

2020 – 21 & 2021 - 22 General Education Executive Summary

Department: History, Geography, Intercultural Studies & Modern Languages	Date: 6/3/2021
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Joel Helmer, Matt Phillips, John Hink, Vicki Anderson, Amy Royuk, Tobin Beck	
See General Education Assessment Plan for: a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology	
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Students completed a pre-test map test during the first week of class and the same test at the end of the semester. The test consisted of labeling/identifying countries, major cities, water bodies, and prominent landforms from around the world. Scores were then compared. During the semester, each student completed a series of eleven map quizzes from different world regions, including the places included on the pre and post tests.	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Do students in Geog 202: World Regional Geography learn to identify geographic features on a world map? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> 46 students completed both the pre and post test. All but one showed improvement between the two tests, and that student scored the same. The average for the pre-test was 38% while the average for the post-test was 72%. 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Students showed a dramatic improvement in their ability to identify places on a map. This demonstrates that requiring map quizzes during the semester does improve student geographic literacy and locating places on a world map. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> NA	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6/3/2021 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> via email <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Tobin Beck, Joel Helmer, Matt Phillips, Vicki Anderson, John Hink, Amy Royuk	
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION *- <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> Requiring memorization of places in geography courses is important and we will also consider adding these to other disciplines. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> We will continue to give map quizzes in World Regional Geography. c. <i>Program:</i> Continue to focus on teaching about our world through geography, history, political science, and modern languages. d. <i>Assessment:</i> It would be interesting to develop a pre and post test for other disciplines and compare results. 2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Students will continue to improve their geographic literacy. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> NA	
If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.	

What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? na

Submitted by:Joel Helmer **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 7/6/2021

Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed:Approved 7/6/2021

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na