adjustments are need at this time. For SLO 3, the targets were met. However, the URST director will discuss with the Executive Committee the structure of the exit survey. Upon review of the survey and assessment results, the URST director feels that the survey is not yielding the best information to assess student learning and experiences of the major. It may be the case that additional and/or different questions need to be added.

Women's and Gender Studies - BA/Minor

Assessment Report Summary WGST

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Our assessment results indicate that students in WGST 200, the introduction course to the major, score well on measures of critical thinking (SLO #1), identification of social justice issues, and understanding intersectionality (SLO #2). Our data collection for student learning in the Capstone course (WGST 401) was flawed this year because of a major error in developing the senior survey in Qualtrics and because of convoluted rubrics and essay prompts that did not capture student learning, as was evidenced in other Capstone assignments and in another senior-level course, the Internship (WGS 381). In fact, students completing Internships in WGS scored very highly on the application of course concepts to real-life experiences (SLO #3).

The program recently changed the signature assignment in WGST 200, and is still tweaking the rubric to best capture student learning. As such, we are not going to make major changes to the assignment. On the other hand, the essay prompts for the Capstone course (WGST 401) could benefit from additional specificity, as could the rubrics, since scorers found the rubrics difficult to apply. These will be revised for next year’s assessment.

The 3 SLOs for WGS were revised last year for the 2017-18 assessment. As such, we will not be making any significant changes to the SLOs or to the program’s curriculum, so that we can focus on collecting better data with honed assignments and rubrics. Ultimately, improved essay prompts will help students in these courses, and will help the program better capture student learning. And improved rubrics will allow us to gauge student learning with additional specificity.