

File #

Office of Program Review & Assessment

To: Dr. Ken Ambrose, Chair, Department of Sociology
 From: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment
 Date: August 11, 2004

Subject: Yearly Assessment Report, BA Sociology/Anthropology

1. Thank you for submitting the Yearly Assessment Report for the program,. Please use the information in this report to guide your assessment activities during AY 2004-2005.

2. What follows is a brief critique of the report you submitted for the academic year 2002-2003.

I. Principal Elements of the assessment plan	The outcomes were listed, however, there is confusion between assessment and faculty evaluation
Student outcomes	Students only measured in terms of academic achievement at the senior level. Students can evaluate the faculty and the course, however, there are few provisions for the students to be evaluated.
Assessment Tool or Approach/ Standards/Benchmark BOT Initiative #3	No direct assessment measures listed. Surveys are the primary tool listed. No National standards indicated. Portfolios are mentioned, however, there are no data presented.
Results/Analysis:	No results mentioned.
Action Taken:	None mentioned.
Information on how assessment data is used to improve program quality (3 examples)	None mentioned
Chart	A chart was included, but did not contain any information.

3. Review of the Assessment Summary Chart “Marshall University: Assessment of Student Outcomes.”

This chart will help the program and the University Assessment Committee monitor a program’s patterns of evidence. Please remember that you do not have to assess every outcome every year; however, within a 3-4 year period of time all program objectives must be evaluated, results analyzed, and actions taken (feedback loop) documented.

The program needs to complete the assessment chart and begin to actively measure student academic achievement at the undergraduate level. Realistic outcomes need to be constructed from the goals presented with suitable measuring instruments. Data should be collected, analyzed, and used to provide information as to how the program may improve its delivery system.

4. Efficacy of Assessment:

As Marshall approaches its ten year self—study by the North Central Association’s Higher Learning Commission, programs will be measured in terms of their efficacy of assessment. Programs are evaluated in terms of the development of measurable learning outcomes; the use of viable assessment measures and the implementation of an effective feedback loop. The current report has been evaluated based on these categories. Scores can range from 0-3 in each category. Overall total scores ranging from 1-3 indicate that the program is in the Beginning Stages of developing a viable assessment program. Overall scores ranging from 4-6 indicate that a program is making progress toward implementing a viable assessment program and overall scores ranging from 7-9 indicate that a program is in the maturing stages of continuous improvement. All programs should be in Level 2 (overall score 4-6) (Making progress toward implementing a viable assessment program) or Level 3 (overall score 7-9) (Maturing stages of continuous improvement) by May 2005.

Scores:	
I. Learning Outcomes	2
II. Assessment Measures	1
III. Feedback Loop	1
Overall Score:	4.7

Interpretation: The program has achieved an overall score of 4.7 which places it in Level 2 of the NCA/HLC levels of program assessment efficacy. The reviewers felt that the goals were listed and that the program was making an effort to evaluate student attitudes; however, there is a definite lack of measurable outcomes and a lack of content related measuring instruments. Little information was given as to how the feedback loop was closed.

5. Recommendations:

The program should develop a set of measurable outcomes which are measurable. It should also develop a set of measuring instruments which use both direct and indirect methods. Additionally, the program needs to articulate an effective system of analyzing the data collected and feeding this information back into the program to improve student academic achievement.

6. General Comments:

It is imperative that programs keep a record of their assessment activities and have this information available for the NCA/HLC site committee if requested.

7. Thanks so much for continuing to aid Marshall in its ongoing assessment efforts.

Enclosures

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports
Report for the Academic Year 2002-2003
Comments for Programs with Program Reviews**

Program: BA - SOCIOLOGY

Please note: Some programs (those with current program reviews) will not address the questions in the same order.

Assessment Guidelines Report	Evaluator's Comments
Summarize the principal elements of the departmental assessment plan	Confuses assessment with faculty evaluation Not normative just summative advising - does not measure student learning from freshmen on up - just get senior level
Provide summary information on the following elements: Student Outcomes	outcomes are improved - more directly tied to Sociology - see page 2 - 1-6
Assessment Tool or Approach/Standards/Benchmark (BOT Initiative #3)	Portfolio - capstone course surveys - indirect
Results/Analysis	None
Action Taken	None - No feedback loop
Provide information on how assessment data is used to improve program quality. Include at least 3 specific examples drawn from the past 5 years.	Not clear - not presented
Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/appropriate assessment tools/standards/results/action taken	Yes: ___ No: <u>X</u> Blank refers to text of plan

Program: BA - Sociology
Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level

Marshall University

PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS

NCA Levels of Implementation Academic Year 2003

DATE: Summer 2004

1. Learning Objectives

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified. **3**

Level 2

All in level 1 plus:

They describe student behaviors.

They are program, not class or course, objectives.

They are clear.

*Don't use word
understand*

Level 3

All in level 2 plus:

Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.

Objectives are appropriate in number.

They are measurable.

They support Marshall's educational goals.

They span multiple learning domains.

2. Assessment Measures

Level 0

No measures were identified.

Level 1

Measures were identified.

Level 2

All in Level 1 plus:

They relate to the learning objectives.

They include direct measures of student learning

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

They emphasize direct measures of student learning.

They are multiple.

They emphasize direct learning.

They focus on real-world tasks.

They stress higher order learning.

They are integrated in the curriculum.

They allow performance to be gauged over time.

*Very Few
Need
more
Assessment
Tools
Need
to link
assessment
to learning
objectives*

3. Feedback Loop

Level 0

The feedback loop was not described.

Level 1

Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used. *NOT clear*

No performance expectations/standards have been established. *still*

Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. **1**

Level 2

Data routinely are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.

Performance expectations/standards have been established.

Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.

Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.

Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.

The improvement of student learning is central to the department.

Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports
Report for the Academic Year 2002-2003
Comments for Programs with Program Reviews**

Program: B/Soc

Please note: Some programs (those with current program reviews) will not address the questions in the same order.

Assessment Guidelines Report	Evaluator's Comments
Summarize the principal elements of the departmental assessment plan	<i>They follow students' needs. Students evaluate program. Faculty chair evaluator reviews.</i>
Provide summary information on the following elements: Student Outcomes	<i>6 student outcomes</i>
Assessment Tool or Approach/Standards/Benchmark (BOT Initiative #3)	<i>Capstone - Entrance to graduate school</i>
Results/Analysis	<i>Continuation of program</i>
Action Taken	
Provide information on how assessment data is used to improve program quality. Include at least 3 specific examples drawn from the past 5 years.	
Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/appropriate assessment tools/standards/results/action taken	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Program: BA Sociology
Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level
Marshall University
PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS
NCA Levels of Implementation Academic Year 2003
DATE: Summer 2004

1. *Learning Objectives*

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

Level 2

All in level 1 plus:

- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.

Level 3

All in level 2 plus:

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They are measurable.
- They support Marshall's educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.

2. *Assessment Measures*

Level 0

No measures were identified.

Level 1

Measures were identified.

Level 2

All in Level 1 plus:

- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They include direct measures of student learning

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.
- They are multiple.
- They emphasize direct learning.
- They focus on real-world tasks.
- They stress higher order learning.
- They are integrated in the curriculum.
- They allow performance to be gauged over time.

3. *Feedback Loop*

Level 0

The feedback loop was not described.

Level 1

- Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.
- No performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

Level 2

- Data routinely are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.
- Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
- The improvement of student learning is central to the department.
- Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.

Program: BA Sociology
 Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level
 Marshall University
 PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS
 NCA Levels of Implementation Academic Year 2003
 DATE: Summer 2004

1. Learning Objectives

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

Level 2

All in level 1 plus:

- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.

Level 3

All in level 2 plus:

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They are measurable.
- They support Marshall's educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.

no measurable outcomes
obj list

2. Assessment Measures

Level 0

No measures were identified.

Level 1

Measures were identified.

Level 2

All in Level 1 plus:

- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They include direct measures of student learning

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.
- They are multiple.
- They emphasize direct learning.
- They focus on real-world tasks.
- They stress higher order learning.
- They are integrated in the curriculum.
- They allow performance to be gauged over time.

3. Feedback Loop

Level 0

The feedback loop was not described.

Level 1

- Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.
- No performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

Level 2

- Data routinely are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.
- Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
- The improvement of student learning is central to the department.
- Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.



former students. It is not the role of the department to track and evaluate our former students' work performance.

A.5. Resources:

(a) Financial: Provide information related to financial support of the program. Address the total commitment of the department and what portion of the department resources are devoted to this particular program. Include state appropriate funds, grants, and contracts, state funds and student fees.

Most of the funding for the Department comes from state-appropriated funds. These funds pay for the nine faculty members, secretary for the department, secretary for the Oral History program and four graduate assistants.

If this program were terminated as a major, what resource savings would occur (reduced faculty, staff, space requirements, courses taught, etc.). Additionally, in what other ways would termination of the program impact on the institution.

If this BA program were terminated, no savings would occur in terms of faculty, staff, space requirements, courses taught, etc. It would have a negative impact on the institution. We teach many of the international and multicultural courses and reach hundreds of students each semester with the introductory sociology and anthropology courses. These are *very* popular for students in their fulfillment of social science requirements. In fact, the department has been asked on more than one occasion to *add* additional sections of Introductory Sociology.

(b) Facilities: Describe special facilities available for the program including classrooms, laboratories, computer facilities, library facilities or equipment need for program deliver.

There has been adequate classroom space and office space is sufficient at this time, although barely. The Archeological Lab has moved to the basement of Old Main which means the artifacts are no longer in danger from flooding which occurred in the basement of Smith Hall where it was located before. There is a need for a seminar room for our students. Computers have been obtained, and a systematic way of replacing them has been implemented by the College of Liberal Arts. Additional equipment is needed so that presentations, lectures, etc. can be taken to the classroom.

A.6. Assessment Information: In addition to the planned continuation of surveys of graduates, which are designed, conducted and reviewed by all members of the program, several other methods are routinely employed in accomplishing both student and programmatic assessment.

a.) Each faculty member is assigned a proportionate number of undergraduate program majors whose individual progress is monitored frequently and closely. When problem areas are discovered, this student/faculty relationship makes possible the initiation of corrective action whether the students' needs are academic or of a personal nature. Student needs for tutoring and/or remedial course work are sometimes evident and appropriate remedies are undertaken.

b.) Students in each class are afforded an opportunity to evaluate each course ^{look in the} program. A standardized instrument has been used in the past with the provision that faculty may supplement the instrument with additional evaluative criteria or measures. The results of these student evaluations are then reviewed and suggested deficiencies are identified and responded to where reasonable and amenable to change. The Chair of the program also makes routine visits to classes as a method for maintaining a measure of familiarity with faculty classroom work. **From our Assessment proposal we have the following goals:**

1. Think critically, logically and creatively about sociology and anthropology
2. Develop the proper methodological and theoretical skills for understanding the effects of social institutions
3. Understand the role of the individual in the larger social context
4. Give students a basic understanding of the processes of human social life through the theories, methods, and research findings of sociological inquiry
5. Help our majors establish a perspective that will enable them to better understand the social world in which they live
6. Give students insights into their own social experiences as well as aid them in analyzing the social and cultural settings and processes that influence their thoughts, feelings, and actions.

(See Appendix VIII for further information on Assessment Plan)

c.) No national exams exist against which to assess the knowledge and skills of the graduates of the B.A. program in Sociology. There are a variety of ways in which we are establishing the benchmark for the Department. Our capstone course (Senior Seminar which was introduced into the curriculum in the mid 1970's) is one way that we have established our benchmark. A portfolio which includes theory, research methods, diversity, and social institutions is required of our majors. This course and others rely on the quantitative and qualitative materials in evaluating the performance of our students. Another is to judge the quality of our program by the success of our majors in being admitted to graduate and professional programs.

A.7. Previous Reviews: The previous review of this program (1993) recommended "Continuation of the program at the current level of activity."

A.8. Advisory Committees: The program has seen no need for establishing an advisory committee. Should such a committee formation show merit, the program would give it thorough consideration?

A.9. Strengths/Weaknesses:
Strengths

1. The major strengths of the department would be the faculty. They are hardworking and dedicated to the students. They have included the research which they are doing in their

Chart I Assessment Summary
Marshall University
Assessment of Student Outcomes: Component/Course/Program Level
5 year summary

Component Area/Program/Discipline: _____ Sociology/Anthropology _____

Component / Course / Program Level					
Student Outcome	Person or Office Responsible	Assessment Tool or Approach	Standards/Benchmark	Results/Analysis	Action Taken
1. See Narrative for Assessment.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					