



## Annual Assessment Report 2022-2023

### BS Geography (Geospatial Analysis, Environmental Studies, Geographic Studies)

### Geography & Anthropology

### College of Letters, Arts, & Social Sciences

#### CONTACT

**Name of Program Assessment Lead** Lin Wu and Katherine Kinkopf

**Name of Person Completing Report** Lin Wu and Katherine Kinkopf

**DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION** No

#### DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

**How were the program's SLOs developed? (select all that apply)**

- We do not have disciplinary accreditation but drew from our disciplinary/professional organizations, and developed our SLOs as a program/department.
- We developed them as a program/department using our own knowledge and expertise of the field.

**Other than the [CPP Catalog](#) and the [Office of Assessment and Program Review website](#), where else are your SLOs published? Select all that apply.**

- Department Website - provide URL: <https://www.cpp.edu/class/geography-anthropology/about/geography-learning-outcomes.shtml>
- Published in alternative place. Please specify: Printed SLOs department entrance flyer rack near Bldg. 5-150

#### ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN 2022-2023

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2022-2023**. This includes data collection, rubric development, data analysis, discussion of findings, development or implementation of closing the loop improvement strategies, update of your assessment plan and/or curriculum matrix, etc.

**How many total SLOs does your program assess according to your assessment plan?**

- 3

**How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2022-2023?**

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2022-2023 (e.g., artifact collection, scoring, closing the loop, etc.). May also have engaged in assessment planning activities unrelated to specific SLOs (e.g., modified curriculum matrix, assessment plan, etc.).

**Please list the SLOs examined**

- SLO #1: SLO 2a: Students will be able to identify, define, and draw conclusions to research problems in physical and/or human geography fields and be able to propose solutions to these problems.
- SLO #2: SLO 2b: Students will be able to observe, collect, evaluate, and process geographic data using geospatial technology tools and methods.
- SLO #3: SLO 2c: Students will be able to perform data analysis qualitatively and quantitatively using geospatial tools and methods such as GIS, remote sensing, modeling software, and statistical methods.

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 2a: Students will be able to identify, define, and draw conclusions to research problems in physical and/or human geography fields and be able to propose solutions to these problems.**

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)</li> <li>Scored direct evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework</li> <li>Capstone product (e.g., project, senior thesis, etc.)</li> <li>Portfolio/E-portfolio of student work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used rubric or scoring guide</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.)</li> <li>Scored indirect evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for indirect evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement</li> <li>Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed assessment results to make program decisions to improve SLO achievement (e.g., design new course, modify assignments, etc.)</li> <li>Implemented closing the loop improvement strategies to improve SLO achievement</li> </ul>		

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
15	The proportion of reaching M, D, I level with each criterion	Yes	Our students, in general, are doing well as expected, most performing at master and development levels measured by each of the criteria. For SLO 2a, more students reach master levels in identifying problems and relevant geographic variables; more students are at development levels in suggesting solutions and drawing conclusions. We discussed ways we could help students improve by developing more exercises and assignments that give students more chances to practice data analysis, draw conclusions from analysis results, and propose solutions. While we have been working with students on these aspects through term projects and term papers, perhaps more exercises and assignments throughout the semester and repeated in different courses will better prepare them.

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 2b: Students will be able to observe, collect, evaluate, and process geographic data using geospatial technology tools and methods.**

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)</li> <li>Scored direct evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework</li> <li>Capstone product (e.g., project, senior thesis, etc.)</li> <li>Portfolio/E-portfolio of student work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used rubric or scoring guide</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.)</li> <li>Scored indirect evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for indirect evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement</li> <li>Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed assessment results to make program decisions to improve SLO achievement (e.g., design new course, modify assignments, etc.)</li> <li>Implemented closing the loop improvement strategies to improve SLO achievement</li> </ul>		

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
15	The proportion of reaching M, D, I level with each criterion	Yes	Our students, in general, are doing well as expected, most performing at master and development levels measured by each of the criteria. For SLO 2b, most students reached master levels in identifying, evaluating, collecting, and processing geographic data. We discussed ways we could help students improve by developing more exercises and assignments that give students more chances to practice data analysis, draw conclusions from analysis results, and propose solutions. While we have been working with students on these aspects through term projects and term papers, perhaps more exercises and assignments throughout the semester and repeated in different courses will better prepare them.

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 2c: Students will be able to perform data analysis qualitatively and quantitatively using geospatial tools and methods such as GIS, remote sensing, modeling software, and statistical methods.**

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)</li> <li>Scored direct evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework</li> <li>Capstone product (e.g., project, senior thesis, etc.)</li> <li>Publication or grant proposal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used rubric or scoring guide</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.)</li> <li>Scored indirect evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for indirect evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement</li> <li>Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed assessment results to make program decisions to improve SLO achievement (e.g., design new course, modify assignments, etc.)</li> <li>Implemented closing the loop improvement strategies to improve SLO achievement</li> </ul>		

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
15	The proportion of reaching M, D, I level with each criterion	Yes	Our students, in general, are doing well as expected, most performing at master and development levels measured by each of the criteria. For SLO 3c, about half reached the master level and half at the development level in geographic data analysis. We discussed ways we could help students improve by developing more exercises and assignments that give students more chances to practice data analysis, draw conclusions from analysis results, and propose solutions. While we have been working with students on these aspects through term projects and term papers, perhaps more exercises and assignments throughout the semester and repeated in different courses will better prepare them.

## IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

**Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2022-2023? Select all that apply.**

- Assessment procedure changes (SLOs, curriculum matrix, rubrics, evidence collected, sampling, communications with faculty, etc.)
- Course-level changes (e.g., syllabus, content, pedagogy)
- Program curricular changes (e.g. course sequencing, changes to required curriculum, added or deleted courses)

**Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2021-2022? Select all that apply.**

- Program/department faculty as whole
- A committee of program/department faculty
- College curriculum committee
- College assessment committee
- College Assessment Liaison
- Students

**The past academic year posed both challenges and opportunities. Please share any assessment discoveries (e.g., insights about assessment procedures, great achievements, etc.) regarding program assessment in 2022-2023 so that others may learn from your experiences.**

The department used student portfolios as the main assessment data for years. Qualitative approaches were used to assess portfolios and worked well. However, we found that well-designed assignments may work better with quantitative approaches using rubrics. The department faculty discussed that as we continue to collect portfolios as our assessment data, we will develop more assignments to help assess specific SLOs.

**Please share how the program triangulates various data sources to determine student success. Consider assessment findings, [CPP's GI2025 markers](#), [CSU Dashboard](#), [CPP's Student Success Dashboard on Tableau](#), course evaluations, etc.**

Following what we discussed in last year's report, the department faculty reviewed our course GAP data provided by the CSU dashboard. We found that most of our courses had a small or no gap in all the categories; one to two courses showed URM and Gender gaps. The department faculty discussed ways to reduce or close the gaps in these courses, including improving course design, assigning T/T faculty to these courses when possible, sharing these GAP data with part-time faculty, and discussing strategies to provide more support to students to close the gap.

**Does the program offer a certificate or credential (e.g., teaching credential)?**

- No

The most current assessment plan and curriculum matrix we have on file for your program may be found [here](#). To ensure we have the most updated assessment plan and curriculum matrix for your program, and for posting on our website, please upload the following documents:

**Assessment Plan** - Yes

**Curriculum Matrix** - Yes

If you would like us to review other assessment documents such as your evidence (e.g., assignment, survey, interview questions etc.) or scoring rubric, please upload/provide them. (Select all that apply)

- Rubric