I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

1. Name and Contact Information of Program Assessment Coordinator:

LaDona Knigge, Associate Professor of Geography and Planning
GEOP, Mail: Zip 425, Phone: 898-5881, Email: lknigge@csuchico.edu

2. Student Learning Outcomes

Undergraduate:

1.1. Students can formulate geographic research questions.

1.2. Students can collect, compile, and interpret geographic data.

1.3. Students can present geographic data in a map.

2.1. Students can recognize the presence and application of regional, local and global dimensions of the social and physical worlds in the landscape.

2.2. Students can recognize the presence and application of regional, local and global dimensions of the social and physical worlds in data.

3.1. Students can explain interactions between the size and distribution of human and non-human populations, resources and the natural environment in historic and contemporary perspectives.

3.2. Students are cognizant of varying interpretations of causality, interaction, policy and values in human-environmental relationships.

3.3. Student will understand ways in which they use the environment can affect future generations and other human and natural systems.

4.1. Students can analyze information from different physical or social sciences from a geographic perspective.

4.2. Students can interpret popular media (novels, films, newspapers) from a geographic perspective.

5.1. Students provide appropriate geographic skills to community-based organizations and associations.

6.1. Students can use and cite scholarly sources of information correctly.

6.2. Students can write and speak clearly in the discipline of geography.

Graduate:
1.0 The student will have demonstrated an acceptable level of understanding of geographic and planning concepts as shown in the thesis/project proposal and the completed thesis/project.

2.0 The student will have demonstrated an acceptable ability to conduct a literature review and convey the act of geography or planning as a discipline of critical spatial and temporal observation.

3.0 The student will have demonstrated an acceptable thesis/project proposal.

4.0 The student will have demonstrated an acceptable ability to organize ideas and content in written work through literature review and thesis/project proposal; and demonstrated application of geographic information and content used to solve a specific problem in a MA project or research questions in a MA thesis.

5.1 The student will have demonstrated a written communication that:
   - Presents information in an organized and concise manner.
   - Ideas are stated clearly and professionally.
   - Grammar, spelling, punctuation, word choice, structure and format are virtually error free and appropriate.
   - Perceived as a professional document.

5.2 The student will be able to give an oral presentation that:
   - Demonstrates professional presentation skills.
   - Preserves information in an organized and logical manner.
   - Demonstrates a professional level use of visual aids.

3. Course Alignment Matrix:

   Link:
   
   http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/vpprae/evaluation/apr/portfolios/bss/grad/geogma/matrix.pdf

4. Learning Outcomes Assessed in AY 2011-2012:

   Undergraduate:
   
   6.2. Students can write clearly in the discipline of geography.

   NOTE: Graduate Assessment conducted by Graduate Coordinator Dr. Don Hankins is not included in this report

5. Assessment Methodology Used:

   Undergraduate SLO  6.2. Students can write clearly in the discipline of geography.

   A direct assessment written assignment was used to measure this learning objective. GEOP faculty evaluated student written research papers in the class GEOG 444 Foundations of Biogeography. There was no sample. The GEOG 444 class set of sixteen papers was evaluated. The Assessment Rubric, developed by the GEOP faculty, measured the presence and application of a geographical topic for the paper, as well as the degree that the paper stays on topic, uses transitions and use of an appropriate number articles in the development of the thesis and to present evidence and opposing points of view about the topic. The rubric also included measurements regarding
the proper formatting of paper and references among other things. These criteria were collectively used to assess this student learning outcome. Each student final paper assignment was given a ranked score of Excellent, Very Good, Average, or Fail. GEOP Assessment strategy has a requirement that 75%-80% of students must score Excellent, Very Good, or Average on their written activity. If more than 20-25% of students score Fail, then GEOP will take appropriate action to rectify the low performance of students. The assessment evaluation was performed by Professors Knigge and Fairbanks. To determine if recent department curriculum changes have been effective (WP class now 390 rather than 490, implementation of mandatory advising and with students advised to take 390WP course prior to 490 courses) papers were also evaluated based on whether the student had take 390WP course or not.

6. Assessment Results:

The assessment strategy requirement is that 75%-80% of students will score Excellent or Good. The results are summarized as follows:

Excellent: 31%
Good: 50%
Average: 13%
Poor: 6%

Total Scores: Excellent/Good = 81%, Average/Poor = 19%

As can be seen in the data results, overall total student scores were well above 75% Excellent/Good requirement of the GEOP assessment strategy.

Additionally, it appears that students who take 390WP course are performing better than those who either have not or are taking it concurrently based on this small sample.

Of the sixteen students, seven had successfully completed 390WP, five had not yet taken 390WP, three were taking 390WP course concurrently and one student was a graduate student and was eliminated from this portion of the assessment. It is notable that all of the seven students who had taken the WP390 course were in the excellent/good category (3 students excellent; 4 students good). Of the five students that had not taken the 390WP course, three were in excellent or good category (two excellent & one good), and two were in the average/poor category (one average, one poor). Of the three students taking the course concurrently, two were in good category and one in average category. While this is a very small sample, it appears to indicate that students who take 390WP course are performing better than those who either have not or are taking it concurrently.

7. Analysis / Interpretation of Results

The data results for the assessment of undergraduate SLOs indicate that students exceed the minimum requirements set by the Department of Geography and Planning Faculty. Additionally the data indicates that the department curriculum redesign to offer WP course at 300 level and mandatory advising are effective in improving writing in 400 level courses.

8. Planned Program Improvement Actions Resulting from Outcomes

Geography 444 SLO assessment surveys indicated that the students were meeting learning objectives. No actions are needed to change this class.
9. Planned Revision of Measures or Metrics

No changes suggested by department faculty at this time.

10. Planned Revisions to Program Objectives or Learning Outcomes

No changes suggested by department faculty at this time.

11. Changes to Assessment Schedule

None needed

12. Information for Next Year

AY 12/13 Assessment:

SLO 5.1. Students provide appropriate geographic skills to community-based organizations and associations.

AY 11/12 Assessment Facilitator:

LaDonna Knigge, Associate Professor of Geography and Planning
GEOP, Mail: Zip 425, Phone: 898-5881, Email: lknigge@csuchico.edu

II. Appendices

A. Measurement Standards

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC 2011-12

Undergraduate SLO 6.3. Students can write clearly in the discipline of geography.

GEOG 444 Rubric for Spring 2012 Foundations of Biogeography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Paper</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Excellent: 90-100%</th>
<th>Very Good: 80-89%</th>
<th>Average: 70-79%</th>
<th>Fail: 0-69%</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s clear why this topic is geographical</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction is well written; includes a question and thesis</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures are clear, documented and well-integrated</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stays on topic and uses transitions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments and evidence are appropriate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It's clear why this topic is geographical

25

Introduction is well written; includes a question and thesis

20

Figures are clear, documented and well-integrated

15

Stays on topic and uses transitions

20

Arguments and evidence are appropriate

20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate number of peer-reviewed articles and they are well integrated</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposing points of view are accommodated</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion is clear and sums up main points and implications of research</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar and spelling are almost error free</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formatting of paper and references is correct</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper is appropriate length</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSESSMENT RUBRIC 2010-11**

**Undergraduate SLO 2.2.** Students can recognize the presence and application of regional, local and global dimensions of the social and physical worlds in data.

GEOG 390 *Foundations of Geographical Analysis and Writing* Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4** EXCELLENT | Beyond expectations for the presence of geographical dimensions of social and physical data.  
Exceptional application of geographical dimensions of social and physical data. |
| **3** GOOD | Complete presence of geographical dimensions of social and physical data.  
Well-done application of geographical dimensions of social and physical data. |
| **2** FAIR | Some presence of geographical dimensions of social and physical data.  
Application of geographical dimensions of social and physical data. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 POOR | No presence of geographical dimensions of social and physical data.  
No application of geographical dimensions of social and physical data. |

**ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

**Undergraduate SLO 3.1.** Students can explain interactions between the size and distribution of human and non-human populations, resources and the natural environment in historic and contemporary perspectives.

GEOG 435 *Historical Geography of North America* Spring 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 EXCELLENT | Beyond expectations for explanation of size and distribution of populations, natural resources, and natural environment.  
Exceptional use of historic and contemporary perspectives. |
| 3 GOOD | Complete explanation of size and distribution of populations, natural resources, and natural environment.  
Full use of historic and contemporary perspectives. |
| 2 FAIR | Some explanation of size and distribution of populations, natural resources, and natural environment.  
Use of historic and contemporary perspectives. |
| 1 POOR | No explanation of size and distribution of populations, natural resources, and natural environment.  
No use of historic and contemporary perspectives. |

**ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

**Graduate SLO 4.1.** The student will have demonstrated an acceptable ability to organize ideas and content in written work through literature review and thesis/project proposal; and demonstrated application of geographic information and content used to solve a specific problem in a MA project or research questions in a MA thesis.

GEOG 604 *Planning Practice and Theory* Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 EXCELLENT</td>
<td>Beyond expectations to organize ideas and content in written work through literature review and thesis/project proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>GOOD</strong> Complete ability to organize ideas and content in written work through literature review and thesis/project proposal. Well-done application of geographic information and content used to solve a specific problem in a MA project or research questions in a MA thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>FAIR</strong> Some ability to organize ideas and content in written work through literature review and thesis/project proposal. Application of geographic information and content used to solve a specific problem in a MA project or research questions in a MA thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>POOR</strong> No ability to organize ideas and content in written work through literature review and thesis/project proposal. No application of geographic information and content used to solve a specific problem in a MA project or research questions in a MA thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSESSMENT RUBRIC 2009-10**

**Graduate SLO 5.2** The student will be able to give an oral presentation that: demonstrates professional presentation skills, presents information in an organized and logical manner, and demonstrates a professional level use of visual aids.

GEOG 660 **Landscape Ecology** Fall 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Presentation: Annual Program Assessment Report_GEOP_2011-2012</th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong>&lt;br&gt;Excellent grasp, more than needed, of material in presentation and in answering questions.</td>
<td>Good grasp and presentation of material, and answers all questions without elaboration.</td>
<td>Less than a full grasp of the information. Presentation and answers to questions acceptable.</td>
<td>No grasp of information, presents misinformation, and unable to answer questions accurately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic component</strong>&lt;br&gt;Well-stated and clear reference to a geographic problem that is integrated throughout the presentation.</td>
<td>Statement made about the geographic problem and integrated into rest of presentation most of the time.</td>
<td>Some references to a geographic problem, but little integration into rest of presentation.</td>
<td>No reference to a geographic problem and no integration into the rest of presentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong>&lt;br&gt;Information is presented in a logical and engaging sequence that is easy for the audience to follow.</td>
<td>Information is presented in a logical sequence that the audience to follow, but is less engaging.</td>
<td>Presentation jumps around and is not easy to follow.</td>
<td>The audience cannot follow the presentation because it does not follow a logical sequence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maps &amp; Graphics</strong>&lt;br&gt;Graphics explain and highly reinforce the rest of the presentation.</td>
<td>Graphics are tied to the presentation.</td>
<td>Too few graphics and are not well related to the rest of the presentation.</td>
<td>Graphics either not used or are superfluous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation style</strong>&lt;br&gt;Speaks clearly, precisely, and loud enough for audience to hear. Delivery at a speed that allows for easy understanding. Maintained eye contact with minimal or no reading of notes.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and loud enough to be easily heard. Delivery at a speed that allows for easy understanding. Eye contact usually maintained except when consulting notes.</td>
<td>Speaks less clearly, or too softly, or rapidly to be easily understood most of the time. Some eye contact, but mostly reading from notes.</td>
<td>Speaks too softly or rapidly to be understood. Reads from notes exclusively with no eye contact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance with assignment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Paper presented within allotted time which left plenty of time for questions. Well explained and justified research problem. Excellent graphics.</td>
<td>Presenter within time allotment and could answer at least one question. Relevant graphics used. Research problem presented.</td>
<td>Some justification for the research problem. Graphics poorly integrated into presentation. Hurried to comply with time limit.</td>
<td>No clear research problem or justification for research. No graphics. Exceeded allotted time. Did not or could not answer questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>