

2020 – 21 & 2021 - 22 General Education Executive Summary

Department: Human and Social Sciences	Date: 06/14/2022
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Kathy Miller and Sara Brady	
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> See attached rubric and spreadsheet. Kathy Miller and Sara Brady scored one SOC 101 (Introduction to Sociology) and one SOC 361 (Social Theory) artifact together according to the rubric. Then each one of us took 7 SOC 101 artifacts and 7 SOC 361 artifacts. The attached spreadsheet shows the individual scores. Sara Brady, then, used Microsoft Excel to calculate the means standard deviations, and t test p values for each of the four categories of the rubric.	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Q1: To what extent are entry-level and senior-level behavioral science students knowledgeable about the main disciplinary components of their respective field? Q2: To what extent do entry-level and senior-level behavioral science students apply their knowledge about their discipline to a specific scenario or case study? Q3: Do senior-level behavioral science students display higher levels of knowledge than entry-level behavioral science students? **NOTE: the CEL questions from the General Education Plan have been removed from this executive summary. 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> SOC 361 students scored significantly higher than SOC 101 students on identification and application of sociological theories, $ps < .05$. SOC 101 students scored significantly higher than SOC 361 students on discussing strengths and limitations of a sociological theory, $p < .001$. There were no differences between SOC 101 and SOC 361 students in terms of analysis of a sociological theory, $p = .110$. Only SOC 361 (on average) did not demonstrate proficiency in one of the areas of the rubric (discussing strengths and limitations). 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Overall, lower-level and upper-level behavioral science students are knowledgeable about the main disciplinary components of sociology with upper-level students demonstrating a greater proficiency than lower-level students or at least half of the rubric categories. Overall, lower-level and upper-level behavioral science students are capable of applying their knowledge toward specific examples relevant to the field of sociology, with upper-level students demonstrating a greater proficiency than lower-level students. Across 2 out of 4 rubric criteria, upper-level behavioral science students displayed greater knowledge about sociological theories than did lower-level students. However, lower-level students performed similarly or better than upper-level students in theoretical analysis and discussing strengths and limitations of sociological theories. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e., interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Unlike students enrolled in SOC 101, students enrolled in SOC 361 were not given explicit instructions to discuss the strengths and limitations of their chosen sociological theory. Therefore, the differences between SOC 101 and SOC 361 in terms of being able to discuss the strengths and limitations of a sociological theory are most likely due to the instructions given to students at the time the artifacts were collected.	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared?</i> Date: June 14, 2022 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e., met as a department)</i> Email <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Thad Warren, Kathy Miller, and Sara Brady	
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> Faculty will continue to emphasize sociological theory in both lower-level and upper-level courses. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Instructions will be given that allow students the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge in the strengths and limitations of a given sociological theory.	

c. *Program*: Behavioral science students will be given instruction on sociological theory with specific emphasis on comparing sociological theories to each other. This assessment only measured their knowledge of one specific theory.

d. *Assessment*: Future assessments will ensure equivalent instructions are given to both lower-level and upper-level students.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Our program will work toward revising the questions in each classes' assignment so that they are able to be better compared. In doing so, we can better assess student learning (knowledge) in the next academic year.

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).*
There are no budget implications.

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? Assessing strengths and weaknesses of all sociological theories is an interesting question that has yet to be fully investigated.

Submitted by:Sara Brady **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 6/23/22

Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed:Approved – 6/23/22

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Behavioral Science/Sociology Assessment Essay

Purpose

The purpose of the essay is to analyze critically the major theoretical perspectives of sociology, apply one theoretical perspective to a specific scenario, and discuss the strengths and limitations of that theoretical perspective to address and explain society and social behavior.

Content

Your written, typed essay should address the following:

1. Identify the three main theoretical perspectives in sociology for explaining human social behavior and society. (Functionalism, Conflict and Symbolic Interaction)
2. Identify and explain the core characteristics of one of these theoretical approaches (models) that you most identify with. (need minimum of 3 characteristics)
3. In detail, generate a specific scenario/example that you will apply this theoretical perspective to. (Keep in mind if you chose a micro or macro perspective and that your scenario/example fits that level.) Apply this theoretical approach/perspective to explain assumptions and views about the scenario/example you chose. Use the core characteristics explained earlier in your explanation to apply to your scenario and explain it with those characteristics.
4. Be sure to address and include the strengths and limitations of the perspective that you choose. Adequately compare and contrast the other sociological perspectives when addressing the strengths and limitations of the theory that you chose to analyze and explain.
5. Use relevant, scholarly sources to support main ideas and arguments. Scholarly sources could include peer-reviewed articles, textbooks, or edited books.

Form

1. Essay should be between 3-5 pages, double-spaced.
2. Essay should include a defined introduction, body, and conclusion.
3. Essay should use standard grammar, spelling, and punctuation.
4. Essay should adhere to basic APA, MLA or Chicago style in form and citation style. (Be consistent whatever style you use.) Essay should include a title page and reference page (an abstract page is not necessary).

Knowledge Rubric

Criteria	Exemplary = 3	Proficient = 2	Basic =1	Failing = 0
Identification of main disciplinary components <i>Identifying common concepts of discipline (i.e., psychology, sociology, criminal justice, Christian-education leadership)</i>	Identifies all disciplinary components correctly and cogently.	Identifies most disciplinary components.	Minimally identifies disciplinary components.	Does not identify common disciplinary components.
Analysis of one disciplinary component <i>Analyzing one component of disciplinary concept in detail</i>	Analyzes disciplinary component in detail and correctly identifies all major sub-components of disciplinary concept.	Analyzes most of disciplinary component correctly and identifies most of the major sub-components of disciplinary concept.	Minimally analyzes disciplinary component correctly and minimally identifies the major sub-components of disciplinary concept.	Does not correctly analyze any of the disciplinary concepts.
Application of disciplinary component <i>Applying component of disciplinary concept to a novel scenario in a person's everyday life or in their profession/vocation</i>	Applies completely all major sub-components of disciplinary concept to a novel scenario and correctly applies concepts.	Applies most of major sub-component of disciplinary concept to a novel scenario. Most of sub-components are applied correctly.	Minimally applies major sub-components of disciplinary concept to a novel scenario. Some of sub-components are applied correctly.	Does not apply the disciplinary concept to a novel scenario.
Strengths and limitations <i>Identifying the strengths and limitations of disciplinary concept in practice and/or application</i>	Identified the strengths and limitations of explained disciplinary concepts by adequately comparing and contrasting other disciplinary concepts with the present concept explained in essay. Knowledge of the other disciplinary components is clearly evident.	Identified most strengths and limitations of the explained disciplinary concept. Compared and contrasted most of the other disciplinary concepts. Knowledge of the other disciplinary components is evident.	Minimally identified strengths and limitations of explained disciplinary concept. Minimally compared and contrasted other disciplinary concepts. Awareness of some the other disciplinary components is evident.	Does not address strengths or limitations of disciplinary concept.

Data from Artifacts

class	id of dis	analy	applic	str/limits
101-1	2	3	2	0
101-2	1	3	2	1
101-3	1	3	3	1
101-4	1	3	3	1
101-5	0	1	3	0
101-6	2	2	3	1
101-7	2	1	3	0
101-8	0	1	0	1.5
101-9	1	2	2	1.5
101-10	1	2	2	3
101-11	0	2	1	1.5
101-12	3	3	2	2
101-13	1	1.5	1.5	0
101-14	0	2	1	0
101-15	3	3	2	3
361-1	3	3	3	0
361-2	3	3	3	0
361-3	2	3	3	0
361-4	2	1	3	0
361-5	3	3	3	0
361-6	1	2	2	0
361-7	3	3	3	0
361-8	3	2	2	0
361-9	1	3	3	0
361-10	3	3	3	0
361-11	3	3	3	0
361-12	2	2	2	0
361-13	3	3	3	0
361-14	3	3	3	0
361-15	3	2	2	0

Analysis of Artifacts

	Id M & SD		Analy M & SD		App M & SD		S/L M & SD	
SOC 101	1.20	1.01	2.17	0.79	2.03	0.90	1.10	1.02
SOC 361	2.53	0.74	2.60	0.63	2.73	0.46	0.00	0.00
p	.000		.110		.012		.000	