

**Trend Data for Assessment Findings, Geography Undergraduate Program
June 2012**

Department/Program Geography/Undergraduate **Assessment Coordinator** Gebeyehu Mulugeta

Instrument	2009/2010 Results	Actions Taken	2010/2011 Results	Actions Taken	2011/2012 Results	Actions Taken	Summary
Graduation Rates	No Data		No Data		No Data		
1 st Year Retention Rates	One freshman major enrolled in 2008; didn't enroll 2 nd year.		No Data		No Data		
<i>Student Self Assessment (Indirect or Reflective Assessment Instrument)</i>	Overall, responses to questions indicate Satisfaction with program, but some responses to closed-ended questions suggest we should & can do better.	Results will be discussed at faculty meeting in fall 2010	Responses to questions indicate students are making satisfactory progress toward completing their studies; overall responses by students were judged to express satisfaction with the program.	Results were reported at program assessment meeting on 5/18/2011	Students said, compared to the previous year, they had a much better understanding of the world around them and the environment; they were better researchers & writers, more computer/internet-literate, and more confident and assertive; they could relate topics in geography to issues in their communities. Overall, the responses indicate satisfaction with the program..	Students didn't identify any area that needed improvement.	Student feedback were all positive and very encouraging.
<i>Geography Proficiency Test I</i>	(a) 2 majors and 2 minors took test; only 1 of the majors met the criterion ($\geq 70\%$) set for satisfactory performance with a score of 76%; the 2 nd major & the minor	a) Continuing effort to improve: Geog 2840 & 2860 developed & taught in 2008/2009 AY (b) GIS option introduced to attract quality students &	(a) 5 majors and 1 minor took test; only 2 of the majors met the criterion ($\geq 70\%$) set for satisfactory performance with a scores of 89% & 73%; 3 majors & the	Faculty re-examined questions that students had difficulty with and decided to rewrite some of questions and agreed to put more emphasis on	One geography took the test & scored 47%, much lower than the 70% or better set for a satisfactory performance. Among the four	Questions 4 and 12 in <i>Geog Prof Test I</i> and Question 6 in <i>Geog Prof Test II</i> will be modified;	The new courses that have been developed in the last three years appear to have helped; results suggest more needs to be done

	scored below 70% (b) Results showed student learning should be enhanced in all aspects of geography	increase number of majors (c) Results will be discussed at faculty meeting in fall 2010 to consider additional improvements.	geography minor scored below 70% (b) Results showed student learning should be enhanced further in the physical and technique areas.	concepts relating to the questions in their respective classes; Mark Bouman volunteered to draft a list of fundamental concepts that need to be emphasized to share with adjunct instructors.	geography minors who took the test, one student scored 79%, three scored in the 53-58 range, and one student scored 37%; among the minors, one student scored better than the minimum required for satisfactory performance.	instructors would give special emphasis to concepts in physical geography and the technique areas in all courses they teach; faculty would meet every two weeks starting on September 20, 2012, to consider different areas of focus (GIS, Environmental Studies, Urban Studies, Environmental Justice) for the major and develop a recruitment plan.	to achieve assessment goals.
Geography Proficiency Test II	a) 1 major and 2 minors took test; the major scored 63% and the two minors scored 65% & 61%. Scores didn't meet criterion (≥ 70) set for satisfactory performance	a) Continuing effort to improve: Geog 2840 & 2860 developed & taught in 2008/2009 AY (b) GIS option introduced to attract quality students & increase number of	a) 1 geog major and 1 geog minor took test; the major scored 76%, 6% higher than the threshold set for satisfactory performance, & the minor scored 63%,	Faculty discussed the results & recommended some changes to the assessment instrument.	Four geog minors took the test; the scores were 57%, 57%, 48%, and 46%; considering that the criterion	Questions 4 and 12 in Geog Prof Test I and Question 6 in Geog Prof Test II will be modified;	The new courses that have been developed in the last three years appear to have helped; results suggest more needs to be done to achieve

	<p>(b) Results showed student learning should be enhanced in all aspects of geography</p>	<p>majors (c) Results will be discussed at faculty meeting in fall 2010 to consider additional improvements.</p>	<p>7% lower than the threshold set for satisfactory performance. (b) Results showed student learning should be enhanced in all aspects of geography than the</p>		<p>(≥70%) for satisfactory performance was set for the geography majors, these performances by the geography minors are not considered bad, but they could do better than this.</p>	<p>instructors would give special emphasis to concepts in physical geography and the technique areas in all courses they teach; faculty would meet every two weeks starting on September 20, 2012, to consider different areas of focus (GIS, Environmental Studies, Urban Studies, Environmental Justice) for the major and develop a recruitment plan.</p>	<p>assessment goals.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---	--	--------------------------