

## Assessment Report Summaries: Revised Assessment Model 2019-2020

### Accounting

In ACC216, there currently are two main strategies for assessing the improvement in the students' ability to communicate in writing: 1) an analysis of the revised assignments, and 2) analysis of student responses to a comprehensive, course-specific, detailed (6-page) exit assessment. Analysis of the data indicates that there is significant improvement between the first and second drafts of every paper. Furthermore, there is sustained improvement from the early papers to the late-semester papers.

**Chemistry**

The chemistry department is carrying out direct assessment of student learning through the incorporation of tracked questions in exams, quizzes, and assignments. This will

## **Finance**

Using a grading rubric that included grammar, writing clarity and business writing style, students in FIS 409's three main papers were assessed at the first draft and the final draft. In addition to being evaluated by the professor, the final papers are assessed by the professionals on the Client Board, who evaluate the students' arguments and make suggestions for improvement. The improvement in grammar, writing clarity and business writing style were looked at by the Professor who taught the class and graded the Rubric. The improvement in the results is greatly due to Prof. Holly Hughey coming into class to explain the difference between academic and business writing styles as well as numerous revisions by the students following feedback from the Professor. This iterative approach appears to be working well and consequently, the class will continue it.

## **Political Science**

This year's target was to see whether students are "able to communicate research findings and arguments in a clear, logical, and persuasive manner" based on a team reading of a collection of short papers. We used a three-point scale to score the papers, ranging from under-developed, to developing, to mastery. As part of our spring 2018 assessment efforts, we noted the need to integrate more assignments at the 200- and 300-levels that ask students to synthesize multiple and competing perspectives. We also noted the need to give particular attention to underlying assumptions and implications. While the group expressed approval of this particular assignment, it's possible that the space limitations embodied in the assignment lead students to write a little less than they otherwise might have. Finally, reading these papers generated a useful conversation about how students succeed (or not) at writing abstracts. At least one member of the department who has not done much in the way of teaching how to write an abstract reported that he will work on this in the future.

## **Psychology**

This past year we assessed the following student learning goals: the learning of key concepts in our psychology 100 class, the ability to critically think about and applying psychological principles related to research design and analysis, as well as principles applying psychological outcomes to everyday life and social situation in the context of appropriately using ethics to understand the limitations of psychological knowledge. The data suggests students were successfully exposed to a psychology curriculum that demonstrates these learning goals. Direct measures from the introductory level course in psychology suggest students demonstrated knowledge of most subfields in Psychology. Indirect measures from a senior student exit survey and a survey of faculty teaching and updating our Statistics course in the department also suggest students have been exposed to a consistent level of instruction regarding the critical analysis, interpretation, reporting, and execution of scientific inquiry within the science of psychology.

## **Sociology**

We now have two different instructors who teach SOC 290: History of Social Thought, in a rotation that is designed to make it so that no one instructor is teaching more than one writing intensive course per semester. While we feel that we share goals and have developed similar (though not identical) courses, we wanted to assess the learning outcomes of our students in each course. The full-time instructors who were teaching introductory-level courses in 17-18 together developed a 5-question multiple choice quiz (see Appendix C) that evaluates the existence (pass/fail) of tangible outcomes present in our 5 concept competencies. While we were not able to answer the question for which we designed our assessment this year, we know that at least one of the theory courses is meeting core sociological competencies, and thus that our students are getting consistent education reflecting core sociological learning goals in both our introductory and one theory course. Since the instructors teaching theory feel that they are teaching comparable courses, we feel reasonably confident that we are meeting these goals across our theory courses.

