

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO
ANNUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

Due: 9/30/2017
Email to Ryan Patten

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

1. Name and Contact Information of Program Assessment Coordinator:

LaDona Knigge, Associate Professor of Geography & Planning
GEOP, Mail ZIP 0425, Phone 530 898-5881, email lknigge@csuchico.edu

2. Student Learning Outcomes

<http://www.csuchico.edu/geop/department/index.shtml>

3. Course Alignment Matrix:

<http://www.csuchico.edu/geop/department/2014%20Matrix>

4. Learning Outcome(s) Assessed in AY 2015-2016:

Goal 5: Demonstrate proficiency in written and spoken communication.

1. Students can write clearly in the discipline of geography and use and cite scholarly sources of information correctly.

5. Assessment Methodology Used:

What kinds of assessment methods were used: embedded assessment of student work in a particular course? Type of assignment? Performance on standardized or other exams? Sample size? Sampling strategy? Who evaluated student performance? How was successful performance measured? Etc.

Embedded assessment of samples of final writing assignment of GEOG 390 Foundations of Geographical Analysis and Writing (WP) course were selected for this assessment. The sample of 15 student papers from two sections of the course were selected because of the small class size and number of students with junior and senior status. Papers by students with senior status were first selected and the remainder of the sample consisted of randomly selected papers written by juniors.

In fall 2016, 10 samples of the 15 student papers were evaluated. Five of these papers were written by students with senior status. In fall 2015, 5 student papers (1 senior) of the 8 student papers were selected for the evaluation.

Writing assessment was conducted across the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences with a common AAC&U rubric used across the college. Norming sessions were conducted in the April of 2017. Three evaluators from the department of Geography & Planning participated in this evaluation. All papers were read and evaluated independently by two of the evaluators, Reviewer #1 LaDona Knigge and Reviewer #2 Don Hankins. The third evaluator, Jacque Chase, was the instructor of the class and was consulted to assist when the two evaluators' scores differed by more than one point. The papers were from GEOG 390 class taught by Dr. Chase.

GEOP assessment strategy requires that no more than 20-25% of students score at *Level 1 Below Expectations* and a minimum of 60% of students score at *Level 4 Exceeds Expectations* or *Level 3 Meets Expectations* and 75-80% of students score at Levels 2, 3 or 4.

6. Assessment Results:

Please describe outcomes of assessment. How well did students perform on the assessment task(s)? Feel free to use the table below to report results, adapting the table as necessary, and/or provide narrative describing the assessment results.

The following table contains the results of the four categories evaluated for this assessment (content, organization, sources & evidence and grammar and style).

	1 Below Expectations		2 Needs Improvement		3 Meets Expectations		4 Exceeds Expectations		N=30
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Content	1	3.3	9	30.0	12	40.0	8	26.7	30
Organization	0	0.0	10	33.3	17	56.7	3	10.0	30
Sources & Evidence	0	0.0	8	26.7	17	56.7	5	16.7	30
Grammar & Style	2	6.7	9	30.0	15	50.0	4	13.3	30

In the category of *content*, 66.7% of the sample papers either met or exceeded expectations. In the area of *organization*, 66.7% of the sample papers either met or exceeded expectations. In the area of *sources & evidence*, 73.4% of the sample papers either met or exceeded expectations. In the area of *grammar & style*, 63.3% of the sample papers either met or exceeded expectation. The percentage of student papers evaluated at or above Level 3 exceeded the department benchmark of 60%. A very small percentage of student papers were rated as *below expectations* and the following were evaluated as *Needs improvement*: 30% in the area of *content*, 33.5 % in the area or *organization*, 26.7% in the area of *sources and evidence*, and 30% in the area of *grammar & style*. Nearly one-third of the student papers in all categories were evaluated as *needs improvement*.

Of the 30 sample papers, twelve papers were written by students with senior class-standing and eighteen of the papers were written by students with junior class-standing. Results for seniors and juniors were analyzed separately.

Seniors N = 12	1 Below Expectations		2 Needs Improvement		3 Meets Expectations		4 Exceeds Expectations		N=12
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Content	0	0.0	3	25.0	5	41.7	4	33.3	12
Organization	0	0.0	1	8.3	9	75.0	2	16.7	12
Sources & Evidence	0	0.0	4	33.3	6	50.0	2	16.7	12
Grammar & Style	1	8.3	5	41.7	4	33.3	2	16.7	12

Of the paper written by seniors:

- In *content*, 75% percent of the papers either met or exceeded expectations
- In *organization*, nearly 92% of the papers met or exceeded expectations.
- In *sources & evidence*, 66.7% of the papers met or exceeded expectations
- In *grammar & style*, 50% of the papers met or exceeded expectations

Juniors N = 18	1 Below Expectations		2 Needs Improvement		3 Meets Expectations		4 Exceeds Expectations		N-18
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Content	1	5.6	6	33.3	7	38.9	4	22.2	18
Organization	0	0.0	9	50.0	8	44.4	1	5.6	18
Sources & Evidence	0	0.0	4	22.2	11	61.1	3	16.7	18
Grammar & Style	1	5.6	4	22.2	11	61.1	2	11.1	18

Of the paper written by juniors:

- In *content*, just over 61% percent of the papers either met or exceeded expectations
- In *organization*, 50% of the papers met or exceeded expectations.
- In *sources & evidence*, 77.8% of the papers met or exceeded expectations
- In *grammar & style*, 72.2% of the papers met or exceeded expectations

Student Learning Outcome	Sample and Sample Size	Measure	Percent of Students Achieving
SLO 5.1	GEOG 390 Fall 2015 Sample of 5/8 papers selected 1/5 paper by senior 4/5 papers by juniors	Embedded assessment of sample of five papers from eight total for this semester. The sample consisted of all papers (one) of the papers was written by a student with senior status; the remaining four were randomly selected from the population and were written by juniors.	See above
SLO 5.1	GEOG 390 Fall 2016 Sample of	Embedded assessment of sample of ten papers from 25 total for this semester. All papers written by seniors were selected first (five); the remaining five papers were randomly selected from the pool of papers written by juniors (13). The remaining seven papers were written by sophomores and were not used for random sample.	See above

7. Analysis / Interpretation of Results

What did the results tell you about how well students were achieving your Student Learning Outcome expectations?

The results of this assessment indicate that a majority of GEOP student papers evaluated either meet expectations or exceed expectations. Nearly one-third of the student papers in all categories were evaluated as *needs improvement*. According to the GEOP [Course Alignment Matrix](#), students in GEOG 390 are expected to both ‘practice’ and ‘demonstrate’ proficiency in written communication. It does not appear that senior status has a consistent bearing on higher performance. The results when comparing papers written by seniors and juniors were mixed.

At the time of this assessment, GEOP did not have any required capstone courses with ‘mastery’ as the level of proficiency for SLO 5.1. However several 400 level courses have SLO 5.1 associated with them (405S, 407, 411, 413, 425, 426 427, 428, 429, 436, 444, 445 and 506). These courses provide students with an additional opportunity to further develop their writing skills.

How were the results shared with faculty, students, and/or other stakeholders?

The results of this assessment were emailed to faculty and will be discussed at December faculty meeting as part of the work to create GWAR courses and revise GEOG 390 course.

8. Planned Program Improvement Actions Resulting from Outcomes (if applicable)

How will the assessment data and their evaluation be used to improve the program? Possible actions might include revising pedagogy, courses, curricula, or other learning support mechanisms.

The department will have three W courses: 101, 390 and proposed GVAR courses. CPCR were submitted to change GEOG 101i to GEOG 101W according to EM 17-009. A CPCR was also submitted to add GEOG 101 as a prerequisite for GEOG 390.

The department curriculum committee has been working to revise the curriculum to comply with Executive Memorandum 17-009 (Sept 7, 2017) Writing Across the Curriculum Program and Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement. The department is in the process of submitting CPCR to create two GVAR courses: GEOG 407 (Physical option) and GEOG 438 (Human Option). The addition of GEOG 407 and 438 to the core requirements was approved at the October 6, 2017 faculty meeting. CPCR were submitted to make this change. SLOs and prerequisites for the GVAR courses will be topic of spring semester curriculum and department meetings.

Geography has 'mandatory advising' requiring students to meet with an advisor each semester before they register for classes for the following semester. The use of a special sheet to track writing proficiency and the students' grade from GEOG 101W through mandatory advising was discussed at the October 6, 2016 faculty meeting.

9. Planned Revision of Measures or Metrics (if applicable)

A possible revision of a measure might be to recommend a change in the assignments that are evaluated for program assessment, or the number of assignments examined, and by whom. A metric revision might be for program faculty to decide to change the "bar" for acceptable performance.

GEOG 390 is currently being taught by Don Hankins as a combination of GEOG 317 and GEOG 390 with more of a hands-on field component to supplement the writing requirement. The success of this course in terms of writing will be revisited in the spring semester.

10. Planned Revisions to Program Objectives or Learning Outcomes (if applicable)

After examining the assessment data it might be appropriate to revise one or more of the Program Objectives or Student Learning Outcomes.

GEOG 407 & 438 have been approved by the department to put forth as GVAR courses and the SLOs and course assignments will be revised as part of this process.

11. Changes to Assessment Schedule (if applicable)

Do the results create a need for change in your assessment schedule? If so, please describe.

Once the curriculum has been revised to comply with EM-17-009, the assessment plan will be amended to re-evaluate this SLO.

12. Information for Next Year

What learning outcome(s) are you examining next year and who will be the contact person?

Goal 5: Demonstrate proficiency in written and spoken communication.

2. Students can speak clearly in the discipline of geography.

Don L. Hankins email dhankins@csuchico.edu

II. Appendices (please include any of the following that are applicable to your program)

A. Assessment Data Summaries (Details that elaborate on item 6, above.)

Sample papers were independently evaluated using the rubric by LaDona Knigge (Reviewer #1) and Don Hankins (Reviewer #2). The Assessment Committee met and compared results. Papers with rating that was more than one point apart (1 below expectations, 2 needs improvement, 3 meets expectation and 4 exceeds expectation) for the four categories of content, organization, sources and evidence and grammar and style were flagged for further review. These papers were evaluated by the third reviewer Jacque Chase (Reviewer #3), in collaboration with Knigge & Hankins. This resulted in reassigning scores (1-4) to the category with the discrepancy of greater than one point. The results of this session are shown in the table below. Original scores by both evaluators are reported; categories with more than one point score difference are highlighted in yellow and the revised score is reported in post review column.

The reassigned scores were used for the remainder of the assessment.

ID #	Content				Organization				Sources and Evidence				Grammar & Style			
	post review	#1	#2	post review	post review	#1	#2	post review	post review	#1	#2	post review	post review	#1	#2	post review
1	1	Junior	2	3		2	2		3	3		1	2			
2	15	Junior	3	2		2	3		3	3		3	3			
3	16	Junior	3	4		3	3		3	4		3	4			
4	17	Junior	2	2		2	2		2	3		2	4	3		
5	23	Junior	4	3		3	2		3	3		3	3			
6	2	Senior	2	1	4	3	2	4	3	2	3	1	3	2		
7	4	Senior	4	4		4	4		4	4		4	4			
8	7	Senior	3	4		3	2	4	3	2	4	2	3			
9	14	Senior	2	3		3	3		2	3		2	4	3		
10	18	Senior	2	4	3		3	3		2	3	2	4	2		
11	A	Senior	4	3		3	4	2	3	3	3	3	3			
12	C	Junior	1	2		2	2		2	3		3	3			
13	D	Junior	3	2		3	2		3	2		3	2			
14	F	Junior	4	4		4	3		4	4		3	4			
15	G	Junior	3	3		3	3		2	3		2	3			

B. Measurement Standards (Rubrics, etc.)

See attached rubric

C. Survey Instruments

See attached assignment

Please submit your completed report electronically to rpatten@csuchico.edu by Friday, September 30, 2016.

B. Rubric - Measurement Standards

	Below expectations 1	Needs Improvement 2	Meets Expectations 3	Exceeds Expectations 4
Content	Shows minimal engagement with the topic, failing to recognize multiple dimensions/ perspectives; lacking even basic observations	Shows some engagement with the topic without elaboration; offers basic observations but rarely original insight	Demonstrates engagement with the topic, recognizing multiple dimensions and/or perspectives; offers some insight	Demonstrates engagement with the topic, recognizing multiple dimensions and/or perspectives with elaboration and depth; offers considerable insight
Organization	Organization is missing both overall and within paragraphs. Introduction and conclusion may be lacking or illogical.	Organization, overall and/or within paragraphs, is formulaic or occasionally lacking in coherence; few evident transitions. Introduction and conclusion may lack logic.	Few organizational problems on any of the 3 levels (overall, paragraph, transitions). Introduction and conclusion are effectively related to the whole.	Organization is logical and appropriate to assignment; paragraphs are well-developed and appropriately divided; ideas linked with smooth and effective transitions. Introduction and conclusion are effectively related to the whole.
Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing. Little to no evidence is supplied.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas. Some evidence is provided, but not enough to develop argument in unified way.	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas. Evidence is accurate, well documented, and relevant, but not complete.	Demonstrates skillful use of high quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas. Evidence is relevant, accurate, complete, well integrated, well documented, and appropriate
Grammar and Style	Multiple and serious errors of sentence structure; frequent errors in spelling and capitalization; intrusive and/or inaccurate punctuation such that communication is hindered. Proofreading not evident.	Sentences show errors of structure and little or no variety; many errors of punctuation, spelling and/or capitalization. Errors interfere with meaning in places. Careful proofreading not evident.	Effective and varied sentences; some errors in sentence construction; only occasional punctuation, spelling and/or capitalization errors.	Each sentence structured effectively, powerfully; rich, well-chosen variety of sentence styles and length; virtually free of punctuation, spelling, capitalization errors.

C. Assignment

What is the Explanatory Report?

You will write an explanatory (informative, descriptive) report on a local issue. By local I mean Chico or Butte County. Your report will make references to places outside of the local area in the literature review section. Your paper should be 7-10 pages long, double-spaced, 1-inch margins, no big spaces between paragraphs, and not counting all your visuals. Please include a cover page. Do not include headings or footers in the main body of your paper. Cover page does not count towards paper length minimum. Include at least one properly formatted and referenced items (these do not count toward 7-10 page minimum for paper)

- Map
- Graphic (a chart, for example)
- Photo
- Table

Think about your audience when writing this report. You are writing to inform someone—the public or a policymaker. Define terms, use transitions, cut down on unnecessary words, and do not try to create a solution. You are informing someone who might be able to make policy, but your job is not to come up with solutions. Think about this as a background report. However, after having done research you are entitled to an informed position on the issue. For instance, if I was writing report on panhandling laws I'd include all sides of the debate, but my conclusion might reflect a concern with the legality of banning panhandling as well as an acknowledgement that panhandling is a problem (maybe it's not—not sure, but this is just an example).

Mandatory Sections to your Report:

1. **A meaningful title:** Make your title compelling (not dry). Try to make it say something about what you are researching. Your title can be a question. You should include information that this is a study of xxx in Butte County, or Chico.
2. **Introduction.** Write an introduction that says what the report is about and why it's an important topic. Be engaging and use clear, straightforward language. ½ page.
3. **Literature Review.** This should have been drafted during the annotated bibliography and further explored in the concept map. Think of the major themes that you've found in articles that orient your research and thinking about the topic. Your field research and local research section should “fit” with this section of the paper. For example, if the literature on sit-lie ordinances brings up the legality of this legislation, and you write about this in your literature review portion, then you should explore that in your field research. 1.5-2 pages.
4. **Local Research: Background information (Secondary Research)** 2 pages
 - a. Include a description of how the issue has evolved (from issues you put in your timeline and news article summary, and from interview materials). You could adapt the timeline as a table in this section.
 - b. Provide information of the various “stakeholders” involved in the issue, and describe any controversies about the issue that you have learned from your news article analysis. Think about who is affected, and how different people or groups feel about the issue. You could provide a table here of the who's who of the issue.
5. **Local Research: Fieldwork (Primary Research)** 3 pages
 - a. Describe what method you used to do your fieldwork portion.
(Provide a map that will show the area of town or the county where you carried out your research, and/or that was a focus of your research.)
 - b. Provide findings of your field research. Use table and/or graph here.
6. **Conclusion** ½ page

7. **Reference list** No more than 1 page—use single space within each reference, double space between each reference; One part on local research and one on scholarly sources.

A rubric has been provided.