



# Comprehensive PLO Assessment Report

Social Sciences

## PLO

**PLO Name:** Social Science Concepts & Theories (PLO 1)

**PLO:** Students will be able to analyze social science concepts and theories.

**PLO Status:** Active

### Mapping

- CAN ILOs: (X - Selected)

- **CAN ILO #1 - Critical Thinking & Information Literacy:** undefined (X)
- **CAN ILO #2 - Creativity:** undefined (X)
- **CAN ILO #3 - Communication:** undefined (X)
- **CAN ILO #4 - Community, Civic Responsibility, and ability to Engage with Diverse Perspectives:** undefined (X)

Assessment Method	Results, Analysis & Next Steps
<b>Assessment Method Status:</b> Active <b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Essay <b>Assessment Method:</b> General analytic rubric. The rubric was organized into three rows, one row for each PLO, and into three columns that included descriptive feedback for each level of competency: "Incomplete", "Acceptable", and "Accomplished." During the 2018-2019 assessment period the Social Science faculty examined the PLO "Produce evidence-based arguments." When evaluating the student writing assignments, the faculty selected one of the five scoring options (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, or 2) to indicate the students' level of competency ("incomplete" was represented by the scores 0 and 0.5, "acceptable" by 1 or 1.5, and accomplished by a 2). An average score of 1.0 ("acceptable") was desired. <b>Criterion for Success:</b> An average score of 1.0 ("acceptable") is desired.	<b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2020 - 2023 <b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Spring 2021 <b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 40 <b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 38 <b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 40 papers and exams were assessed. 95% (38/40) of the papers/exams received at least a 1 "acceptable" score. The average was 1.46, exceeding the minimum average score of 1 and an increase from the previous assessment. <b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met <b>Result Entered:</b> 09/09/2022 <b>Optional Information</b>
	<b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2014 - 2017 <b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Spring 2015 <b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 23 <b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 19 <b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 23 student writing assignments were scored using the rubric. 19 writing samples were scored to assess students' competency of PLO 2, with 4 papers marked as "not applicable" for this learning outcome. The average score for PLO 2 was 1.2, meeting the minimum average score of 1.0. <b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met

Assessment Method	Results, Analysis & Next Steps
	<p><b>Next Steps:</b> 06/01/2015 The criterion was met, as competency score for this PLO was found to be "acceptable." Faculty also discussed the benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as a refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program. By discussing and reading what is done in others' departments and classes, several faculty viewed the assessment process as valuable.</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022</p> <p><b>Optional Information</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2011 - 2014</p> <p><b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Spring 2014</p> <p><b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 18</p> <p><b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 14</p> <p><b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 18 student writing assignments were scored using the rubric. 14 writing samples were scored to assess students' competency of PLO 1, with 3 papers marked as "not applicable" for this learning outcome. The average score for PLO 1 was 1.17, exceeding the minimum average score of 1.0.</p> <p><b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b> 12/18/2013 The criterion was met, as the average competency for each of the three PLOs was found to be "acceptable." Because this was the first time the rubric was used to assess students' competency of the PLOs, qualitative feedback was gathered from the scoring faculty. There was one major area of concern that was discussed during the scoring of the samples: there was some difficulty identifying the social science theories that the writing assignments were targeting (although faculty attached the writing prompt). This may have resulted in unnecessary scores of 0 ("incomplete"), or a no-score ("not applicable"). Faculty also discussed a benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as a refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program. By discussing and reading what is done in others' departments and classes, several faculty viewed the assessment process as valuable.</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022</p> <p><b>Optional Information</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2017 - 2020</p> <p><b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Fall 2017</p> <p><b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 45</p> <p><b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 37</p> <p><b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 45 papers and exams were assessed. 82% (37/45) papers/exams received at least a 1 "acceptable" score. The average was 1.31, exceeding the minimum average score of 1.0.</p>

Assessment Method	Results, Analysis & Next Steps
	<p><b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b> 12/08/2017 Discussion from the above assessment period demonstrated an improvement in random sampling. Although criterion was met for this PLO and there was a slight increase in identifying the social science theories, continued concern was discussed regarding the difficulty in consistent assessment of analyzing social science concepts and theories as some assignments had limited ability to adequately assess this goal, which may have altered the results. Continued improvement in identifying papers/exams which will allow for adequate assessment of PLO, while using random a selection from those papers/exams during the next assessment period was discussed. Also, faculty discussed a benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program.</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022</p> <p><b>Optional Information</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2017 - 2020</p> <p><b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Fall 2018</p> <p><b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 76</p> <p><b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 70</p> <p><b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 76 papers and exams were assessed. 92% (70/76) of the papers/exams received at least a 1 "acceptable" score. The average score for the PLO "Produce evidence-based arguments" was 1.43 which is similar to the previous program review assessment period. The criterion was met.</p> <p><b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b> 11/02/2018 During the first 2 years using the current assessment method major areas of concern that were discussed during the scoring of the samples included: difficulty identifying the social science theories that the writing assignments were targeting (although faculty attached the writing prompt) and confusion with sampling methods. Discussion from the above assessment period demonstrated continued improvement in random sampling. During the previous assessment period faculty discussed difficulty in identifying social science theories that the writing assignments were targeting. This concern was not addressed during the 2018-2019 assessment period as that PLO was not examined. Faculty will address this specific concern during the next assessment period. Also, faculty discussed a benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program.</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022</p> <p><b>Optional Information</b></p>

## PLO

**PLO Name:** Diverse Viewpoints (PLO 2)

**PLO:** Students will be able to evaluate diverse viewpoints related to the human experience.

**PLO Status:** Active

### Mapping

- CAN ILOs: (X - Selected)

- **CAN ILO #1 - Critical Thinking & Information Literacy:** undefined (X)
- **CAN ILO #2 - Creativity:** undefined (X)
- **CAN ILO #3 - Communication:** undefined (X)
- **CAN ILO #4 - Community, Civic Responsibility, and ability to Engage with Diverse Perspectives:** undefined (X)

Assessment Method	Results, Analysis & Next Steps
<b>Assessment Method Status:</b> Active <b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Essay <b>Assessment Method:</b> The rubric is organized into three rows, one row for each PLO, and into three columns that included descriptive feedback for each level of competency: "Incomplete", "Acceptable", and "Accomplished". When evaluating the student writing assignments, the faculty will select one of the five scoring options (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, or 2) for each row of the rubric to indicate the students' level of competency ("incomplete" is represented by the scores 0 and 0.5, "acceptable" by 1 or 1.5, and accomplished by a 2). <b>Criterion for Success:</b> An average score of 1.0 ("acceptable") is desired.	<b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2017 - 2020 <b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Fall 2019 <b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 50 <b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 46 <b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 50 papers and exams were assessed. 92% (46/50) papers/exams received at least a 1 "acceptable" score. The average was 1.52, exceeding the minimum average score of 1 and an increase from the previous assessment. <b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met <b>Result Entered:</b> 09/09/2022 <b>Optional Information</b>
	<b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2011 - 2014 <b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Fall 2013 <b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 13 <b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 10 <b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 13 writing samples were scored to assess students' competency of PLO 2, with 3 papers marked as "not applicable" for this learning outcome. The average score for PLO 2 was 1.0, meeting the minimum average score of 1.0. <b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met

Assessment Method	Results, Analysis & Next Steps
	<p><b>Next Steps:</b> 12/18/2013 The criterion was met, as the average competency for each of the three PLOs was found to be “acceptable.” Because this was the first time the rubric was used to assess students’ competency of the PLOs, qualitative feedback was gathered from the scoring faculty. There was one major area of concern that was discussed during the scoring of the samples: there was some difficulty identifying the social science theories that the writing assignments were targeting (although faculty attached the writing prompt). This may have resulted in unnecessary scores of 0 (“incomplete”), or a no-score (“not applicable”). Faculty also discussed a benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as a refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program. By discussing and reading what is done in others’ departments and classes, several faculty viewed the assessment process as valuable.</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022</p> <p><b>Optional Information</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2014 - 2017</p> <p><b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Spring 2016</p> <p><b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 12</p> <p><b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 11</p> <p><b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 12 writing samples were scored to assess students’ competency of PLO 2, with 1 paper marked as “not applicable” for this learning outcome. The average score for PLO 2 was 1.2, meeting the minimum average score of 1.0.</p> <p><b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b> 05/12/2016 The results were promising in that the average score increased from 1 to 1.2. It is difficult to assess why this occurred and more research and assessments should be done in the next few PLO cycles.</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022</p> <p><b>Optional Information</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2014 - 2017</p> <p><b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Spring 2017</p> <p><b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 45</p> <p><b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 39</p> <p><b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> Between December 2016-April 2017 45 papers and exams were assessed. 87% (39/45) papers/exams received at least a 1 "acceptable" score. The average was 1.49, exceeding the minimum average score of 1 and an increase from the previous assessment.</p> <p><b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met</p>

Assessment Method	Results, Analysis & Next Steps
	<p><b>Next Steps:</b> 04/27/2017 The criterion was met, as competency score for this PLO was found to be "acceptable." Faculty continued to discuss the benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as a refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program. The assessment will be conducted again in the future.</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022</p> <p><b>Optional Information</b></p>

## PLO

**PLO Name:** Evidence Based Arguments (PLO 3)

**PLO:** Students will be able to produce evidence based arguments.

**PLO Status:** Active

## Mapping

- CAN ILOs: (X - Selected)

- **CAN ILO #1 - Critical Thinking & Information Literacy:** undefined (X)
- **CAN ILO #2 - Creativity:** undefined (X)
- **CAN ILO #3 - Communication:** undefined (X)
- **CAN ILO #4 - Community, Civic Responsibility, and ability to Engage with Diverse Perspectives:** undefined (X)
- **CAN ILO #5 - Quantitative Reasoning:** undefined (X)

Assessment Method	Results, Analysis & Next Steps
<p><b>Assessment Method Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Assessment Method Category:</b> Essay</p> <p><b>Assessment Method:</b> The rubric is organized into three rows, one row for each PLO, and into three columns that included descriptive feedback for each level of competency: "Incomplete", "Acceptable", and "Accomplished". When evaluating the student writing assignments, the faculty will select one of the five scoring options (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, or 2) for each row of the rubric to indicate the students' level of competency ("incomplete" is represented by the scores 0 and 0.5, "acceptable" by 1 or 1.5, and accomplished by a 2).</p>	<p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2020 - 2023</p> <p><b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Spring 2022</p> <p><b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 35</p> <p><b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 34</p> <p><b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 35 papers and exams were assessed. 93% (34/35) of the papers/exams received at least a 1 "acceptable" score. The average was 1.62, exceeding the minimum average score of 1 and an increase from the previous assessment.</p> <p><b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 09/09/2022</p> <p><b>Optional Information</b></p>
	<p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2017 - 2020</p> <p><b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Fall 2018</p>

Assessment Method	Results, Analysis & Next Steps
<p><b>Criterion for Success:</b> An average score of 1.0 ("acceptable") is desired.</p>	<p><b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 45  <b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 41  <b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 45 papers and exams were assessed. 91% (41/45) of the papers/exams received at least a 1 "acceptable" score. The average was 1.43, exceeding the minimum average score of 1.  <b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met  <b>Result Entered:</b> 09/09/2022  <u><b>Optional Information</b></u></p>
	<p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2011 - 2014  <b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Fall 2013  <b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 17  <b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 16  <b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 17 writing samples were scored to assess students' competency of PLO 3, with 1 paper marked as "not applicable" for this learning outcome. The average score for PLO 3 was 1.09, exceeding the minimum average score of 1.0.  <b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met  <b>Next Steps:</b> 12/18/2013 Action: The criterion was met, as the average competency for each of the three PLOs was found to be "acceptable." Because this was the first time the rubric was used to assess students' competency of the PLOs, qualitative feedback was gathered from the scoring faculty. There was one major area of concern that was discussed during the scoring of the samples: there was some difficulty identifying the social science theories that the writing assignments were targeting (although faculty attached the writing prompt). This may have resulted in unnecessary scores of 0 ("incomplete"), or a no-score ("not applicable"). Faculty also discussed a benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as a refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program. By discussing and reading what is done in others' departments and classes, several faculty viewed the assessment process as valuable.  <b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022  <u><b>Optional Information</b></u></p>
	<p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2014 - 2017  <b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Fall 2014  <b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 20  <b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 15  <b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 20 student writing assignments were scored using the rubric. 15 writing samples were scored to assess students' competency of PLO 1, with 5 papers marked as "not applicable" for this learning outcome. The average score for PLO 1 was 1.17, exceeding the minimum average score of 1.0 or "acceptable".</p>



Assessment Method	Results, Analysis & Next Steps
	<p><b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b> 12/19/2014 The criterion was met, as competency score for this PLO was found to be "acceptable." Faculty also discussed the benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as a refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program. By discussing and reading what is done in others' departments and classes, several faculty viewed the assessment process as valuable.</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022</p> <p><u><b>Optional Information</b></u></p>
	<p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2014 - 2017</p> <p><b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Fall 2015</p> <p><b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 27</p> <p><b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 23</p> <p><b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> 27 papers and exams were assessed. 85% (23/27) of the papers/exams received at least a 1 "acceptable" score. The average was 1.44, an increase from the previous assessment.</p> <p><b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b> 12/18/2015 One of the faculty members misunderstood the instructions and did not randomly select their papers. This could have caused a slight uptick in the overall results. The assessments should be conducted again in the future.</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022</p> <p><u><b>Optional Information</b></u></p>
	<p><b>Assessment Cycle:</b> 2014 - 2017</p> <p><b>Which semester was this result gathered in?:</b> Fall 2016</p> <p><b>Number of Students Assessed:</b> 45</p> <p><b>Number of Students Who Met the Criterion:</b> 39</p> <p><b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b> Between December 2016-April 2017 45 papers and exams were assessed. 87% (39/45) papers/exams received at least a 1 "acceptable" score. The average was 1.53, exceeding the minimum average score of 1 and an increase from the previous assessment.</p> <p><b>Result Conclusion:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b> 04/27/2017 The criterion was met, as competency score for this PLO was found to be "acceptable." Faculty continued to discuss the benefit to using the rubric as a way to improve instruction. The general analytic rubric was viewed as a tool to share and learn from each other, which was viewed as a refreshing given the diversity of the social sciences program. The assessment will be conducted again in the future.</p> <p><b>Result Entered:</b> 03/25/2022</p> <p><u><b>Optional Information</b></u></p>

