

Undergraduate Learning Assessment Report

Departmental Report Template

19 June 2009

Academic departments have adopted and implemented learning assessment policies and procedures that were established by the College of Humanities and Social Sciences in October 2008 (policies and documents attached). Three instructional goals were scheduled for assessment at that time. Assessments of goals 1 and 2 were conducted in late May, as soon as all necessary data were available. Following are summaries of those assessments. A review of preliminary data relevant to the third goal was also made and the results are reported below. Assessment activity on all three goals is in the attached six-column table.

Goal 1: Overall Teaching Effectiveness

The Department's first assessment goal focuses on an instructor's overall teaching effectiveness in Silly Walks. The method of assessment for this goal is a review of student responses to the SUU course evaluation survey item concerning overall teaching effectiveness (Question #9). The expected outcome is that the average of the department's responses should meet or exceed the SUU average for a given academic year.

Responses on the overall teaching effectiveness objective were selected as an overall proxy for the quality of instruction for a given course. Each academic year, responses for each Fall and Spring class are arrayed (Table 1, attached), and the departmental average is calculated for classes that were evaluated (N=37). The departmental average of all mean scores on the overall teaching effectiveness question is 4.43, and a decrease of 0.2 over last year's mean score of 4.45 and an increase of 0.10 over three years ago when the department average was 4.33. The AY 08-09 SUU average is 4.37. According to this measure, then, departmental instruction is resulting in gains in student's perceptions of overall teaching quality at a level above the SUU average. Thus, the first goal is currently being met.

The review also showed, however, that in 9 of 37 specific undergraduate courses, the SUU average of 4.33 was not being met (starred values in Table 1, Column 3). Assessment procedures specify that the review committee and chair will identify any courses that are below standard. The committee and chair will then review the course materials, organization, and presentation, and recommend changes. Preliminary recommendations for changes in these courses include highlighting objectives in the course syllabi and increasing factual material in both lectures and assignments.

Goal 2: Organizational Effectiveness

According to the second goal, HSS faculty will offer well-organized courses. The method of assessing progress toward that goal involves review of student responses to survey question regarding organizational effectiveness (Question #5). The average of departmental responses should meet or exceed the SUU average.

During the Fall 08 and Spring 09, the departmental average for organizational effectiveness was 4.40 compared to the SUU mean of 4.20, an increase of .05 above last year's average of 4.35 and a three-year increase of .10. According to this measure, Departmental instruction exceeded the SUU average in the

degree to which students report sound organizational practices in their classes. Thus, the second departmental goal is currently being met.

The review also showed that 2 of the 37 courses the SUU average was not met (starred values in Table 1, Column 5). Assessment procedures specify that the review committee and chair will identify any courses that are below standard. The committee and chair will then review the course materials, organization, and presentation, and recommend changes. Preliminary recommendations for changes in these courses include more detailed syllabi, use of daily PowerPoint outlines, and timely grading responses by instructors.

Goal 3: Capstone Assessment

The third goal of assuring overall learning outcomes centers on an evaluation of student's capstone experience. In the capstone experience, students typically produce a capstone paper or creative activity, or they take a comprehensive exam. Capstone experiences in HSS come in the form of a capstone course taught by a single faculty member or a capstone experience that would be chaired by a faculty member with one or more committee members evaluating a student's work. Depending on the size of the department and its major, assessment may be of all its capstone projects or a representative sample of projects.

Each year, the scholarly products of a department's capstone experience will be assessed by a committee of at least three department faculty to independently evaluate that scholarly material on a scale of high pass, pass, low pass, fail. A department may elect to use a group of scholars outside of SUU to evaluate its capstone material or it may include faculty outside of its department as evaluators per departmental bylaws.

The college goal is that 75% of its students will receive a composite committee score of pass or high pass.

Failure to meet the 75% rate will result in departmental re-evaluation of the capstone experience and/or critical preparatory course work that leads to that final learning experience.

Graduate Learning Assessment Report
Departmental Report Template
19 June 2009

Department faculty met in October of 2008 to review and ratify learning assessment policies and procedures (document attached). One instructional goal pertaining to the department's Master's program was identified: students will achieve expertise in the history, methods, and theories relevant to the discipline. Success in this goal is to be gauged by reviewing the results of the MA comprehensive examination during an academic year. We would expect that if the goal is being met, at least 80% of graduate students would pass the comprehensive examination on their first attempt. This measure is scheduled for odd-numbered years.

During the 2005-2006 academic year, 7 graduate students took their comprehensive exams. Eight of those students passed their exams on their first attempt, while one had to retake one or more of their questions. The overall rate of first attempt passage is 87%, which is just above our benchmark of 80%. In the 2009-10 academic year, 4 students took their comprehensive exams with a pass rate of 100%. This is an improvement over the last round of evaluation for the 01-02, 02-03 cycle in which the Department had a 77% passage rate.

Table 1. Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching Evaluation Scores for SUU Course Survey Question #9 (Overall Teaching Effectiveness) and Question #5 (Organizational Effectiveness), Fall 2008 & Spring 2009

Course Fall 05- Spr 06	Section	Course Average Teaching	SUU Score Teaching	Course Score Organization	SUU Score Organization
1013	001.S	4.68	4.37	4.37	4.20
1013	002.S	4.70	4.37	4.86	4.20
1013	003.S	4.39	4.37	4.26	4.20
2033	001.S	4.66	4.37	3.58*	4.20
2033	002.S	4.61	4.37	4.51	4.20
2033	003.S	4.56	4.37	4.69	4.20
2043	001.S	3.12*	4.37	4.36	4.20
2043	002.S	4.82	4.37	4.72	4.20
2053	001.S	4.48	4.37	4.34	4.20
2053	002.S	4.45	4.37	4.28	4.20
2063	001.S	3.73*	4.37	3.15*	4.20
2063	002.S	4.88	4.37	4.91	4.20
3273	001.S	4.93	4.37	4.30	4.20
3413	001.S	4.64	4.37	4.25	4.20
3723	001.S	4.78	4.37	4.71	4.20
3843	001.S	4.37	4.37	4.69	4.20
4123	001.S	4.54	4.37	4.31	4.20
4953	001.S	4.42	4.37	4.87	4.20
1013	001.F	4.79	4.37	4.98	4.20

1013	002.F	3.47*	4.37	4.24	4.20
1013	003.F	4.52	4.37	4.39	4.20
2033	001.F	4.80	4.37	4.55	4.20
2033	002.F	4.44	4.37	4.37	4.20
2043	001.F	4.38	4.37	4.26	4.20
2043	002.F	4.61	4.37	4.43	4.20
2043	003.F	4.11*	4.37	4.86	4.20
2053	001.F	4.48	4.37	4.21	4.20
2053	002.F	4.06*	4.37	4.49	4.20
2053	003.F	3.17*	4.37	4.33	4.20
2053	004.F	4.69	4.37	4.57	4.20
2053	005.F	4.40	4.37	4.84	4.20
3333	001.F	4.98	4.37	4.20	4.20
3513	001.F	4.39	4.37	4.23	4.20
3523	001.F	4.56	4.37	4.32	4.20
3603	001.F	4.37	4.37	4.66	4.20
3673	001.F	4.43	4.37	4.57	4.20
3823	001.F	3.22*	4.37	4.32	4.20

Table 2. Graduating Student Survey 2003-2004, Summary of Key Scores

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>COLFA Avg. Score</u>	<u>Dept. Avg. Score</u>
#23	4.04	3.48
#25	4.10	3.72
#29	2.79	2.54
#30	2.54	2.40
#31	2.47	2.20

#23 – Your education in your major has adequately prepared you for employment or further study.

#25 – Your experiences in your major program enabled you to develop plans about your future career.

#29 – How would you describe the preparation you have received at SUU for the job or future study you have/expect, now that you are graduating?

#30 – Based upon the preparation you received at SUU, how successful do you think you will be in getting the job you want, compared with college graduates from comparable institutions?

#31 – Based upon the preparation you received at SUU, how much of an advantage do you think you would have in keeping a job in your major compared with other college graduates from comparable institutions?

Departmental Reporting Template
Five Column Assessment Documentation
 July 2009

Essential Faculty Performance Goal	Learning Outcome/Objective	Program Success Criteria	Assessment Method	Results of Assessment/Conclusions Reached	Improvements Anticipated/Made
Performance	Faculty will be overall effective teachers	Average of dept responses on SUU teaching effectiveness survey item meet or exceed SUU average	Responses tabulated, averaged, compared	Dept average exceeds SUU average; a few under-performing courses identified	Steps initiated to enhance teaching performance in lectures and assignments
Performance	Faculty will exhibit effective organizational skills	Average of dept responses on SUU organizational survey item meet or exceed SUU average	Responses tabulated, averaged, compared	Dept average exceeds national average; a few under-performing courses identified	Steps initiated to enhance organizational practices in lectures and grading
Attitudinal	The program will enhance preparation for professional careers	Averages of dept responses to graduating student survey questions regarding satisfaction with career preparation will exceed HSS averages	Responses tabulated, averaged, compared for 2003-2004 academic year	Dept averages was similar or slightly higher than HSS averages on 5 of 5 measures	On-going review of course and curriculum content toward emphasizing career preparation; consider approaching this goal through performance as well as attitudinal measures

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Learning Assessment Policies and Procedures

Responsibility for Completion

Assessments will be considered by the department general faculty functioning as a committee of the whole, or designated subcommittee. The committee will report findings to the department chair, which will produce two final learning assessment reports (undergraduate and graduate) and oversee implementation. Reports will be filed in the department and dean's offices, and the provost's office when there are university-wide recommendations.

Schedule

Assessments will be conducted at least biannually, with all procedures completed by April 30. Final reports will be completed by the end of Spring semester.

Degree Program: B.A./B.S.

Goal: Faculty will exhibit superior overall teaching effectiveness.

Assessment Method: review of student responses to the SUU course evaluation survey item regarding gains in overall teaching effectiveness for all classes in a semester.

Expected Outcome: The average of department responses should match or exceed the SUU average.

Department Response: Department committees and chairs will identify any courses that are below the standard. The committee and chair will then review the course materials, organization, and presentation, and recommend changes. Appropriate changes will be implemented and surveys of those classes will be reviewed again the next time the courses are offered.

Goal: Faculty will offer well-organized courses.

Assessment Method: review of student responses to the SUU course evaluation survey item regarding organizational effectiveness for all classes in a semester for which this learning objective has been identified by the instructor.

Expected Outcome: The average of department responses should match or exceed the SUU average.

Department Response: Department committees and chairs will identify any courses that are below the standard. The committee and chair will then review the course materials, organization, and presentation, and recommend changes. Appropriate changes will be implemented and surveys of those classes will be reviewed again the next time the courses are offered.

Goal: The program will enhance preparation for professional careers.

Assessment Method: Every two years, in anticipation of undergraduate catalog revision, review of department subsets of the SUU Office of Institutional Research Graduating Students Survey. Focus on responses that indicate degree of satisfaction with the major as career preparation.

Expected Outcome: The average of department responses should match or exceed the average for all majors in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Department Response: If satisfaction ratings are significantly below those of other liberal arts majors, the department will reevaluate its curriculum and advising procedures with the goal of focusing greater attention to career preparation.

Departmental Policy Template
Learning Assessment Policies and Procedures

Degree Program: M.A.

Goal: Students will achieve expertise in the history, method, and theory of Silly Walks.

Assessment Method: Review of the results of departmental M.A. comprehensive exams for the academic year.

Expected Outcome: At least 80% of graduate students will pass the comprehensive exam on their first attempt.

Department Response: If the goal is not being met, the department will reevaluate its curriculum and advising procedures.

Goal: The program will enhance preparation for doctoral study and professional careers in Silly Walks and related fields.

Assessment Method: Biannual review of data tabulated by the DSW Graduate Advisor of Record to determine the academic or occupational status of recent graduates.

Expected Outcome: At least 75% of graduates should obtain employment or gain admission to a doctoral program in Anthropology or a related field.

Department Response: If the goal is not being met, the department will reevaluate its curriculum and advising procedures.

Departmental Assessment Timeline

	SPRING	SUMMER	FALL
2002	<p>Review and ratify updated assessment policies and procedures</p> <p>Review goals, revise as necessary</p> <p>Conduct scheduled assessments (undergraduate goals 1.2)</p>	<p>Submit assessment report</p> <p>Distribute assessment report with preliminary recommendations to faculty</p>	<p>Review assessment report in September faculty meeting</p> <p>Recommend course, curriculum adjustments</p> <p>Implement course, curriculum adjustments</p> <p>Reevaluate adjusted courses</p>
2003	<p>Review and ratify updated assessment policies and procedures</p> <p>Review goals, revise as necessary</p> <p>Conduct scheduled assessments (undergraduate goal 3, graduate goal 1)</p> <p>Reevaluate adjusted courses</p>	<p>Submit assessment report</p> <p>Distribute assessment report with preliminary recommendations to faculty</p>	<p>Review assessment report in September faculty meeting</p> <p>Recommend course, curriculum adjustments</p> <p>Implement course, curriculum adjustments (including undergraduate catalog revision)</p> <p>Reevaluate adjusted courses</p>
2004	<p>Review and ratify updated assessment policies and procedures</p> <p>Review goals, revise as necessary</p> <p>Conduct scheduled assessments (undergraduate goals 1, 2)</p> <p>Reevaluate adjusted courses</p>	<p>Submit assessment report</p> <p>Distribute assessment report with preliminary recommendations to faculty</p>	<p>Review assessment report in September faculty meeting</p> <p>Recommend course, curriculum adjustments</p> <p>Implement course, curriculum adjustments (including graduate catalog revision)</p> <p>Reevaluate adjusted courses</p>