

**SOUTH PUGET SOUND COMMUNITY COLLEGE**  
**Assessment and Research Council**

**Current Status of Program Assessment**  
**Social Sciences Division**

**Program:** Anthropology

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
Data under collection and review	

**Program:** ECE/PEP

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
Awaiting Annual Review	

**Program:** Economics

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
Students who register for more than one economics course simultaneously consistently have problems in one course or the other.	Continue to discourage all students from taking both courses at the same time. This was brought to the attention of the counselors. Since economics is required for Business majors, alerting the business department and other advisors to this problem could help

**Program:** Education

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
Data under collection and Review	

**Program:** Forensics

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
<p>Chapman: “This was the first time I taught the 5 credit Osteology class. I noticed that student grades did improve dramatically from when it was a 3 credit class. In addition, 6 of the 19 students (almost 1/3) who completed the class are now enrolled in Forensic Anth. No dramatic problems come to mind.”</p> <p>Fors 255</p> <p>Bosse: “We lost 2 classes to snow days, and one to instructor illness. That put great pressure on the instructional goals. However, as this course has a prerequisite of Fors 101 or Psyc 255, all the students were familiar with my instructional method. An enthusiastic group, they voluntarily cut back on break time. I prepared and provided students with either PowerPoint note taking outlines, or MS Word based “skeleton” outlines to assist/expedite their note-taking. The “lost time” was made up without loss of learning or student performance. Of greatest interest, and satisfaction to me, were the numerous and unsolicited handwritten comments on the informal student survey I conducted. The anonymous comments were overwhelmingly positive and complimentary of both the subject and instructional style. There was not a single negative comment in the bunch. This might explain why I looked forward to teaching this class every meeting.”</p>	<p>As the Forensic course offerings grow, additional sessions of Fors 255 must be considered. The course, offered in a less than desirable time slot (afternoon), twice per week, and with prerequisite(s), still enjoyed a high student census. This course, as part of the rapidly expanding Criminal Behavior Program, which has grown almost exponentially in popularity, will see increased demand. Offering the course at night and/or at Hawks Prairie might appeal to even more students.</p>

**Program:** History

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
Data under collection and annual review	

**Program:** Human Development

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
Awaiting Annual review	

**Program:** Geography

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
This is the first year that Physical Geography has been offered and student interest is high. Assessment is ongoing to determine student competence and satisfaction	

**Program:** International Intercultural Studies

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
Student survey scores for Items 1-4 & 6-8 indicated 100% “satisfied” to “highly satisfied”. Item 5 received 93% “satisfied” to “highly satisfied”. Comments were, “Needed more emphasis on current political situations in Nepal and Sri Lanka”.	Survey indicates that the instructional goals were adequately met. There can, however, be improvement in each area, especially in Item 5, awareness of the contemporary political and economic situations. A little more class time must be devoted to contemporary Nepal and Sri Lanka.

**Program:** Political Science

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
Found high correlation between those students who did poorly and those whose class participation is low.	This was a “good” course in that students engaged. Class discussion greatly adds to the ability of all to understand the concepts and material. I will attempt to do more to encourage class participation.

**Program:** Psychology

Key Findings / Issues	Action Plans
<p><b>Results:</b> Repeated comments from Fall 2003:</p> <p>“Overall, Psychology department members are satisfied with student learning outcomes as measured above. However, there are some obvious challenges facing the department”.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assessing “critical thinking skills,” continues as a challenge, but great strides were made this term.</li> <li>2. Obvious communication and data gathering issues for full-time and adjunct faculty continue, resulting in a lack of data of some assessment criteria for different instructors. There does not appear to be a broad acceptance of the assessment criteria, tools or analysis, as developed. Some of this may be attributable to “learning curve,” some to apathy, some to the overall lack of structured communication within the department, and some perhaps due to other reasons/explanations.”</li> </ol> <p>Comments from Winter 2004:</p> <p>There has been great consistency in the numerical data collected and analyzed to date. Trends noted have been discussed and corrected, or determined to be “normal” results given the evaluation criteria. Aside from the continuing trend of lower full-time faculty grades versus adjunct grades, and no routine meetings of all department members to discuss the trends or other departmental issues (which therefore necessitates most discussion to be via e-mail), the only continuing concern involves the current assessment modality in general. It appears to be a general consensus in the department that individual</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The full-time versus adjuncts grades needs continued surveillance. It will require discussion when (if) funding is available to pay for departmental meeting(s).</li> <li>2. The current assessment modalities will continue to be used. However, the frequency of persistent assessment probably is contraindicated, based on the perpetuating trends noted in the numerical assessment and analysis. This is another topic of discussion for a departmental meeting.</li> </ol> <p>A general attitude of the current assessment modality is that one person (Bosse) is responsible for departmental assessment. Failing a query for information or repeated calls for data from the Dean of Social Sciences, it is fair to state no assessment would occur. Thus, the current assessment criteria have not, and probably will never be, accepted in its’ current format. However, all professors will generally continue to qualitatively assess their classes and methods. At some point, this issue will need to be discussed at the division level, and allowances made for more creative, more individualized assessment, perhaps by individual class, or by individual professor. This is an issue which needs to be addressed at the Division level.</p>

**Program:** Psychology (continued)

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
<p>professors routinely assess their teaching methods, testing methods, and the like, and make adjustments in the best educational interests of the students and the institution, but that effort has been “standardized” and emasculated by administrative requirements to quantify the efforts, thereby rendering the results more easily “reviewed” and perhaps “compared” administratively. Besides unduly restricting the academic and intellectual flexibility previously enjoyed, the “snapshot” currently required is generic and perhaps truly not reflective of the individualized and ingenious assessment being conducted simultaneously with the administratively imposed generic assessment.</p>	

**Program:** Sociology

<b>Key Findings / Issues</b>	<b>Action Plans</b>
Data under Collection and Review	